

1 population probably in the neighborhood of 15%, 20% at most of... and yet
2 given the infrastructure investments that are projected right now over the next
3 two to three years. We are looking at those figures going from 20% capable to
4 perhaps 75% capable in that type of time frame. But we are talking about multi-
5 billion dollar investments and that's what it has taken in the consolidation that is
6 taking place in the industry. All of these mergers that you are seeing, you have
7 seen that economies of scale are what is really necessary to make those kinds
8 of mega investments. The mergers have occurred the, economies of scale are
9 coming together and the infrastructure is being put in as we speak from many
10 sources not just from the cable industry but the expansion and satellite industry
11 and the enhancement in broadcast capability as well.

12 HOLLOWAY: I think we are going to take about ten minute break
13 for right now, we need to get up and stretch just a bit and I think some of...we
14 are seeing people fall asleep so, we think maybe you need get up a little bit
15 and...

16 HOLLOWAY: Shirley Olinger?

17 OLINGER: Yes, good evening. My name is Shirley Olinger. I
18 have been requested to make this very fast and I will. I am a nuclear engineer, I
19 work for the Department of Energy at Rocky Flats and I am going to start on
20 slide 11 all the previous slides were on health studies they have been discussed
21 already. And I think the bottom line is there is indication that low levels of
22 radiation exposure from these towers can be linked to childhood leukemias and
23 cancers. So, we are on slide 11. There is a study that hasn't been talked about

1 that was done by the Telecom industry and it reviews the setting of standards.
2 And it states in the study, that I thought that was interesting that the U.S.
3 typically sets standards based on the highest level of exposure not known to be
4 dangerous, where as the Soviets they set their standards typically based on
5 estimating the lowest levels where effects observed and then setting the
6 standard well below that. So, it's a difference in philosophy and that's why we
7 see the difference in standards between the U.S. and other countries. The
8 standard will be discussed by Dr. Mattson after me. The other interesting thing
9 about the Telecom study is they did a product liability analysis where they... and
10 they did this for the Telecom industry to look at what could go on with lawsuits.
11 And they described a possible plaintiff's case as follows. The biological effects
12 should have been viewed as a health hazard and we should have been warned
13 about it. The industry should have sponsored more research, the antenna
14 system should have been designed to minimize power levels and it is not a
15 surprise to me that after this 1995 liability analysis that the Telecom industry
16 lobbied hard and won in the 1996 Telecom Act. That any local government
17 cannot use health risk as a reason for siting towers, cell towers. This next slide
18 talks about the different standards around the world. Our standard the lowest
19 part of the standard is 200 microwatts. The most recent published proposal is
20 the Swiss. The Swiss health officials have proposed strict rules based on what's
21 called a precautionary principal or ALARA as low as reasonably achievable to
22 sensitive areas such as homes, workplaces and playgrounds. And this will
23 result in power levels requirements a hundred times lower than the standards by

1 the ICNIRP, which is the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation
2 Protection. If this was Russia this super tower would not be able to be built on
3 Lookout Mountain. And this standard set is well below the lowest level where
4 the biological effects are observed. In my field in the ionizing radiation, Russia
5 is often behind our standards so to know that this super tower would not be able
6 to be built if we were in Russia is very troubling to me. So, why isn't the public
7 aware? It seems clear to me when the very people that could share this
8 information with the public, the media, are the people that were really, that's
9 causing this hazard. If this was not the case the headlines would read children
10 and families guinea pigs to cancer study by broadcasters. The broadcasting
11 and the Telecom industries are spending lots of money lobbying against tougher
12 standards and against performing non-ionizing radiation standards as the did
13 recently in our Congress. There are also lobbying to remove local government's
14 rights to intervene in siting their towers and antennas. This is kind of
15 reminiscent of the tobacco industry in the 1960's and 70's. The tobacco industry
16 lobbied against higher standards, they performed biased studies, and they
17 bought the broadcast companies. The FCC regulates this industry that
18 regulates this industry has a conflicting mission of promoting these technologies
19 and they are not independent. This is clearly a case of the fox guarding the hen
20 house. We are counting on our local officials to take care of their citizens not
21 the Washington beltway. Our community has the highest level of non-ionizing
22 radiation in the nation, why would you ever consider increasing it. We would
23 expect that you would look at reducing it. So, the conclusions, the levels will

1 significantly increase. Our Ralston children will be exposed 1500 hundred times
2 more than the average Denver resident. And the studies show that childhood
3 Leukemia can be linked to low levels of this hazard as low as two micro-watts.
4 And eventually the U.S. standards and science will catch up with other countries
5 even with the tremendous lobbying and the one sided media coverage being
6 presented by the broadcast companies. As the general public and our Elected
7 Officials become more educated the quicker this will happen. Cancers in our
8 community will be blamed on the tower and probably litigated. Jefferson County
9 could become the party of that lawsuit. The FCC has not performed an
10 environmental impact statement and Dr. Mattson will talk about that further. And
11 lastly the broadcast companies hope you will stay in the dark as is the public.
12 So, the bottom line is common sense says it's not a good idea to co-locate this
13 hazard among families and children in a growing community. It's simply not
14 prudent, I ask you, I beg you to rather be safe then sorry. I recommend that no
15 additional radiation is introduced in residential areas and playgrounds. That
16 independent monitoring be performed by independent agency and that you also
17 challenge the Federal Government to have an independent public health
18 monitoring of this hazard. That you recommend to the FCC that they perform an
19 environmental impact statement and look at alternatives. That you recommend
20 that Congress fund a comprehensive study for this type of hazard as they have
21 done for the power line industry. Thank you for your time.

22 SHEEHAN: Just one quick question.

23 HOLLOWAY: Oh, you have a question?

1 SHEEHAN: Your one slide on our community has the highest
2 levels of RF radiation in the nation. What is your source on that?

3 OLINGER: That's numerous sources from the FCC they have
4 quoted that to Al Hislop. And looking at just radiation levels in other
5 communities looking at the studies.

6 SHEEHAN: Maybe if someone could just kind of point me the
7 way to the exact piece of paper that shows me the source on that at some point
8 with the CARE group, I would appreciate that.

9 CARNEY: That was Jerry Uhlich of the FCC said it to Carol
10 Lomond and we have repeated it to the FCC and they have never denied it.

11 SHEEHAN: Well, I don't know if it's written, if it's written some
12 way or substantiated some place, I need that. I need that as factual record, I
13 guess for my basis of decision.

14 MATTSON: Good evening, my name is Roger Mattson. M-A-T-T-
15 S-O-N. I reside at 481 Crawford Street in Golden, that's Tripp Ranch right at the
16 base of Lookout Mountain. I am an expert in radiation standards. But, I also
17 have a bias, so my residence is a bias, I also have 14 members of my family
18 living in 5 households living within about 5 miles of this mountain. So, that's my
19 bias now I will talk about what I know as an expert. I have spent my adult life in
20 nuclear safety and radiation protection. Half of my career with the federal
21 government with the federal regulatory agencies for Nuclear Safety and
22 Radiation Protection and the Atomic Energy Commission, the Nuclear
23 Regulatory Commission and the Environmental Protection Agency. For a period