

From: Doncrest Community

Sent: Monday, September 16, 2024 2:26 PM

To: Clerks Richmondhill clerks@richmondhill.ca

Subject: INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS - FEB 23/24

Dear Clerks of Richmond Hill,

I have registered as a delegate through xxx, and I would like to request this information and documentation to be included in the Committee of the Whole Meeting on September 18, 2024 for all the delegates. Thank you very much.

Kind Regards,

Jack Tai

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Doncrest Community

Date: Fri, Feb 23, 2024 at 10:21 PM

Subject: URGENT Information to support a Council vote to issue a non-concurrence letter to Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED) with reference to the Rogers Communications Telecommunications Facility Proposal; Rogers Site Code: C8136; City File #: TELE-22-0001; Address: 120 West Beaver Creek Road, Richmond Hill, Ontario; Legal: PT of Common Element York Region Condominium Plan NO. 606; Coordinates: Lat: (NAD 83) N 43° 51' 0.3" & Long (NAD 83) W 79° 23 41.4"

To: officemayor@richmondhill.ca, godwin.chan@richmondhill.ca, joe.dipaola@richmondhill.ca, carol.davidson@richmondhill.ca, scott.thompson@richmondhill.ca, castro.liu@richmondhill.ca, simon.cui@richmondhill.ca, karen.cilevitz@richmondhill.ca, michael.shiu@richmondhill.ca

Cc: Umar Javed umar.javed@richmondhill.ca , Sandra DeMaria Sandra.demaria@richmondhill.ca

Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

More than 8-months ago, May 30, 2023, Forbes Bros acting for Rogers Communications (Proponent) requested, and was granted, an extension of their public consultation process re City-File #: TELE-22-0001.

On Jan 12, 2024 notification was received from the Proponent that they are now preparing to put their proposal before Council (no date was provided).

Our attached letter labeled “Request for Richmond Hill Councillors to vote non-concurrence re 120 West Beaver Creek” provides information on SECTIONS 1 – 4 outlined below.

SECTION 1:

1.1 Photographic evidence of proximity to residential area and visual disruption to residents’ enjoyment of property.

1.2 Potential Adverse Impacts on Health: Too Close to School, Residents, Recreational Areas.

SECTION 2:

2.1 Information obtained on August 24, 2023 through the Municipal Freedom of Information Act revealed irregularities on the application and failure to provide all required documentation.

2.2 Proponent’s failure to adhere to Government of Canada’s Innovation, Science and Economic Development (ISED) CPC-2-0-03 - Radiocommunication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems (CPC-2-0-03) and the Richmond Hill 2021 RADIO-COMMUNICATION AND BROADCASTING ANTENNA SYSTEMS PUBLIC CONSULTATION APPLICATION FORM (City Protocol)

SECTION 3:

3.1 Inadequate Public Consultation.

3.2 Proponent's Response to Questions Submitted by the Public – Request for Responsibility and Accountability for Answers Provided by the Proponent.

SECTION 4:

4.1 No Proof of a Gap in Service. 193 Residents and commercial business representatives have signed a petition opposing the proposed Rogers installation at 120 West Beaver Creek, plus 513 on-line signatures. (petition attached).

4.2 Liability – Question not adequately answered.

There is ample evidence that if the proposed cell tower is installed and activated people will be harmed. If the information provided is not sufficient to issue a letter of non-concurrence to ISED, please let us know what additional substantiation you require.

Please confirm receipt of this email.

Respectfully,

The Doncrest Community and Concerned Richmond Hill Residents

Representing 193 constituents composed of 171 Doncrest residents and 22 West Beaver Creek commercial unit representatives.

Supporting Attachments referenced in the Letter:

- 1 Resident_Owner Written Comments Questions to Rogers Site Code_C8136_FC-Response 2_09.25 FINAL.pdf
- FOI RH App and Authorization of Registered Owner_000385.pdf
- FOI RH letter from Jennifer Antico_000386.pdf
- 4 C8136 Location Frequencies 2023.pdf
- Petition

Date: February 23, 2024

- To: Mayor David West; officemayor@richmondhill.ca
Deputy Mayor, Godwin Chan; godwin.chan@richmondhill.ca
Regional & Local Councillor, Joe DiPaola; joe.dipaola@richmondhill.ca
Councillor, Carol Davidson; carol.davidson@richmondhill.ca
Councillor, Scott Thompson; scott.thompson@richmondhill.ca
Councillor, Castro Liu; castro.liu@richmondhill.ca
Councillor, Simon Cui; simon.cui@richmondhill.ca
Councillor, Karen Cilevitz; karen.cilevitz@richmondhill.ca
Councillor, Michael Shiu; michael.shiu@richmondhill.ca
- cc: Umar Javed, BURPI Planner I – Development Planning Division | Planning and Building Services;
umar.javed@richmondhill.ca
- cc: Sandra DeMaria, MCIP, RPP. Manager of Development – Site Plans. Development Planning Division, Planning and Infrastructure; Sandra.demaria@richmondhill.ca
- cc: Doncrest Community and Concerned Richmond Hill Residents; doncrestcommunity@gmail.com

Subject: URGENT Information to support a Council vote to issue a non-concurrence letter to Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED) with reference to the Rogers Communications Telecommunications Facility Proposal; Rogers Site Code: C8136; City File #: TELE-22-0001; Address: 120 West Beaver Creek Road, Richmond Hill, Ontario; Legal: PT of Common Element York Region Condominium Plan NO. 606; Coordinates: Lat: (NAD 83) N 43° 51' 0.3" & Long (NAD 83) W 79° 23 41.4"

More than 8-months ago, Forbes Bros acting for Rogers Communications (Proponent) requested a "pause" in their public consultation process. A widely distributed email from Sean Ogilvie <sogilvie@forbesbrosLtd.ca> Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2023 11:24 PM Quote: *"...we have also requested an extension as we are still receiving/expecting some public input and follow-up replies from members of the public..."*

On Jan 12, 2024 a widely distributed email from Sarah Duncan <sduncan@forbesbrosLtd.ca> Date: Fri, Jan 12, 2024 at 2:01 PM Subject: Update: Proposed Rogers tower site C8136 - 120 West Beaver Creek Rd., Richmond Hill ON (City file: #TELE-22-0001) Quote: *"On behalf of Rogers, we have reviewed and compiled all the feedback received since March 2023."* Quote: *"As noted in the May 30th email, we will advise you of a future Council date."*

Two attachments, provided in Ms. Duncan's email noted above, have been included with this letter for reference purposes; attachment labeled *"1 Resident_Owner Written Comments Questions to Rogers Site Code_C8136_FB Response 2-09.25 Final.pdf"* and attachment labelled *"4 C8136 Location Frequencies 2023"*.

We respectfully ask Councillors to vote for a non-concurrence letter to ISED at the Council Meeting, and we provide our reasons to support this request:

SECTION 1:

- 1.1 Photographic evidence of proximity to residential area and visual disruption to residents' enjoyment of property.**
- 1.2 Potential Adverse Impacts on Health: Too Close to School, Residents, Recreational Areas.**

SECTION 2:

2.1 Information obtained on August 24, 2023 through the Municipal Freedom of Information Act revealed irregularities on the application and failure to provide all required documentation.

2.2 Proponent’s failure to adhere to Government of Canada’s Innovation, Science and Economic Development (ISED) CPC-2-0-03 - Radiocommunication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems (CPC-2-0-03) and the Richmond Hill 2021 RADIO-COMMUNICATION AND BROADCASTING ANTENNA SYSTEMS PUBLIC CONSULTATION APPLICATION FORM (City Protocol)

SECTION 3:

3.1 Inadequate Public Consultation.

3.2 Proponent Response to Questions Submitted by the Public – Request for Responsibility and Accountability for Answers Provided by the Proponent.

SECTION 4:

4.1 No Proof of a Gap in Service. 193 Residents and commercial business representatives have signed a petition opposing the proposed Rogers installation at 120 West Beaver Creek, plus 513 on-line signatures. (petition attached).

4.2 Liability – Question not adequately answered.

SECTION 1:

1.1 Photographic evidence of proximity to residential area and visual disruption to residents’ enjoyment of property.

NOTE: In the Proponent’s widely distributed email dated Jan 12, 2024, attachment labeled “1 Resident_Owner Written Comments Questions to Rogers Site Code_C8136_ FB Response 2-09.25 Final.pdf” (attached), there are a number of questions asking for information on the number of antennas to be attached to tower; the Proponent’s answers consistently reference a total of **12 antennas** being attached to the proposed cell tower. Referencing Proponent’s email dated Jan 12, 2024 attachment labeled “4 C8136 Location Frequencies 2023” documents **42 transmitters** for this site.

Comparison of three photographs of the proposed cell tower:

Figure 1. – Undated photo provided in the Forbes Bros *INFORMATION PACKAGE FOR A ROGERS COMMUNICATIONS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY PROPOSAL at 120 WEST BEAVER CREEK ROAD, RICHMOND HILL ON* does not indicate at what distance the photo was taken. Forbes Bros notes below the photo “Above: simulated steel lattice tri-pole tower as it would appear from West Beaver Creek Road looking west. Please note that although considered to be accurate, this is an artist’s rendering only.”



Above: simulated steel lattice tri-pole tower as it would appear from West Beaver Creek Road looking west. Please note that although considered to be accurate, this is an artist’s rendering only.

Figure 2. Photo dated Jan 24, 2024 “resident’s rendering” of the proposed tower (tower design as specified in proponent’s information package), taken at a **distance of 150 meters**, looking east from Red Oak Drive, facing the proposed cell tower site, showing visual disruption to residents at a **tower height of 27 meters**. The “resident’s rendering” depicts **approximately 8 antennas** not the **42 transmitters** the Proponent documents for this site in attachment labelled “**4 C8136 Location Frequencies 2023**”. NOTE: A VERY YOUNG CHILD’S BEDROOM, SITUATED ON THE 2ND FLOOR, IS 110 METERS FROM THE PROPOSED CELL TOWER SITE.



Elevation and distance measurements provided by Google Earth Pro.

Figure 3. Photo dated Jan 24, 2024 “resident’s rendering” of the proposed tower (tower design as specified in proponent’s information package), taken at a **distance of 150 meters**, looking east from Red Oak Drive, facing the proposed cell tower site, showing visual disruption to residents at a **tower height of 33.75 meters** (cell tower height could be increased by 25% after one year - without consultation). The “resident’s rendering” depicts **approximately 16 antennas**. Proponent did not provide information on how many additional transmitters – over and above the **42 proposed transmitters** at a tower height of 27m – could be added to the tower at the increased height. NOTE: A VERY YOUNG CHILD’S BEDROOM, SITUATED ON THE 2ND FLOOR, IS 110 METERS FROM THE PROPOSED CELL TOWER SITE.



Elevation and distance measurements provided by Google Earth Pro.

1.2 Potential Adverse Impacts on Health: Too Close to School, Residents, Recreational Areas.

There is ample evidence that if the proposed cell tower is installed and activated people will be harmed.

The Doncrest Public School is within 400 meters from the proposed cell tower. Numerous peer reviewed science studies recommended a buffer zone of at least 500 meters between school and cell towers. <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/5GCell-Towers-Near-Schools-Children-Scientific-Research-Briefing-.pdf>

More than 40 peer reviewed science studies have proved long term biological harm to people living within 400 meters <https://ehtrust.org/cell-towers-and-cell-antennae/compilation-of-research-studies-on-cell-tower-radiation-and-health/>

A recent review:

Balmori, A. (2022). **Evidence for a health risk by RF on humans living around mobile phone base stations: From radiofrequency sickness to cancer.** *Environmental Research*, 113851. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.113851>

Other relevant studies indicating harm for people living close to cell towers (base stations):

1. Rodrigues, N. C. P., Dode, A. C., de Noronha Andrade, M. K., O'Dwyer, G., Monteiro, D. L. M., Reis, I. N. C., ... Lino, V. T. S. (2021). **The Effect of Continuous Low-Intensity Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields from Radio Base Stations to Cancer Mortality in Brazil.** *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(3). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18031229>

2. Zothansiam, -, Zosangzuali, M., Lalramdinpui, M., & Jagetia, G. C. (2017). **Impact of radiofrequency radiation on DNA damage and antioxidants in peripheral blood lymphocytes of humans residing in the vicinity of mobile phone base stations.** *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15368378.2017.1350584>

Limits for human exposure in Safety Code 6 for cell tower type emissions are based only on thermal/heating effects based on a 6-minute exposure. See Table 5: <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/health-risks-safety/limits-human-exposure-radiofrequency-electromagnetic-energy-range-3-300.html>

Radiofrequency radiation (RF) is an agent classified by the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer (WHO-IARC) as "Group 2B, a possible human carcinogen."

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5504984/#:~:text=RF%20radiation%20was%20classified%20as,health%20hazards%20from%20RF%20radiation>

Radiofrequency-Electromagnetic Radiation (RF-EMR) is scheduled to be re-evaluated by WHO-IARC. Many medical doctors and researchers assert that there is now enough evidence that RF-EMR should be classified as a Group 1 *known* carcinogen.

Please see the following peer-reviewed paper by Anthony B. Miller, a Canadian MD and cancer epidemiologist. Dr. Miller worked on the monograph which presented the evidence for a Group 2B classification.

1. Miller, A. B., Morgan, L. L., Udasin, I., & Davis, D. L. (2018). **Cancer epidemiology update, following the 2011 IARC evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (Monograph 102).** *Environmental Research*, 167(673- 683). DOI. 10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.043). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.043>

2. Miller, A. B., Sears, M. E., Morgan, L. L., Davis, D. L., Hardell, L., Oremus, M., & Soskolne, C. L. (2019). **Risks to Health and Well-Being From Radio-Frequency Radiation Emitted by Cell Phones and Other Wireless Devices.** *Frontiers in Public Health*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2019.00223>

Abstracts available in Appendix.

SECTION 2:

2.1 Information obtained on August 24, 2023 through the Municipal Freedom of Information Act revealed irregularities on the application and failure to provide all required documentation.

The proponent's application was obtained through "Notice of Collection". "The information collected on this form is authorized under the Planning Act R.S.O. 1990 as amended, c. P.13. All information is considered to be available to the members of the PUBLIC upon demand. This practice is in accordance with the principles contained in the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act."

Referencing: **Richmond Hill 2021 RADIO-COMMUNICATION AND BROADCASTING ANTENNA SYSTEMS PUBLIC CONSULTATION APPLICATION FORM** Date stamped CITY OF RICHMOND HILL PLANNING AND REGULATORY SERVICES DEPARTMENT JULY 27 2022 RECEIVED.

2.1.1 Irregularities in the proponent's submission: (*scanned FOI App and Authorization of Registered Owner-000385)

- The application was neither signed nor dated.*

2.1.2. Section: **Authorization of Registered Owner(s)**

- Quote: "I Jennifer Antico of the City of Burlington in the Province of Ontario solemnly declare that all of the above statements contained within the application are true and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the *Canada Evidence Act*." Ms. Antico did not sign nor date this statement.*
- Reference is made on this page to "Please refer to the attached Owner's Authorization" this attachment was not included in the material provided.

2.1.3. Incomplete application – (**scanned FOI letter from Jennifer Antico_000386)

- Quoting unsigned letter to Simone Fiore, Planner 11, Subdivisions City of Richmond Hill dated May 5, 2022 from Jennifer Antico, Real Estate & Government Affairs FORBES Bros (copy attached), Ms Antico writes "As discussed via email there are several documents being requested at the application stage, however, they are not normally completed until after consultation is completed and the location is finalized. Therefore, it is our preference to include these requirements as a condition to concurrence."**

2.2 Proponent's failure to adhere to Government of Canada's ISED CPC-2-0-03 - Radiocommunication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems (CPC-2-0-03) <https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/spectrum-management-telecommunications/en/learn-more/keydocuments/procedures/client-procedures-circulars-cpc/cpc-2-0-03-radiocommunication-and-broadcasting-antennasystems> and the Richmond Hill 2021 RADIO-COMMUNICATION AND BROADCASTING ANTENNA SYSTEMS PUBLIC CONSULTATION APPLICATION FORM (City Protocol) <https://www.richmondhill.ca/en/shared-content/resources/documents/2021-Development-Applications/2021-RadioCommunication-and-Broadcasting-Antenna-Systems-Public-Consultation-App.pdf>

2.2.1 In our opinion, Mr. Sean Ogilvie, Manager Real Estate & Gov. Affairs, Forbes Bros Ltd., demonstrates a disregard for the City Protocol and CPC-2-0-03, Section 4. Mr. Ogilvie fails to include the City's option to issue a letter of non-concurrence opposing the proposed antenna location.

Quoting **CPC 2-0-03 4. Contacting the land-use authority**

"Following the land-use authority process

"Proponents must follow ISED's default public consultation process where the local land-use authority does not have an established and documented public consultation process applicable to antenna siting."

Quoting email from: Sean Ogilvie; dated March 30, 2023, 1:59PM; to: Umar, Michael, Godwin, Officemayor@richmondhill.ca; Majid, Jay, Jack "By default it the entire document is a consultation guideline as a municipality cannot create bylaws that directly regulate a federal undertaking. While we are required to consult with

the City and public, the City has no authority to create laws or bylaws that could be used to delay, deny or otherwise impair an essential element of the federal undertaking.”

2.2.2 Proponent did not comply with the City Protocol 6.1 Public Notification Package:

Quote “• *draft covering letter to circulated residents advising that the City has received the application for public consultation on a proposed radio-communication and broadcasting antenna system”.*

The need for a draft covering letter is noted in 3 additional places in the City Protocol: Cover Page 1: *5. Notification Letter to Circulated Residents Template*; Page 22: *Appendix “3” - Public Consultation Protocol Flowchart Proponent’s Cover Letter & Notification Package Submitted*; Page 24: *Appendix “5” – Notification Letter to Circulated Residents Template*;

This covering letter is a published requirement in the City Protocol and assures residents that information they are receiving is before the City’s municipal office and assures a degree of accuracy.

Quoting email from: Sean Ogilvie; dated March 30, 2023, 1:59PM; to: Umar, Michael, Godwin, Officemayor@richmondhill.ca; Majid, Jay, Jack “*I apologize if the lack of a cover letter has caused any inconvenience for you during this process.*”

2.2.3 Proponent did not comply with City Protocol 7.4 Written Public Comments:

Quote “• *the proponent must respond in writing to the City within 14 days of receiving City and public comments to acknowledge receipt of all questions, comments or concerns from both members of the public and the City.*”

Proponent did not respond in writing to the City to acknowledge receipt until 40 days later, not 14-days as required, after a concerned resident followed up with the City to verify compliance.

Quoting email from: Sean Ogilvie; May 12, 2023, 1:31PM; to: Umar; Jack “*We do not normally provide confirmation of receipt of comments to the City*”.

Note: Requests were made on May 17, 2023 and Jan 16, 2024 to Umar Javed, City of Richmond Hill, Planner I, Site Plans and to Sandra DeMaria, Manager of Development – Site Plans, to provide information on all areas where the proponent did not fully comply with the City Protocol. No reply has been received as at Feb 23, 2024.

SECTION 3:

3.1 Inadequate Public Consultation

Proponent - Forbes Bros Ltd., C8136 Virtual Community Information Session, Thursday March 30, 2023, from 5:00pm – 6:30pm (GMT-5)

3.1.1 The designated meeting time was not appropriate to allow people, who work and commute, to participate.

3.1.2 We were advised, just prior to the Information Session, that the Forbes Bros Ltd., Contact Person named on the Information Package, Sean Ogilvie, Manager Real Estate & Gov. Affairs, Forbes Bros Ltd., was not able to host the meeting and his colleague Jay Lewis would take the call. Mr. Lewis’ presentation was very brief as related to the proposed cell tower for which this Information Session was held. Instead of allowing questions immediately after providing information on this specific proposed cell tower site, Mr. Lewis proceeded to show a series of irrelevant pictures of Rogers installations, thus reducing the time available for residents to ask questions.

3.1.3 Mr. Lewis was ill-prepared to answer questions from residents and could not/did not provide adequate answers to important, relevant questions from the public on the virtual call.

3.2 Proponent Response to Questions Submitted by the Public – Request for Responsibility and Accountability for Answers Provided by the Proponent. Referencing proponent’s email From: Sarah Duncan sduncan@forbesbrosLtd.ca; Date: Fri, Jan 12, 2024 at 2:01 PM; Subject: Update: Proposed Rogers tower site C8136 - 120 West Beaver Creek Rd., Richmond Hill ON (City file: #TELE-22-0001) attachment “1 Resident_Owner Written Comments Questions to Rogers Site Code_C8136_FB Response 2-09.25 Final.pdf”.

3.2.1 Re Proponents attachment “1 Resident_Owner Written Comments Questions to Rogers Site Code_C8136_FB Response 2-09.25 Final.pdf”

Question not answered - Question 22; “You quote a maximum (worst case) exposure level calculated to be 14.38% at ground level and 10.88% at ground level 100m south of the proposed tower location (closest residential area). What would the maximum exposure be to buildings that are higher than ground level that could include multi-level homes and schools?” i.e. residential bedrooms situated on a second floor.

3.2.2. Liability

Question not adequately answered – Question 24 Residents’ responses June 12, 2023; “Can Rogers document possession of liability insurance that does not exclude health claims due to radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure?”

Environmental Health Trust (EHT) Electromagnetic Field Insurance Policy Exclusion Are The Standard
<https://ehtrust.org/key-issues/electromagnetic-field-insurance-policy-exclusions/>

3.2.3 Referencing email from: Doncrest Community <doncrestcommunity@gmail.com> Sent: January 24, 2024 8:51 AM; To: Sarah Duncan sduncan@forbesbrosLtd.ca; Subject: Question Regarding Proposed Rogers tower site C8136 - 120 West Beaver Creek Rd

Quote: “Can you please attest that all answers provided by Forbes Bros have been fully agreed to by Rogers Communications, and Rogers Communications accepts full responsibility and accountability for all information provided by Forbes Bros?”

Response from: Sarah Duncan sduncan@forbesbrosLtd.ca Date: Wed, Jan 24, 2024 at 11:26 AM Subject: Re: Question Regarding Proposed Rogers tower site C8136 - 120 West Beaver Creek Rd To: Doncrest Community <doncrestcommunity@gmail.com>

Quote: “Rogers has engaged Forbes to take this site through the municipal consultation process which includes responding to public comments. Rogers will review and/or provide relevant technical information which is submitted to the public but does not typically review industry standard information (e.g. basic information about Health Canada’s Safety Code 6 requirements).”

SECTION 4:

4.1 No Proof of a Gap in Service. 193 Residents and commercial business representatives have signed a petition opposing the proposed Rogers installation at 120 West Beaver Creek, plus 513 on-line signatures. (petition attached).

Quoting Proponent’s Information Package “Proposed Site and Background Information: ...The site as proposed will provide wireless voice and data services for subscribers to the Rogers network.”

Rogers has not demonstrated that there is a gap in service in the affected area whereby Rogers customers currently have no voice or data service access and 911 access. Of the 123 homes within the impacted area, 119 (96.7%) oppose the tower to be built within 400 meters from where they live, indicating that they DO NOT want or need this service; 3 (2.4%) don’t care if it’s built or not; 1 (0.82%) acknowledges the issue but doesn’t wish to sign anything. The proponent noted at the March 30, 2023 Public Community Information Session that they have not conducted any survey to check demand.

4.2 Liability

As taxpayers, we request the proponent to document possession of liability insurance that does not exclude health claims due to radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure.

Quoting **Rogers Communications Inc., 2022 ANNUAL REPORT ROGERS COMMUNICATIONS INC. | 67 MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS**

“Radio frequency emissions

From time to time, media and other reports have highlighted alleged links between radio frequency emissions from wireless devices (including new 5G technology) and various health concerns, including cancer, and interference with various medical devices, including hearing aids and pacemakers. This may discourage the use of wireless devices or expose us to potential litigation even though there are no definitive reports or studies stating that these health issues are directly attributable to radio frequency emissions. Future regulatory actions may result in more restrictive standards on radio frequency emissions from low-powered devices like wireless devices. We cannot predict the nature or extent of any restrictions.”

<https://www.sedar.com/GetFile.do?lang=EN&docClass=7&issuerNo=00003765&issuerType=03&projectNo=03501890&docId=5374520> Liability

This question of Liability, asked in questions #9, #10, #24, #25, #31 and #32 in the *“1 Resident_Owner Written Comments Questions to Rogers Site Code_C8136_ FB Response 2-09.25 Final.pdf”* document, has not been adequately answered.

There is ample evidence that if the proposed cell tower is installed and activated people will be harmed. If the information we have provided is not sufficient to issue a letter of non-concurrence, please let us know what additional substantiation you require.

Please confirm receipt of this email.

Respectfully,

The Doncrest Community and Concerned Richmond Hill Residents

cc: The Doncrest Community and Concerned Richmond Hill Residents

APPENDIX - ABSTRACTS:

1. Balmori, A. (2022). **Evidence for a health risk by RF on humans living around mobile phone base stations: From radiofrequency sickness to cancer.** *Environmental Research*, **113851**. ABSTRACT: The objective of this work was to perform a complete review of the existing scientific literature to update the knowledge on the effects of base station antennas on humans. Studies performed in real urban conditions, with mobile phone base stations situated close to apartments, were selected. Overall results of this review show three types of effects by base station antennas on the health of people: radiofrequency sickness (RS), cancer (C) and changes in biochemical parameters (CBP). Considering all the studies reviewed globally (n = 38), 73.6% (28/38) showed effects: 73.9% (17/23) for radiofrequency sickness, 76.9% (10/13) for cancer and 75.0% (6/8) for changes in biochemical parameters. Furthermore, studies that did not meet the strict conditions to be included in this review provided important supplementary evidence. The existence of similar effects from studies by different sources (but with RF of similar characteristics), such as radar, radio and television antennas, wireless smart meters and laboratory studies, reinforce the conclusions of this review. Of special importance are the studies performed on animals or trees near base station antennas that cannot be aware of their proximity and to which psychosomatic effects can never be attributed. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.113851>
2. Miller, A. B., Morgan, L. L., Udasin, I., & Davis, D. L. (2018). **Cancer epidemiology update, following the 2011 IARC evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (Monograph 102).** *Environmental Research*, 167(673-683). DOI. 10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.043). ABSTRACT: Epidemiology studies (case-control, cohort, time trend and case studies) published since the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) 2011 categorization of radiofrequency radiation (RFR) from mobile phones and other wireless devices as a possible human carcinogen (Group 2B) are reviewed and summarized. Glioma is an important human cancer found to be associated with RFR in 9 case-control studies conducted in Sweden and France, as well as in some other countries. Increasing glioma incidence trends have been reported in the UK and other countries. Non-malignant endpoints linked include acoustic neuroma (vestibular Schwannoma) and meningioma. Because they allow more detailed consideration of exposure, case-control studies can be superior to cohort studies or other methods in evaluating potential risks for brain cancer. When considered with recent animal experimental evidence, the recent epidemiological studies strengthen and support the conclusion that RFR should be categorized as carcinogenic to humans (IARC Group 1). Opportunistic epidemiological studies are proposed that can be carried out through cross-sectional analyses of high, medium, and low mobile phone users with respect to hearing, vision, memory, reaction time, and other indicators that can easily be assessed through standardized computer-based tests. As exposure data are not uniformly available, billing records should be used whenever available to corroborate reported exposures. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.043>
3. Miller, A. B., Sears, M. E., Morgan, L. L., Davis, D. L., Hardell, L., Oremus, M., & Soskolne, C. L. (2019). **Risks to Health and Well-Being From Radio-Frequency Radiation Emitted by Cell Phones and Other Wireless Devices.** *Frontiers in Public Health*, 7. ABSTRACT: Radiation exposure has long been a concern for the public, policy makers and health researchers. Beginning with radar during World War II, human exposure to radio-frequency radiation (RFR) technologies has grown more than 100,000-fold over time. In 2011, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) reviewed the published literature and categorized RFR as a 'possible' (Group 2B) human carcinogen. A broad range of adverse human health effects associated with RFR have been reported since the IARC review. In addition, three large-scale carcinogenicity studies in rodents exposed to levels of RFR that mimic lifetime human exposures have shown significantly increased rates of Schwannomas and malignant gliomas, as well as chromosomal DNA damage. Of particular concern are the effects of RFR exposure on the developing brain in children. Compared with an adult male, a cell phone held against the head of a child exposes deeper brain structures to greater radiation doses per unit volume, and the young, thin skull's bone marrow absorbs a roughly 10-fold higher local dose. Recent reports also suggest that men who keep cell phones in their trouser pockets have significantly lower sperm counts and significantly impaired sperm motility and morphology, including mitochondrial DNA damage. Based on the accumulated evidence, we recommend that IARC re-evaluate its 2011 classification of the human carcinogenicity of RFR, and that WHO complete a systematic review of multiple other health effects such as sperm damage. In the interim, current knowledge provides justification for governments, public health authorities, and physicians/allied health professionals to warn the

population that having a cell phone next to the body is harmful, and to support measures to reduce all exposures to RFR. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2019.00223>

4. Rodrigues, N. C. P., Dode, A. C., de Noronha Andrade, M. K., O'Dwyer, G., Monteiro, D. L. M., Reis, I. N. C., ... Lino, V. T. S. (2021). **The Effect of Continuous Low-Intensity Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields from Radio Base Stations to Cancer Mortality in Brazil**. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(3).

ABSTRACT: BACKGROUND: this study aims to estimate the rate of death by cancer as a result of Radio Base Station (RBS) radiofrequency exposure, especially for breast, cervix, lung, and esophagus cancers. METHODS: we collected information on the number of deaths by cancer, gender, age group, gross domestic product per capita, death year, and the amount of exposure over a lifetime. We investigated all cancer types and some specific types (breast, cervix, lung, and esophagus cancers). RESULTS: in capitals where RBS radiofrequency exposure was higher than 2000/antennas-year, the average mortality rate was 112/100,000 for all cancers. The adjusted analysis showed that, the higher the exposure to RBS radiofrequency, the higher cancer mortality was. The highest adjusted risk was observed for cervix cancer (rate ratio =2.18). The spatial analysis showed that the highest RBS radiofrequency exposure was observed in a city in southern Brazil that also showed the highest mortality rate for all types of cancer and specifically for lung and breast cancer. CONCLUSION: the balance of our results indicates that exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields from RBS increases the rate of death for all types of cancer. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18031229>

5. Zothansiam, -, Zosangzuali, M., Lalramdinpuii, M., & Jagetia, G. C. (2017). **Impact of radiofrequency radiation on DNA damage and antioxidants in peripheral blood lymphocytes of humans residing in the vicinity of mobile phone base stations**. *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine*, 1–11. ABSTRACT: Radiofrequency radiations (RFRs) emitted by mobile phone base stations have raised concerns on its adverse impact on humans residing in the vicinity of mobile phone base stations. Therefore, the present study was envisaged to evaluate the effect of RFR on the DNA damage and antioxidant status in cultured human peripheral blood lymphocytes (HPBLs) of individuals residing in the vicinity of mobile phone base stations and comparing it with healthy controls. The study groups matched for various demographic data including age, gender, dietary pattern, smoking habit, alcohol consumption, duration of mobile phone use and average daily mobile phone use. The RF power density of the exposed individuals was significantly higher ($p < 0.0001$) when compared to the control group. The HPBLs were cultured and the DNA damage was assessed by cytokinesis blocked micronucleus (MN) assay in the binucleate lymphocytes. The analyses of data from the exposed group ($n = 40$), residing within a perimeter of 80 m of mobile base stations, showed significantly ($p < 0.0001$) higher frequency of micronuclei when compared to the control group, residing 300 m away from the mobile base station/s. The analysis of various antioxidants in the plasma of exposed individuals revealed a significant attrition in glutathione (GSH) concentration ($p < 0.01$), activities of catalase (CAT) ($p < 0.001$) and superoxide dismutase (SOD) ($p < 0.001$) and rise in lipid peroxidation (LOO) when compared to controls. Multiple linear regression analyses revealed a significant association among reduced GSH concentration ($p < 0.05$), CAT ($p < 0.001$) and SOD ($p < 0.001$) activities and elevated MN frequency ($p < 0.001$) and LOO ($p < 0.001$) with increasing RF power density. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15368378.2017.1350584>

1	
Question submitted March 28, 2023	<p>1. Forbes Bros. notification to Residents/owners does not comply with the Richmond Hill 2021 Radio- Communication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems Public Consultation Application Form Appendix 5:</p> <p>Forbes Bros. did not send a covering letter to Residents as required in Appendix 5 - NOTIFICATION LETTER TO CIRCULATED RESIDENTS TEMPLATE. [See Appendix 1]</p>
Proponent response May 25, 2023	<p>Both the draft and final copy of the notification package were submitted to the City for review and were approved. Although they might not match word for word the exact version of the Appendix to the City policy they are substantially similar and convey the relevant information about the tower and public commenting process.</p>
Residents' responses June 12, 2023	<p>It is the Proponent's responsibility to fully comply with the Richmond Hill Radio-Communication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems Public Consultation Application Form For the processing of applications undertaking public consultation and obtaining a Council position in accordance with the City's Public Consultation Protocol for Radio- Communication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems. (City Protocol) https://www.richmondhill.ca/en/shared-content/resources/documents/2023-Development-Applications-/2023-Radio-Communication-and-Broadcasting-Antenna-Systems-Public-Consultation-App-1.pdf</p> <p>ISED CPC-2-0-03 — Radiocommunication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems; 4. Land-use authority and public consultation; Following the land-use authority process <i>Proponents must follow the land-use consultation process for the siting of antenna systems, established by the land-use authority, where one exists.</i> https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/spectrum-management-telecommunications/en/learn-more/key-documents/procedures/client-procedures-circulars-cpc/cpc-2-0-03-radiocommunication-and-broadcasting-antenna-systems</p>
Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023	<p>Why did the Proponent not fully comply with the City Protocol?</p>
Proponent response January 11, 2024	<p>The proponent complied with the City Protocol by submitting a complete application including draft consultation materials for review by the City. The City reviewed and approved these materials as compliant with the City protocol and directed the proponent to distribute the materials to the mailing list provided. Although there are slight differences in the wording (e.g. cover letter) the notification package distributed contained all relevant information about the proposed cell tower and public commenting process.</p>
2	
Question submitted March 28, 2023	<p>2. Forbes Bros. information package, - Health Canada's Safety Code 6 Compliance - doesn't comply with the wording of the Richmond Hill 2021 Radio-Communication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems Public Consultation Application Form - 6.1 Public Notification Package:</p> <p>Rogers Communications attests that the radio antenna system described in this notification package will be installed and operated on an ongoing basis so as to comply with Health Canada's Safety Code 6, as may be amended from time to time, for the protection of the general public.</p>

	<p>The Richmond Hill 2021 Radio- Communication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems Public Consultation Application Form – 6.1 Public Notification Package requires: an attestation that the general public will be protected in compliance with Health Canada's Safety Code 6 including combined effects within the local radio environment at all times.</p> <p>What are the consequences when a proponent does not follow the Richmond Hill 2021 Radio- Communication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems Public Consultation Application Form?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>The notification package includes an attestation that the public will be protected in compliance with Health Canada's Safety Code 6. The notification package states:</p> <p><i>Rogers Communications attests that the radio antenna system described in this notification package will be installed and operated on an ongoing basis so as to comply with Health Canada's Safety Code 6, as may be amended from time to time, for the protection of the general public including any combined operation of additional carrier co-locations and nearby installations within the local radio environment.</i></p> <p>The proponent has complied with the Richmond Hill Antenna Systems policy. The City has reviewed and accepted as complete our application and confirmed our notification documents were satisfactory to be mailed to the public.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>City Protocol "an attestation that the general public will be protected in compliance with Health Canada's Safety Code 6 including combined effects within the local radio environment at all times."</p> <p>It is the Proponent's responsibility to fully comply with the Richmond Hill Radio-Communication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems Public Consultation Application Form For the processing of applications undertaking public consultation and obtaining a Council position in accordance with the City's Public Consultation Protocol for Radio- Communication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems. (City Protocol)</p> <p>ISED CPC-2-0-03 — Radiocommunication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems; 4. Land-use authority and public consultation; Following the land-use authority process</p> <p><i>Proponents must follow the land-use consultation process for the siting of antenna systems, established by the land-use authority, where one exists.</i></p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Why did the Proponent not fully comply with the City Protocol?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>The proponent has complied with the City Protocol as a specific attestation was included in the notification noting that the site will be in full compliance with and as well the general public will be protected via Health Canada's Safety Code 6.</p>
<p>3</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>3. ISED in the introduction of Client Procedures Circular (CPC-2- 0-03) state:</p> <p>"In exercising its mandate, Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED) believes that it is important that antenna systems be deployed in a manner that considers the local surroundings."</p>

	<p>And</p> <p>In addition to Impact Assessment Act requirements, "proponents are responsible for ensuring that antenna systems are installed and operated in a manner that respects the local environment and that complies with other statutory requirements, such as those under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999, the Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994, and the Species at Risk Act, as applicable."</p> <p>Has Rogers done any research on the existence of any migration bird species in the Natural Conversation Area right next to the proposed site? How is Rogers complying to the Migratory Birds Convention Act? According to research studies (https://ehtrust.org/biological-effects-of-electromagnetic-radiation-on-birds/), Electromagnetic exposure is disruptive to birds, especially migratory birds. Please see here Prohibition from the Migratory Birds Convention Act.</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>To date Rogers has not completed any studies on the existence of migratory bird species on the adjacent wooded lot. The proposed site does not require the removal or alteration of any natural areas and is located entirely within an existing developed/paved area. It is anticipated the proposed site will have no impact on any adjacent natural features. Rogers is in compliance with the Migratory Birds Convention Act as they are not clearing trees or vegetation, not draining or flooding land, not removing any nesting habitat or destroying, taking, harming nests or eggs.</p> <p>The above notwithstanding Forbes would consider construction approval conditions that include pre- construction surveys to identify habitats and nesting areas as well as post construction monitoring to assess whether additional or modified mitigations measures are warranted. These assessments would be completed by a qualified natural heritage professional to the satisfaction of the City of Richmond Hill.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>No further questions at this time.</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>No further questions at this time.</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>No further response provided.</p>
<p>4</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>4. Have Rogers done any research on the existence of any endangered species in the Natural Conversation Area right next to the proposed site? How is Rogers complying to the Species at Risk Act? According to numerous peer reviewed research studies (https://ehtrust.org/published-research-adverse-effect-wireless-technology-electromagnetic-radiation-bees/), Electromagnetic fields from power lines, cell phones, cell towers and wireless have been shown to negatively impact birds, bees, wildlife and our environment.</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>To date Rogers has not completed any studies on the existence of endangered species on the adjacent wooded lot. Similarly, the City of Richmond Hill through their departmental and/or agency comment process have not raised any concerns specific to species at risk in this area. The proposed site does not require the removal or alteration of any natural areas or habitats and is located entirely within an existing</p>

	<p>developed/paved area. It is anticipated the proposed site will have minimal to no impact on any adjacent natural features or wildlife. Similar to the Migratory Birds Act, Rogers is not removing any critical habitat, killing, harming, possessing any listed species. The proposed site does not violate any of the Measures to Protect Listed Wildlife Species in the Species at Risk Act. The Species at Risk Act does not specifically list any prohibitions or protections relating to radiofrequency exposure.</p> <p>The above notwithstanding Forbes would be happy to agree to construction approval conditions that include pre- construction surveys to identify habitats and nesting areas as well as post construction monitoring to assess whether additional or modified mitigations measures are warranted. These assessments would be completed by a qualified natural heritage professional to the satisfaction of the City of Richmond Hill.</p>
Residents' responses June 12, 2023	No further questions at this time.
Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023	No further questions at this time.
Proponent response January 11, 2024	No further response provided.
5	
Question submitted March 28, 2023	<p>5. Rogers appears to have THREE installations already in place in this area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kinnear Court (approx. 688 m from 120 West Beaver Creek proposed site); (extended lamp post) (600MHz, 700MHz,1900MHz,2100MHz, 2600MHz, 3500MHz) - Approx. 250 m from 120 West Beaver Creek, Rogers antenna (850MHz, 1900MHz, 2100MHz) - From the information package, there is one existing roof mounted telecommunication site approximately 330m east of Rogers proposed location at 125 West Beaver Creek Road. What are the frequencies utilized by this installation?
Proponent response May 25, 2023	<p>Rogers presently operates two existing base stations nearby the new proposed location. One rooftop site at 90 West Beaver Creek Road approximately 280m north of the new proposed location and a tower site at 25 Kinnear Court approximately 690m northeast of Rogers new proposed location. If the new site is built that would be three Rogers sites in this industrial area. Please refer to the attached map showing Rogers existing sites in the area. According to industry records search there appears to be a rooftop or indoor small cell Terago Networks site approximately 330m east of the proposed Rogers location at 125 West Beaver Creek Road. Records indicate this site utilizes 22400 MHz and 25200 MHz frequencies. It is unclear if this site is still in operation.</p>
Residents' responses June 12, 2023	<p>City Protocol; 6.1 Public Notification Package;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>an attestation that the general public will be protected in compliance with Health Canada's Safety Code 6 including combined effects within the local radio environment at all times;</i>

	<p>ISED CPC-2-0-03 — Radiocommunication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems; 4. Land-use authority and public consultation; Following the land-use authority process <i>Proponents must follow the land-use consultation process for the siting of antenna systems, established by the land-use authority, where one exists.</i></p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Rogers notes the designated area as industrial - however it is adjacent to residential and school areas. Will this inaccurate "designation" be corrected in all documentation and communications?</p> <p>Can Rogers confirm they have dismantled and removed all Rogers transmitting/receiving installations that are not presently operational? Why is Rogers not aware of the operational status and frequencies of area installations? As required in the City Protocol the attestation "<i>combined effects within the local radio environment at all times</i>"?</p> <p>What is the link for the Industry Records search you refer to? Is this an ISED site?</p> <p>Is it a Rogers site that's utilizing 22400 MHz (22.4 GHz) and 25200 MHz (25.2 GHz) – these are millimeter wave frequencies that, to the best of our knowledge, have not been released by ISED – is this an experimental site?</p> <p>Can Rogers confirm frequencies currently used at Rogers two active base stations and provide the number of transmitters per installation? Can Rogers provide power output of each transmitter per installation?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>The proposed telecommunication tower site is designated an industrial area (M-1 per Richmond Hill's Zoning Bylaw 150-80, Zoning Map 27). It is adjacent other industrial designations to the north and east. It is abutted by Open Space zones to the west and south. Although there are residential and institutional (school) zones nearby the location of the proposed site is designated industrial and it would be incorrect to describe the location as a different designation.</p> <p>It's our understanding that all Rogers sites in the area are currently operational and Rogers will remove them if they are no longer needed. Rogers is aware of all their own operational status and frequencies and frequencies of nearby stations are documented with ISED. Based on this information Rogers is able to calculate their compliance with Safety Code 6 including combined effects in the area.</p> <p>Please reach out to Terago Networks directly for details on their site and frequencies being used.</p> <p>Please refer to the attached outlining the number of transmitters, frequencies, and transmitter power at Rogers sites located at 25 Kinnear Court and 90 West Beaver Creek Rd.</p>
<p>6</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>What are the current number of transmitters at each location noted above?</p>

<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Industry records are not readily available listing the number of transmitters at each site. A range of frequencies is occasionally listed. Each site (including in combination with each other) is required to comply with the radiofrequency exposure limits set in Health Canada's Radiofrequency Exposure Guideline (Safety Code 6). If there is concern that any individual (or combination) of nearby sites do not comply with the requirements of Safety Code 6 you can request the pertinent information from the proponent/operator of that system. Rogers has provided their Safety Code 6 compliance calculations and demonstrated the proposed site will be operating at worst case (all transmitters at full power at the same time, including provisions for future equipment) 14% of the allowable exposure limit, and 10.8% at ground level 100m away from the site (closest residential area). If the Department of Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada (ISED) have concerns about compliance they may carry out their own assessment.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Question not answered. To clarify, the question relates to Rogers specifically not the "industry."</p> <p>ISED CPC-2-0-03 — Radiocommunication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems; 4. Land-use authority and public consultation; Following the land-use authority process</p> <p><i>Proponents must follow the land-use consultation process for the siting of antenna systems, established by the land-use authority, where one exists.</i></p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>How can Rogers be assured they are staying below Safety Code 6 if they don't know the number of transmitters at each site?</p> <p>What are the current number of transmitters at each Rogers location noted in Questions 5.?</p> <p>What is the power output of each transmitter?</p> <p>What are the current number of transmitters on any/all Rogers installations not presently active?</p> <p>What is the link for the Industry Records search you refer to? Is this an ISED site?</p> <p>You quote 14% of the allowable exposure limit, and 10.8% at ground level 100m away from the site (closest residential area). What would the maximum exposure be to buildings that are higher than ground level that could include multi-level homes and schools?</p> <p>To avoid "a worst-case exposure level" will Rogers withdraw their application to install a cell tower at this location?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>As noted in response to question #5, Please refer to the attached outlining the number of transmitters, frequencies, and transmitter power at Rogers sites located at 25 Kinnear Court and 90 West Beaver Creek Rd.</p> <p>As the distance increases from the telecommunication tower the RF exposure will decrease. As such, the RF exposure will be even further below the 10.8% of the allowable exposure limit located 100m away or further from the site being that the closest school is over 300m from the proposed location. Any other buildings located closer than 100m would be 14% or lower.</p> <p>All frequencies deployed at the site are licensed by the department of ISED and comply with all applicable regulations. As referenced, Rogers provided their Safety Code 6 compliance calculations for the proposed site at 120 West Beaver Creek Rd and demonstrated the proposed site will be operating within the allowable limits. We will continue to provide as much relevant information as possible, if you have concerns about the validity of Safety Code 6 requirements, their applicability, and/or enforcement we would recommend you reach out to the appropriate authorities having jurisdiction.</p>

	Rogers has not withdrawn their application to install a telecommunication tower at this location. Health related concerns regarding have been noted and will be included in the public consultation package to the City.
7	
Question submitted March 28, 2023	Has this wireless service been mandated? THIS QUESTION WAS SUBMITTED BUT DELETED BY THE PROPONENT.
Proponent response May 25, 2023	
Residents' responses June 12, 2023	THIS QUESTION WAS SUBMITTED BUT DELETED BY THE PROPONENT.
Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023	Has this wireless service been mandated? If yes, by whom? Please provide the link to the authority. Why was this question removed from the proponent's response?
Proponent response January 11, 2024	Wireless services are regulated under the authority of the Radiocommunication Act, ISED is the federal department responsible for overseeing the safe operation of wireless antenna towers and sites. ISED Toronto District Office 151 Yonge Street, 4th floor Toronto ON M5C 2W7 Telephone: 1-855-465- 6307 Fax: 416-954-3553 Email: ic.spectrumtoronto- spectretoronto.ic@canada.ca This response was removed by mistake when formatting and replying to original questions.
8	
Question submitted March 28, 2023	What is the minimum cell/text/internet service required by law? THIS QUESTION WAS SUBMITTED BUT DELETED BY THE PROPONENT.

<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>THIS QUESTION WAS SUBMITTED BUT DELETED BY THE PROPONENT.</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>What is the minimum cell/text/internet service required by law?</p> <p>Why was this question removed from the proponent's response?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p><i>It is ISEDs position that Canadians have access to fast and reliable wireless coverage.</i></p> <p><i>Please refer to the following link from ISED with more information on 'Facts about Towers'. https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/spectrum-management-telecommunications/en/safety-and-compliance/facts-about-towers. Or the following for ISEDs Telecommunications Reliability Agenda. https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/ised/en/reliable-telecom-services</i></p> <p><i>This response was removed by mistake when formatting and replying to original questions.</i></p>
<p>9</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>9. Residents' #</p> <p>7. Proponents renumbered #</p> <p>From the Information Package, this tower is to provide enhanced wireless network coverage for Leslie Street, West Beaver Creek Rd, Valleymede Dr, and Briggs Ave. According to the above cell tower map on https://www.ertyu.org/, Rogers already has an antenna system located between Leslie and West Beaver Creek serving those streets. They also have another antenna system roughly 250m from the new proposed site based on Google Map. Why do they need to put another tower 250m away from the existing antenna system, both within 400m of residential and school area? What is the coverage radius of these two existing antenna systems?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p><i>Please see attached map for reference to the closest existing Rogers sites to the proposed new location at 120 West Beaver Creek Rd.</i></p> <p><i>A cellular network is a complex system that allows mobile devices, such as smartphones, to connect and communicate with each other and the wider internet. The network consists of multiple components, one infrastructure component being cell towers. Cell towers, also known as mobile base stations, are physical structures equipped with antennas that transmit receive radio signals. They are strategically placed to cover specific geographic areas called cells. Each cell tower has a coverage range and capacity. Multiple towers are deployed to provide coverage across an entire area. Multiple towers/base stations are sometimes deployed in close proximity to each other in dense urban areas for a variety of factors including (but not limited to); population density, capacity and traffic management, signal penetration and obstacles, network redundancy/reliability, and load balancing.</i></p> <p><i>The target coverage area for this site is the residential area of the Doncrest neighbourhood. Although Rogers operates base stations surrounding this neighbourhood they are not able to provide reliable coverage to the centre of the residential areas surrounding Valleymede Drive and Briggs Avenue with these existing sites. Because the coverage target cannot be achieved using existing infrastructure (existing Rogers sites or other Carriers' infrastructure) a</i></p>

	<p>new mobile base station site is required. The closest feasible location to place a new tower and achieve the coverage objective is on and industrial property along the west side of West Beaver Creek.</p> <p>The new proposed site will work with the existing Rogers sites to provide contiguous and reliable coverage for the residential, institutional, commercial and industrial areas throughout and surrounding the Doncrest neighbourhood. Please see the attached coverage maps for reference to the coverage range/pattern.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>The Information Package quote <i>"The site as proposed will provide wireless voice and data services for subscribers to the Rogers network."</i> Rogers has not demonstrated that there is a gap in service whereby Rogers' customers, in the affected area, currently have no voice or data service access. The proponent noted at the March 30th Public Community Information Session that they have not conducted any survey to check demand.</p> <p>188 Residents and commercial business representatives have signed a petition opposing the proposed Rogers installation at 120 West Beaver Creek, plus 461 on-line signatures.</p> <p>Telecom Acknowledges Potential Litigation: Quoting Roger Communications Inc., 2022 ANNUAL REPORT ROGERS COMMUNICATIONS INC. 67 MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS</p> <p><i>"Radio frequency emissions From time to time, media and other reports have highlighted alleged links between radio frequency emissions from wireless devices (including new 5G technology) and various health concerns, including cancer, and interference with various medical devices, including hearing aids and pacemakers. This may discourage the use of wireless devices or expose us to potential litigation even though there are no definitive reports or studies stating that these health issues are directly attributable to radio frequency emissions. Future regulatory actions may result in more restrictive standards on radio frequency emissions from low-powered devices like wireless devices. We cannot predict the nature or extent of any restrictions."</i> Posted to SEDAR; Rogers Communications Inc. Mar 9 2023 18:19:11 ET MD&A-English PDF 965K Page 67</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Has this wireless service been mandated? If yes, by whom? Please provide the link to the authority.</p> <p>What is the minimum cell/text/internet service required by law?</p> <p>Why did Rogers not undertake a survey to check demand?</p> <p>Can Rogers document possession of liability insurance that <u>does not exclude</u> health claims due to radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure?</p> <p>As Rogers has acknowledged potential litigation, are landowners, from whom Rogers rents/leases space for their installations, advised to obtain liability insurance that <u>does not exclude</u> health claims due to radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure in case they may be exposed to litigation?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to response in question #7 for wireless service mandated and #8 for minimum cell service required.</p> <p>The public consultation process allows for members of the public to provide comments, concerns, support, and ask questions for the proposed tower location and features. It is up to Rogers to determine where coverage is needed. Therefore, as provided in our previous response, and consistent to the response included in the public community information session: please see the attached coverage maps for reference to the coverage range/pattern.</p>

	<p>For telecommunications companies like Rogers, liability insurance may cover a range of risks, including claims related to RF exposure, property damage, bodily injury, and other liabilities that may arise from their services, infrastructure, or operations. Similarly, landowners too may obtain liability insurance. When leasing space for the installations, the landowners are not specifically advised to obtain liability insurance with regards to exposure to radiofrequency. As mentioned, Rogers is required to comply with the Health Canada's exposure limits, the federal departments of ISED and Health Canada are responsible for establishing and enforcing those limits, the LUA is typically considered a commenting body to both the applicant and the federal bodies.</p>
<p>10</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>10. Residents' # 8. Proponents renumbered #</p> <p>Prior to proposing a new freestanding mobile base station facility, the area is Investigated for existing tower infrastructure and/or tall structures suitable for antenna deployment.</p> <p>A FOURTH Rogers installation in this area seems unreasonable. What is the procedure to request Rogers re- exam cell tower location in an area that does not impact public school, Residents and recreational space?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Rogers presently operates two existing base stations nearby the new proposed location. One rooftop site at 90 West Beaver Creek Road approximately 280m north of the new proposed location and a tower site at 25 Kinnear Court approximately 690m northeast of Rogers new proposed location. If the new site is built that would be three Rogers sites in this industrial area. Please refer to the attached map showing Rogers existing sites in the area.</p> <p>Rogers has examined the proposed location considering factors such as; the coverage requirement, network capacity, existing infrastructure, population density, topography/obstructions, in addition to items such as land- use compatibility, available power, available space, access, and interested land-owners. Considering all these factors Rogers has indicated the proposed location at 120 West Beaver Creek Road is the best option to provided improved service for the Doncrest neighbourhood. Public consultation (i.e., written questions/comments to the proponent) is the appropriate avenue to request information/examination of new proposed cell tower locations. The City of Richmond Hill may also request additional information if they feel it is warranted.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>On May 11/23, a Freedom of Information Request has been filed with the City of Richmond Hill for all material related to this application process to obtain more detail on this application.</p> <p>188 Residents and commercial business representatives have signed a petition opposing the proposed Rogers installation at 120 West Beaver Creek, plus 461 on-line signatures.</p> <p>Telecom Acknowledges Potential Litigation: Quoting Rogers Communications Inc., 2022 ANNUAL REPORT ROGERS COMMUNICATIONS INC. 67 MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS</p> <p><i>"Radio frequency emissions</i> <i>From time to time, media and other reports have highlighted alleged links between radio frequency emissions from wireless devices (including new 5G</i></p>

	<p><i>technology) and various health concerns, including cancer, and interference with various medical devices, including hearing aids and pacemakers. This may discourage the use of wireless devices or expose us to potential litigation even though there are no definitive reports or studies stating that these health issues are directly attributable to radio frequency emissions. Future regulatory actions may result in more restrictive standards on radio frequency emissions from low-powered devices like wireless devices. We cannot predict the nature or extent of any restrictions."</i></p> <p>Posted to SEDAR; Rogers Communications Inc. Mar 9 2023 18:19:11 ET MD&A-English PDF 965K Page 67</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Upon obtaining this documentation additional questions will follow.</p> <p>Can Rogers confirm it has dismantled and removed all Rogers area installations that are not presently operational?</p> <p>Can Rogers document possession of liability insurance that <u>does not exclude</u> health claims due to radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure?</p> <p>As Rogers has acknowledged potential litigation, are landowners, from whom Rogers rents/leases space for their installations, advised to obtain liability insurance that <u>does not exclude</u> health claims due to radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure in case they may be exposed to litigation?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to response #5 and #9 above.</p>
<p>11</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>11. Residents' # 9. Proponents renumbered # Rogers proposes to install as part of this installation transmitting and receiving antenna equipment and provisions for future technology services. What is this future technology and what frequencies will be emitted?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Rogers has reserved space on the tower to accommodate 1x 3 sectored 5G services. As this is reserved future space the frequencies have not yet been determined for this site.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Rogers has not identified a gap in their talk and text service.</p> <p>188 Residents and commercial business representatives have signed a petition opposing the proposed Rogers installation at 120 West Beaver Creek, plus 461 on-line signatures.</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Are the 5G services mandated? If yes, by whom and when? Provide the link to the authority.</p>
<p>Proponent response</p>	<p>Wireless services, including 5G services, are regulated under the authority of the Radiocommunication Act, ISED is the federal department responsible for overseeing the safe operation of wireless antenna towers and sites.</p>

<p>January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Contact information is provided below:</p> <p>ISED Toronto District Office 151 Yonge Street, 4th floor Toronto ON M5C 2W7 Telephone: 1-855-465- 6307 Fax: 416-954-3553 Email: ic.spectrumtoronto- spectretoronto.ic@canada.ca</p>
<p>12</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>12. Residents' # 10. Proponents renumbered # Will the proposed cell tower be utilized for any frequencies that may be termed "experimental"?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>There are currently no plans to utilize frequencies at this site that are considered "experimental". The proposed site will deploy mainly LTE (4G) and some 3.5G services which are considered mature technologies. Rogers is anticipating deploying 5G services at this site in the future. While 5G is still a relatively new technology, it is no longer considered experimental as it has been extensively tested and deployed by cellular network operators worldwide. The technology is designed to provide faster data speeds, lower latency, and greater capacity than previous generations of wireless technology.</p> <p>All frequencies to be deployed at the proposed site will be licensed by the department of Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada and comply with all applicable regulations.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Please see Appendix 2, 3 & 4.</p> <p>Health Canada conducted a major review last year titled "Analysis of Recommended Localized Human Exposure Limits for Radiofrequency Fields in the Frequency Range, 6 GHz to 300 GHz." Health Canada, Consumer & Clinical Radiation Protection Bureau (CCRPB). Approved by Narine Martel, Director, 2021, 243. This report can be obtained by request from Health Canada. This "analysis" did not find any 5G mmWave studies on humans except temperature. Page 32: Extract: <i>"No human studies were identified that assessed endpoints such as cancer, ocular effects, reproductive system effects, cognitive effects, impacts on the immune system, non-specific symptoms or any other adverse health outcome..."</i> in response to exposure to RFEMF in the 6-300 GHz frequency range." (See Appendix 5)</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Are the 5G services mandated? If yes, by whom? Provide the link to the authority.</p> <p>How will Rogers evaluate Safety Code 6 levels from Massive MIMO (Massive Multiple-input Multiple-output), beamforming phased arrays and full duplex technology?</p> <p>Quoting "While 5G is still a relatively new technology, it is no longer considered experimental as it has been extensively tested and deployed by cellular network operators worldwide." Can Rogers provide peer reviewed research and studies to support the statement as it relates to human health?</p> <p>Given the statement by Health Canada that "No human studies were identified that assessed endpoints such as cancer, ocular effects, reproductive system effects, cognitive effects, impacts on the immune system, non-specific symptoms or any other adverse health outcome..." how could these higher frequencies not be</p>

	considered experimental?
Proponent response January 11, 2024	<p>Please refer to response in question #11 above.</p> <p>Health Canada is the authority for radiofrequency exposure regulations and as such, Rogers follows these regulations. Please contact Health Canada for concerns about the validity of Safety Code 6 requirements, their applicability, and/or enforcement.</p> <p>Consumer and Clinical Radiation Protection Bureau - Health Canada 775 Brookfield Road A.L. 6302C Ottawa, Ontario K1A 1C1 E-mail: HC.ccrpb-pcrpc.SC@canada.ca Telephone: 613-957-2991</p>
13	
Question submitted March 28, 2023	<p>13. Residents' # 11. Proponents renumbered # Will this tower be used for 5G frequencies? Will this be publicly posted and will there be reasonable notice given to Residents such as ourselves? If no, why not?</p>
Proponent response May 25, 2023	Rogers has proposed a future 3-sector 5G deployment at this site. The specific frequencies to be allocated to these sectors have not yet been determined as it will be a future allotment. There are no plans to publicly post this information anywhere. Additional notification is not required for modification to an existing mobile base station site. 5G frequencies are covered by Health Canada's current radio frequency exposure limits (Safety Code 6) and do not require special/additional notification procedures.
Residents' responses June 12, 2023	<p>The Information Package quote "The site as proposed will provide wireless voice and data services for subscribers to the Rogers network." Rogers has not demonstrated that there is a gap in service whereby Rogers' customers, in the affected area, currently have no voice or data service access. The proponent noted at the March 30th Public Community Information Session that they have not conducted any survey to check demand.</p> <p>188 Residents and commercial business representatives have signed a petition opposing the proposed Rogers installation at 120 West Beaver Creek, plus 461 on-line signatures.</p>
Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023	<p>To facilitate Residents monitoring and measuring health and harmful effects from this proposed cell tower installation - will Rogers provide written notice to the City of all changes to frequency, transmitting/receiving hardware, changes in power output, and provide a revised full report of all frequencies operating at the location within 24 hours of any modification made to the installation? If not, why not?</p> <p>Will Rogers provide notification to City of planned increase in size and/or height of the installation? If not, why not?</p>
Proponent response January 11, 2024	<p>It is not a requirement for Rogers to submit a report to the City for any and all changes to the operational status of their sites. All frequencies to be deployed at the proposed site will be licensed by the department of Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada and comply with all applicable regulations. ISED is responsible for ensuring the towers comply with the exposure limits outlined in Safety Code 6 and maintain a market surveillance program and routinely audit antenna installations and devices to verify compliance.</p> <p>Rogers will provide notification to the City of any design or height changes above 25% of the height of the tower. As per the City of Richmond Hill's policy; no increase in height may occur within one year of completion of the initial construction.</p>

14	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>14. Residents' # 12. Proponents renumbered # Specify what "enhanced coverage" means? Explain why enhanced coverage could not be accommodated by fiber optic cable?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Enhanced cell phone coverage refers to technologies and techniques that are used to improve the quality, range, and reliability of cell phone signals in areas with poor reception.</p> <p>Wireless communication requires the use of radio frequency (RF) signals to transmit data between devices. Fiber optic cable is a wired communication technology that transmits data using light signals over a glass or plastic fiber. While fiber optic cable can transmit data over long distances at high speeds and with low latency, it cannot transmit RF signals without the use of additional equipment.</p> <p>To provide wireless coverage to mobile devices, cell phone towers use RF signals to transmit data wirelessly. These RF signals are transmitted over the airwaves and are received by mobile devices equipped with wireless receivers. While fiber optic cable can be used to connect cell phone towers to the core network, it cannot be used to transmit RF signals directly to mobile devices.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>It has been established that the affected area Residents have phone and text service; 911 service is accessible.</p> <p>188 Residents and commercial business representatives have signed a petition opposing the proposed Rogers installation at 120 West Beaver Creek, plus 461 on-line signatures</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>The need for enhanced cell phone coverage has not been established. Will Rogers withdraw its application for the proposed cell tower installation Rogers Site Code: C8136?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to response to question #9 and provided coverage maps. Opposition for the proposed site has been noted and will be included in the public consultation documents to the City.</p>
15	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>15. Residents' # 13. Proponents renumbered # There are no existing installations within 500 m of the location. Why 500 metres?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>500m is a typical range in which colocation might be technically feasible. If an existing tower with adequate deployment height and structural capacity is within 500m of a new proposed base station location than it is often investigated for tower sharing rather than building a new standalone tower site. In this case there are no existing tower sites within 500m of Rogers proposed location.</p>

<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>There is ample evidence, in the peer reviewed scientific and medical literature, that if the proposed cell tower moves forward people will be harmed.</p> <p>The Doncrest Public School is within 400 meters from the proposed cell tower. Peer reviewed science studies recommended a buffer zone of 500 meters between school and cell towers. https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/5GCell-Towers-Near-Schools-Children-Scientific-Research-Briefing-.pdf</p> <p>More than 40 peer reviewed scientific studies have documented evidence of biological harm to people living within 400 meters. https://ehtrust.org/cell-towers-and-cell-antennae/compilation-of-research-studies-on-cell-tower-radiation-and-health/</p> <p>A recent review: Balmori, A. (2022). Evidence for a health risk by RF on humans living around mobile phone base stations: From radiofrequency sickness to cancer. Environmental Research, 113851. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.113851</p> <p>Other relevant studies indicating harm for those living close to cell towers (base stations): 1. Rodrigues, N. C. P., Dode, A. C., de Noronha Andrade, M. K., O'Dwyer, G., Monteiro, D. L. M., Reis, I. N. C., ... Lino, V. T. S. (2021). The Effect of Continuous Low-Intensity Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields from Radio Base Stations to Cancer Mortality in Brazil. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18031229 2. Zothansiam, -, Zosangzuali, M., Lalramdinpui, M., & Jagetia, G. C. (2017). Impact of radiofrequency radiation on DNA damage and antioxidants in peripheral blood lymphocytes of humans residing in the vicinity of mobile phone base stations. Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/15368378.2017.1350584</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Quoting: C4ST Fact checks Government of Canada Webpages Regarding Health Risks and Wireless Technologies including 5G (January 2021) https://www.appel5gappeal.ca/eng/fact-checker.php</p> <p><i>Children are not little adults. All of the "safety" information in Safety Code 6 is based on "models," not real children.</i></p> <p>Quoting Health Canada re Safety Code 6 https://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection/H46-2-99-237E.pdf Page 3, Paragraph 5 <i>"In a field where technology is advancing rapidly and where unexpected and unique problems may occur, this Code cannot cover all possible situations and blind adherence to rules cannot substitute for the exercise of good judgement."</i></p> <p>As noted, more than 40 peer reviewed scientific studies have documented evidence of biological harm to people living within 400 meters. Will Rogers put the safety of children first and withdraw its application for a cell tower installation at 120 West Beaver Creek?</p>
<p>Proponent response</p>	<p>Rogers has not withdrawn its application for the proposed site. As mentioned, please note that while we will continue to provide as much relevant information as possible, we have confirmed Rogers compliance with the applicable Health Canada radiofrequency exposure regulations. If you have</p>

<p>January 11, 2024</p>	<p>concerns about the validity of Safety Code 6 requirements, their applicability, and/or enforcement we would recommend you reach out to the appropriate authorities having jurisdiction.</p>
<p>16</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>16. Residents' # 14. Proponents renumbered # Existing facilities are "too far away" to provide "enhanced mobile coverage". Please define these and provide proof.</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>The target coverage objective is the residential area of the Doncrest neighbourhood. The closest existing mobile base station sites (towers and roof mounted sites) are existing Rogers sites (monopole at Kinnear Ct, roof mounted site on West Beaver Creek, monopole at Old 16th Ave, and rooftop structure at Bayview/HWY 7). These sites surround the Doncrest neighbourhood but do not provide the coverage reach and capacity required to provide reliable and high-quality service in the residential area. If Rogers could achieve the target coverage by upgrading or modifying one of their existing sites they would have already done so. It is much easier in terms of cost, time, and administration to modify an existing site rather than build a new one.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>It has been established that the affected area Residents have phone and text service; 911 service is accessible.</p> <p>The Information Package quote <i>"The site as proposed will provide wireless voice and data services for subscribers to the Rogers network."</i> Rogers has not demonstrated that there is a gap in service whereby Rogers' customers, in the affected area, currently have no voice or data service access. The proponent noted at the March 30th Public Community Information Session that they have not conducted any survey to check demand.</p> <p>188 Residents and commercial business representatives have signed a petition opposing the proposed Rogers installation at 120 West Beaver Creek, plus 461 on-line signatures</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>It has been established that cell/text/internet and 911 service is currently available to the area Residents, why isn't "enhanced" service for Rogers customers being addressed through other means directly to Rogers customers- fiber optic cable to the home?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>The proposal supports enhanced wireless voice & data coverage which is provided through wireless network infrastructure, in this case antennas and telecommunication tower. Wireless communication requires the use of radio frequency (RF) signals to transmit data between devices. These RF signals are transmitted over the airwaves and are received by mobile devices equipped with wireless receivers. Please refer to question #14 for Fiber Optic response.</p> <p>The coverage map does show there is unreliable, existing coverage in the area. The proposed site will provide more reliable and high-quality service.</p>
<p>17</p>	
<p>Question submitted</p>	<p>17. Residents' # 15. Proponents renumbered # Location "does not have adequate deployment height or structural capacity" for their antenna equipment. Please define these and provide proof.</p>

<p>March 28, 2023</p>	
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>The location described in this question is unclear. Generally, deployment height and structural capacity are references to factors that may affect the feasibility of colocation or tower sharing. For tower sharing to be feasible the existing site would have to be located in the target coverage area and have adequate deployment height and structural capacity for additional antenna equipment. If the existing location in question was too low to provide useful coverage then it would be disqualified as a viable candidate. Similarly, if the existing site in question was already loaded with equipment and not structurally capable of supporting any additional equipment then it would be disqualified as a feasible tower sharing candidate.</p> <p>In this case Rogers required approx. 30m in deployment height, enough space for their proposed antenna equipment, and to be located near the Doncrest neighbourhood to achieve the target coverage objective. No existing facility in the area fulfills these requirements and so a new base station tower site has been proposed.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>The Information Package quote <i>"The site as proposed will provide wireless voice and data services for subscribers to the Rogers network."</i> Rogers has not demonstrated that there is a gap in service whereby Rogers' customers, in the affected area, currently have no voice or data service access. The proponent noted at the March 30th Public Community Information Session that they have not conducted any survey to check demand.</p> <p>188 Residents and commercial business representatives have signed a petition opposing the proposed Rogers installation at 120 West Beaver Creek, plus 461 on-line signatures.</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>It has been established that the affected area Residents have phone and text service; 911 service is accessible. Why is "enhanced service for Rogers customers" not facilitated through fiber optic cable to the home?</p> <p>Is the proposed cell tower structure being engineered in a manner that will accommodate additional structure modifications that will support an increase in the height of the tower?</p> <p>Is the proposed cell tower structure being engineered in a manner that will accommodate additional structure modifications that will support an increased structural load capacity to add additional transmitters/antennas? What is the maximum number of transmitters/antennas that will be attached to this proposed cell tower structure?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to response to question #16 above.</p> <p>While the site is designed to suit the needs of Rogers network and their customers, it is possible that in the future another carrier (e.g., Bell, Freedom Mobile) might share this tower location to improve their network. This will be in the form of adding antennas to the existing proposed 27m tower. If Colocation occurs it will be on the tower as originally constructed. It is extremely unlikely the height of the tower will increase for colocation purposes. If height of the tower were to increase above 25% of the proposed tower, an additional public consultation process will occur.</p> <p>The final approved design will dictate the maximum number of operators/antennas it can support. Currently 12 panel antennas in 6 sectors have been proposed ranging from 20m to 26m in height.</p>

<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>18. Residents' # 16. Proponents renumbered # When describing the purpose of the tower, they say things like: to provide their customers with improved wireless network coverage; they will provide wireless voice and data services for subscribers of their network. Why should a tower that is meant to serve a specific company's clients be imposed on an entire community?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>The tower site proposed is to provide improved Rogers wireless services. While the site is designed to suit the needs of Rogers network and their customers it is possible that in the future another carrier (e.g., Bell, Freedom Mobile) might share this tower location to improve their network as well. Additionally, devices linked to another service provider may be able to "roam" or piggyback on Rogers improved service in the area if their primary provider does not serve this particular area.</p> <p>In Canada we are fortunate that we have competitive wireless service offerings. Having multiple cell network providers competing in the same market can lead to better prices, more innovative services, and improved quality of service. This is because each provider is motivated to improve its offerings to attract and retain customers. Although Canada's various wireless networks are similar, they are not the exact same and this gives us more options to choose from based on needs, geographic location, and other offerings.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>The Information Package quote <i>"The site as proposed will provide wireless voice and data services for subscribers to the Rogers network."</i> Rogers has not demonstrated that there is a gap in service whereby Rogers' customers, in the affected area, currently have no voice or data service access. The proponent noted at the March 30th Public Community Information Session that they have not conducted any survey to check demand.</p> <p>188 Residents and commercial business representatives have signed a petition opposing the proposed Rogers installation at 120 West Beaver Creek, plus 461 on-line signatures.</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>It has been established that the affected area Residents have phone and text service; 911 service is accessible. Why is "enhanced service for Rogers customers" not facilitated through fiber optic cable to the home?</p> <p>Does Rogers enhanced customer service include listening to customers, and potential customers, opposition to Rogers proposed cell tower at this location?</p> <p>Quoting the National Post: <i>Canada's wireless costs 'continue to be the highest or among the highest in the world': Finnish report</i> <i>In a previous analysis of the Canadian cellphone market, Helsinki-based Rewheel put the blame squarely on Canada's lack of telecom competition</i> Author of the article:Tristin Hopper Published Oct 10, 2021 • Last updated Oct 10, 2021 • 3 minute read https://nationalpost.com/news/canada/canadas-wireless-costs-continue-to-be-the-highest-or-among-the-highest-in-the-world-finnish-report</p> <p>Please explain your comment and provide documentation to support your quote: <i>"In Canada we are fortunate that we have competitive wireless service offerings. Having multiple cell network providers competing in the same market can lead to better prices, more innovative services, and improved quality of service."</i></p>
<p>Proponent response</p>	<p>Please refer to response to question #16 above. The purpose of the public consultation process allows for members of the public to provide opinions on a proposal such as this one. Opposition to this specific proposal has been documented and will be provided to the City.</p>

<p>January 11, 2024</p>	<p>In Canada, there is more than one wireless service offering. To name a few; Rogers, Telus, Bell, Freedom Mobile, SaskTel, Videotron. Furthermore, the CRTC is taking action to help additional competitors establish themselves in the wireless market. This will help promote competition and lower prices for consumers. It will also encourage investment in infrastructure, such as 5G (fifth generation) technology. https://crtc.gc.ca/eng/phone/mobile/indus.htm</p>
<p>19</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>19. Residents' # 17. Proponents renumbered # Which gap are you filling with this new tower?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Please see the attached before/after coverage maps showing the coverage pattern and range of the new proposed site.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Non-computer-generated comment from Proponent at the Community Information Session noted - The proponent noted at the March 30th Public Community Information Session that they have not conducted any survey to check demand.</p> <p>A computer-generated model does not accurately reflect the wants and needs of the community.</p> <p>The Information Package quote "The site as proposed will provide wireless voice and data services for subscribers to the Rogers network." Rogers has not demonstrated that there is a gap in service whereby Rogers' customers, in the affected area, currently have no voice or data service access.</p> <p>188 Residents and commercial business representatives have signed a petition opposing the proposed Rogers installation at 120 West Beaver Creek, plus 461 online signatures.</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Why is Rogers imposing computer-generated model information over "real live people's" desired service needs?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>The coverage maps are a visual representation of the improved coverage the proposed site will provide to the area. The public consultation process allows members of the public to ask questions, provide comments and feedback on the proposed location and design, and ultimately provide a position either for or against the proposal. In this case, opposition for the proposal is documented and will be provided in the public consultation package to the City.</p>
<p>20</p>	
<p>Question submitted</p>	<p>20. Residents' # 18. Proponents renumbered #</p>

<p>March 28, 2023</p>	<p>Have you looked at alternative sites closer to Bayview and Highway 7 to serve Valleymede and Briggs, and alternative sites in the blocks between West Wilmot St, West Beaver Creek, Leslie and Highway 7 that's at least 400m away from residences?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Rogers currently operates a roof mounted mobile base station at HWY 7 and Bayview (approx.. 125m from the nearest residential dwellings) and a monopole tower site at West Wilmot & Kinnear CT. Even with both of these locations in operation additional sites are required to service the residential area of the Doncrest neighbourhood.</p> <p>Please see attached coverage maps and existing Rogers site map for reference.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>The computer-generated model does not reflect the area Residents wants and needs.</p> <p>The Information Package <i>quote "The site as proposed will provide wireless voice and data services for subscribers to the Rogers network."</i> Rogers has not demonstrated that there is a gap in service whereby Rogers' customers, in the affected area, currently have no voice or data service access. The proponent noted at the March 30th Public Community Information Session that they have not conducted any survey to check demand.</p> <p>188 Residents and commercial business representatives have signed a petition opposing the proposed Rogers installation at 120 West Beaver Creek, plus 461 on-lines signatures</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Why is Rogers imposing computer-generated model information over "real live people's" desired service needs?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to response to question #19 above.</p>
<p>21</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>21. Residents' # 19. Proponents renumbered # What is the coverage radius of your new proposed tower?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Please see the attached before/after coverage maps showing the coverage pattern and range of the new proposed site.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>The computer-generated model does not reflect the area Residents wants and needs. The proponent noted at the March 30th Public Community Information Session that they have not conducted any survey to check demand.</p> <p>The Information Package quote <i>"The site as proposed will provide wireless voice and data services for subscribers to the Rogers network."</i> Rogers has not demonstrated that there is a gap in service whereby Rogers' customers, in the affected area, currently have no voice or data service access.</p>

	188 Residents and commercial business representatives have signed a petition opposing the proposed Rogers installation at 120 West Beaver Creek, plus 461 on-line signatures.
Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023	Why is Rogers imposing computer-generated model information over "real live people's" desired service needs?
Proponent response January 11, 2024	Please refer to response to question #19 above.
22	
Question submitted March 28, 2023	22. Residents' # 20. Proponents renumbered # Will the frequency and power ever be adjusted to a higher level? If this adjustment to a higher level occurs, will this be publicly posted and will there be reasonable notice given to Residents such as ourselves? If no, why not?
Proponent response May 25, 2023	The amount of power that a cell tower uses to transmit signals can vary depending on several factors, such as the number of active users, the distance between the tower and the user, and the terrain in the surrounding area. In areas with high user demand, the cell tower may increase its power output to accommodate the increased traffic. However, in areas with low user demand, the tower may reduce its power output to save energy and reduce interference with other nearby cell towers. Regardless of the adjustments the site must always remain compliant with Health Canada's radiofrequency exposure guidelines Safety Code 6. Rogers has confirmed this site will comply with Health Canada's exposure limits on an ongoing basis with a maximum (worst case) exposure level calculated to be 14.38% at ground level and 10.88% at ground level 100m south of the proposed tower location (closest residential area). Increases/changes to frequencies and power are already built into the calculations for this site. The provided Safety Code 6 compliance calculations assume all transmitters on at full power at the same time as well as include additional frequency and power output to allow for future capacity growth at the site. Even though notification is not required for modifications to an existing site (except a change in height or design) the information provided is actually much higher than it would be on the "in- service" date because it accounts for future increases.
Residents' responses June 12, 2023	To avoid "maximum (worst-case) exposure level" we oppose the proposed cell tower installation.
Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023	What is the power output of each transmitter? How many transmitters will be placed on the cell tower. What is the projected level of electricity required to operate the proposed cell tower? Have any contracts been entered into/or expected to be entered into for use of electricity, to operate the cell tower installation, at a rate below what the constituents are required to pay for their electricity?

	<p>You quote <i>a maximum (worst case) exposure level calculated to be 14.38% at ground level and 10.88% at ground level 100m south of the proposed tower location (closest residential area).</i> What would the maximum exposure be to buildings that are higher than ground level that could include multi-level homes and schools?</p> <p>Though Rogers notes notification of increases/changes to frequencies and power output is not required will Rogers agree to notify the City within 24 hrs of all changes made to frequencies, power output and structural modifications?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to the attached document for the transmitter power for the proposed site.</p> <p>The proposed telecommunication tower is not yet approved for construction and therefore not at the stage of powering the site. Power to the site can be provided by the local service provider and or the property owner.</p> <p>Please refer to response in question #6 regarding the exposure to buildings higher than ground level and please refer to response in question #13 regarding notification of changes 24 hours in advance.</p>
<p>23</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>23. Residents' # 21. Proponents renumbered #</p> <p>Roger's Representative Sean indicated in his email response that RF radiation under Safety Code 6 limits causes no biological harm and is not strong enough to break chemical bonds. Please explain why hundreds of peer reviewed scientific studies, recognized by the US Federal Court with exposures far below Canada's Safety Code 6 limits show that cell tower RF radiation does in fact present harm to humans and the environment nearby?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Rogers exposure levels significantly exceed the required Health Canada radiofrequency exposure guidelines ("Safety Code 6") limits. The exposure limits in Safety Code 6 are based on Health Canada research and an ongoing review of published scientific studies on potential adverse health effects. Safety Code 6 is reviewed on a regular basis to confirm that it continues to provide protection against all known potentially adverse health effects.</p> <p>While some studies have reported biological effects or adverse health effects of RF fields at levels below the limits in Safety Code 6, these studies only form part of the dataset and do not represent the prevailing line of scientific evidence in these respective areas. The Government of Canada specifically advises that "Based on the available scientific evidence, there are no health risks from exposure to the low levels of radiofrequency EMF which people are exposed to from cell phones, cell phone towers, antennas and 5G devices" (more information available at: https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/cellphones-towers.html)</p> <p>Some sources refer to specific scientific publications, no single scientific study, considered in isolation, can prove or disprove the existence of an adverse health effect. There are criteria that scientists use to establish scientific evidence for the existence of an adverse health effect.</p> <p>The evidence needs to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • generally accepted by the broader scientific community • reproducible, to ensure the results were not random or due to other factors • evaluated in its totality, meaning that both positive and negative results are evaluated on their own merit and then evaluated as a whole

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• consistent across studies, that is, the evidence is stronger if different types of studies (epidemiology and laboratory) point to the same conclusion <p>Health Canada continues to monitor all domestic and international scientific evidence on radiofrequency EMF and health. If new scientific evidence were to show that exposure to radiofrequency EMF at levels below the Canadian limits is a health concern, we would take action to protect your health and safety.</p> <p>The above information is taken directly from the Government of Canada (Health Canada) radiation and safety webpage 5G technology, cell phones, cell phone towers and antennas available here: https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/cell-phones-towers.html</p> <p>Please note that while we will continue to provide as much relevant information as possible, we have confirmed Rogers compliance with the applicable Health Canada radiofrequency exposure regulations. If you have concerns about the validity of Safety Code 6 requirements, their applicability, and/or enforcement I would recommend you reach out to the appropriate authorities having jurisdiction:</p> <p>Consumer and Clinical Radiation Protection Bureau - Health Canada 775 Brookfield Road A.L. 6302C Ottawa, Ontario K1A 1C1 E-mail: HC.ccrpb-pcrpc.SC@canada.ca Telephone: 613-957-2991</p> <p>ISED Toronto District Office 151 Yonge Street, 4th floor Toronto ON M5C 2W7 Telephone: 1-855-465- 6307 Fax: 416-954-3553 Email: ic.spectrumtoronto- spectretoronto.ic@canada.ca</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>In reply to your lengthy "answer", we reference <i>C4ST Fact-checks Government of Canada Webpages Regarding Health Risks and Wireless Technologies, including 5G. Canadians for Safe Technology (C4ST) has fact-checked ("Fact-checks")</i> some of these statements and found them to be inaccurate and misleading to the point of being "misinformation." https://www.appel5gappeal.ca/eng/fact-checker.php</p> <p>Addressing the points in the link you provided: 5G technology, cell phones, cell phone towers and antennas https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/cell-phones-towers.html#factsheet.</p> <p>Fact Sheet Heading: About Cell Phone Towers and 5G Technology <i>5G is the term used to describe the 5th generation of wireless communication technology that will be used by newer mobile devices and antenna installations. 5G can use:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• frequencies used by current mobile devices for example 3G and 4G• frequencies above 6GHz

Quoting Fact-checks: *5G will use millimetre frequencies, in addition to many of the same frequencies already in use (2G, 3G,4G and LTE). The science on the effects of exposure to millimetre frequencies on biological systems is sparse. Most studies have looked at only one frequency in the millimetre range and not the complex RF mixtures that 5G technologies will emit.*

Two recent literature reviews published in peer-reviewed journals analyzing the scientific evidence on the biological effects of 5G frequencies both concluded that there is not enough known about these 5G millimetre frequencies to assure safety.

The review by Dr. Myrtil Simkó and Dr. Mats-Olof Mattson (2019) from Sweden identified 94 relevant studies, with 80% of the in vivo studies and 58% of the in vitro studies showing biological effects. They concluded, "The available studies do not provide adequate and sufficient information for a meaningful safety assessment."

- *The review by Finnish researcher Dr. Darius Leszczynski (2020) on skin and skin cells concluded, "the scientific evidence concerning possible effects of millimeter-waves on humans is insufficient to devise science- based exposure limits and to develop science-based human health policies."*

Furthermore, considering that many 5G technologies are still in development, Health Canada cannot possibly assure safety for biological effects of these complex technologies. Health Canada's basis for its statement on safety is based only on temperature simulations.

2) Safety Code 6 (2015) is outdated. It does not protect the health of Canadians from RF radiation emitted by pre-5G technologies (cell phones, cell tower antennas, Wi-Fi, etc.).

We draw your attention to Phonegate Canada: Court authorizes class action against Apple and Samsung; September 22, 2022 ("Phonegate")
<https://phonegatealert.org/en/class-action-apple-samsung/>

Quote: For his part, Dr. Marc Arazi, who revealed the scandal in 2016 and is author of the book "Phonegate", recently translated into English: "We are pleased with this favorable ruling, which opens up important prospects for the recognition of the Phonegate scandal in Canada as well as in the rest of the world. For the moment, Apple and Samsung are concerned, but we hope that, in the long run, all manufacturers and cell phone operators will be held accountable for their actions that knowingly endanger the health of billions of users."

Quote: Sharon Noble, Canadian Board Member of the NGO Phonegate Alert, appeals to the Canadian government: "The Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development (ISED), formerly Industry Canada, is responsible for testing wireless devices to ensure they meet Health Canada's Safety Code 6 standards, which are among the lowest in the developed world. As a result, 9 out of 10 cell phones on the Canadian market have SAR levels well above regulatory limits in actual use (in contact or near contact with the body). The ISED protocol, still today, allows to test phones up to 15 mm from the "body". This ruling is therefore an important step forward that must be taken into account by the Canadian government very quickly in order to put in place regulations that will really protect the health of users of cell phones and connected objects."

Addressing the points in the link you provided: *5G technology, cell phones, cell phone towers and antennas*
<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/cell-phones-towers.html#factsheet>.

Fact Sheet Heading: *Health Effects of Radiofrequency EMF*

Thousands of scientific studies have evaluated the safety of radiofrequency EMF. Evidence from these studies establishes only 2 adverse health effects that can occur at levels above the Canadian limits

- *tissue heating, such as the warming of your skin*
- *nerve stimulation which can cause a tingling sensation in your skin*

The occurrence of these health effects depends on a combination of

- *the intensity of radiofrequency EMF exposure*
- *how long you are exposed to radiofrequency EMF*
- *the distance of your body from the source of radiofrequency EMF*

Limits for human exposure in Safety Code 6 focus only on thermal/heating effects based on a 6-minute exposure.

<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/health-risks-safety/limits-human-exposure-radiofrequency-electromagnetic-energy-range-3-300.html>.

Numerous peer-reviewed scientific studies published since the Health Canada 2015 Safety Code 6 update and subsequent study by the House of Commons Parliamentary Health Committee (HESA) provide strong evidence of cellular biological harms.

<https://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/41-2/HESA/report->

13/. These include biochemical changes, damage to DNA and other cellular components in human sperm and other types of cells, additional effects in humans and other organisms (such as effects on development, behaviour, brain activity, cancers), and **human Electrohypersensitivity (EHS)**. (See Appendix 2 and linked resource.) These studies report harmful effects at RF-EMR levels far below those that cause excessive heating; in other words, **adverse effects occur at levels far below Health Canada's Safety Code 6 guidelines**, which are based solely on thermal effects. Recent research and clinical publications are summarized in Appendix 3 and 4.

Paper written by Toronto physician on EHS: **PRELIMINARY Clinical Practice Guidelines in the Diagnosis and Management of Electromagnetic Field Hypersensitivity (EHS)**

<https://www.womenscollegehospital.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Preliminary-Clinical-Guidelines-for-EHS.pdf> by Dr. Riina Ines Bray BAsC, MSc, MD, FCFP, MHSc Medical Director, Environmental Health Clinic, Women's College Hospital Assistant Professor, Department of Family and Community Medicine and Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto

Health Canada conducted a major review last year titled "**Analysis of Recommended Localized Human Exposure Limits for Radiofrequency Fields in the Frequency Range, 6 GHz to 300 GHz.**" Health Canada, Consumer & Clinical Radiation Protection Bureau (CCRPB). Approved by Narine Martel, Director, 2021, 243. This report can be obtained by request from Health Canada. This "analysis" did not find any 5G mmWave studies on humans except temperature. Page 32: Extract: "**No human studies were identified that assessed endpoints such as cancer, ocular effects, reproductive system effects, cognitive effects, impacts on the immune system, non-specific symptoms or any other adverse health outcome...**" in response to exposure to RFEMF in the 6-300 GHz frequency range." (Appendix 4).

Quoting ISED - RSS-102 — Radio Frequency (RF) Exposure Compliance of Radiocommunication Apparatus (All Frequency Bands)

2.6 User Manual Requirements *The applicant is responsible for providing proper instructions to the user of the radio device, and any usage restrictions,*

	<p><i>including limits of exposure durations. The user manual shall provide installation and operation instructions, (Footnote7) as well as any special usage conditions (e.g. proper accessory required, including the proper orientation of the device in the accessory, maximum antenna gain in the case of detachable antenna), in order to ensure compliance with SAR and/or RF field strength limits. For instance, compliance distance shall be clearly stated in the user manual.</i></p> <p><i>The user manual of devices intended for controlled use shall also include information relating to the operating characteristics of the device; the operating instructions to ensure compliance with SAR and/or RF field strength limits; information on the installation and operation of accessories to ensure compliance with SAR and/or RF field strength limits; and contact information where the user can obtain Canadian information on RF exposure and compliance. Other related information may also be included.</i></p> <p><i>Footnote 7: All device operating instructions and installations shall be supported by the test configurations and the test results. Applying instructions as a substitute for providing test results is unacceptable. Caution statements or warning labels are only acceptable for alerting users from certain unintended use conditions that are not required for normal operations.</i></p> <p>https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/spectrum-management-telecommunications/en/official-publications/standards/radio-equipment-standards/licence-exempt-radio-apparatus-standards-list/rss-102-radio-frequency-rf-exposure-compliance-radiocommunication-apparatus-all-frequency-bands#s2.6</p> <p>Technology is moving fast – Safety Code 6 is not keeping up with all aspects and harmful effects, documented in independent scientific studies, caused by radio frequency microwave radiation (RF-EMR) exposure. RF-EMR is a biologically-active physical agent that is increasing greatly in everyday environments as a result of the RF-EMR emissions generated for wireless telecommunications. Today's RF-EMR levels are approximately 1,000,000,000,000,000,000 times historical levels (The Lancet Planetary Health (2018) https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(18)30221-3).</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Clarify your use of the word “exceed” “Rogers exposure levels significantly exceed the required Health Canada radiofrequency guidelines...” Is Rogers acknowledging they are over Safety Code 6 limits?</p> <p>Frank Clegg, former President of Microsoft Canada, challenges Rogers VP Dean Prevost to provide the scientific studies that support Mr. Prevost’s statements that these emissions are safe. See video - Video: Clegg Safety Challenge 5 minutes 12 seconds https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LqPJxyeDqYo</p> <p>Quoting Health Canada re Safety Code 6 https://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection/H46-2-99-237E.pdf Page 3, Paragraph 5 “In a field where technology is advancing rapidly and where unexpected and unique problems may occur, this Code cannot cover all possible situations and blind adherence to rules cannot substitute for the exercise of good judgement.”</p> <p>Now that Rogers Communications Inc., has been made aware it is relying on misleading information, will Rogers Communications accept full responsibility and accountability for their wireless deployment decisions?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>The exposure levels significantly <i>exceed</i> the <i>minimum</i> requirement, or stated differently, are <i>well below</i> the requirements of Health Canada’s radiofrequency exposure guidelines (“Safety Code 6”) limits.</p> <p>Rogers has met Health Canada’s set out requirements. If you have concerns about the validity of Safety Code 6 requirements, their applicability, and/or enforcement we would recommend you reach out to the appropriate authorities having jurisdiction. See above May 25th response for contact information.</p>

24	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>24. Residents' # 22. Proponents renumbered # If this cell tower were to be installed, and any of the Doncrest Residents who live within 400 meters experience any electromagnetic sensitivity symptoms within the next 20 years, can we hold Roger's Representative Sean and anyone who selects this site and approves this personally and financially accountable? Are you willing to formalize this guarantee in an agreement with all of the Residents?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>I would recommend you contact a liability/legal expert for input on this question however, in my opinion:</p> <p>Liability for health claims related to cell towers would likely depend on whether the installation and operation of the cell tower was conducted in a manner that complied with all applicable regulations and guidelines. If the installation and operation of the tower complied with all applicable safety guidelines and regulations, and the scientific evidence did not support a causal link between RF exposure and the alleged health effects, it may be difficult to establish liability.</p> <p>Rogers has demonstrated the site will be compliant with all applicable safety regulations and attested this compliance will be maintained on an ongoing basis including any changes to those regulations. It is the government of Canada's conclusion that "Based on the available scientific evidence, there are no health risks from exposure to the low levels of radiofrequency EMF which people are exposed to from cell phones, cell phone towers, antennas and 5G devices".</p> <p>If you would like additional information on Safety Code 6 requirements, their applicability, and/or enforcement I would recommend you reach out to the appropriate authorities having jurisdiction (Health Canada and ISED listed in question 23)</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Telecom Acknowledges Potential Litigation: Quoting: Rogers Communications Inc., 2022 ANNUAL REPORT ROGERS COMMUNICATIONS INC. 67 MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS</p> <p><i>"Radio frequency emissions</i> <i>From time to time, media and other reports have highlighted alleged links between radio frequency emissions from wireless devices (including new 5G technology) and various health concerns, including cancer, and interference with various medical devices, including hearing aids and pacemakers. This may discourage the use of wireless devices or expose us to potential litigation even though there are no definitive reports or studies stating that these health issues are directly attributable to radio frequency emissions. Future regulatory actions may result in more restrictive standards on radio frequency emissions from low-powered devices like wireless devices. We cannot predict the nature or extent of any restrictions."</i></p> <p>Posted to SEDAR; Rogers Communications Inc. Mar 9 2023 18:19:11 ET MD&A-English PDF 965K Page 67</p> <p>More than 40 peer reviewed scientific studies have documented evidence of biological harm to people living within 400 meters. https://ehtrust.org/cell-towers-and-cell-antennae/compilation-of-research-studies-on-cell-tower-radiation-and-health/</p>

<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Can Rogers document possession of liability insurance that does not exclude health claims due to radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure?</p> <p>As Rogers has acknowledged potential litigation, are landowners, from whom Rogers rents/leases space for their installations, advised to obtain liability insurance that does not exclude health claims due to radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure in case they may be exposed to litigation?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to response to #9 above.</p>
<p>25</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>25. Residents' # 23. Proponents renumbered # If RF radiation and 5G is so safe like Sean mentioned, why do insurance companies rank 5G and electromagnetic radiation as a "high" risk, comparing the issue to lead and asbestos, and unwilling to provide insurance cover liabilities related to damages from long term exposure to radiofrequency emissions?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>I am not aware of any official ranking by insurance companies that specifically identifies 5G technology as high risk. While it is true that the deployment of new technologies can sometimes introduce new risks that need to be assessed and managed, it is important to note that the insurance industry typically evaluates risks based on a wide range of factors, including the likelihood and severity of potential losses, and the availability of data and scientific evidence to support risk assessments.</p> <p>As it pertains to this specific proposed tower, the site will deploy mainly LTE (4G) and some 3.5G services which are considered mature technologies. Rogers is anticipating deploying 5G services at this site in the future. While 5G is still a relatively new technology, it is no longer considered "new" as it has been extensively tested and deployed by cellular network operators worldwide. All frequencies to be deployed at the proposed site will be licensed by the department of Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada and comply with all applicable regulations.</p> <p>It is possible that individual insurance companies may have different risk assessments regarding the deployment of 5G technology than the Government of Canada. Exactly how and why and particular insurance company ranks radiofrequency energy and specifically 5G frequency bands as a risk is a question best addressed by those insurance companies.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Insurers Have Expressed Concerns: https://ehtrust.org/LIABILITY-AND- RISK-FROM-5G-AND-CELL-TOWERS/ Insurance Company Quotes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lloyds of London 2010 Report "The danger with EMF is that, like asbestos, the exposure insurers face is underestimated and could grow exponentially and be with us for many years" • Swiss Re Report 2019 "5G rated as a "high off the leash" emerging risk" • Swiss Re Reports 2013, 2014 ranks the "unforeseen consequences of EMF" to the insurance industry as "High" <p>Telecom Acknowledges Potential Litigation: Quoting Rogers Communications Inc., 2022 ANNUAL REPORT ROGERS COMMUNICATIONS INC. 67 MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS</p>

	<p><i>“Radio frequency emissions</i> <i>From time to time, media and other reports have highlighted alleged links between radio frequency emissions from wireless devices (including new 5G technology) and various health concerns, including cancer, and interference with various medical devices, including hearing aids and pacemakers. This may discourage the use of wireless devices or expose us to potential litigation even though there are no definitive reports or studies stating that these health issues are directly attributable to radio frequency emissions. Future regulatory actions may result in more restrictive standards on radio frequency emissions from low-powered devices like wireless devices. We cannot predict the nature or extent of any restrictions.”</i></p> <p>Posted to SEDAR; Rogers Communications Inc. Mar 9 2023 18:19:11 ET MD&A-English PDF 965K Page 67</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Can Rogers document possession of liability insurance that <u>does not exclude</u> health claims due to radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure?</p> <p>As Rogers has acknowledged potential litigation, are landowners, from whom Rogers rents/leases space for their installations, advised to obtain liability insurance that <u>does not exclude</u> health claims due to radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure in case they may be exposed to litigation?</p> <p>Frank Clegg, former President of Microsoft Canada, challenges Rogers VP Dean Prevost to provide the scientific studies that support Mr. Prevost’s statements that these emissions are safe. See video - Video: Clegg Safety Challenge 5 minutes 12 seconds https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LqPJxyeDqYo</p> <p>Your reference “While 5G is still a relatively new technology, it is no longer considered experimental as it has been extensively tested and deployed by cellular network operators worldwide.” Can Rogers provide a list of third-party peer reviewed research and studies that verify human health will not be adversely affected by the frequencies emitted from this antenna and technologies?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to response to #9 above for our response to liability insurance.</p> <p>Rogers follows the regulations set out by the appropriate government authorities. In this case, Health Canada’s radiofrequency exposure guidelines (“Safety Code 6”) for all installations.</p>
<p>26</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>26. Residents’ # 24. Proponents renumbered # RF radiation is currently classified as Class 2B “possible human carcinogen” by WHO. Lead is under the same classification. Are city planners willingly exposing the nearby Residents and Natural Conversation Area to such pollutant 24/7?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Radiofrequency energy was classified as ‘possibly carcinogenic to humans’ (class 2B carcinogen) by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). This designation was based on limited evidence of cell phone use (not cell tower exposure) and puts cell phone use in the same class 2B category as aloe vera and pickled vegetables.</p> <p>It is important to note that the IARC did not find a direct link between radiofrequency EMF exposure and cancer and that the vast majority of research to date does not support a link between radiofrequency RF exposure and cancers in humans.</p>
<p>Residents’ responses June</p>	<p>People are not being given a choice not to be exposed to RF radiation emitted 24/7 from the proposed cell tower installation at 120 West Beaver Creek.</p>

<p>12, 2023</p>	<p>IARC does not differentiate sources of RF nor RF frequencies.</p> <p>RF radiation is an agent classified by the World Health Organization as “Group 2B Possibly carcinogenic to humans.” https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5504984/#:~:text=RF%20radiation%20was%20classified%20as,health%20hazards%20from%20RF%20radiation</p> <p>Peer reviewed scientific evidence that supports a link between radiofrequency RF exposure and cancers in humans:</p> <p>1. Hardell, L., & Carlberg, M. (2018). Comments on the US National Toxicology Program technical reports on toxicology and carcinogenesis study in rats exposed to whole-body radiofrequency radiation at 900 MHz and in mice exposed to whole-body radiofrequency radiation at 1,900 MHz. International Journal of Oncology Extracts from the abstract: We conclude that there is clear evidence that RF radiation is a human carcinogen ... Based on the Preamble to the IARC Monographs, RF radiation should be classified as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1. https://doi.org/10.3892/ijo.2018.4606</p> <p>2. Miller, A. B., Morgan, L. L., Udasin, I., & Davis, D. L. (2018). Cancer epidemiology update, following the 2011 IARC evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (Monograph 102). Environmental Research, 167(673-683). Extracts for Abstract: When considered with recent animal experimental evidence, the recent epidemiological studies strengthen and support the conclusion that RFR should be categorized as carcinogenic to humans (IARC Group 1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.043</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>We are not exposed to aloe vera and pickled vegetables – 24/7. Other Class 2B agents include DDT and Chloroform.</p> <p>Will Rogers agree that RF radiation should be categorized as an IARC Group 1 <i>known</i> carcinogen?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>We will continue to provide as much relevant information as possible, we have confirmed Rogers compliance with the applicable Health Canada radiofrequency exposure regulations. If you have concerns about the validity of Safety Code 6 requirements, their applicability, and/or enforcement we would recommend you reach out to the appropriate authorities having jurisdiction (see above response in question #23).</p>
<p>27</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>27. Residents' # 25. Proponents renumbered # What did Forbes Bros. do for the disability community to receive and comprehend the Information Package?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Outside of the required City applications, mailed notices, and notice sign on the property, no additional measures were undertaken for the disabled community. The written notice was stamped in bold indicating the enclosed information pertained to an antenna system in the community, and the notice itself included information about the virtual meeting and contact information including mailing address, phone number, and email of the proponent and the City of Richmond Hill. If email or internet access was a limiting factor phone numbers were available. If phones were a limiting factor, a physical mailing address was available.</p> <p>No instructions or requests were received from the City of Richmond Hill or public to provide any additional measures for the disabled community.</p>

<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Forbes Bros Ltd. did not comply with City Protocol 6.1 Public Notification Package: <i>"• draft covering letter to circulated Residents advising that the City has received the application for public consultation on a proposed radio-communication and broadcasting antenna system (see Appendix "5");"</i></p> <p>No covering letter was sent with the Forbes Bros Information Package. No information in the Information Package indicating that the City has received the application and the application is currently being reviewed by a City staff. The distributed Information Package was not adequately identifiable.</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Why did Forbes not fully comply with the City Protocol?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to response to question # 1.</p>
<p>28</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>28. Residents' # 26. Proponents renumbered # How is the city planner providing internet access for the disability community who is vulnerable to electromagnetic sensitivity symptoms?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Forbes does not speak for nor represent the City of Richmond Hill however my opinion on this concern:</p> <p>I do not believe it is the City planners job to provide internet access for the disabled community who might be vulnerable to electromagnetic sensitivity symptoms. Hard wired internet services may be available for public use (e.g., a local public library might offer computers with ethernet or fiber connections instead of Wifi) and a sensitive individual can investigate alternative installations to wireless internet services at home.</p> <p>As it pertains to this specific proposed site and the consultation process the notification documents include phone numbers and physical addresses to mail letters if sensitive individuals choose not to use email and/or do not have access to wired internet services.</p> <p>Forbes did not receive any direct requests (either via email, physically written, or over the phone) for alternative means to participate in the public consultation process not already provided Via email, physically written, or over the phone) for alternative means to participate in the public consultation process not already provided.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>No further questions at this time.</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>What service does Rogers provide to customers who request wired internet and phone service with NO wireless components or RF-EMR emitting equipment inside the residence?</p> <p>Does Rogers fibre optic cable have embedded wireless RF-EMR emitting components, that cannot be completely turned off, that would expose vulnerable</p>

	<p>people to unwanted/unexpected radiofrequency radiation?</p> <p>We are glad to know that Rogers will provide alternative means to participate in the public consultation process upon request. Is this correct?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>The notification documents for the public consultation process include phone numbers and physical addresses to mail letters if sensitive individuals choose not to use email and/or do not have access to wired internet services. Individuals were not required to use any wireless or wired components to participate in the public consultation. The public consultation process followed was outlined by the City of Richmond Hill.</p>
29	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>29. Residents' # 27. Proponents renumbered # How is the city planner protecting the nearby Residents who choose not to be 24/7 exposed to the environmental pollutants from cell towers? At home we can turn wi-fi off and use ethernet instead of wi- fi, but we cannot turn off a cell tower.</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Forbes does not speak for nor represent the City of Richmond Hill however my opinion on this concern: City planning departments may review and consider factors such as zoning regulations, land use compatibility, aesthetics, and public input when evaluating proposed cell tower installations. However, the primary responsibility for establishing and enforcing RF exposure limits in Canada lies with the federal agencies of Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada (ISED) and Health Canada's Consumer and Clinical Radiation Protection Bureau. City planning departments typically defer to these federal regulations when considering the placement and construction of new cell towers or base station sites.</p> <p>The Canadian federal agencies that establish and enforce the RF exposure limits consider the health of the public protected as long as the exposure limits are respected. Rogers has indicated the proposed site will exceed the exposure limits by a significant margin.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Please refer to Resident Response – Question 21.</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Has this wireless service been mandated? If yes, by whom? Please provide the link to the authority.</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to response to question #7 above.</p>
30	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>30. Residents' # 28. Proponents renumbered # Who will monitor the health of our community caused by this tower and who do we report health issues to?</p>

<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>You should continue to monitor your own health as normal and if you are having issues you should speak to a doctor. Outside of individualized care there are federal provincial and local Public Health Agencies that monitor certain aspects related to community health. As it relates specifically to this proposed tower Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada (ISED) is responsible for ensuring the towers comply with the exposure limits outlined in Safety Code 6 and maintain a market surveillance program and routinely audit antenna installations and devices to verify compliance.</p> <p>More information on ISED's role in protecting the general public from RF exposure can be found at this FAQ page: https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/spectrum-management-telecommunications/en/radiocommunications/antenna-structures-and-you/frequently-asked-questions-faq-radiofrequency-rf-energy-and-health#se</p> <p>or by contacting the local ISED office:</p> <p>ISED Toronto District Office 151 Yonge Street, 4th floor Toronto ON M5C 2W7 Telephone: 1-855-465- 6307 Fax: 416-954-3553 Email: ic.spectrumtoronto-spectretoronto.ic@canada.ca</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>No further questions at this time.</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>To facilitate Residents monitoring and measuring health and harmful effects from this proposed cell tower installation - will Rogers provide written notice to the City of all changes to frequency, transmitting/receiving hardware, changes in power output, and provide a revised full report of all frequencies operating at the location within 24 hours of any modification made to the installation? If not, why not?</p> <p>Will Rogers provide notification to City of planned increase in size and/or height of the installation? If not, why not?</p> <p>Are all frequencies and changes to frequencies emitted from a cell tower reported to ISED? If yes, what is the timeframe in which a change must be reported to ISED and what is the specific department that receives this information?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to response in question #13 above.</p> <p>Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada (ISED) is responsible for ensuring the towers comply with the exposure limits outlined in Safety Code 6 and maintain a market surveillance program and routinely audit antenna installations and devices to verify compliance.</p>
<p>31</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>31. Residents' # 29. Proponents renumbered # In the event that people are injured from exposure to levels emitted by these antennas, who is liable for damages? Rogers? The Land Use Authority (LUA)? Or which other entity?</p>

<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>This is a hypothetical / situational question that is probably best suited for legal or liability experts. While each group has a role to play, there are too many individual considerations to provide a general statement on liability. For example, Rogers is required to comply with the Health Canada's exposure limits, the federal departments of ISED and Health Canada are responsible for establishing and enforcing those limits, the LUA is typically considered a commenting body to both the applicant and the federal bodies. In each of these roles there are many variables that could impact liability and most likely would require a case-by- case assessment of the situation E.g., was the carrier non-compliant with the limits? Was there some determination that the limits were not adequate? Were federal, provincial, or municipal governments or some other agency negligent in their responsibilities in some manner?</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Telecom Acknowledges Potential Litigation: Quoting Rogers Communications Inc., 2022 ANNUAL REPORT ROGERS COMMUNICATIONS INC. 67 MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS</p> <p><i>"Radio frequency emissions From time to time, media and other reports have highlighted alleged links between radio frequency emissions from wireless devices (including new 5G technology) and various health concerns, including cancer, and interference with various medical devices, including hearing aids and pacemakers. This may discourage the use of wireless devices or expose us to potential litigation even though there are no definitive reports or studies stating that these health issues are directly attributable to radio frequency emissions. Future regulatory actions may result in more restrictive standards on radio frequency emissions from low-powered devices like wireless devices. We cannot predict the nature or extent of any restrictions."</i></p> <p>Posted to SEDAR; Rogers Communications Inc. Mar 9 2023 18:19:11 ET MD&A-English PDF 965K Page 67</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Can Rogers document possession of liability insurance that <u>does not exclude</u> health claims due to radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure?</p> <p>As Rogers has acknowledged potential litigation, are landowners, from whom Rogers rents/leases space for their installations, advised to obtain liability insurance that <u>does not exclude</u> health claims due to radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure in case they may be exposed to litigation?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to response to #9 above.</p>
<p>32</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>32. Residents' # 30. Proponents renumbered # Are there any insurance policies in place in the event of any injuries that are linked to cell tower emissions?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>As agents to Rogers facilitating real estate and municipal consultation services, we are not privy to specific information about their insurance policies. The specific coverage and terms of liability insurance policies can vary depending on the insurance provider, the nature of the business, and other factors.</p> <p>For telecommunications companies like Rogers, liability insurance may cover a range of risks, including claims related to RF exposure, property damage, bodily injury, and other liabilities that may arise from their services, infrastructure, or operations.</p> <p>I am not aware (and it does not appear to be published) whether any governmental bodies such as ISED, Health Canada or Municipalities carry insurance</p>

	that specifically covers injuries related to "cell tower emissions".
Residents' responses June 12, 2023	<p>Telecom Acknowledges Potential Litigation: Quoting: Rogers Communications Inc., 2022 ANNUAL REPORT ROGERS COMMUNICATIONS INC. 67 MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS</p> <p><i>"Radio frequency emissions From time to time, media and other reports have highlighted alleged links between radio frequency emissions from wireless devices (including new 5G technology) and various health concerns, including cancer, and interference with various medical devices, including hearing aids and pacemakers. This may discourage the use of wireless devices or expose us to potential litigation even though there are no definitive reports or studies stating that these health issues are directly attributable to radio frequency emissions. Future regulatory actions may result in more restrictive standards on radio frequency emissions from low-powered devices like wireless devices. We cannot predict the nature or extent of any restrictions."</i></p> <p>Posted to SEDAR; Rogers Communications Inc. Mar 9 2023 18:19:11 ET MD&A-English PDF 965K Page 67</p>
Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023	<p>Can Rogers document possession of liability insurance that <u>does not exclude</u> health claims due to radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure?</p> <p>As Rogers has acknowledged potential litigation, are landowners, from whom Rogers rents/leases space for their installations, advised to obtain liti insurance that <u>does not exclude</u> health claims due to radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure in case they may be exposed to litigation?</p>
Proponent response January 11, 2024	Please refer to response to #9 above.
33	
Question submitted March 28, 2023	<p>33. Residents' # 31. Proponents renumbered # Does the cell tower have a lightning rod? If so, what is its height? What is the total height of the tower including the lightning rod?</p>
Proponent response May 25, 2023	<p>Cell towers commonly include some kind of lightning protection, this includes lightning rods/air terminals, grounding systems, surge protection devices, and adequate bonding and shielding of support and electronic materials.</p> <p>As this specific tower has only been proposed and not approved for construction, lightning protection has not yet been specified.</p> <p>A lightning rod would stick up above the top of the tower by a small margin (~1m) but is much smaller than the face width of the tower and is generally not very noticeable. In this case since there are considerations for airport zoning regulations, alternatives to a lightning rod that do not increase the tower height may be required.</p>
Residents' responses June 12, 2023	

<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Has Rogers not provided the City with complete plans for the construction of this installation? If not, why not?</p> <p>Is there a height restriction, on this proposed cell tower, per NAV Canada?</p> <p>Are there frequency restrictions, on this proposed cell tower, per NAV Canada?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>The proposal is currently in the public consultation phase. The public consultation process allows members of the public to ask questions and provide comments and feedback on the proposed location and design. As such, this newly proposed site is not yet approved for construction and certain engineering parameters are still undetermined (geotechnical analysis, structural foundation design etc.). The final approved design will include this information.</p> <p>This specific tower has only been proposed and has not yet been approved by NAV Canada. That said, it is unlikely there will be a height restriction for the location of the proposed tower. In the case that there are height restrictions, Rogers will comply with all NAV Canada and Transport Canada's guidelines.</p>
<p>34</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>34. Residents' # 34. Proponents # What are the current RF levels at the school, in the children's playground?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>To the best of my knowledge radiofrequency exposure levels are generally calculated on a site- by-site basis (including combined effects of other radio equipment operating in the area) but are not readily available for any non-tower location, e.g., the current exposure level's at the school or playground.</p> <p>If you are concerned about the current radiofrequency exposure levels at the school you can procure the services of competent technical personnel from reputable associations/companies to take independent measurements. The person making such an assessment must: be knowledgeable in the area of RF measurements using Health Canada's "Technical Guide" for interpretation and compliance assessment; have the appropriate instruments to perform a proper RF field survey; and be able to interpret the measurement results.</p> <p>More information is available at (#28): https://ised- isde.canada.ca/site/spectrum-management-telecommunications/en/radiocommunications/antenna-structures-and-you/frequently-asked- questions-faq- radiofrequency-rf-energy-and-health#s27</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>"To the best of my knowledge" and "not readily available" are not answers.</p> <p>This question relates to City Protocol 6.1 Public Notification Package: an attestation that the general public will be protected in compliance with Health Canada's Safety Code 6 including combined effects within the local radio environment at all times.</p> <p>ISED's (28) How do I get an independent radiofrequency (RF) field measurement to ensure that the site I am concerned about meets the regulatory limits? What should I look for? You can procure the services of competent technical personnel from reputable associations/companies to take independent measurements. The person making such an assessment must: be knowledgeable in the area of RF measurements using Health Canada's "Technical Guide" for interpretation and</p>

	<p>compliance assessment; have the appropriate instruments to perform a proper RF field survey; and be able to interpret the measurement results.</p> <p>The results should be accurately documented in a report, including a site map, the locations surveyed and the measurement results, details on the instrument(s) used, the method of measurement, abnormalities observed, as well as the measurement uncertainties. A well documented report, in addition to the measurements conducted by competent personnel, provides a proper record of the survey and confidence in the results.</p> <p>If you want to conduct your own measurements, be aware that, over the years, tools (RF survey meters) have been marketed directly to consumers by vendors for this purpose. However, most of these tools work only on selected frequencies and are not calibrated (against a known standard), and therefore cannot provide reliable results. Before buying or using such electronic instruments, make sure that you understand its specifications and limitations, as well as how the tool works. https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/spectrum-management-telecommunications/en/radiocommunications/antenna-structures-and-you/frequently-asked-questions-faq-radiofrequency-rf-energy-and-health#s29</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>It appears it's up to the concerned Residents to hire a RF Engineer to take readings and report discrepancies, on a service that they never asked for. Who, at Rogers Communications, will be responsible for reimbursing the community for the cost of hiring an RF Engineer to conduct periodic testing of RF-EMR levels?</p> <p>Does Rogers do boots-on-the-ground technician RF-EMR testing, not computer-generated modeling, to verify RF measurements in areas of service? If yes, how often is this testing done per area? If not, why not?</p> <p>How does Rogers comply with "combined effects" if they do not know what the existing levels are as noted in your response to question 5?</p> <p>Quoting: C4ST Fact checks Government of Canada Webpages Regarding Health Risks and Wireless Technologies including 5G (January 2021) https://www.appel5gappeal.ca/eng/fact-checker.php</p> <p><i>"Children are not little adults. All of the "safety" information in Safety Code 6 is based on "models," not real children."</i></p> <p>Quoting Health Canada re Safety Code 6 https://publications.gc.ca/collections/Coll%20ection/H46-2-99-237E.pdf <i>Page 3, Paragraph 5</i> <i>"In a field where technology is advancing rapidly and where unexpected and unique problems may occur, this Code cannot cover all possible situations and blind adherence to rules cannot substitute for the exercise of good judgement."</i></p> <p>Will Rogers put the safety of children first and withdraw its application for a cell tower installation at 120 West Beaver Creek? Does Rogers computer-generated modeling include cumulative density with existing competitor telecom installations? If not, why not?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p><i>We would suggest first contacting Health Canada to further discuss concerns regarding radiofrequency exposure levels. If you have concerns about the validity of Safety Code 6 requirements, their applicability, and/or enforcement we recommend you reach out to the appropriate authorities having jurisdiction. Compliance with Safety Code 6 includes any combined operation of additional carrier co-locations and nearby installations within the local radio environment. Rogers has confirmed compliance with the applicable Health Canada radiofrequency exposure regulations.</i></p> <p><i>Please also refer to response to question #2 above and attached Safety Code 6 document.</i></p>
<p>35</p>	

<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>35. Residents' # 35. Proponents # What are the anticipated levels if a cell tower would be placed on the proposed site?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Rogers has confirmed this site will comply with Health Canada's exposure limits on an ongoing basis with a maximum (worst case) exposure level calculated to be 14.38% at ground level and 10.88% at ground level 100m south of the proposed tower location (closest residential area).</p> <p>The new proposed site is approximately 320m SE of the closest portion of the Doncrest Public School and soccer field. The exposure levels would be below 10% of the allowable Safety Code 6 limits as the signal strength dissipates with distance.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>To avoid "maximum (worst-case) exposure level" we oppose this proposed cell tower.</p> <p>See Appendix 6 - Safety Code 6 (2015) - Power Density (Labels have been added to highlight 5G antenna & cell tower antenna frequencies and the limits based on <u>6 minutes</u> exposure.)</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>You quote "a maximum (worst case) exposure level calculated to be 14.38% at ground level and 10.88% at ground level 100m south of the proposed tower location (closest residential area)." What would the maximum exposure be to buildings that are higher than ground level that could include multi-level homes and schools?</p> <p>Quoting: C4ST Fact checks Government of Canada Webpages Regarding Health Risks and Wireless Technologies including 5G (January 2021) https://www.appel5gappeal.ca/eng/fact-checker.php</p> <p>"Children are not little adults. All of the "safety" information in Safety Code 6 is based on "models," not real children. "</p> <p>Quoting Health Canada re Safety Code 6 https://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection/H46-2-99-237E.pdf Page 3, Paragraph 5 "In a field where technology is advancing rapidly and where unexpected and unique problems may occur, this Code cannot cover all possible situations and blind adherence to rules cannot substitute for the exercise of good judgement."</p> <p>Does Rogers, having now been made aware that more than 40 peer reviewed scientific studies have documented evidence of biological harm to people living within 400 meters, accept full responsibility and accountability for exposing children to harm?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to response in question #6 regarding the exposure to buildings higher than ground level. Please refer to response above of May 25, 2023 and compliance with Safety Code 6.</p>
<p>36</p>	
<p>Question submitted</p>	<p>36. Residents' # 36. Proponents # Can antennas be installed facing away from the school/playground areas?</p>

<p>March 28, 2023</p>	
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>This site is proposed as a 6 sector (with offset 3 sector) antenna deployment – essentially providing 360 degree coverage around the site. While the antennas are not exclusively directed toward the school it would degrade the service provided to omit the sector that propagates in that direction.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>There is ample evidence that if the proposed cell tower moves forward people will be harmed.</p> <p>The Doncrest Public School is within 400 meters from the proposed cell tower. Numerous peer reviewed science studies recommended a buffer zone of 500 meters between school and cell towers. https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/5GCell-Towers-Near-Schools- Children-Scientific-Research-Briefing-.pdf</p> <p>More than 40 peer reviewed scientific studies have documented evidence of biological harm to people living within 400 meters https://ehtrust.org/cell-towers-and-cell-antennae/compilation-of-research-studies-on-cell-tower-radiation-and-health/</p> <p>A recent review: Balmori, A. (2022). Evidence for a health risk by RF on humans living around mobile phone base stations: From radiofrequency sickness to cancer. Environmental Research, 113851. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.113851</p> <p>Other relevant studies indicating harm for those living close to cell towers (base stations):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rodrigues, N. C. P., Dode, A. C., de Noronha Andrade, M. K., O'Dwyer, G., Monteiro, D. L. M., Reis, I. N. C., ... Lino, V. T. S. (2021). The Effect of Continuous Low-Intensity Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields from Radio Base Stations to Cancer Mortality in Brazil. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18031229 2. Zothansiana, -, Zosangzuali, M., Lalramdinpuii, M., & Jagetia, G. C. (2017). Impact of radiofrequency radiation on DNA damage and antioxidants in peripheral blood lymphocytes of humans residing in the vicinity of mobile phone base stations. Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/15368378.2017.1350584
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Quoting: C4ST Fact checks Government of Canada Webpages Regarding Health Risks and Wireless Technologies including 5G (January 2021) https://www.appel5gappeal.ca/eng/fact-checker.php</p> <p><i>“Children are not little adults. All of the “safety” information in Safety Code 6 is based on “models,” not real children”.</i></p> <p>Does Rogers, having now been made aware that more than 40 peer reviewed scientific studies have documented evidence of biological harm to people living within 400 meters, accept full responsibility and accountability for exposing children to harm?</p>
<p>Proponent response</p>	<p>Please refer to response in questions #35 on May 25, 2023 regarding RF exposure to children and compliance with Safety Code 6.</p>

January 11, 2024	
37	
Question submitted March 28, 2023	<p>37. Residents' # 37. Proponents # If RF levels exceeded the BioInitiative/Building Biologist levels recommended for children/vulnerable people, what steps would need to be taken to reduce levels?</p>
Proponent response May 25, 2023	<p>In Canada, radiofrequency (RF) exposure requirements are established by Health Canada and regulated by Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED). There is no requirement to adhere to BioInitiative or other non-federally mandated exposure guidelines.</p> <p>BioInitiative and other similar recommendations for reduced exposure limits are an application of the precautionary principle - a public policy approach for risk management of possible, but unproven, adverse health effects.</p> <p>The application of the precautionary principle should be proportional to the level of risk and its associated uncertainty, the severity of the outcome and the level of societal benefit. In the context of RF energy from broadcasting and radiocommunication installations and apparatus, health risks from exposure below the limits specified in Health Canada's guideline document have not been established.</p> <p>To reduce the exposure limits to BioInitiative recommended levels, the City of Richmond Hill (and more importantly the federal government through ISED) would have to adopt and enforce these levels as policy.</p>
Residents' responses June 12, 2023	No further questions at this time.
Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023	No further questions at this time.
Proponent response January 11, 2024	No further response provided at this time.
38	
Question submitted March 28, 2023	<p>38. Residents' # 38. Proponents # How/when will the RF levels be publicly shared?</p>

<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Power density calculations of “worst case” scenarios have been shared via public consultation for this proposed site at ground level and at 100m south (closest residential area). If you require additional information or information in the future about this specific site you should contact the proponent or operator of the installation. If the proponent/operator does not provide the pertinent information within a reasonable time frame, contact your local Industry Canada office. Industry Canada may ask the proponent/operator to provide the information or, where the Department has concerns about compliance, it may carry out its own assessment.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>See Appendix 6 - Safety Code 6 (2015) - Power Density (Labels have been added to highlight 5G antenna & cell tower antenna frequencies and the limits based on <u>6 minutes</u> exposure.)</p> <p>ISED's (28) How do I get an independent radiofrequency (RF) field measurement to ensure that the site I am concerned about meets the regulatory limits? What should I look for? You can procure the services of competent technical personnel from reputable associations/companies to take independent measurements. The person making such an assessment must: be knowledgeable in the area of RF measurements using Health Canada's "Technical Guide" for interpretation and compliance assessment; have the appropriate instruments to perform a proper RF field survey; and be able to interpret the measurement results.</p> <p>The results should be accurately documented in a report, including a site map, the locations surveyed and the measurement results, details on the instrument(s) used, the method of measurement, abnormalities observed, as well as the measurement uncertainties. A well documented report, in addition to the measurements conducted by competent personnel, provides a proper record of the survey and confidence in the results.</p> <p>If you want to conduct your own measurements, be aware that, over the years, tools (RF survey meters) have been marketed directly to consumers by vendors for this purpose. However, most of these tools work only on selected frequencies and are not calibrated (against a known standard), and therefore cannot provide reliable results. Before buying or using such electronic instruments, make sure that you understand its specifications and limitations, as well as how the tool works. https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/spectrum-management-telecommunications/en/radiocommunications/antenna-structures-and-you/frequently-asked-questions-faq-radiofrequency-rf-energy-and-health#s29</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>You quote “Power density calculations of “worst case” scenarios have been shared via public consultation for this proposed site at ground level and at 100m south (closest residential area).” What would the maximum exposure be to buildings that are higher than ground level that could include multi-level homes and schools?</p> <p>To facilitate Residents monitoring and measuring health and harmful effects from this proposed cell tower installation - will Rogers provide written notice to the City of all changes to frequency, transmitting/receiving hardware, changes in power output, and provide a revised full report of all frequencies operating at the location within 24 hours of any modification made to the installation? If not, why not?</p> <p>Will Rogers provide notification to City of planned increase in size and/or height of the installation? If not, why not?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to response in question #6 regarding the exposure to buildings higher than ground level. Please refer to response in question #13 regarding notification to the City for modifications made to the installation.</p>

39

<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>39. Residents' # 39. Proponents # Re Roger's compliance with Safety Code 6: Forbes Bros. stated in the Information Package that Rogers will comply with Health Canada's Safety Code 6 (...) "including any combined operation of additional carrier co- locations and nearby installations." How will you monitor the RF radiation emitted by the combined operation of your antennas AND those of your competitors? How do you share this information with each other? Who monitors the combined effects? Even if each antenna separately respected Safety Code 6 limits (which experts state are inadequate to begin with), how are the combined and cumulative effects measured in each location (home, school, park, etc.)?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Industry Canada requires that all proponents and operators ensure that their radiocommunication and broadcasting installations comply with its regulatory limits at all times including the combined effects of nearby installations within the local radio environment. Antenna proponents are required to perform an assessment of RF exposure on proposed antenna systems prior to installation to ensure compliance, and to keep records of the assessment. Rogers Safety Code 6 analysis takes into account the electromagnetic fields of existing radio operators located in proximity to the site being studied, this is standard practice for all Carriers. ISED also conducts audits to ensure compliance and requires proponents and operators of antenna systems to take immediate action at any site if the Department believes that the regulatory limits are not being respected.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>How does Rogers comply with "combined effects" when they are unable to acknowledge whether an antenna within 330m, identified as belonging to Terago Networks, is operational?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Rogers will work with Terago and ISED to ensure that all information is obtained to meet the licensing and Safety Code 6 requirements.</p>

40

<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>40. Residents' # 40. Proponents # How many antennas will this tower have? and what type (disk, sector, etc.)?</p>
---	--

<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Currently proposed are 12 panel antennas in 6 sectors. Antenna hardware includes T2008M6R032V03, AIR6449, FFV4-65A-R6 and TBD hardware future antennas.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>What is the maximum number of antennas Rogers will be attaching to this cell tower structure – including any co- operated antennas?</p> <p>What is the maximum number of transmitters Rogers will be attaching to this structure?</p> <p>What is the maximum number of transmitters will Rogers permit a co- operator to attach to the antenna?</p> <p>What is the power output of each transmitter?</p> <p>Are these antennas and transmitters mandated?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Currently 12 panel antennas in 6 sectors. There are currently only plans for Rogers antennas at this proposed telecommunication tower. Please refer to the attached document outlining the number of transmitters, frequencies, and transmitter power proposed. There is no colocation agreement associated with this proposal at this time. The maximum number of antennas is unknown at this time, however, it will comply with all requirements of Safety Code 6.</p> <p>Wireless services, including antennas and transmitters, are regulated under the authority of the Radiocommunication Act, ISED is the federal department responsible for overseeing the safe operation of wireless antenna towers and sites.</p>
<p>41</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>41. Residents' # 41. Proponents # What frequency band will each of these antennas use, and at what power density?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>The site is designed to provide 6-sectored LTE 700/2100/2600 MHz services with an offset 3- sectored LTE 850/1900/2500 MHz services and 3 sectored of 3.5GHz technology. There are also provisions to include 1x 3 sectored 5G services. Power density is varies depending on the location of measurement. Rogers has provided power density calculations demonstrating a maximum (worst case) exposure level calculated to be 14.38% at ground level and 10.88% at ground level 100m south of the proposed tower location (closest residential area).</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>You quote "<i>Rogers has provided power density calculations demonstrating a maximum (worst case) exposure level calculated to be 14.38% at ground level and 10.88% at ground level 100m south of the proposed tower location (closest residential area).</i>" What would the maximum exposure be to buildings that are higher than ground level that could include multi-level homes and schools?</p>

	<p>What is the power output of each transmitter?</p> <p>What frequencies will these antennas be using?</p> <p>Has this wireless service been mandated? If yes, by whom? Please provide the link to the authority.</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to response in question #6 regarding the exposure to buildings higher than ground level.</p> <p>Please refer to the attached document outlining the number of transmitters, frequencies, and transmitter power proposed.</p> <p>Please refer to response in question #7 regarding regulating authority for wireless services.</p>
42	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>42. Residents' # 42. Proponents # What specifically are these antennas for? Will they eventually be used for the extremely high millimeter wave (mmWave) transmissions (24 GHz and 38 GHz) that 5G technology will be using? If not, do you plan to add antennas that transmit mmWaves within the next 2 years?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>The proposed site is currently qualified to provide 6-sectored LTE 700/2100/2600 MHz services with an offset 3- sectored LTE 850/1900/2500 MHz services and 3 sectored of 3.5GHz technology.</p> <p>As of this writing the radio qualification for this site indicates 5G services in the Mid-Band sub-6 GHz (frequencies between 1 GHz and 6 GHz that strike a balance between coverage and capacity). At this time I am not aware of any plans for deployment of mmWave frequencies at this site.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	<p>WE DO NOT CONSENT TO BEING EXPOSED TO THIS TECHNOLOGY.</p> <p>Health Canada conducted a major review last year titled "Analysis of Recommended Localized Human Exposure Limits for Radiofrequency Fields in the Frequency Range, 6 GHz to 300 GHz." Health Canada, Consumer & Clinical Radiation Protection Bureau (CCRPB). Approved by Narine Martel, Director, 2021, 243. This report can be obtained by request from Health Canada. This "analysis" did not find any 5G mmWave studies on humans except temperature. Page 32: Extract: "No human studies were identified that assessed endpoints such as cancer, ocular effects, reproductive system effects, cognitive effects, impacts on the immune system, non-specific symptoms or any other adverse health outcome..." in response to exposure to RFEMF in the 6-300 GHz frequency range." (Appendix 4).</p>
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Has this wireless service been mandated? If yes, by whom? Please provide the link to the authority.</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>Please refer to response in question #7.</p>
43	

<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>43. Residents' # 43. Proponents # Will you be renting space on your tower to other companies? What is the maximum number of antennas that it can support?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>It is a federal requirement in Canada that tower sites be made available for colocation or "tower sharing". Typically, Rogers does not actively market towers for sharing (such as third party tower companies) but by regulation cannot maintain an exclusive structure if sharing is requested by another operator.</p> <p>As this is a new proposed site not yet approved for construction certain engineering parameters are still undetermined (geotechnical analysis, structural foundation design etc.) the final approved design will dictate the maximum number of operators/antennas it can support.</p> <p>At a proposed height of 27m (and Rogers occupying 20-26m) it is unlikely this site would support more than two Carriers.</p>
<p>Residents' responses June 12, 2023</p>	
<p>Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023</p>	<p>Is Rogers asking the City to approve its application based on possible but not yet determined construction and engineering parameters?</p> <p>At a proposed height of 27m does that mean Rogers will raise the height of the tower by 25% if there was another carrier interested in co-locating or Rogers decided to add more transmitters?</p>
<p>Proponent response January 11, 2024</p>	<p>The construction and engineering parameters are outstanding as the application is in the public consultation stage seeking recommendation from the City. If the proposal is approved, it will be constructed in compliance with the National Building Code and The Canadian Standard Association and respect good engineering practices including structural adequacy.</p> <p>If colocation occurs, it is customarily added onto the existing structure as is versus raising the height 25%.</p>
<p>44</p>	
<p>Question submitted March 28, 2023</p>	<p>44. Residents' # 44. Proponents # There are many Residents in this community who don't speak English. What has Rogers done to ensure that the non-English speaker, especially the elders who are also not tech savvy enough to join the public hearing, to comprehend the Information Package and have access to voice their concern in the public hearing?</p>
<p>Proponent response May 25, 2023</p>	<p>Public notification documents were submitted to and approved for distribution by the City of Richmond Hill. Notification documents were provided in English as required.</p> <p>As a point of interest, ISED has updated its consultation policies (commencing on or after August 1, 2023) to require proponents provide initial communications with the public in both official languages in communities located in census subdivisions that have minority official language population of any size. Certain land use authorities also require public communications in multiple languages.</p>

	As of this writing the City of Richmond Hill does not have any requirements or preferences to distribute public communications in multiple languages and prior to and during public consultation no requests from the public or City were received for notification materials in any other language or format.
Residents' responses June 12, 2023	No further questions at this time.
Resident follow-up questions June 12, 2023	No further questions at this time.
Proponent response January 11, 2024	No further response provided.

Please note, Forbes Response noted in Red.

Richmond Hill

CITY OF RICHMOND HILL
PLANNING AND REGULATORY
SERVICES DEPARTMENT

JUL 27 2022

RECEIVED

Per: _____

2021

RADIO-COMMUNICATION AND BROADCASTING ANTENNA SYSTEMS PUBLIC CONSULTATION APPLICATION FORM

For the processing of applications undertaking public consultation and obtaining a Council position in accordance with the City's Public Consultation Protocol for Radio-Communication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems.

PRE-SUBMISSION MEETING REQUIREMENT

All applicants are required to meet with City staff prior to the formal submission of a Radio-Communication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems Public Consultation Application Form. To arrange a meeting, please contact the Planning and Infrastructure Department via e-mail at planning@richmondhill.ca.

MATERIALS ATTACHED:

1. General Information
2. Plan Requirements and Supporting Documentation
3. Radio-Communication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems Public Consultation Application Form
4. Application and Processing Fees
5. TRCA Requirements

APPENDICES:

1. Submission Requirements
2. City of Richmond Hill Public Consultation Protocol for Radio-Communication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems
3. Public Consultation Protocol Flowchart
4. Public Notice Sign Template
5. Notification Letter to Circulated Residents Template
6. Development Application Summary
7. Sample Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan

AUTHORIZATION OF REGISTERED OWNER(S)

I, Jennifer Antico of the City of Burlington in the Province of Ontario solemnly declare that all of the above statements contained within the application are true and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the *Canada Evidence Act*.

Please refer to the attached Owner's Authorization

I/We, _____, being the registered owner(s) of the subject lands, hereby authorize _____ to prepare and submit this application for approval.

I/We, _____, being the registered owner(s) of the subject lands, hereby authorize and provide consent to municipal and relevant external agency review staff to enter upon the subject lands during regular business hours over the time that the application(s) is/are under consideration by the City of Richmond Hill.

Signature of Registered Owner: _____

Signature of Registered Owner: _____

Date: _____

"Notice of Collection"

"The information collected on this form is authorized under the *Planning Act R.S.O. 1990* as amended, c. P.13. All information is considered to be available to the members of the PUBLIC upon demand. This practice is in accordance with the principles contained in the *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*."

OFFICE USE ONLY

File Number: <input type="checkbox"/> D25- _____	Related File Number: <input type="checkbox"/> D01- _____ <input type="checkbox"/> D02- _____ <input type="checkbox"/> D03- _____ <input type="checkbox"/> D04- _____ <input type="checkbox"/> D05- _____ <input type="checkbox"/> D06- _____
Date Received:	Date Completed:
Amount Paid: \$	Checked by:
Pre-submission meeting date:	Pre-submission meeting Planner(s):
Planner Assigned:	Development Process Coordinator:
Pre-application meeting date:	Pre-application meeting Planner(s):
Planner Assigned:	Development Process Coordinator:

May 5, 2022

Simone Fiore, MCIP RPP
Planner II, Subdivisions
City of Richmond Hill
225 East Beaver Creek Road
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 3P4

Dear Ms. Simone Fiore,

Enclosed for your review is our application for a 27m steel lattice tri-pole at 120 West Beaver Creek Rd. I have reviewed your letter of February 14 outlining the submission requirements (listed below) and have enclosed the following documents:

REQUIREMENT	STATUS	COPIES	DOCUMENT	REQUEST
A completed application form and fees	Included	1	Application form & Letter of Authorization	
Draft Public Notification Letter	Included	1	Draft Mail & Newspaper Notification	
Development Application Summary	Included	1	Summary Document	
Purpose, Siting and Planning Justification Study	Included	1	Justification Report	
Safety Code 6 compliance statement	Included	1	Safety Code 6 Letter	
Canadian Environmental Assessment Act Status Statement	Included		Included in public consultation mail notice	
Draft Public Notice Sign	Included	1	Draft Signage document	
IC's Spectrum Management and Telecommunication General Information Notice	Included		Included in public consultation mail notice	
Engineering and Structural Adequacy Statement	Included		Included in public consultation mail notice	
Antenna System Construction Notes/Details				Condition of Concurrence. Not completed until concurrence is received.
Site Servicing and Grading Plan				Condition of Concurrence. Not completed until

				concurrence is received.
Concept Plan with coordinates & Site Plan	Included	1	Site Survey	
Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan				Condition of Concurrence. Not completed until concurrence is received.
Arborist Report				Condition of Concurrence. Not completed until concurrence is received.
Summary of opportunities for Colocation within 500m	Included		Included in Justification Report	
Plan depicting the distance between property boundary and nearest residential	Included	1	Residential Setback Map	
Visual Rendering	Included	1	Photo Rendering	
Digital submission	Included	2	USB	

As discussed via email, there are several documents being requested at the application stage, however, they are not normally completed until after the consultation is complete and the location is finalized. Therefore, it is our preference to include these requirements as a condition to concurrence.

Enclosed is the application fee of \$1,840.00.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Antico
Real Estate & Government Affairs
130, 482 South Service Road E, Oakville, ON L6J 2X6
C: 343.575.3477 F: 888.622.4939

forbesbrosltd.ca

90 West Beaver Creek Road

Site Type	Number of Transmitters	Tx Frequency [MHz]	Rx Frequency [MHz]	Tx transmitter power [W]	Latitude (WGS84)	Longitude (WGS84)
Repeater	1	869	824	1	43.85246944	-79.39476667
Repeater	3	1930	1850	1	43.85246944	-79.39476667
Repeater	2	2110	1710	1	43.85246944	-79.39476667

25 Kinnear Court

Site Type	Number of Transmitters	Tx Frequency [MHz]	Rx Frequency [MHz]	Tx transmitter power [W]	Latitude (WGS84)	Longitude (WGS84)
Macro	3	627	673	79.43	43.85281111	-79.38706111
Macro	6	734	704	79.43	43.85281111	-79.38706111
Macro	9	1937.5	1857.5	158.49	43.85281111	-79.38706111
Macro	9	1975	1895	158.49	43.85281111	-79.38706111
Macro	2	2117.5	1717.5	79.43	43.85281111	-79.38706111
Macro	4	2117.5	1717.5	120.23	43.85281111	-79.38706111
Macro	2	2650	2530	60.26	43.85281111	-79.38706111
Macro	4	2650	2530	158.49	43.85281111	-79.38706111
Macro	3	3565	3565	39.81	43.85281111	-79.38706111

120 West Beaver Creek Road

Site Type	Number of Transmitters	Tx Frequency [MHz]	Rx Frequency [MHz]	Tx transmitter power [W]	Latitude (WGS84)	Longitude (WGS84)
Macro	3	627	673	79.43	43.850083	-79.394833
Macro	6	734	704	79.43	43.850083	-79.394833
Macro	9	1937.5	1857.5	158.49	43.850083	-79.394833
Macro	9	1975	1895	158.49	43.850083	-79.394833
Macro	2	2117.5	1717.5	79.43	43.850083	-79.394833
Macro	4	2117.5	1717.5	120.23	43.850083	-79.394833
Macro	2	2650	2530	60.26	43.850083	-79.394833
Macro	4	2650	2530	158.49	43.850083	-79.394833
Macro	3	3565	3565	39.81	43.850083	-79.394833