



PLANNING + NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES

Land Use Review

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

Complete this form if you are appealing an **Administrative Decision** to City Planning Commission.

Appellant Contact Information

Jacqueline M. Ostrom

719 238-1993

Name of Appellant

Phone Number

1207 Glen Haven Point Colorado Springs, CO 80907

Address (Include City, State, ZIP)

jacquiem108@gmail.com

Email

Project Information

Project Taurus

Project Name

Corporate Ridge No. 1 Lot 4, 1565 High Tech Way, Colorado Springs, CO 80907

Site Address (TSN if not yet addressed)

Administrative approval decision by Colorado Springs City Planning is hereby being appealed The De

Type of Application Being Appealed

Record number DEPN-26-0039

All File Numbers Associated with the Application

Daniel Sexton, LUR/DRE

Project Planner's Name

Hearing Date

Item Number on Agenda

Appellant Authorization

The signature(s) below certifies that I (we) is(are) the authorized appellant and that the information provided on this form is in all respects true and accurate to the best of my (our) knowledge and belief. I(we) familiarized myself(ourselves) with the rules, regulations and procedures with respect to preparing and filing this petition. I agree that if this request is approved, it is issued on the representations made in this submittal, and any approval or subsequently issued building permit(s) or other type of permit(s) may be revoked without notice if there is a breach of representations or conditions of approval.

Signature of Appellant

Date

Jacqueline M. Ostrom

June 22, 2026



PLANNING + NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES

Land Use Review

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

Appeal Submittal Should Include:

All Items Are Required

- ☐ Completed Appeal Form (this document).
- ☐ Evidence of "Affected Party" Status – check the box below and provide justification for the chosen box.
- ☐ Notice of Appeal (see requirements on page 3 of this document).
- ☐ \$176 check payable to the City of Colorado Springs.

Submit all 4 items above to into the Accela review system - <https://aca-prod.accela.com/COSPRINGS/Default.aspx>.

Appeals are accepted for 10 days after a decision has been made. Submittals must be received no later than 5pm MST on the due date of the appeal. Incomplete submittals and / or submittals received after 5pm or outside of the 10-day window will not be accepted. If the due date for the submittal falls on a weekend or federal holiday, the deadline is extended to the following business day at 5 pm MST.

If you need additional assistance with this application, please call the Land Use Review front desk at (719) 385-5905.

Affected Party Status

Please indicate, per UDC Subsection 7.5.415.A(1)(a) (Right to Appeal), which of the definitions of "Affected Party" that applies to the Appellant.

- ☐ (1) The applicant for the decision being appealed;
- ☐ (2) The owner or tenant of a lot or parcel of land located within one thousand (1,000) feet of the subject lot; or
- ☐ (3) Any owner or tenant of a lot or parcel of land located within three (3) miles of the subject property who has preserved standing by:
 - ☐ (a) Testifying at the public hearing on the application;
 - ☐ (b) Submitting written comments prior to the public hearing on the application; or
 - ☒ (c) In the case of applications approved by the Manager or an administrative official, submitting written comments to the Manager or administrative official during the comment period before the Manager or administrative official's action.



PLANNING + NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES

Land Use Review

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

Notice of Appeal

The Notice of Appeal Shall State:

- (1) The specific provision(s) of this UDC that is the basis of the appeal;
- (2) Which of the following criteria for reversal or modification of the decision is applicable to the appeal:
 - (a) The decision is contrary to the express language of this UDC;
 - (b) The decision is erroneous; or
 - (c) The decision is clearly contrary to law; and
- (3) Describe how the criteria for the relevant application have or have not been met.

ORIGINAL RESEARCH article

Front. Behav. Neurosci., 26 April 2026

Sec. Individual and Social Behaviors

Volume 20 - 2026 | <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2026.1729876>

Infrasound exposure is linked to aversive responding, negative appraisal, and elevated salivary cortisol in humans



Kale R. Scatterty ^{1,2}



Dawson VonStein ¹

L

Lisa B. Prichard ³

B

Brian C. Franczak ⁴



Trevor J. Hamilton ^{1,2*}



Rodney M. Schmaltz ^{1*}

1. Department of Psychology, MacEwan University, Edmonton, AB, Canada

2. Neuroscience and Mental Health Institute, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

See more

Article metrics

[View details](#)

16,9k

Views

786

Downloads

Abstract

Introduction: Infrasound describes sound wave frequencies below 20 Hz, which are typically imperceptible to humans. Some animals perceive and demonstrate aversion to infrasound, raising concerns about its potential adverse effects as an anthropogenic pollutant. Recent research suggests humans may also respond to infrasound, despite being below the conventional limit of human hearing. This study explored the non-auditory impact of infrasound on human mood and stress responding. **Methods:** Participants ($n = 36$) were exposed to calming or unsettling music with infrasound (~ 18 Hz) present or absent in a 2×2 between-subjects design (*calming vs. unsettling, infrasound on vs. off*). Self-report measures were collected immediately post-exposure, and saliva was collected immediately pre-exposure and 20 min post-onset for cortisol assay. **Results:** Participants did not detect infrasound above chance ($p = 0.241$). Infrasound was associated with elevated salivary cortisol ($p = 0.022$, $r_b = 0.390$) and higher self-reported irritability ($p = 0.049$, $\eta^2 = 0.096$), disinterest ($p = 0.044$, $\eta^2 = 0.121$; $p = 0.047$, $\eta^2 = 0.118$), and sadness appraisal ($p = 0.002$, $\eta^2 = 0.253$) across both music conditions, with no expectancy effects. Interest, irritability, sadness appraisal, and cortisol were also identified as important predictors of infrasound exposure via random-forest modeling. **Discussion:** Without auditory detection nor expectancy effects, infrasound exposure was linked to elevated cortisol and more negative affective self-reporting. These findings align with previous animal studies and suggest infrasound may be aversive to humans, acting as a potential environmental irritant and contributing to more negative subjective experience.

Research Findings on Infrasound

Health and Mood Alterations:

Infrasound exposure (frequencies below 20 Hz) can impact human well-being even when it is below the conventional hearing threshold. Synthesis of literature indicates that prolonged exposure to low-frequency noise is strongly associated with emotional and psychological changes, notably heightened annoyance, distraction, and sleep disorders, alongside potential long-term correlations with high blood pressure and cardiovascular issues (Araújo Alves et al., 2020).

Perception and Sound Unpleasantness:

While pure infrasound requires very high sound pressure levels to be consciously detected, its interaction with audible sound alters human perception. Research indicates that when infrasound is combined with normal audio-frequency noise, it creates an amplitude modulation effect that increases the perceived unpleasantness and annoyance of the environment (Burke et al., 2020).

References:

Araújo Alves, J., Neto Paiva, F., Torres Silva, L., & Remoaldo, P. (2020). Low-Frequency Noise and Its Main Effects on Human Health—A Review of the Literature between 2016 and 2019. *Applied Sciences*, 10(15), 5205.

Cited by: 175

Burke, E., Uppenkamp, S., & Koch, C. (2020). A psychoacoustical study to investigate the perceived unpleasantness of infrasound combined with audio-frequency sound. *Acta Acustica*, 4, 20.

Cited by: 18

Closed-loop chillers utilizing silicone oil (typically Polydimethylsiloxane or PDMS) present highly specific physical risks to aquatic ecosystems. Unlike traditional glycol-based or PFAS-based coolants, silicone oil does not mix with water and has very low chemical toxicity. Instead, its main hazard stems from its physical behavior on and under the water surface. [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]

The precise environmental dynamics, creek-specific risks, and community points of leverage regarding a potential data center release include the following actions and impacts:

1. Mechanisms of Creek Contamination

- **Surface Film Smothering:** Silicone oil is completely insoluble and lighter than water. A leak creates an immediate micro-thin surface film that lowers water surface tension, which prevents native water-walking insects (such as water striders) from staying afloat and disrupts mosquito-larvae respiration. [1, 2]
- **Benthic Sediment Trapping:** Over time, floating silicone oil binds heavily to suspended organic dirt, clay particles, and creek silt. The heavily weighted oil then sinks to the creek bed. This forms a physical barrier that coats rocks, which blocks pore water exchange and suffocates burrowing organisms, fish eggs, and macroinvertebrates. [1, 2]
- **Zero Bioaccumulation:** On a positive biological note, silicone oil molecules are too large to pass through biological membranes. If fish ingest it, the fluid passes through them inertly without accumulating in tissue or traveling up the food chain. [1]
- **Extreme Persistence:** Silicone oils do not degrade via water-borne bacteria or UV rays in a creek setting. Once it settles into the sediment, it remains there for decades unless physically excavated. [1, 2, 3]

2. The Danger of "System Cleanouts"

- **System Maintenance Blowdown:** Closed-loop industrial systems require regular flushing to remove sediment scale and degraded fluid. This gray sludge must never enter municipal sewers or storm drains. Water treatment plants are completely incapable of filtering or treating silicone oil. [1, 2]
- **Chemical Additive Cocktails:** The silicone oil itself may be inert, but system flushes often contain proprietary anti-corrosion chemical packages, biocides, and surfactants. These chemical additives are often highly toxic to fish and aquatic life. [1]

3. Spill Response & Cleanup Realities

- **Traditional Absorbents Fail:** Standard oil spill booms and pads designed for petroleum fuels are inefficient at trapping heavy silicone oils. [1, 2]
- **Specialized Remediation:** Effective remediation requires immediate physical skimming of the surface using superhydrophobic, polymer-coated sponges or applying oil-solidifying agents that turn the floating fluid into a removable rubbery sheet. [1, 2, 3]

4. Direct Action Items for Community Oversight

Action Item [1, 2, 3]	Technical Focus	Community Goal
Demand SDS Sheets	Request the Safety Data Sheet (SDS) for the exact cooling fluid brand (e.g., <u>Dow DOWSIL</u> series).	Identify what toxic anti-corrosive or biocide additives are mixed into the loop.
Verify Containment	Review site blueprints for multi-stage secondary containment basins under all outdoor chillers.	Ensure a physical structural barrier exists to catch the maximum capacity of the loop before a leak reaches the soil.
Review Disposal Plan	Request the written standard operating procedure (SOP) for chiller maintenance flushes.	Force a legal commitment that all flush wastewater is hauled away by a certified hazardous waste contractor.
Isolate Storm Drains	Inspect the location of onsite storm drains relative to the chiller yard.	Ensure storm infrastructure features isolation valves that can manually shut down during a facility spill to block creek path access