

Re: Rogers Communication Inc. (Rogers) tower proposal W2716 at Channel Ridge, Salt Spring Island

**Oona McOuat** <oonasong@yahoo.com>

To: STS DGSO / DGOGS SST (IC)

Cc: SSIInfo, Laura Patrick, Peter Grove Islands Trust, Peter Luckham, David Marlor, Stefan Cermak, Gail Sjuberg, Elizabeth - M.P. May, Elizabeth - M.P. May, simon.kennedy@ised-isde.gc.ca, francois-philippe.champagne@parl.gc.ca

Thu, Sept 8, 2022 at 11:16 a.m.

**Attention:** Susan Hart, Executive Director General, Spectrum Management Operations Branch, Spectrum and Telecommunications Sector

Dear Ms. Hart,

Thank you for your letter of August 30th, 2022, found below.

In regards to the Rogers-Channel Ridge, Salt Spring cell tower application, in it you say:

"ISED also confirmed with the Salt Spring Island Land Trust Committee (SSLTC), as the land-use authority, that they deemed their 2001 Cellular Antennae Proposal Form and Procedural Guideline to be obsolete at the time."

This statement is troubling, to say the least, as a Salt Spring Local Trust Committee (SS LTC) staff report contained in the agenda package for the July 27, 2021 LTC meeting states:

"In preliminary discussions with staff, the proponent was advised the SS LTC has not adopted a telecommunications policy following ISED's revoking of the 2001 Procedure for Cellular Phone Antenna Proposals and Letter of Understanding (due to dated procedural guidelines).

Clearly either ISED and/or the SS LTC made the decision to disregard the Cellular Antennae Procedural Guideline which the SSI LTC had voted by resolution to adopt on April 26, 2001. Given that it has been confirmed to me by David Marlor, the Director of Local Planning Services for the Islands Trust, that no further resolution either amending or revoking the 2001 policy had been passed at the time the Rogers Channel Ridge application was processed, it is evident the 2001 protocol was the policy that should have been followed for this Rogers-Channel Ridge siting.

That said - there were several requirements contained within that 2001 policy that were not met by the SS LTC or by Rogers, the proponent in this siting. These points can be provided in detail upon your request.

Further, if indeed somehow Section 122 (4) of BC's Community Charter could be overridden in this matter, and this 2001 policy could have been cast aside by either ISED or the SS LTC with no formal or documented process having taken place to do so, as communicated to you in detail by my colleague Julian Clark in his email message of September 5, 2022, the other two procedural documents that could have been used in this siting, the "Islands Trust Draft Model Protocol" and ISED's CPC-2-0-03, were not followed either.

Although a letter of concurrence is an agreement between a proponent and a local government and ISED does not generally permit citizens to intervene in antenna siting matters, clearly, public servants and elected officials are required by law and by an unspoken code of ethics to listen and respond to, and act upon, irregularities reported to you by citizens.

I trust you and those with the authority to rectify this situation will do so, thus ensuring that the public retains confidence in those we elect and hire to serve us and the public good,

All the Best,  
Oona McOuat

**STS DGSO / DGOGS SST (IC)** <ic.stsdgso-dgogssst.ic@ised-isde.gc.ca>

**To:** oonasong@yahoo.com

**Cc:** STS DGSO / DGOGS SST (IC)

Thu, Oct 27, 2022 at 10:52 a.m.

Dear Oona McOuat:

On behalf of Susan Hart, Director General of the Spectrum Management Operations Branch, Spectrum and Telecommunications Sector, I am writing in response to your email of September 8, 2022 regarding the Rogers Communication Inc. (Rogers) tower proposal W2716 at Channel Ridge, Salt Spring Island, British Columbia.

Innovation, Science and Economic Development (ISED) recognizes that land-use authorities such as municipalities are directly impacted by towers and therefore have a key role to play regarding the location of these structures. Therefore, our collaborative and consultative policy "[CPC-2-0-03 Radiocommunication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems](#)" (CPC-2-0-03) requires proponents to first contact the municipality to determine the local consultation requirements when they intend to propose a new tower structure.

In the case of this tower proposal, the Salt Spring Island Land Trust Committee (SSLTC), as the land-use authority, directed Cypress Land Services (Cypress), an agent of Rogers, to use the ISED default public consultation process listed in CPC 2-0-03. ISED reviewed the public consultation process conducted by Cypress and found that the consultation process was properly administered and conducted in compliance with the CPC-2-0-03. Since the regulatory processes were properly followed, ISED will not intervene further and considers this matter closed.

Thank you for taking the time to follow-up with the Department.

Yours sincerely,

Marc-André Rochon,  
Senior Director, Spectrum Management Operations Branch  
Spectrum and Telecommunications Sector