

**From:** [Chelsea Richards](#)  
**To:** [Board Of Supervisors](#); [COB Staff](#); [Justin Cummings](#); [Trina Barton](#); [Andy Schiffrin](#); [Sandy Brown](#); [Jamie Sehorn](#); [Manu Koenig](#); [Felipe Hernandez](#); [Ramon Gomez](#); [Maria Orozco](#); [Rae Spencer-Hill](#); [Fifth District](#); [Monica Martinez](#); [Megan Renfrew](#); [Jesseka Rodriguez](#); [Kimberly De Serpa](#); [Maureen McCarty](#); [Regina Kelbert](#)  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 10- Protect the People, DENY THIS TOWER!  
**Date:** Monday, June 9, 2025 10:40:06 AM

---

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Dear Supervisors,

Why are my children holding fake plastic tree branches?



Because our family—and our neighbors—are fighting to stop a 140-foot cell tower dressed up as a fake tree from being built in the heart of our rural residential neighborhood in Santa Cruz, California.

We recently visited four nearby "monopine" towers. Under every single one, we found disturbing amounts of plastic pollution—broken plastic branches littering the ground.

Beyond microplastics, cell towers create concerns around health (cancer and degenerative diseases for those who live within a 1,640 ft radius), safety (increased fire risk, multiple cases of towers falling over in strong winds), property values (15-20% reduction), aesthetics (ugly AF), and environment (harms trees, birds, bees).

We know that the FCC does not care about these things and makes navigating this issue a

challenging job for you, but here is the best part:

**We have multiple legal grounds to deny this tower!**

**1. There is no gap in coverage-** We will be bringing in our attorneys and an expert witness to show you current drive test data taken last week by multiple AT&T cell phone users (not the 2-year-old, vague, unexplained-methods drive test maps CTI brought forth to show an At&T "coverage gap").

**2. The alternative tower site at Patrick Road is indeed a viable option for colocation.** Contrary to Sheila McDaniel's staff report, this tower will create no new visual impacts for the residents- It is already an eyesore. It is also a metal tower that will not have the horrendous microplastic shedding of a fake tree. The owner of the property has submitted in writing his desire for his site to be used for wireless communication and ability to adapt placement of his tower to higher grounds on his property so it can be more effective without having to increase the height.

This 3-year battle has been so stressful, taxing, and impactful for my family. It has caused extreme stress for me during my pregnancy with my son and my postpartum and has taken major hits on both my husband's business and my own. My family has liquidated many of our personal assets that we were going to use to build a home on foundation on our post-burn property that instead we used to hire attorneys to protect the land and neighborhood we love. For health reasons that the FCC will not acknowledge, we will need to relocate if this tower is constructed which will uproot our family with two small children from a community that I have been a part of for 20 years.

It felt so good to have the Planning Commission hear us and deny CTI's application, however, It seems like County Council did not make strong enough legal arguments to uphold their decision without the supervisors feeling a fear of CTI suing. Since then, we have strengthened our evidence, pulled in 2 more skilled attorneys, and hired expert witnesses so you can feel confident to turn CTI away, protect our zoning height restrictions, and keep our rural neighborhood a neighborhood.

Please uphold your duty to serve the people of this county and not this out-of-state, multi-billion dollar entity!

Sincerely,  
Chelsea Richards