Magnifico, Rose

Subject: Committee of the Whole - Dec. 1, 2015 - Tower at Weston & Teston

C 2
Communication
CW: Dec 1/15
Item: 8

-----Original Message-----
From: npasquino@rogers.com [mailto:npasquino@rogers.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 26, 2015 8:45 AM
To: Clerks@vaughan.ca
Cc: npasquino@rogers.com
Subject: Committee of the Whole - Dec. 1, 2015 - Tower at Weston & Teston

Good morning:
I am writing to the Committee in connection with Item 8: SITE DEVELOPMENT FILE DA.14.058 JOHN PAGNANI WARD 1 - VICINITY OF WESTON ROAD AND TESTON ROAD.
I live at 11 Sonya Place and have an interest in the proposed development. I recently moved to this location and for whatever reason was not aware of the public consulation process and did not participate in it. I am primarily concerned from a health perspective about the long-tem impact of the tower. As the Committee is aware, in addition to the existing Rimwood Estates community, Block 41, once developed, will bring a significant number of people in close proximity to the tower (and if I am not mistaken one of the proposed schools is planned to be relatively close to the new tower location).
The Staff report deals with health concerns as follows:

"Radiation and harmful effects of the tower

Industry Canada has adopted Health Canada's guidelines for safe human exposure to RF energy, commonly known as Safety Code 6. Compliance with these guidelines is mandatory at all times and is a condition of a carrier's spectrum license. Bell Mobility Inc. attests that the proposed radio antenna system described will comply with Health Canada's Safety Code 6 limits, as may be amended from time to time, for the protection of the general public including any combined effects of additional carrier co-locations and nearby installations within the local radio environments."
Based on the foregoing, it is not clear how compliance with these guidelines will be monitored over time.
I might suggest that the Committee consider how it can be satisfied that the equipment in fact is operating as it should within prescribed guielines to ensure the safety of our community.
An attestation of compliance puts the risk of non-compliance on the person making the attestation, but it seems to me that there is no mechanism in place to evaluate compliance over time.
I would ask the Committee to consider imposing a periodic mandatory reporting obligation on the Proponent (who presumably would flow that obligation to the telecommunications companies that locate equipment on the site), as a condition of your approval, to ensure the equipment is regularly monitored by competent professionals and tested to ensure it in fact meets the standard described above (and more importantly, continues to meet the standard over time as equipment ages and fails, etc.). In my view this approach is not unreasonably and balances the interests of the various stakeholders and would be in the best interest of the community.
Thank you for your consideration.

Nick

Nick G. Pasquino
npasquino@rogers.com
(416) 459-0039