

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Agenda Management Support](#)  
**Subject:** Item 10 comment\_Kaufman, M  
**Date:** Monday, June 9, 2025 11:59:36 AM

---

**From:** Matthew Kaufman <matthew@eeph.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 3, 2025 1:38 PM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
**Cc:** Trina Barton <Trina.Barton@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
**Subject:** 186 Summit Cell Tower, 125 Patrick alternative

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

I am the owner of the property at 125 Patrick Road in Bonny Doon that has been included as an "alternative site" for the proposed AT&T/CTI tower at 186 Summit. I wanted to clear up a few things that may help the Board with some upcoming decisions.

First, some background:

1. The existing 186 Summit tower (70 foot steel lattice) owned by CTI was initially constructed in 1969 for use as a Cable TV receive site, and the tower at 125 Patrick (150 steel lattice, later extended to 180 feet steel lattice in the 1980s) was constructed in 1971 for paging and two-way radio use.
2. In the late 1970s and through the early 2000s, Santa Cruz County maintained two-way radio repeaters for the Fire dispatch channel, the Sheriff dispatch and secondary channels, the Public works channel, and the Ambulance-Hospital channel. These repeaters were removed when the landlord increased the fees and the system was reconfigured, but the licenses and coordinations for these channels have been maintained. These channels are intended for re-use by the Next Generation radio system, and installing components of that system at the 125 Patrick site would benefit from the existing FCC licenses.
3. In the early 1990s, the tower at 125 Patrick had cellular antennas added by Cellular One (later Cingular, later AT&T) and after a period of non-conformance the use permit was amended in 1994 for that use (though unfortunately when that was done the drawings showed the full 180 feet of tower and existing antennas but dimensioned it as the original 150 feet). In the mid-2000s, Cingular removed the antennas from that tower.

4. I purchased that property at 125 Patrick in 2014, and it was still in use for paging and two-way radio use at that time. That use continued until the CZU fire.
5. In 2020, the CZU Lightning Complex fire destroyed the 180 foot tower at 125 Patrick along with the two shelter structures at the base. Due to the County zoning and permitting process and legal objections raised by neighbors, it took until October 2023, but a 150 foot replacement tower now stands where the existing tower had been.
6. 200 amps of electrical power is available at the site, but due to the County zoning and permitting process, I'm still unable to get an electric permit to install the meter.

Co-location options for AT&T or other wireless providers:

1. I am open to a discussion with any carrier interested in co-locating on my replacement tower. The original tower was a Rohn 55 tower, 18" face made of 11 gauge tubular steel with point guying. The existing replacement is a Magnum tower, also 18" face but made of solid steel rod with star guying as an anti-torque measure. This makes it substantially stronger and able to support more antenna load than might be assumed, though whether it is sufficient for what the carrier needs would need to be determined. However, the tower is currently 150 feet tall, which limits coverage to the south due to topography and trees that are a lot taller than they were in 1971 when the original tower was built. Zoning approval is required to install cellular antennas, though the existing 1994 use permit could potentially simplify that approval.
2. For carriers that are not served by a 150 foot tower but would be at 180 feet, my existing replacement tower was engineered for a total height of 180 feet, the guy anchors have additional attachment points for one additional set of guys, and the additional 30 feet of tower is fabricated and at the property. Zoning approval is of course required to extend the tower and install cellular antennas. At the extended height, the total wind loading the tower can support is lower, and so whether that is sufficient for what the carrier needs would need to be determined.
3. For carriers that would require a height beyond 180 feet to achieve their needed coverage, my existing replacement tower cannot be extended past 180 feet, in part because it would require additional guy anchors located farther from the base of the tower, and my property is not wide enough to extend the anchors any farther. The only solution using my property would be to construct a new self-supporting tower or monopole. This could be done at the original location, or farther up the hill on my property. The latter has the advantage that the total 210 feet that a carrier might need to fully clear the trees for coverage to the south could be achieved with a structure shorter than 199 feet, which would eliminate the need for FAA lighting

of the tower.

In all cases it should be noted that the existing tower at 125 Patrick is visible from Empire Grade, as would any extension or alternative tower on that parcel.

Matthew Kaufman

[matthew@eeeph.com](mailto:matthew@eeeph.com)

(831) 227-9048