

Karen Chafe

From: Chad Murphy
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 10:37 AM
To: CityClerk; Planning
Cc: Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett
Subject: Comments from [REDACTED] 42 Sugarloaf Place - DEV2200164

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 10:10 AM
To: Chad Murphy <cmurphy@stjohns.ca>
Subject: (EXT) Re: Response to Comments - 42 Sugarloaf Place - DEV2200164

By the way Chad in all due respect, would you want this thing on top of you? Rogers nor you live here, we do, we do NOT want it here. It doesn't matter what info you send me, it can all be easily debunked by science and it will simply depend on whom one chats with.

Any reasonable doubt in the slightest is enough for anyone to reject such a project for the crystal clear health hazard reasons.

Not to mention what it will do to our wells and well water.

There is zero long term studies done on long term exposure for 5g and electromagnetic energy. One thing is certain it causes mass oxidative stress to the oxygen molecules inside our bodies. Affecting the electrons, causing them to split and reek havoc causing all sorts of inflammation.

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: Chad Murphy <cmurphy@stjohns.ca>
Sent: February 9, 2023 3:15 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett <LLyghtleBrushett@stjohns.ca>
Subject: Response to Comments - 42 Sugarloaf Place - DEV2200164

Good afternoon [REDACTED]

I have received your comments on the telecom tower at 42 Sugarloaf Place. Roger's has provided us with some information in response to other questions we received that may also help address some of your concerns. I have attached their comments below. In the meantime, if you have additional questions or concerns you can contact Roger's or Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada.

Thanks,
Chad

Contact Information on behalf of Rogers Communications Inc.

Rogers Communications Inc.

Network Implementation – Public Consultations

800, de la Gauchetière West, # 4000

Montreal, Quebec H5A 1K3

Email: rogers.maritimesconsultations@rci.rogers.com

Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada

John Cabot Building

10 Barter's Hill, 10th floor

St. John's NL A1C 6M1

Telephone: 709-772-4890

Email: ic.spectrumnld-spectredtl.ic@canada.ca

Site Reference: A1284 - Outer Ring Hwy. @ Logy Bay Rd

Health Canada does not set distance limits but companies are required to follow provisions set out in Safety Code 6. As you are aware, the Government of Canada tightly regulates the use of radio frequencies (including wireless communications) to ensure that it is used safely. Strict adherence to Safety Code 6 is a condition of Innovation, Science and Economic development Canada's licensure for all Canadian wireless communications carriers. Any changes, additions, or modifications to the antenna equipment by a carrier are also subject to Safety Code 6 and Rogers attests that the proposed telecommunications tower will comply and respect all Health Canada's Safety Code 6 guidelines, which are among the most rigorous in the world. We invite you to review the following credible sources:

<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/occupational-exposure-regulations/safety-code-6-radiofrequency-exposure-guidelines.html>

<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation.html>


<https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/smt-gst.nsf/eng/sf11467.html>

https://www.5gcc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/CWTA_5G-Wireless-and-RF-Safety_EN_2019.08.07.pdf

<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/cell-phones-towers.html>

The 50X safety margin from Health Canada is the minimum requirement and the SC6 calculation takes into account among others, the distance between a tower and a certain location. SC6 guidelines must be respected for all new towers or for upgrades to existing structures and Rogers will do so to ensure the safety of the public, including neighboring lots.

I've included the graph and explanation from the ISDE Canada web link <https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/spectrum-management-telecommunications/en/safety-and-compliance/facts-about-towers/radiofrequency-energy-and-safety#s5>



What amount of RF exposure is considered safe? Exposure to RF energy below the Canadian limits is safe. The limits are set far below the threshold (at least 50-fold safety margin) for all known established adverse health effects. Health Canada has incorporated several tiers of precaution into the limits to ensure safety, including a conservative threshold for the occurrence of adverse health effects, the use of worst-case exposure scenarios and an additional safety margin beyond the threshold.

Health Canada considers all peer-reviewed scientific studies, including those of the World Health Organization and the IARC and uses a weight-of-evidence approach when reviewing scientific literature to establish the recommended exposure limits in Safety Code 6.

The following web link <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/occupational-exposure-regulations/safety-code-6-radiofrequency-exposure-guidelines.html> states that:

Scientifically-established health effects

We continuously review and consider all peer-reviewed scientific studies that investigate potential biological and adverse health effects, including thermal and non-thermal effects. In 2011, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), which is part of the World Health Organization, classified radiofrequency EMFs as possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B). This decision was based on limited evidence showing an increased risk for glioma, a malignant type of brain cancer, associated with wireless phone use.

However:

- *IARC did not find a direct link between radiofrequency EMF exposure and cancer*
- *the vast majority of research to date does not support a link between radiofrequency EMF exposure and cancers in humans*

We agree with the World Health Organization that additional research in this area is warranted.

Chad Murphy
Development Officer I
Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
City of St. John's
709-576-8452
cmurphy@stjohns.ca

Karen Chafe

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 4:58 PM
To: CityClerk
Subject: (EXT) Fw: Message

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: January 30, 2023 3:16 PM
To: planning@stjohns.ca <planning@stjohns.ca>
Subject: Fw: Message

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: January 30, 2023 3:15 PM
To: cityclerk@st.johns.ca <cityclerk@st.johns.ca>
Subject: Message

My name is [REDACTED] and I live on [REDACTED] in St.John's. This message is in regards to an application from Rogers to install a wireless telecommunications tower or towers on 42 Sugar Loaf place.

I am strongly opposed to such a project for I am completely aware of the extreme dangers and hazards associated with such a device. Even though my common sense has already warned me, there are many scientific studies done that shows that these electromagnetic waves, radiation from the electromagnetic spectrum, causes all sorts of diseases and disorders, such as...DNA breaking, breast tumors, brain tumors and all sorts of general cancers.

The closer one lives to such a device, the greater the risk. I have called the number of 576-6192 and as of yet had no call back. If anyone at city hall is interested in such a dangerous device, may I suggest constructing it near their house, to see if they like it.

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Outlook](#)

Karen Chafe

From: Chad Murphy
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 10:38 AM
To: CityClerk; Planning
Cc: Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett
Subject: Comments from [REDACTED] Re: 42 Sugarloaf Place - DEV2200164

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 4:27 PM
To: Chad Murphy <cmurphy@stjohns.ca>
Subject: (EXT) Re: Response to Comments - 42 Sugarloaf Place - DEV2200164

Hello Chad, I really do not care what guide lines and safety regulations that healthcare Canada or Rogers are telling me, of course they are going to say it is safe BUT Scientists all over the world say something completely different, which I will be bringing to the table.

Let me ask you a question, would you want this thing next to your house and plus my well is another factor.

If I have to see a lawyer on this I will and bring it to the attention of the public via media, whatever it takes.

I have much material from professional sources to debunk anything that big tech or health Canada has to say.

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: Chad Murphy <cmurphy@stjohns.ca>
Sent: February 9, 2023 3:15 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett <LLyghtleBrushett@stjohns.ca>
Subject: Response to Comments - 42 Sugarloaf Place - DEV2200164

Good afternoon [REDACTED]

I have received your comments on the telecom tower at 42 Sugarloaf Place. Roger's has provided us with some information in response to other questions we received that may also help address some of your concerns. I have attached their comments below. In the meantime, if you have additional questions or concerns you can contact Roger's or Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada.

Thanks,
Chad

Contact Information on behalf of Rogers Communications Inc.

Rogers Communications Inc.
Network Implementation – Public Consultations
800, de la Gauchetière West, # 4000
Montreal, Quebec H5A 1K3

Email: rogers.maritimesconsultations@rci.rogers.com

Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada

John Cabot Building
10 Barter's Hill, 10th floor
St. John's NL A1C 6M1
Telephone: 709-772-4890

Email: ic.spectrumnl-d-spectredtl.ic@canada.ca

Site Reference: A1284 - Outer Ring Hwy. @ Logy Bay Rd

Health Canada does not set distance limits but companies are required to follow provisions set out in Safety Code 6. As you are aware, the Government of Canada tightly regulates the use of radio frequencies (including wireless communications) to ensure that it is used safely. Strict adherence to Safety Code 6 is a condition of Innovation, Science and Economic development Canada's licensure for all Canadian wireless communications carriers. Any changes, additions, or modifications to the antenna equipment by a carrier are also subject to Safety Code 6 and Rogers attests that the proposed telecommunications tower will comply and respect all Health Canada's Safety Code 6 guidelines, which are among the most rigorous in the world. We invite you to review the following credible sources:

<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/occupational-exposure-regulations/safety-code-6-radiofrequency-exposure-guidelines.html>

<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation.html>


<https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/smt-gst.nsf/eng/sf11467.html>

https://www.5gcc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/CWTA_5G-Wireless-and-RF-Safety_EN_2019.08.07.pdf

<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/cell-phones-towers.html>

The 50X safety margin from Health Canada is the minimum requirement and the SC6 calculation takes into account among others, the distance between a tower and a certain location. SC6 guidelines must be respected for all new towers or for upgrades to existing structures and Rogers will do so to ensure the safety of the public, including neighboring lots.

I've included the graph and explanation from the ISDE Canada web link <https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/spectrum-management-telecommunications/en/safety-and-compliance/facts-about-towers/radiofrequency-energy-and-safety#s5>



What amount of RF exposure is considered safe? Exposure to RF energy below the Canadian limits is safe. The limits are set far below the threshold (at least 50-fold safety margin) for all known established adverse health effects. Health Canada has incorporated several tiers of precaution into the limits to ensure safety, including a conservative threshold for the occurrence of adverse health effects, the use of worst-case exposure scenarios and an additional safety margin beyond the threshold.

Health Canada considers all peer-reviewed scientific studies, including those of the World Health Organization and the IARC and uses a weight-of-evidence approach when reviewing scientific literature to establish the recommended exposure limits in Safety Code 6.

The following web link <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/occupational-exposure-regulations/safety-code-6-radiofrequency-exposure-guidelines.html> states that:

Scientifically-established health effects

We continuously review and consider all peer-reviewed scientific studies that investigate potential biological and adverse health effects, including thermal and non-thermal effects. In 2011, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), which is part of the World Health Organization, classified radiofrequency EMFs as possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B). This decision was based on limited evidence showing an increased risk for glioma, a malignant type of brain cancer, associated with wireless phone use.

However:

- IARC did not find a direct link between radiofrequency EMF exposure and cancer*
- the vast majority of research to date does not support a link between radiofrequency EMF exposure and cancers in humans*

We agree with the World Health Organization that additional research in this area is warranted.

Chad Murphy
 Development Officer I
 Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
 City of St. John's
 709-576-8452
cmurphy@stjohns.ca

Karen Chafe

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 5:04 PM
To: CityClerk
Subject: (EXT) [REDACTED]

I have signatures of protest in this area against the construction of a communications tower on sugar loaf place, despite what guide lines health Canada has, there is overwhelming proof by mainstream Scientists all over the world, just how dangerous it is to be anywhere near such a tower.

I will be taking a photo of the signatures and forwarding them to you.

Thank you

Sent from [Outlook](#)



Safe Distances from Mobile Towers

██████████ • February 14, 2020



Note: I get asked all the time what I personally use for EMF protection—and who I buy from. I use **EMR Shielding Solutions**.

They are **Authorized Distributors** of legitimate shielding protections. They don't carry scammy harmonizers, pendants, and other iffy products.

Use Code: JBEATEMF for 5% off. *(Always free shipping over \$30.)*



We ♥ honesty! Beat EMF may earn a commission through links on this page at no additional cost to you.



If your'e familiar with mobile tower radiation – and the fact that it exists – you're probably wondering what a safe distance would be.

We dig into that today and discuss different scenarios.

Plus, what you can do if you realize you're too close.

Why Is Mobile Tower Radiation a Concern?

Cell towers are built in order to boost the signal reception of our phones while also facilitating different kinds of wireless communication.

Unfortunately, having a strong signal and good reception comes at the cost of radiation.

And the closer you are to the source – the cell tower – the higher your radiation exposure.

Several countries have already implemented measures to keep cell towers away from residential areas, schools, hospitals, and recreational grounds.

The U.S. is a little slower to act...it is big money after all.

(dear reader, I just practiced immense self-control and spared you from an hour's long rant about government profiting off of frequencies...you're welcome haha)

Anyways, the precautions taken by other countries were because of the possible effects that cell tower radiation has on the human body.

And research continues to expand on such effects every year.

To date, researchers have found a link to radiation and significant changes in an organism's health.

For example, one study revealed that dairy cows living near cell towers tend to produce less milk:

When they were relocated to an area far from radiation sources, their milk yield went back to normal within days.

However, upon placing them in the area near cell towers once more, their milk production declined again.

Studies have also been conducted on humans.

There was one conducted in 2007, which found that people who live near active cell towers had low levels of melatonin and serotonin.

That's a big deal because those hormones are intricately involved in the immune system, mood stabilization, and sleep regulation.

The experiment was done before and after cell towers were activated.

Results showed that **before activating the cell towers, the participants had normal hormone levels.**

Other studies gathered data from various people living at different distances from the cell towers.

To be specific, a total of 530 participants with 260 women and 270 men were studied.

The goal was to better understand the relationship between their distance from cell towers and complaints of physical discomfort.


In the end, the results showed that those who lived near the base stations of cell towers experienced more frequent and intense bouts of fatigue and headaches.

Examples of Symptoms Reported Relative to Their Distance from Cell Towers

[HOME](#)[FEATURED](#)[CATEGORIES](#)[RECOMMENDED PROTECTIONS](#)[GUIDE](#)

Is Cell Tower Radiation Harmful? – A Brief Look At The Science!

Written by [David](#) • in [Cell Phone Towers](#)



Cell phone towers emit mass amounts of Radio Frequency (RF) Radiation also known as “microwave” radiation. If you have ever seen the huge size and quantity of power cables that run these towers you know that the amperage they use is significant as well.

But is cell phone tower radiation really harmful? **According to many scientific studies, there is a significant increase in cancer and other diseases, the closer one lives to a cell tower. For example this study, which was published in 2004, showed that “the risk of newly developing cancer was three times higher among those patients who had lived during past ten years (1994-**

2004), within a distance of 400m from the cellular transmitter, in comparison to those who had lived further away.”


In this article we will first briefly discuss what cell tower radiation is. Then we will look at several scientific studies comparing cancer rates in people living close to cell towers vs. those living further away. And finally I will show a video of myself testing the radiation coming from a cell tower and talk about the best ways I know of to protect yourself from this radiation.

Latest Videos

[How To Neutralize 5G Cellphone Radiation.mp4](#)



IT WOULD BE SO REFRESHING AND
DECENT, FOR AN ELECTED CITY COUNCIL
TO PROCLAIM "WE HAVE YOUR BACKS";
WE ARE SAYING NO TO ROGERS
PROPOSAL AND SENDING THEM BACK TO
THE DRAWING BOARD. FIND ANOTHER
SITE, PEOPLE. END OF STORY.



FEB. 11, 2023

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
PO BOX 908
ST. JOHN'S, NL A1C 5M2

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,
THE RESIDENTS OF [REDACTED] SUGARLOAF ROAD AND
[REDACTED] SUGARLOAF PLACE, ST. JOHN'S RECEIVED A LETTER
REFERENCING A REQUEST BY ROGERS COMMUNICATIONS
INC. TO ERECT A TELECOMMUNICATIONS TOWER AT THE
BACK OF THE PROPERTY AT 42 SUGARLOAF PLACE.
THE PROPOSED SITE IS ALMOST DIRECTLY BEHIND [REDACTED]
SUGARLOAF ROAD, THE COUNCIL FOR THE CITY OF
ST. JOHN'S HAS INVITED COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSAL.

I AM STRONGLY OPPOSED TO THE INSTALLATION
OF THE TOWER AT THE PROPOSED SITE. ASIDE FROM
THE UGLINESS OF A 213 FOOT STRUCTURE IN A
RELATIVELY NATURALLY WILD ENVIRONMENT, THERE ARE
THE NOW WELL RESEARCHED HEALTH HAZARDS TO
THOSE LIVING CLOSE TO THESE TOWERS. THIS TECHNOLOGY
IS RELATIVELY NEW AND EFFECTS ON HUMANS
ARE NOW BECOMING EVIDENT.

THE DISTANCES RECOMMENDED TO BE
CONSIDERED SAFER ARE 300 TO 400 METERS.
THOSE ARE MINIMUMS DISTANCES. THIS TOWER
FALLS WELL INSIDE OF THOSE MEASUREMENTS.
TO REFERENCE HEALTH CANADA GUIDELINES
AS A FALLBACK SOLUTION TO THESE
REASONABLE CONCERNS IS TOTALLY ANTIQUATED
AND SOMEWHAT TYPICAL RESPONSES BE IT
FROM ANY LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT.
AND THAT APPLIES TO BOTH

THE MUNICIPAL LEVEL AND PROVINCIAL LEVELS.

BY NOW, ANY DISCERNING INDIVIDUAL HAS LEARNED TO QUESTION ALL SUCH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS. COMPANIES, BY AND LARGE, DO NOT POLICE THEMSELVES UNLESS THEY ARE FORCED TO DO SO. AND CANADA'S STANDARDS ARE BARELY WORTH DISCUSSING. JUST LOOK AT THE MINING INDUSTRY AND OUR SO-CALLED RECYCLING POLICIES. THEY ARE A JOKE. SORRY, I DIGRESS. HEALTH CANADA, DO NOT FORGET, OKAYED THALIDOMIDE, CIGARETTES, VALIUM (AS NOT ADDICTIVE) AND THE DISASTEROUS OXYCONTIN JUST TO NAME A FEW. THE DEPARTMENT NAME MAY HAVE CHANGED OVER TIME BUT NOT MUCH ELSE. RADIATION/EMF EMISSIONS COMING FROM THESE TOWERS IS UNSAFE, HARMFUL AND DANGEROUS. I AM SURE THERE ARE FAR SAFER SITES AWAY FROM CITY RESIDENTS WHERE THESE TOWERS CAN BE ERECTED.

ALSO, BOTH OF THE HOUSES ADJACENT TO THE PROPOSED SITE HAVE WELLS FOR THEIR WATER. AND WATER IS ABSOLUTELY AFFECTED BY HIGH LEVELS OF RADIATION. AND ONE HAS TO DO IS LOOK AT THE PHOTOGRAPHS OF ICE CRYSTALS THAT ARE SUBJECTED TO MICROWAVES. THEY ARE COMPLETELY ALTERED IN SHAPE.

I DOUBT THE COUNCIL IS GOING TO GIVE A
GUARANTEE THEIR WATER QUALITY AND
SAFETY WILL NOT BE AFFECTED. CITY
COUNCILS ARE ELECTED FOR THE
BENEFITS AND WELL BEING OF ITS
CITIZENS, NOT CORPORATIONS. TO THROW
SAFETY CONCERNS TO THE WIND SO
A FEW PEOPLE CAN HAVE FASTER
INTERNET IS WHAT WE HAVE COME TO
EXPECT FROM SUCH REPRESENTATIVES.

IN 1907, A STATEMENT FROM CATHOLIC
CATECHISM TEACHINGS SAID:

"FIRST, THE COMMON GOOD PRESUPPOSES
RESPECT FOR THE PERSON AS SUCH. IN
THE NAME OF THE COMMON GOOD, PUBLIC
AUTHORITIES ARE BOUND TO RESPECT THE
FUNDAMENTAL AND INALIENABLE RIGHTS OF
THE HUMAN PERSON."

FURTHER TO THAT:

"IN 1909 FINALLY THE COMMON GOOD
REQUIRES PEACE; THAT IS, THE STABILITY
AND SECURITY OF A JUST ORDER. IT
PRESUPPOSES THAT AUTHORITY SHOULD ENSURE
BY MORALLY ACCEPTABLE MEANS THE
SECURITY OF SOCIETY AND ITS MEMBERS."
TO ERECT SUCH A TOWER KNOWING
FULL WELL THERE ARE HAZARDS IS NOT
SOMETHING ANY RESIDENT MUST HAVE TO
FIGHT AGAINST. FOR ONCE, JUST ONCE.

Christine R. Carter

From: david michael <seite1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2023 3:17 PM
To: Planning
Subject: (EXT) Fw: Message

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: david michael
Sent: January 30, 2023 3:15 PM
To: cityclerk@st.johns.ca <cityclerk@st.johns.ca>
Subject: Message

My name is Ken Martin and I live on 61 sugar loaf rd in St.John's. This message is in regards to an application from Rogers to install a wireless telecommunications tower or towers on 42 Sugar Loaf place.

I am strongly opposed to such a project for I am completely aware of the extreme dangers and hazards associated with such a device. Even though my common sense has already warned me, there are many scientific studies done that shows that these electromagnetic waves, radiation from the electromagnetic spectrum, causes all sorts of diseases and disorders, such as...DNA breaking, breast tumors, brain tumors and all sorts of general cancers.

The closer one lives to such a device, the greater the risk. I have called the number of 576-6192 and as of yet had no call back. If anyone at city hall is interested in such a dangerous device, may I suggest constructing it near their house, to see if they like it.

Ken Martin

Sent from [Outlook](#)

Christine R. Carter

From: david michael <seite1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2023 3:35 PM
To: Planning
Subject: (EXT) Message

My phone number is 754-3879 and I will be getting signatures from everyone on the Sugar loaf rd opposing this cancer causing device. I will send a photo of it to this address.

Thank you

Sent from [Outlook](#)

Christine R. Carter

From: Chad Murphy
Sent: Thursday, February 2, 2023 9:26 AM
To: CityClerk; Planning
Cc: Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett
Subject: Email Response - 42 Sugarloaf Place - DEV2200164

See below email from Ken Martin regarding proposed cell tower at 42 Sugarloaf Place.

From: david michael <seite1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2023 9:40 PM
To: Chad Murphy <cmurphy@stjohns.ca>
Subject: Re: (EXT) Fw: Message

Thank you for your message Chad but what Health Canada's guidelines are in regard to 5g and electromagnetic and microwave energy and what reputable mainstream scientists are reporting are two different things entirely. For example years back Health Canada said that cigarettes were ok to smoke and other things were safe but were really detrimental to our well being and health. I realize that all you need is a safety net with the HC to allow a techno Giant like Rogers to build this cancer causing machine but how many of the Council members including the mayor would want one built in their back yard knowing the dangers and hazards associated with it.

I intend to fight this tooth and nail.

Ken Martin

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: Chad Murphy <cmurphy@stjohns.ca>
Sent: January 31, 2023 12:16 PM
To: david michael <seite1@hotmail.com>
Cc: Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett <LLyghtleBrushett@stjohns.ca>
Subject: RE: (EXT) Fw: Message

Good afternoon Ken,

This is to advise that we have received your submission. I will advise that the city is facilitating the public engagement in accordance with requirements of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada. The construction of the tower is dependent on approval from the Federal Government and all health requirements must be in accordance with Health Canada.

Thanks,
Chad

From: david michael <seite1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2023 3:17 PM

To: Planning <planning@stjohns.ca>

Subject: (EXT) Fw: Message

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: david michael

Sent: January 30, 2023 3:15 PM

To: cityclerk@st.johns.ca <cityclerk@st.johns.ca>

Subject: Message

My name is Ken Martin and I live on 61 sugar loaf rd in St.John's. This message is in regards to an application from Rogers to install a wireless telecommunications tower or towers on 42 Sugar Loaf place.

I am strongly opposed to such a project for I am completely aware of the extreme dangers and hazards associated with such a device. Even though my common sense has already warned me, there are many scientific studies done that shows that these electromagnetic waves, radiation from the electromagnetic spectrum, causes all sorts of diseases and disorders, such as...DNA breaking, breast tumors, brain tumors and all sorts of general cancers.

The closer one lives to such a device, the greater the risk. I have called the number of 576-6192 and as of yet had no call back. If anyone at city hall is interested in such a dangerous device, may I suggest constructing it near their house, to see if they like it.

Ken Martin

Sent from [Outlook](#)

Disclaimer: This email may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the individual(s) addressed in the message. If you are not the intended recipient, any other distribution, copying, or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by return email and delete the original message.

Any correspondence with employees, agents, or elected officials of the City of St. John's may be subject to disclosure under the provisions of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2015, S.N.L. 2015, c.A-1.2.

Christine R. Carter

From: Chad Murphy
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 10:37 AM
To: CityClerk; Planning
Cc: Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett
Subject: Comments from Ken Martin Re: 42 Sugarloaf Place - DEV2200164

From: david michael <seite1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 10:10 AM
To: Chad Murphy <cmurphy@stjohns.ca>
Subject: (EXT) Re: Response to Comments - 42 Sugarloaf Place - DEV2200164

By the way Chad in all due respect, would you want this thing on top of you? Rogers nor you live here, we do, we do NOT want it here. It doesn't matter what info you send me, it can all be easily debunked by science and it will simply depend on whom one chats with.

Any reasonable doubt in the slightest is enough for anyone to reject such a project for the crystal clear health hazard reasons.

Not to mention what it will do to our wells and well water.

There is zero long term studies done on long term exposure for 5g and electromagnetic energy. One thing is certain it causes mass oxidative stress to the oxygen molecules inside our bodies. Affecting the electrons, causing them to split and reek havoc causing all sorts of inflammation.

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: Chad Murphy <cmurphy@stjohns.ca>
Sent: February 9, 2023 3:15 PM
To: david michael <seite1@hotmail.com>
Cc: Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett <LLyghtleBrushett@stjohns.ca>
Subject: Response to Comments - 42 Sugarloaf Place - DEV2200164

Good afternoon Ken,

I have received your comments on the telecom tower at 42 Sugarloaf Place. Roger's has provided us with some information in response to other questions we received that may also help address some of your concerns. I have attached their comments below. In the meantime, if you have additional questions or concerns you can contact Roger's or Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada.

Thanks,
Chad

Contact Information on behalf of Rogers Communications Inc.

Rogers Communications Inc.

Network Implementation – Public Consultations

800, de la Gauchetière West, # 4000

Montreal, Quebec H5A 1K3

Email: rogers.maritimesconsultations@rci.rogers.com

Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada

John Cabot Building

10 Barter's Hill, 10th floor

St. John's NL A1C 6M1

Telephone: 709-772-4890

Email: ic.spectrumnld-spectredtl.ic@canada.ca

Site Reference: A1284 - Outer Ring Hwy. @ Logy Bay Rd

Health Canada does not set distance limits but companies are required to follow provisions set out in Safety Code 6. As you are aware, the Government of Canada tightly regulates the use of radio frequencies (including wireless communications) to ensure that it is used safely. Strict adherence to Safety Code 6 is a condition of Innovation, Science and Economic development Canada's licensure for all Canadian wireless communications carriers. Any changes, additions, or modifications to the antenna equipment by a carrier are also subject to Safety Code 6 and Rogers attests that the proposed telecommunications tower will comply and respect all Health Canada's Safety Code 6 guidelines, which are among the most rigorous in the world. We invite you to review the following credible sources:

<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/occupational-exposure-regulations/safety-code-6-radiofrequency-exposure-guidelines.html>

<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation.html>


<https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/smt-gst.nsf/eng/sf11467.html>

https://www.5gcc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/CWTA_5G-Wireless-and-RF-Safety_EN_2019.08.07.pdf

<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/cell-phones-towers.html>

The 50X safety margin from Health Canada is the minimum requirement and the SC6 calculation takes into account among others, the distance between a tower and a certain location. SC6 guidelines must be respected for all new towers or for upgrades to existing structures and Rogers will do so to ensure the safety of the public, including neighboring lots.

I've included the graph and explanation from the ISDE Canada web link <https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/spectrum-management-telecommunications/en/safety-and-compliance/facts-about-towers/radiofrequency-energy-and-safety#s5>



What amount of RF exposure is considered safe? Exposure to RF energy below the Canadian limits is safe. The limits are set far below the threshold (at least 50-fold safety margin) for all known established adverse health effects. Health Canada has incorporated several tiers of precaution into the limits to ensure safety, including a conservative threshold for the occurrence of adverse health effects, the use of worst-case exposure scenarios and an additional safety margin beyond the threshold.

Health Canada considers all peer-reviewed scientific studies, including those of the World Health Organization and the IARC and uses a weight-of-evidence approach when reviewing scientific literature to establish the recommended exposure limits in Safety Code 6.

The following web link <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/occupational-exposure-regulations/safety-code-6-radiofrequency-exposure-guidelines.html> states that:

Scientifically-established health effects

We continuously review and consider all peer-reviewed scientific studies that investigate potential biological and adverse health effects, including thermal and non-thermal effects. In 2011, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), which is part of the World Health Organization, classified radiofrequency EMFs as possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B). This decision was based on limited evidence showing an increased risk for glioma, a malignant type of brain cancer, associated with wireless phone use.

However:

- *IARC did not find a direct link between radiofrequency EMF exposure and cancer*
- *the vast majority of research to date does not support a link between radiofrequency EMF exposure and cancers in humans*

We agree with the World Health Organization that additional research in this area is warranted.

Chad Murphy
 Development Officer I
 Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
 City of St. John's
 709-576-8452
cmurphy@stjohns.ca

Christine R. Carter

From: Chad Murphy
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 10:38 AM
To: CityClerk; Planning
Cc: Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett
Subject: Comments from Ken Martin Re: 42 Sugarloaf Place - DEV2200164

From: david michael <seite1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 4:27 PM
To: Chad Murphy <cmurphy@stjohns.ca>
Subject: (EXT) Re: Response to Comments - 42 Sugarloaf Place - DEV2200164

Hello Chad, I really do not care what guide lines and safety regulations that healthcare Canada or Rogers are telling me, of course they are going to say it is safe BUT Scientists all over the world say something completely different, which I will be bringing to the table.

Let me ask you a question, would you want this thing next to your house and plus my well is another factor.

If I have to see a lawyer on this I will and bring it to the attention of the public via media, whatever it takes.

I have much material from professional sources to debunk anything that big tech or health Canada has to say.

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: Chad Murphy <cmurphy@stjohns.ca>
Sent: February 9, 2023 3:15 PM
To: david michael <seite1@hotmail.com>
Cc: Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett <LLyghtleBrushett@stjohns.ca>
Subject: Response to Comments - 42 Sugarloaf Place - DEV2200164

Good afternoon Ken,

I have received your comments on the telecom tower at 42 Sugarloaf Place. Roger's has provided us with some information in response to other questions we received that may also help address some of your concerns. I have attached their comments below. In the meantime, if you have additional questions or concerns you can contact Roger's or Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada.

Thanks,
Chad

Contact Information on behalf of Rogers Communications Inc.

Rogers Communications Inc.
Network Implementation – Public Consultations
800, de la Gauchetière West, # 4000
Montreal, Quebec H5A 1K3

Email: rogers.maritimesconsultations@rci.rogers.com

Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada

John Cabot Building
10 Barter's Hill, 10th floor
St. John's NL A1C 6M1
Telephone: 709-772-4890

Email: ic.spectrumnld-spectredtl.ic@canada.ca

Site Reference: A1284 - Outer Ring Hwy. @ Logy Bay Rd

Health Canada does not set distance limits but companies are required to follow provisions set out in Safety Code 6. As you are aware, the Government of Canada tightly regulates the use of radio frequencies (including wireless communications) to ensure that it is used safely. Strict adherence to Safety Code 6 is a condition of Innovation, Science and Economic development Canada's licensure for all Canadian wireless communications carriers. Any changes, additions, or modifications to the antenna equipment by a carrier are also subject to Safety Code 6 and Rogers attests that the proposed telecommunications tower will comply and respect all Health Canada's Safety Code 6 guidelines, which are among the most rigorous in the world. We invite you to review the following credible sources:

<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/occupational-exposure-regulations/safety-code-6-radiofrequency-exposure-guidelines.html>

<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation.html>


<https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/smt-gst.nsf/eng/sf11467.html>

https://www.5gcc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/CWTA_5G-Wireless-and-RF-Safety_EN_2019.08.07.pdf

<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/cell-phones-towers.html>

The 50X safety margin from Health Canada is the minimum requirement and the SC6 calculation takes into account among others, the distance between a tower and a certain location. SC6 guidelines must be respected for all new towers or for upgrades to existing structures and Rogers will do so to ensure the safety of the public, including neighboring lots.

I've included the graph and explanation from the ISDE Canada web link <https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/spectrum-management-telecommunications/en/safety-and-compliance/facts-about-towers/radiofrequency-energy-and-safety#s5>



What amount of RF exposure is considered safe? Exposure to RF energy below the Canadian limits is safe. The limits are set far below the threshold (at least 50-fold safety margin) for all known established adverse health effects. Health Canada has incorporated several tiers of precaution into the limits to ensure safety, including a conservative threshold for the occurrence of adverse health effects, the use of worst-case exposure scenarios and an additional safety margin beyond the threshold.

Health Canada considers all peer-reviewed scientific studies, including those of the World Health Organization and the IARC and uses a weight-of-evidence approach when reviewing scientific literature to establish the recommended exposure limits in Safety Code 6.

The following web link <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/occupational-exposure-regulations/safety-code-6-radiofrequency-exposure-guidelines.html> states that:

Scientifically-established health effects

We continuously review and consider all peer-reviewed scientific studies that investigate potential biological and adverse health effects, including thermal and non-thermal effects. In 2011, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), which is part of the World Health Organization, classified radiofrequency EMFs as possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B). This decision was based on limited evidence showing an increased risk for glioma, a malignant type of brain cancer, associated with wireless phone use.

However:

- *IARC did not find a direct link between radiofrequency EMF exposure and cancer*
- *the vast majority of research to date does not support a link between radiofrequency EMF exposure and cancers in humans*

We agree with the World Health Organization that additional research in this area is warranted.

Chad Murphy
 Development Officer I
 Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
 City of St. John's
 709-576-8452
cmurphy@stjohns.ca