

Dear Sir,

Your response to the public comments for the proposed tower location contains several pieces of ambiguous information which can be very misleading to the public:

1- The public consultation period deadline announced by Jason Lazlo (Bell representative) was [quoted](#) in the Oakville Beaver as August 10, not August 8 as you have in your response. It is likely that the confusing information might have misled the public and negatively affected their timely input. Yes, we already know that Bell did not have to consult the public because the height of the tower is 4 inches shorter than 15 meters making it conveniently exempt from public scrutiny.

2- According to the same article in the Oakville Beaver, the notification sign for the proposed tower at Drago's Auto Body was posted in a very obscure spot, away from public view. Let's hope this was not intentional. Here is the first hand account as quoted from Ward 1 Councillor Ralph Robinson: "The way they do it... They put up such a small, tiny, little notification sign far back from the sidewalk," ... "I went down and looked and you couldn't even read it from the sidewalk. I got hold of our staff and they went and talked to Bell and made Bell move the sign to another pole, closer to the sidewalk so people could see it."

3- Item 5 in your list (Health and Safety): According to research material available, most if not all directed vertical/horizontal emission towers have their lowest emission rate right below the tower. The 1% of the allowable amount based on the out-dated Safety Code 6 right below the tower can not be used to conclude that the emissions in all directions are safe. The actual line-of-sight measurements (not calculations) might indicate much higher radiation levels perhaps 10,000 times higher than what is considered safe by ["The Bioinitiative Report 2007"](#)

4- Item 7 (Support for the tower) claims: "Bell received comments from local residents in support of the proposed tower."

Is it possible that those few local residents were not aware of the serious health risks of the cell towers? In contrast, all the public outcry to cancel this proposed tower comes from the growing number of concerned Canadians for Safe Technology, and the area residents who are aware of the serious harms of these cell towers. **Does the "significant investment" made by Bell come at the cost of the real health concerns brought forth not only by the residents, but by all three levels of their government representatives?**

And finally you mention the emergency and first responders benefit from these towers. It is also possible that these towers can potentially interfere with timely 911 responses as in this report by [CBCNEWS](#).

With all due respect, we find your "Bell's view" very disrespectful, and your choice of tower location irresponsible. It is a callous disregard of the legitimate concerns of the area residents, their elected government representatives, and all Canadians demanding safe technology.

Omeed and Suri Neekon (member [C4ST](#) - We demand Safety Code 6 be changed to protect our future.)