

## **Environmental Petition to the Auditor General**

### **Request that transmission towers be removed from Triangle Mountain, Colwood, British Columbia.**

Sharon and Dennis Noble  
818 Bexhill Place  
Victoria, British Columbia  
V9C 3V5  
July 21, 2008

On June 25, 2008, Dr. Magda Havas, a respected scientist from Trent University, conducted a survey of our neighbourhood. She discovered that the electromagnetic radiation coming from the FM towers on Triangle Mountain reached an extremely high level. How long they had been at this level we can only guess because no monitoring has been done by Industry Canada.

It is not enough to be aghast at the loose EMR standards that Canada has in relation to much of the civilized world, at the inept and, quite possibly, collusive testing that was done here in 2001 by Industry Canada that yielded a suspicious 114 microwatts per square centimeter (114uW/cm<sup>2</sup>). But when Dr. Havas's test at our home yielded an astounding 455 uW/cm<sup>2</sup>, it appears to us that Health Canada and Industry Canada are out of control. The cavalier attitude at these two departments about the danger they put us in as well as the rest of the residents of Triangle Mountain is positively incomprehensible.

Let me put this in perspective. The BioInitiative Report, a collection of 2000 peer-reviewed, non-wireless industry funded, world class scientific studies, recommends a precautionary limit of .01 uW/cm<sup>2</sup>. That means, right at this moment while sitting in our home, we are being exposed to EMR at levels 45,500 times higher than the Report recommends.

Are we worried? Of, course.

Do we think that the people who allowed this, who supported this, who engineered this, deserve to have their fingers rapped? It has crossed our minds. Termination of employment should be the least of their problems.

Do we think that the residents of Triangle Mountain should pay the \$3,000,000 fee that the broadcasters are demanding from us in return for moving their towers to a non-residential site that their engineers have already deemed acceptable and, in some ways, superior to the current site (in letters between David Emerson, former Minister of Industry, Jody Twa, Mayor of Colwood, and Gary Paugh, Industry Canada, 2005)? If we had the money, we'd pay them off.

Gladly. Any suggestions as to where we might find the money would be greatly appreciated.

2

## QUESTIONS:

1. Do Industry Canada and Health Canada not consider it appropriate that they pay the \$3,000,000 fee that the broadcasters are demanding to move their transmission towers from Triangle Mountain to a non-residential site that their engineers have already deemed acceptable and, in some ways, superior to the current site since it was Industry Canada and Health Canada that allowed the broadcasters to place their towers and transmitters in the midst of a residential area? If not, why not?
2. How many sites in Canada have more than two transmitters on them?
3. How many letters, emails, phone calls, and other communications has Industry Canada and Health Canada received each year during the last 5 years from the public concerning electromagnetic radiation, transmission towers of all sorts, and transmitters of all sorts?
4. How often have the field strengths of the transmitters been monitored over the last 5 years?
5. How many reports of breaches of emission guidelines have been reported over the last 5 years?
6. How many random tests (tests that have been conducted without warning the broadcasters in advance) have been carried out over the last 5 years?
7. How many non-random tests have been carried out over the last 5 years?
8. Given that the “modeling” approach Industry Canada allows the broadcasters to use has proven to be inaccurate on Triangle Mountain, how is Industry Canada ensuring that emission levels at other sites, especially where there are antenna farms, are within Safety Code 6 guidelines?
9. Are there consequences to broadcasters found guilty of excessive field strength? If so, what are they? If not, why not?
10. Will Industry Canada immediately undertake random (eg. with no advance notice to the broadcasters) testing of the field strength of the transmitters on Triangle Mountain?
11. Will Industry Canada immediately, during that random test, determine total exposure levels from all of the many transmitters in the area?

12. If these random tests indicate excessive exposure levels at any location, will Industry Canada force immediate removal of the offending transmitters from this residential neighbourhood?

3

13. On July 19, an article appeared in The Times Colonist, our Greater Victoria newspaper, which featured Mayor Twa of Colwood castigating Industry Canada and Health Canada for the high transmission levels we are subjected to. The very same day my wife and I monitored the transmission levels on Triangle Mountain and found them to be 400% lower than they had been for the previous 2 weeks. If Industry Canada should monitor the FM transmitters, how will it ensure that the broadcasters do not immediately lower their broadcasting levels for the period of the testing?

14. Industry Canada has stated (Gary Paugh, Victoria, July 8, 2008) that it would have no reason to warn the broadcasters on Triangle Mountain that Industry Canada was about to monitor them (thus allowing them to temporarily lower their transmitting power). But since it is Industry Canada's policy to random monitor only if there is a demonstrated need to do so and the need to do so, of course, can only be shown by random monitoring, a high reading would prove that Industry Canada was quite remiss in fulfilling its responsibility and, therefore, would have good reason to warn the broadcasters. How can Industry Canada assure the public that any monitoring it does is without prior notification of the broadcasters?

15. What studies can Health Canada cite that demonstrates that time-weighted averaging of EMR is a more accurate and effective indicator of possible radiation harm than a reading of the peaks?

16. If Health Canada cannot provide conclusive proof that the time-weighted average of EMR is a more accurate and effective indicator of possible radiation harm than a reading of the peaks, please justify advocating it instead of measuring the peaks.

17. What studies can Health Canada cite that demonstrate that living in the actual shadow of cell phone and FM transmission towers is safe?

18. If Health Canada cannot provide conclusive proof that living in the actual shadow of cell phone and FM transmission towers is safe, please justify allowing residents to be put in possible jeopardy.

19. On what basis does Industry Canada contend, as it does in its policy documents, that it is not responsible for, nor will it discuss, loss of property value or impairment of health due to transmitters?

20. On what basis is Industry Canada not responsible, as it contends in its policy documents, for loss of property value or impairment of health when it is the failure of Industry Canada to

adequately monitor the emission levels that contribute to that loss and impairment?

21. Will Industry Canada make available its test equipment to its citizens, at no cost, provided

4

they have a qualified expert to use it? If the answer is no, please provide the rationale behind it.

22. If the answer to #21 is yes, will Industry Canada allow an independent source to determine whether the expert the citizens have chosen is, indeed, qualified? If the answer is no, please provide the rationale behind it.

23. If it is Industry Canada's responsibility to police the broadcasting industry, who is it that polices the "Police"?

24. The Standards Council of Canada has a mandate "to benefit the health, safety and welfare of workers and the public..." If Health Canada is failing in its responsibility to protect the health and well being of the citizenry, can the Standards Council establish a service to provide those benefits? If no, please provide the rationale in support of this response.

25. Would the Standards Council see in Health Canada's close ties to the industry as documented in our petition #255 an indication that its objectivity has been compromised? If not, please explain?

26. Does the Standards Council feel that because industry is so imbedded with Health Canada and only a complete change in personnel will resolve the problem, that a new oversight service would be in order? If not, please explain.

27. Would the Standards Council take into consideration standards of safety with regard to electromagnetic radiation that are in effect in other countries, and are recommended by many credible scientists, but which have been disparaged and ignored by Health Canada? If no, please provide the rationale.

28. Will the Standards Council establish a new service that eschews wireless industry influence and relies strictly on science-based, peer-reviewed studies published in accredited scientific journals which have no industry funding? If no, please provide the rationale.

29. Would the Standards Council establish a new service made up of distinguished scientists without ties, direct or indirect, to industry and who will not benefit, directly or indirectly, from the results of their decisions? If no, please explain why not.

30. Under what conditions would the Standards Council provide funding for public input to aid this new service in fulfilling its obligations?

31. How does the Standards Council provide for public participation?

32. How is the public able to access funding in order to participate in the process?