

# ISED responds to Kuno Road residents' concerns about proposed tower

By Mike Riley

Local Journalism Initiative Reporter

In last week's Bancroft This Week article 'Kuno Road residents concerned over placement of proposed Rogers' cell tower,' we brought you the story of ten residents of Kuno Road in Boulter in Carlow Mayo Township, who are concerned about the potential negative health effects of having a cell tower erected on their road, within 400 metres of their homes. This week, Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada, which oversees the placement and construction of these cell towers, formally responded to Bancroft This Week about the Kuno Road residents' concerns regarding this proposed cell tower.

Through ISED, the federal government regulates the siting and construction of cell towers under the Radiocommunication Act. The placement of this cell tower in Carlow Mayo by Rogers is part of the EORN Cell Gap Project; an initiative to expand wireless cell and Internet service in eastern Ontario to achieve access to high-speed Internet and cell service in all regions of the province, including eastern Ontario, by 2025. The Kuno Road residents received an information package from Rogers on June 23 informing them of the proposed tower's location on their road, as they live within 345.3 metres of its proposed location, as dictated by ISED protocols. The residents have until July 23 to publicly respond, and there was a public meeting on this matter scheduled during the Carlow Mayo council meeting on July 11.

ISED's media relations representative Andrea Daigle responded to Bancroft This Week's request for comment by saying that wireless communication is critical to Canada's economy and its ability to compete in a global market. Through ISED's spectrum management program, she says that the department strives to ensure the radio spectrum is used in a safe and efficient way, and with the greatest benefit to Canadians.

'To protect the public, ISED requires that spectrum users continually meet the Canadian radiofrequency safety limits set by Health Canada, commonly referred to as Safety Code 6. The strict limits in Safety Code 6 are designed to protect all Canadians from all scientifically established adverse health effects from exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields. This means that if anyone, including a small child, were exposed to radiofrequency energy from multiple sources within the Safety Code 6 limits for 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, they would not experience adverse health effects,' she says.

While Health Canada's Safety Code 6 deems these RF emissions to be safe, as Daigle said, and they back up these assertions with scientific studies, other countries like those in the European Union, and the City of Toronto, have much more stringent protocols in place regarding RF energy. According to competing scientific studies, these emissions are harmful to human health, and these more stringent regulations have been done in line with what they call the precautionary principle; erring on the side of caution until the safety of the technology is decisively ascertained. In one example, a 2004 German study published in *Umwelt-Medizin-Gesellschaft*, found a higher incidence of cancer found in people living within 400 metres of a cell tower long term than those that did not. Differing views in these scientific studies on the potential dangers or lack thereof of RF energy emissions from cell towers long term has led to a consensus that more research and study need to be done to fully ascertain their effect.

Daigle also reveals that the department recognizes the need to have collaborative and consultative policy with respect to antenna supporting structures, and outlines these procedures in the following document, which can be found at [CPC-2-0-03 ? Radiocommunication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems \(canada.ca\)](#).

The Kuno Road residents were also concerned and miffed that Rogers had signed a lease with a property owner on the road to erect their proposed cell tower before the public consultations had occurred. However, Daigle says that this is not an uncommon practice.

'The tower proponent typically needs to provide the land use authority with a plausible proposed location when engaging with them. Since the details of lease agreements are outside the department's purview, you may wish to contact the proponent directly for any

further details,? she says.

While the proponent, Rogers, has not yet replied to our request for comment by press time, they did contact Bancroft This Week saying they'd have a response to us by early the week of July 10. We will of course bring you their reply to our queries regarding the proposed cell tower on Kuno Road when it comes in, as well as the proceedings from the July 11 public meeting.