

February 10, 2022

Thank you, Vallari, for your recent response to my questions, and the opportunity to comment. Unfortunately, your answers have raised more concerns and questions in regards to the proposed Bell communications tower.

In no particular order:

1. Lighting requirements. You have stated in your Community Notification - “public notification has been designed to provide all the necessary information as required by ISED.....” This appears to contradict what is actually going to happen. Your public notification, quote – “Bell attests that the radio antenna system described in this notification package will comply with Transport Canada/NAV Canada aeronautical safety requirements. Bell has made all necessary applications to Transport Canada and NAV Canada. Both clearances have been received and lighting or painting is not required as per Transport Canada’s assessment.” Your answer to my question – “We have sent the tower proposal to Transport Canada and they have assessed that Day Protection and Night Protection will be required under CAR Standard 621. I have confirmed with Bell that there will be medium intensity lighting at the midlevel and top-level of the proposed tower that will operate 24/7. There

may also be painting requirements to meet the daytime protection standards.” Two exact opposite responses to the same question. If the assessment changed after notifying the public, this should have been communicated. A perceived acceptance by neighbour’s based on no lighting, may have generated more questions, if what you are actually doing had been properly conveyed. Can you explain this discrepancy? There is a concerning lack of transparency here.

2. You state in your answer – “We completely understand that the lighting may cause a slight inconvenience, but unfortunately, Transport Canada’s requirements are non-negotiable due to aeronautical safety reasons.” Based on previous applications, would you not have assumed this lighting would be a safety requirement? Especially when the site is relatively close to Hamilton International Airport. Instead, there is a Community Notification released assuring us no lighting would be required.
3. In regards to your quote above “may cause a slight inconvenience”. What is your definition of slight inconvenience? Maybe, not sleeping at night due to flashing lights reflecting into your bedroom? Not being able to watch the 11:00 news due to reflecting light flashing into your house? How about exacerbating migraines due to the reflecting lights coming into your home?

For this “slight inconvenience”, the shareholders of Bell and the landowners, benefit financially.

4. You apologized for a delayed response (January 14/22 to February 3/22) to my questions based on “it took a while to prepare the coverage maps”. I find this an odd statement. It appears the proposed property is perfect, based on your statement in your Community Notification, “Bell chose this site in order to avoid problematic situations for our future customers such as poor voice and data quality, dropped calls, or even the inability to place a mobile call in the subject area.” How could you have completed due diligence and come up with a proposed location, without knowing what your coverage area will be? These maps should have been one of the first things to complete in order to find the proper location. Along with mapping existing towers and possible usage.
5. The current site is zoned agriculture. If the tower is built, will the assessment change? Are you applying for re-zoning?
6. Why is there such a large building (25mX25m) required at the base? Is the building permit based on agricultural or commercial standards?
7. What is the tower going to be used for? Telecommunication is a broad term. Does it include 5G or newer technology? Are there any concerns about

human health effects for any aspect of this “telecommunication”, and is testing still ongoing?

8. It appears your statement in the Community Notification “continuous coverage and service to our future customer base in the area of Brant County Highway 54 and Mulligan Road” is very misleading or not well researched. Let us assume there are 50 people in the area of Mulligan Road/54. Half of these might be on the Bell network. You are going to spend several million dollars to service 25 people? If your target population area is larger, you should be up front and acknowledge this. Or should this restrictive coverage area have been corrected or expanded?
9. From an article in the Brantford Expositor on February 6, 2022 (Vincent Ball), the minimum distance for any telecommunication tower in the County of Brant, from a residence, is 195 metres. Based on this information your proposed project appears to be non-compliant.
10. You state that “towers are typically placed 1km – 2km apart in rural settings”. Is this a future goal or just a statement? Living, and driving in rural Ontario, there are not many “typical tower” placements – at least not yet. This may be financially positive for the telecommunication companies, but the

aesthetic and land usage implications to rural Ontario, are unimaginable - if towers are placed 1-2km apart as you state.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to comment and look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Barry McBlain

Mailing address – 1328 Hwy #54W Caledonia, N3W 2G9



Properties we are associated with either through ownership or rental agreements, and reached with your Community Notification -

Lot 68,69,70,71,72 and 73.