

Federal Authority Advice Record (FAAR)**FAAR Response must be submitted by January 26, 2026**

[Beacon AI Centers Indus Project – Indus Power].

Registry File: [90121]

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Department/Agency | Health Canada |
| Lead Contact | Ayesha Sohail |
| Full Address | 9700 Jasper Avenue, Floor 09 Edmonton, Alberta T5J 4G3 |
| Email | Ayesha.Sohail@hc-sc.gc.ca |
| Telephone | 780-245-5793 |
| Alternate Contact | Claudia Schiocchet: Claudia.Schiocchet@hc-sc.gc.ca |

1. Will your department or agency exercise a **power, perform a duty or function**, or provide **financial assistance**, related to the project to enable it to be carried out in whole or in part?

As relevant,

- Specify the power, duty or function, or financial assistance, and the likelihood that it will be required to construct the project, based on the Initial Project Description, as either Required, Potential, Likely, Unlikely or Not Required
- Describe any associated Indigenous or public consultation, including timelines
- Describe any associated information requirements (e.g., alternative means assessment, habitat offsetting), and specify those that may be coordinated with the impact assessment process, if an impact assessment is required
- Identify any associated project-specific guidance or issues of which the proponent should be aware, or information the proponent should provide
- Indicate whether your department or agency has identified any power that it will not be exercising or may not be able to exercise to allow the project to be carried out, in whole or in part.

[Health Canada \(HC\) will not exercise a power, perform a duty or function, or provide financial assistance related to the Project.](#)

2. **Using Table 1**, identify project- and context- specific **key issues**, based on the expertise within your mandate¹ and the information in your possession, including the Initial Project Description, any exchanges with the proponent or others related to the project and known means to address the effects of the project. For each key issue:
- Specify the key issue (e.g., specific species and location)
 - Specify the project component or activity linked to the key issue
 - Explain why it's a key issue based on:
 - biophysical effect pathway(s) from the specific project component or activity
 - concern unique to the project or a priority within your mandate
 - the issue being material² to decision making under the *Impact Assessment Act*
 - Identify how the issue could be resolved, including through means other than an impact assessment
 - Identify additional information the proponent could provide including to give confidence on how the issue can be addressed through other means.

Ayesha Sohail

Name and title of Departmental /
Agency Responder

January 26, 2026

Date

¹ Refer to the [Memoranda of Understanding with IAAC](#).

² An issue is material to decision making if its analysis is anticipated to affect the conclusions on (1) whether adverse effects within federal jurisdiction or direct and incidental adverse effects (collectively adverse federal effects) are likely not significant, or of low, medium or high significance; (2) appropriate mitigation measures for significant adverse federal effects; or (3) justification in the public interest.

Table 1: Key Issues to inform the impact assessment process

This table should outline key issues to inform the impact assessment process, including whether an impact assessment is required and, if so, the scope of the assessment and tailoring of the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines.

Key issues are the major concerns directly related to a project component or activity, the analysis of which is anticipated to be material to decision-making under the *Impact Assessment Act*.

Federal authorities' advice should be guided by the identification and resolution of key issues. If an impact assessment is required, it will be focused on key issues.

| Comment ID | a) Key issue | b) Project component or activity | c)(i) Biophysical effect pathway(s) | c)(ii) Concern unique to the project or a priority within your mandate | c)(iii) Material to federal decision-making | d) Means for issue resolution | e) Additional information from the proponent |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| <p><i>Identify comments by organization and comment number.</i></p> <p>e.g.: IAAC-01</p> | <p><i>Specify the key issue (e.g., specific species and location).</i></p> | <p><i>Identify the project component or activity linked to the key issue.</i></p> <p><i>Be specific about the nature, scale, novelty and complexity or the component or activity.</i></p> | <p><i>Identify the specific biophysical effect pathway between the project component or activity and the affected environmental or human receptor (including Indigenous Peoples).</i></p> | <p><i>Describe why it's a key issue within the mandate of your department or agency, including in terms of priorities of the federal government and in terms of anticipated likelihood, severity or uncertainty of effects.</i></p> <p><i>Identify if the key issue is common for projects of this nature or in this sector, or whether it's unique to this project due to its complexity, size or novelty; a sensitive or rare receiving environment; and/or proximity of sensitive environmental or human receptors (including Indigenous Peoples).</i></p> | <p><i>Describe why the key issue is material to decision-making as either:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>an adverse effect within federal jurisdiction, or a direct or incidental adverse effect, that may be significant based on available evidence including:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>federal experts' knowledge and experience with past project assessments;</i> ○ <i>presence of sensitive species, habitats or human receptors (including Indigenous Peoples);</i> ○ <i>novel or complex project activities, components or technologies;</i> ○ <i>high uncertainties in effects or in the effectiveness of mitigation measures;</i> ○ <i>unknown or unproven mitigation; or</i> • <i>a factor for the justification in the public interest anticipated to be material to decision-making such as a likely positive effect contributing to sustainability, to Canada's environmental obligations or climate change commitments or in supporting governmental priorities, such as reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples.</i> | <p><i>Describe how the key issue could be resolved or addressed by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Any means, including powers, duties, functions, frameworks, policies or guidance that your department or agency has;</i> • <i>Any means, including powers, duties, functions, frameworks, policies or guidance from another jurisdiction, including the province;</i> • <i>Common, proven, well-understood or standard mitigation measures to mitigate the effect or effect pathway(s); or</i> • <i>Commitments made by the proponent (e.g., in the Initial Project Description).</i> | <p><i>Describe information the proponent can provide, or commitments the proponent can make, in their Response to the Summary of Issues that would provide confidence that the issue can be resolved by existing means.</i></p> <p><i>Consider whether information, studies, analyses or collaborative work with other authorities would be required to address the issue beyond existing means.</i></p> |
| <p>HC-01</p> | <p>Changes to ambient air quality may lead to potential exposure of Indigenous receptors to airborne Contaminants of Potential Concern (CoPCs).</p> | <p>Construction and operations of the 1,494 MW fossil fuel fired power generation facility may result in the emission of air borne contaminants.</p> | <p>Project related air emissions could result in Indigenous peoples being exposed to CoPCs.</p> <p>An example of a potential exposure route includes inhalation of CoPCs in air contaminated via natural gas combustion, operation of diesel equipment, and dust.</p> | <p>Under the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i>, Health Canada (HC) provides expert information and knowledge to support the assessment of impacts on Indigenous health.</p> <p>Air emissions are expected from Project activities which might lead to impacts on Indigenous health, an area of federal jurisdiction. For non-threshold air pollutants</p> | <p>As per <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> Sections 2(e) and 2(f), adverse effects on the health of Indigenous peoples related to the Project falls within federal jurisdiction.</p> <p>The Project is located in Rocky View County, Alberta, within Treaty 7 territory, the traditional lands of the Blackfoot Confederacy (Siksika, Kainai, Piikani), the Tsuut'ina First Nation, and the Stoney Nakoda Nations (Bears paw, Chiniki, and Goodstoney), and within the Rocky View Métis District of the Otipemisiwak Métis Government. The closest reserve is Tsuut'ina Nation, approximately 23km west of the Project. The Project is 3km east of the City of Calgary and is within the Calgary Regional Airshed Zone. Calgary is a major urban center which houses an urban Indigenous population who may choose to</p> | <p>The iPD provides an air quality assessment for the Project. According to that assessment, the maximum predicted NO₂, CO, and PM_{2.5} concentrations will remain below the Alberta Ambient Air Quality Objectives and Guidelines (AAAQO/G).</p> <p>HC recommends that the most stringent air quality objectives or standards (e.g., Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) or the World Health Organization (WHO) global air quality guidelines for fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂)) be used when undertaking air quality assessments. It is important, during air quality assessments to consider health-</p> | <p>HC recommends comparing the air dispersion modelling results against solely health-based guidelines and encourages identifying any monitoring/adaptive management commitments as needed.</p> <p>HC recommends implementing all economically and technologically feasible mitigation measures to limit emissions of non-</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>(e.g., fine particulate matter [PM_{2.5}] and nitrogen dioxide [NO₂]), air quality criteria and guidelines should not be used as 'pollute-up-to levels', since any increase in exposure will result in an incremental population risk.</p> <p>HC does not have knowledge of the receiving environment being sensitive or rare.</p> | engage in traditional land use activities in the region. | <p>protective guidelines, including for non-threshold contaminants for which health effects can be observed at any level of exposure. Further, applicable air quality standards, such as the CAAQS, should not be considered as "pollute up-to" levels and the Proponent is encouraged to strive for continuous improvement.</p> <p>HC notes and is supportive of the proposed use of a Continuous Emissions Monitoring System (CEMS) for the three combustion gas turbines exhausts with (selective catalytic reduction) SCR systems expected to provide approximately 70% NO_x reduction.</p> | threshold air contaminants to the extent possible. |
| | | | | | | | |

Please insert additional rows as necessary.