

1 ANDERSON: My name is Brent Anderson, 813 Rabbit Run Drive. I
2 am the director of the Stonebridge/Eagle Ridge Homeowners Association. This
3 homeowners association represents at build out 232 residences located directly
4 at the base of Lookout Mountain. Residences in that particular subdivision have
5 been occupied really since January, 2003. We would like to take and provide
6 you with a few comments in opposition to the construction of this tower many of
7 which have already been stated and I'll do my best not to be redundant in that
8 regard. First of all I just for purposes of reiteration, the applicant here not the
9 opponents bear the burden of carrying their case and we've seen hours of
10 testimony contradicting what's been presented by the applicant and of course is
11 your duty to weigh and measure that. It's not an easy thing. Our opposition is
12 based upon first of all significant negative visual effects. You heard already
13 about the fact that this tower is significantly larger. That additional towers can in
14 fact be brought to bear as part of the application subsequent to the initial
15 construction and that we will end up with guyed wire securing this thing and
16 they're significantly larger than the ones that are already currently visible. We've
17 heard much about health effects and what is going to be tantamount to an
18 epidemiological experiment on Lookout Mountain and in Golden. You've heard
19 about CPPAG report which indicates that there is potentially more cancer risks
20 up there associated with the tower which has prompted further study. The thing
21 that I think is important, we've heard a little previously from Harmony Village
22 representative the fact that we worry about what's a potential carcinogen. Can
23 we regulate that? The fact of the matter is that numerous potential carcinogens

1 are already regulated. TCE, trichlorethylene is regulated. PCE percloroethylene is
2 regulated. Polycoordinated bipenal PCP's are regulated. Arsenic is regulated.
3 These are all potential carcinogens and they're regulated to a standard one and
4 one million additional cancer risks. The levels in the CPPAG study would
5 indicate that the exposure here is thousands of times greater than this. We
6 believe that it would be unconscionable and inappropriate for this body to
7 endorse a proposal that does not take into account standards for potential
8 carcinogens that's not consistent with other regulated substances. It's also been
9 said that, well we just don't know. Remember all the common solvents that I just
10 recommended, common solvents used in degreasers have been used for
11 industrial purposes for years and yet only recently in the last 15 or 20 years
12 have been determined to be carcinogenic and we still learn more. Propethelene
13 was a substance or is a substance that only in the last two years has been
14 reevaluated by the EPA and in 2001, the EPA has identified the fact that it may
15 be as much as 40 times more carcinogenic then it was previously thought.
16 Precloric the other example given here is not only a carcinogenic possibility that
17 affects Sacramento, it also has increased the remedy cost for the San Diego
18 Superfund site by as much as two hundred million dollars. That's all since 1977.
19 We don't know what we don't know. Just because we can't see radiation
20 doesn't mean it isn't real. Now we've talked a little bit about who bears these
21 costs. Right now we have the residents who are bearing external costs
22 associated with this proposal. The cost of interference. The cost of remediating
23 that interference. The cost of potential property damage are all things borne by

1 residents and not contemplated in the overall cost of the Lake Cedar proposal.
2 You are the body that need to weigh those costs. One thing that's been said
3 before is how much would this reduce cost. It's an analogy that again is
4 appropriate and comes from the environmental realm. Brownsville's property
5 value based upon the "clean value of the property, less the cost of remediating
6 it" Once remediated these properties typically return to something
7 approximating their original value though never fully recovering because they
8 suffer from additional transactional costs and stigma damage. People living
9 near the towers suffer from the same kinds of damage. Say that 5% let's take
10 Stonebridge as an example. You take 5%, \$400,000.00, 232,000 houses, about
11 four and a half million dollars in damage to that development alone. Existence
12 in these property damages is real. We already have residents, numerous
13 residents who are here tonight, many of whom have said should this tower
14 proposal proceed, they will leave. They will sell their property in Jefferson
15 County, they will move. We've had some homeowners who have had serious
16 trepidation about even moving into this neighborhood and yet have decided that
17 quality of life is sufficient that they'd rather fight to not have a tower and risk their
18 money rather than not leave. They too will likely leave if the tower proposal
19 goes through. Now what can be done about this? Now we have a few other
20 things to think about. First of all we have these externalized costs and yet we
21 have no real obligation to take care of those costs proposed by Lake Cedar
22 Group. Other entities dealt with that either through contacts with environmental
23 insurance programs, bonds or other means where they put corporate

1 guarantees to take and provide some financial security against the risks that
2 exist for those external costs, yet we have no proposal in that regard. Providing
3 alternative sites. I think it's important that we clearly evaluate those. Right now
4 we may lose as many as 188,000 viewers due to signal strength. We have
5 other evidence that would indicate that in fact measured signals would be
6 adequate. It doesn't seem that we have a plan that clearly evaluates the
7 financial impacts to residents, to the Lake Cedar Group, to the County to
8 consider these alternative sites or whether we've even considered all possible
9 alternative sites. This issue has been going to go on for years. It requires
10 creative thought. It requires input from Lake Cedar Group, from the Commission
11 and County and from interested residents to find a permanent resolution to this
12 problem. One that doesn't detrimentally affect the health of our children, our
13 families or detrimentally affect our property values. Thank you very much. I'll
14 answer any questions.

15 SHEEHAN: Questions? Okay, thank you sir. Okay, I think we're
16 done with HOA's and groups and organized groups and all that kind of stuff.
17 Right? Okay, as far as I know. All right with that then I'll dive into the list here.
18 Oh I think we're going to do a break right? Let's take a ten minute break and
19 we'll come back about 8:50. Welcome back to the County Commissioners
20 meeting on Lake Cedar Group LLC, Telecommunications Tower and we left off
21 with general public testimony. Just to remind everyone that in the general public
22 testimony portion, you have now three minutes to testify. You will have a light
23 on the podium. The yellow light shines up when you have one minute left. Red