CITY COUNCIL PRESENTATION

SEPTEMBER 10, 2013

Dear Tina and Dolores,

Thank you for welcoming me to present to the Standing Committee of the Guelph Planning, Engineering and Environment Department. I will be joined by Frank Clegg, the CEO of Canadians for Safe Technology ([www.c4st.org](http://www.c4st.org/))  and former president of Microsoft Canada (for 14 years), as well as Rob Metzinger, Electronics Engineering Technologist, BBEC President of Safe Living Technologies Inc ([www.slt.co](http://www.slt.co/)), as well as Tracey Manton, a strong supporter of this cause.

Kindly forward this letter and all attachments to all City Council members. I respectfully request to speak to council on the same matter. Thank you.

My presentation addresses the city's need to revise its policy on communication towers. The present policy, adopted by the City of Guelph in 2001 (or 2002?) needs revision.

Patrick Sheehy in City Planning tells me that the city only has jurisdiction of towers greater than 16.6 metres, however elsewhere in Canada the height at which Industry Canada allows comment by municipalities is anything over 15 metres. Why should Guelph be different?

Moreover, in February 2013, there was an agreement signed between the Canadian Federation of Municipalities (CFM) and The Canadian Wireless Telecommunications Association (CWTA), the industry's main lobby group, agreeing that cities and towns could comment on cell towers less than 15 metres. (<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-investor/wireless-industry-moves-to-stem-flow-of-cellphone-tower-ire/article9146453/>). So now, in municipalities across Canada, proposed towers, regardless of height, are open to comment – except in Guelph.

That means, the proposed 16-metre-high Bell cell tower at Grange and Starwood – and any other tower between 15 m and 16.6 m – falls through a crack, completely untouchable, neither high enough, nor low enough for city involvement.

With both online and hardcopy petitions, I now represent more than 400 people (and counting) who are strongly opposed to the proposed cell tower at Grange and Starwood, and to the proposed Rogers wireless extended pole on Auden Rd. The cell tower would overshadow two elementary schools. There are several electrosensitive people in the immediate neighbourhood, and besides health risk concerns, particularly to children, people don't want to see their property values go down. No one is complaining about cell phone reception – everyone already has good reception here – and they wonder why they have not been notified about the proposal. (Please see comments on the online petition at [www.gopetition.com/petitions/stop-new-cell-towers.html](http://www.gopetition.com/petitions/stop-new-cell-towers.html)) There is no debate between those who want a cell tower and those who don't; I haven't met anyone who wants it. The only discrepancy here is those who are informed about electromagnetic radiation, and those who are not.

The Canadian Radiocommunications Information and Notification Service (CRINS) helps cities go through the process of working with proponents (i.e. Bell, Rogers, etc.) on the proper notification and placement of cell towers. The organization can also be instrumental in helping cities update their communication tower policy to the "best" of possible options. Their fee gets covered by the proponent. Would the City of Guelph be willing to contact this organization? (The CEO is Todd White, Todd.White@crins-sinrc.ca)

\*\*\*

Moreover, since the city adopted its communication tower policy 12 years ago, a tremendous amount of research has been done in both the medical and scientific communities on the health risks of electromagnetic radiation emitted from cell towers, base stations, antennas and transmitters – as well as cell phones, Wi-Fi, cordless phones, Smart Meters, microwaves, wireless appliances and baby monitors. The City's policy should reflect this greater knowledge so that the City's policy protects the health and safety of our community. Significant advances include the following:

\* In May 2011, the World Health Organization classified radio frequency electromagnetic fields as a Class 2B carcinogen – putting it in the same category as lead and DDT.

\* Electrosensitivity was recognized as at Canadian Human Right.

\* The NRC Research Press have issued a report stating that cell towers should NOT be placed within 500 metres of residential properties, schools, hospitals and daycares, but should be at least 1000 metres.

\* In October 2011, Health Canada issued a cell phone use warning for children under 18. Radiation from cell phones and other sources penetrates deeper into the heads of children.

\* In 2012, a new BioInitiative Report was released – an update on the 2007 BioInitiative Report. The Report comprehensively reviewed over 1800 new scientific studies on the health risks from exposure to electromagnetic fields and wireless technologies (radiofrequency radiation). The Report was put together by 29 highly respected doctors and scientists from around the world. It outlines evidence to the following:

A. Evidence for Damage to Sperm and Reproduction

B. Evidence that Children are More Vulnerable

C. Evidence for Fetal and Neonatal Effects

D. Evidence for Effects on Autism (Autism Spectrum Disorders)

E. Evidence for Electrohypersensitivity

F. Evidence for Effects from Cell Tower-Level RFR Exposures

G. Evidence for Effects on the Blood-brain Barrier

H. Evidence for Effects on Brain Tumors

I. Evidence for Effects on Genes (Genotoxicity)

J. Evidence for Effects on the Nervous System (Neurotoxicity)

K. Evidence for Effects on Cancer (Childhood Leukemia, Adult Cancers)

L. Melatonin, Breast Cancer and Alzheimer’s Disease

M. Stress, Stress Proteins and DNA as a Fractal Antenna

N. Effects of Weak-Field Interactions on Non-Linear Biological Oscillators and Synchronized Neural Activity

The entire report can be read and downloaded at [www.bioinitiative.org/](http://www.bioinitiative.org/) along with a 26-page "Summary for the Public" at [www.bioinitiative.org/report/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/sec01\_2012\_summary\_for\_public.pdf](http://www.bioinitiative.org/report/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/sec01_2012_summary_for_public.pdf)

\* In 2012, Frank Clegg, the former president of Microsoft Canada, established Canadians For Safe Technology (formerly Citizens for Safe Technology), a not-for-profit, volunteer-based coalition and leading website informing Canadians and their policy makers about the dangers to exposures to unsafe levels of radiation. The organization is pushing for a proper review of Safety Code 6 by an independent and unbiased panel of researchers and scientists. The C4ST website ([www.c4st.org](http://www.c4st.org/)) features EMR issues, research studies, news, and education materials, including an electrosensitivity fact sheet, ideal for distribution to health professionals (<http://www.c4st.org/images/documents/C4STESFactSheet.pdf>). Their section on active cell tower conflicts in Canada includes the Grange and Starwood concern (<http://www.c4st.org/community-profiles>).

\*\*\*

Industry Canada's radiocommunication and broadcasting installations comply with Health Canada’s Safety Code 6. Emissions from cell towers are supposed to be below SC6 levels, resulting in Industry Canada licensing these towers anywhere the mobile phone companies chose to put them. The problem with SC6 is that it doesn’t recognize the proven health issues caused by exposure to much less than SC6 limits.

SC6 is based on the thermal effects of microwave radiation – not on non-thermal effects. That is, SC6 is based on the level at which flesh bakes, and does not take into account accumulative biological and health effects (i.e. on our brain waves, or neurological or endocrine systems, etc.).

Canada's Safety Code 6 is one of the worse guidelines in the world today. Guidelines in China, Italy, Switzerland, Russia and India are all 100 times safer than Canada's.  ([www.c4st.org/website-pages/item/widget-kits/educate-yourself.html](http://www.c4st.org/website-pages/item/widget-kits/educate-yourself.html)).

As well:

• The SC6 levels designated as “Safe” were based on science tested in the 1980's on a 220lb mannequin

• There is no consideration or distinction for the developing brains and cells of children, pregnant women, the weak or the elderly.

• Industry Canada does not measure the output of the cellular towers once they are approved and installed.

• Other providers (Rogers) have begun to put clauses in their tower contracts that will allow the contract to be cancelled if/when HC updates SC6 to account for the danger the emissions levels cause local citizens. (They know there is a problem but will not change until they are regulated to do so.)

This year Health Canada is in the process of updating Safety Code 6 and is employing an "Independent" panel from the Royal Society of Canada to review its work before final publication. However, members of the panel have come under fire for conflict of interest. Last month the head of the panel stepped down.

So, while thousands of studies have found harmful health effects from exposure to the radiation emitted from transmission towers, and while a significant and growing percentage of our population are suffering ill health effects caused by emissions, and while an updated Safety Code 6 lies in waiting and may or may not receive a proper review from an independent panel of scientists and researchers – telecommunication companies are continuing to expose us to greater and greater intensity of EMR. Without warning, new towers are popping up everywhere in the city. (And why? No one in the city has weak cell phone reception.)

Many people aren't aware that the symptoms that they're experiencing are being caused by EMR – including headaches, tinnitus, difficulty sleeping, vertigo, eye irritation, skin blotches, shortness of breath, anxiety, numbness, heart palpitations and high or low blood pressure. Indeed, many – if not most doctors – are not informed about electrosensitivity and its symptoms.

Recently, on August 12, 2013, the Town of Oakville passed a motion requesting that Industry Canada place a moratorium on the approval of any new radiocommunication facilities until Safety Code 6 has been finalized (<http://www.c4st.org/news/cell-towers/town-of-oakville-approves-motions-to-radio-communications-facilities-protocol.html>).  The City of Guelph should follow suit, and too, request a moratorium on any new installations until SC6 is properly reviewed.

Logically, the revision of the City's communication tower policy should include the following:

\* that the City's protocol allows comment on cell towers less than 16.6m

\* that cell towers should not be placed within 1000 metres of residential properties, schools, hospitals and daycares

\* that residents within a 1000 meter radius should be consulted in advance to any installation (of cell tower, base station, antenna and transmitter) and that they be informed of the biological health effects – and be given the right to vote on whether they want it or not

\* that installations of antennas on rooftops of apartment buildings or residential dwellings be banned

\* that local councils must be allowed to make their own decisions about tower sites – regardless of tower heights – without being overruled

\* that homes of electrosensitive people be given special consideration with regard to proposed tower sites – and that an area of the city be designated "quiet" with regard to EMR and granted a buffer from towers

\* that EMR levels in the city in popular public and family areas be checked and monitored regularly

Realistically, however, Industry Canada has the last say it seems, and Frank Clegg, who has dealt with IC, will tell you that if a municipality asks for "too much", IC will over-ride the protocol and declare it void, then defaulting to its own policy. He says the city should host a council meeting on cell tower protocol and invite public input; and, should investigate the opportunity to protect children from Wi-Fi in venues such as libraries.

\*\*\*

The scenario on EMR can be likened to that of smoking before it was officially recognized as a health risk. EMR is far worse because those who want to opt out – not smoke, if you will, based on gut instinct, sensitivities, research or simply wanting to err on the side of caution – can't. The hazards of acute and chronic exposure to EMR effect everyone. The exposure that we are being subjected to is unprecedented. And that "we" have to prove health risks is absurd.

Electromagnetic radiation has already been effectively used in warfare. It's a dangerous realm of technology that should be approached with the greatest caution until we learn about its long term effects and implications – and not just on people but wildlife and nature, our ecosystems and biodiversity. (Cell towers with their lights at night are proving to be the worst killers of songbirds, more so even than cats and glass buildings. By one report, there are no more hummingbirds left in Grand Bend. Our precious bees, although we keep hearing about pesticides, EMR is most certainly a factor; just put a cordless phone by a hive and they don't come back.) (Resonance: Beings of Frequency, James Russell documentary:<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-ocu6xJHh1I>  )

Attached are some supporting documents, including an open letter on cell towers from Dr. Magda Havas ([www.magdahavas.com](http://www.magdahavas.com/)), Associate Professor of Environmental & Resource Studies at Trent University, and leader in the field of biological effects of environmental contaminants. Links to important online videos are also included.

Your immediate attention to revising the city's communication tower policy is crucial – not just to help stop the proposed cell tower at Grange and Starwood but to help stop an impending health crisis.

Thank you,

Sue Lebrecht

LINKS

\* Introduction to Electromagnetic Radiation and Health

<http://www.c4st.org/images/documents/intro_docs/IntroductiontoC4STfinal.pdf>

\* Electrosensitivity Fact Sheet

<http://www.c4st.org/images/documents/C4STESFactSheet.pdf>

\* Is Your Technology Safe?

<http://www.c4st.org/images/documents/C4STOnePager.pdf>

VIDEOS

\* Resonance: Beings of Frequency, James Russell documentary:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-ocu6xJHh1I>

\* Smart Meters and EMR: The Health Crisis of Our Time, Dietrich Klinghardt MD, PhD:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b_wxM6IAF1I>

\* Live blood analysis before and after exposure to Smart Meter radiation.

<http://www.electricsense.com/6665/smart-meter-radiation-live-blood-analysis>

\* Smart Meters/Cell Phones/Microwave Radiation by Brian Thiesen (Part 1):

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FPbcGK0OeSo>

\* Smart Meters/Cell Phones/Microwave Radiation by Brian Thiesen (Part 2):

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_Qqg2kXgWSc&feature=endscreen>