

4542 Rocky Point Road
Metchosin, BC V9C 4E4
December 11, 2010

Telus
Darren Hird
4535 Canada Way, 2nd floor
Burnaby, BC V5G 1J9

copy: District of Metchosin
4450 Happy Valley Road
Victoria, BC V9C 3Z3

copy: Industry Canada
Jim Laursen/Michael Krenz
430 - 1230 Government Street
Victoria, BC V8W 3M4

copy: Keith Martin, M.P.
Constituency Office
666 Granderson Road
Victoria, BC V9B 2R8

Dear Telus/Mr. Hird:

I received your official “reply” to my response to your proposal to construct a telecommunications tower at 4537 Rocky Point Road. Your letter, a generic response to individuals who had responded before the September 30 deadline, was disappointing. In my letter I had asked for answers to fifteen specific, non-rhetorical questions. Your generic reply addressed, at best, only one or two of these questions. My understanding, from reading the Industry Canada CPC-2-0-03 guidelines for a public consultation process, is that you were required to provide specific answers to my questions before advancing the process to the next stage.¹ This leaves me in a state of confusion. **How am I supposed to play a role in the current**

¹This departure from the guidelines under which you are conducting a public consultation is only the latest in a series of irregularities. As part of a ten-person group of stakeholders, I have written to Industry Canada outlining Telus’s major points of departure from the guidelines issued by Industry Canada. The group of stakeholders does not believe that Industry Canada can accept such a flawed process as a valid public consultation. We are currently waiting for Industry Canada to suspend the current process and deal with our complaints under the dispute resolution process of CPC-2-0-03. The District of Metchosin has also filed a complaint under the same provisions.

public consultation process without the information that I need in order to form meaningful opinions about your proposal? When we received your initial proposal, we became a part of the overall decision process. We, like you, operate on information—without it we can't be a real part of the decision. *Please accord Metchosin residents the rights assigned in Industry Canada guidelines.*

Three months of thinking about your original proposal has underlined one point for me: **The location you have proposed is not the right place for a Metchosin cell tower.** A tower at 4537 Rocky Point Road would be visually intrusive, sitting right next to a busy road and occupying key sight lines within what Metchosin residents regard as their central village. The proposed tower would be located, moreover, in one of the most densely populated areas of Metchosin and would have maximal affect on the rural values of a large number of residential properties. The radiation output of the tower would give 24/7 exposure to a large number of residents who have health concerns about long-term, low-level radiofrequency radiation (the same concern expressed in the recent 2010 report from the National Research Council of Canada by Levitt and Lai). Many of the local residents with health concerns, I note from reading other letters sent to Telus before the September 30 deadline, already have lowered immune systems from leukemia and other cancers. This conviction that the proposed location is not the right one is more than just my own opinion: there is also a strong feeling in the neighbourhood that the tower belongs somewhere else. When informed about the Telus proposal, 100% of the two dozen people living within 100 meters of the proposed tower agreed with me and exhibited this agreement by signing a petition asking Telus not to put a tower at 4537 Rocky Point Road. When we widened the radius to the two hundred people living within 500 meters of the proposed tower, we found that at least 90% of the contacted people wanted to sign the petition. *Please halt further pursuit of this site as a tower location.*

A major irony in the current tower proposal is that we are discussing Metchosin, one of the most rural of the greater Victoria communities. **Many sites in or near Metchosin provide locations that would be minimally intrusive on the lives of Metchosin residents.** The Rogers cell tower on Neild Road demonstrates that better locations are possible. Telus reports that it has looked at only three other Metchosin sites, two of which meet the same objections as the currently proposed site. No one looking at this situation objectively would say that Telus has expended much effort to accommodate local wishes on this issue. Stories have leaked to us that Telus is now widening its search for a more suitable site. If this is so, I commend Telus for listening to what people are saying. However, the fact that Telus continues to make efforts to acquire the wrong site makes me and others wonder just how serious this search for alternate sites really is. *Please intensify your search for a site more acceptable to Metchosin residents.*

Another matter that has concerned me over these last three months is **the lack of respect Telus has shown to the elected Council of the District of Metchosin.** The original proposal was submitted to residents and the Council at a time when Telus knew that the District of Metchosin was working on an antenna siting policy (yes, I checked—there is documentary proof that Telus knew this). The unexpected proposal appeared to be a deliberate attempt to cut the Council out of

the decision process by initiating what the guidelines call a “default public consultation,” a process that does not require Telus to interact with the District. A cursory reading of the CPC-2-0-03 guidelines shows that Industry Canada places a strong emphasis on close cooperation between tower proposers and local land use authorities. The only reasonable cause for invoking a “default public consultation” would be a situation in which the local land use authority had no interest in being a part of the process. The District of Metchosin is not an uninterested party. It has displayed an active interest in the issue of where towers are sited in Metchosin. It has shown this interest by passing, only a week after it had a look at Telus’s proposal, an antenna siting protocol. In addition the Council has initiated exchanges with Telus that invite it to include the Council in a search for a suitable site. The Council has even offered to review with Telus some District-owned properties as potential sites. So far Telus has not taken up these invitations to partner with the Council in its search for a Metchosin cell tower site. The lack of interaction with the District of Metchosin over these last three months has reinforced my initial impression that Telus’s exclusion of the Council is deliberate, that it is attempting to use Metchosin’s land without consulting Metchosin’s people and their elected representatives. I pay taxes to maintain our local government and to employ the people who work for it. I know from personal experience that our representatives and the other District employees go far beyond the basic requirements of their job descriptions in order to give Metchosin good government. It is frustrating to witness the loss of both my taxes and their efforts. *Please establish a closer cooperation with the District of Metchosin.*

Sincerely,

Kem Luther

Letter and petition results sent by regular mail. Also emailed on December 12 to:

Darren Hird	<darren.hird@telus.com>
District of Metchosin	<mayorandcouncil@metchosin.ca>
Jim Laursen	<jim.laursen@ic.gc.ca>
Michael Krenz	<michael.krenz@ic.gc.ca>
Ken Rehman	<khme@shaw.ca>
Keith Martin Office	<MartiK1A@parl.gc.ca>

and placed on the web at <http://s158336089.onlinehome.us/TelusDocs/>