

Evans, Kelsey

From: Margaret Fritsch <madgefritsch@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2020 1:25 PM
To: SH County Board Parks, Energy, and Environment
Subject: Underwood Creek/Menomonee River Parkway -- Wauwatosa

Email originated from outside of Milwaukee County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content.

Hello members of the Parks, Energy and Environment Committee,

I have three concerns:

1. One positive affect of Covid-19 is seeing more people out exercising—walking, running, riding bikes. Myself included. I dusted off my bicycle and with a neighbor, have ventured out every morning on the streets and bike trails around Wauwatosa. Yesterday we traveled through Hansen Park to the Underwood Creek path and down Underwood Creek road. This road, from 116th south to Bluemound Road, is HORRIBLE. It's rough driving in a car, but on a bicycle—never again. There are no paths or sidewalks and it's nearly impossible to stay close to the side of the road. In order to find a bit of smoothness, one has to ride in the middle of the road. This stretch of road has been bad for years. (Hansen Park is awful too, but I'll skip for now!)

Q: Wondering if there's a plan in the somewhat near future to address the road conditions on this stretch of road?

2. This has been an issue since day one. When the Menomonee River Parkway/Oak Leaf trail was installed a few years ago, from the Village of Wauwatosa (Harmoniee) to Burleigh, there are two areas where the paved path moves away from the street and further down toward the woods. Walking on this early in the morning or late at night is scary, especially as a woman. The path is mostly lit until it ventures toward the woods. For a good stretch of path, you're literally walking along the woods in the dark. One area is near Hoyt Park and the other is near Harding/Beverly Blvd.

Q: What would it take to get an additional light fixture or two in these areas to keep people safe?

3. Also along the Menomonee River Parkway, more waste cans are needed. Now that I'm out and about more, I've noticed people tossing dog poop bags on the ground because there are no trash cans. I believe there is one near Hoyt Park, with dog poop bags, and maybe one more between North Avenue north to Burleigh. As a dog walker, I appreciate the bags. I usually carry my own bag, but have had to use a bag once or twice in an emergency. But I would so appreciate more trash cans so I don't have to carry a smelly poop bag the entire walk.

Q: If the trash is being picked up, what harm/cost would it be to add a few more trash cans along the way?

I've copied my county supervisor as I think he could add some local perspective for you as well on these concerns. Thank you for reading. I appreciate any feedback you could provide me on these issues.

Margaret Fritsch
2404 N. 88th St.
Wauwatosa WI
414-429-4941

Evans, Kelsey

From: Dawn McCarthy <dmccarthy@milwaukeekeepreservation.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 09, 2020 4:36 PM
To: SH County Board Parks, Energy, and Environment
Cc: Wasserman, Sheldon; Shea, Steven; Martin, Felesia; Ortiz-Velez, Sylvia; Sumner, Liz; Cullen, Eddie
Subject: 20-525: Resolution creating the Small Cell Wireless Facilities Workgroup

Email originated from outside of Milwaukee County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content.

Dear Chair and Supervisors (PEEC),

We are writing to support Resolution 20-525, creating the Small Cell Wireless Facilities Workgroup. **A careful review of all relevant federal and state laws is critical in order to recommend a set of guidelines.** In particular we believe that **Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966** applies to Small Cell Wireless Facilities.

In the meantime **we ask that Milwaukee County consider amending Resolutions 20-331, 20-332 and 20-420** to require that MCImetro submit each project for the Section 106 review. Each of these resolutions proposes an easement for projects at sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The National Register of Historic Places is the official list of the Nation's historic places worthy of preservation.

The FCC provides a Fact Sheet for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) here: https://www.fcc.gov/sites/default/files/NEPA_Factsheet_111816.pdf.

As noted in the Fact Sheet, NEPA regulations include requirements for compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA. Under Section 106, each federal agency must consider public views and concerns about historic preservation issues when making final project decisions.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and thank you for your consideration.

Dawn McCarthy
414-520-5191
President Emeritus
Milwaukee Preservation Alliance

Evans, Kelsey

From: CitizenDoug@PawPat.Com
Sent: Thursday, July 09, 2020 5:46 PM
To: SH County Board Parks, Energy, and Environment
Cc: Wasserman, Sheldon; Shea, Steven; Martin, Felesia; Sumner, Liz; Ortiz-Velez, Sylvia; Cullen, Eddie; Smith, Guy; Lucas, Jeremy; Francis, Jen; Hayden, Erica
Subject: 20-35 submission for PEEC meeting 2020-07-10 In Reference To 20-525, 20-331, 20-332, and 20-420 (Small Wireless Facilities and Associated Backhaul Easements)
Attachments: NorthPointCellTower-Annotated.jpg

Email originated from outside of Milwaukee County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content.

20-35 PE&E@MilwaukeeCountyWI.Gov
July 9, 2020

Dear Supervisors:

This e-mail is written regarding inter-related items 20-525, 20-331, 20-332, and 20-420, and submitted as Public Written Comments to 20-35 for the July 10 2020 PE&E Committee Meeting.

1) As to items 20-331, 20-332, and 20-420 which are FiberOptic easements to facilitate Small Wireless Facilities (cell towers) in Milwaukee County Parks: I urge you to lay over the items to the next meeting in order to allow your 20-525 Task Force to study the entire matter of Use of Park Lands (as well as other County lands) for Telecommunications so as to reflect those Task Force findings in consideration of the associated fiberoptic lines.

It is highly doubtful that these fiber "backhaul" easements would be used for any thing other than the associated Small Wireless Facilities already proposed to the County. The detailed drawings submitted to the Parks Committee from Open Records of the Parks Department (some of which I included in my 19-895 "Submitted Materials" study) explicitly show the branch circuits and associated equipment used solely for cell towers. You should, therefore, avoid the Cell Companies' attempts to bifurcate the issue at this time.

If you are forced to take action this July meeting, then I urge you to vote "NO" so as to reject the Fiber Easements. 20-331 Lakefront is in Public Trust Doctrine Lands, National Register of Historic Places (Section 108) Sites, and threatens Safety and General Welfare; 20-420 Root River Parkway is in Flood Plain that FREQUENTLY floods, and threatens Safety and General Welfare; and 20-332 (Lincoln Park and Milwaukee River Parkway may as well be in Flood Plain and threatens Safety and General Welfare.

2) As to item 20-525: I applaud and urge passage of the resolution to create a Task Force. As I've noted since the late Fall of 2019, the County is playing catch-up to the 2018 FCC regulations and to the 2019 Act 14 implemented a year ago; the sooner the better. However, I offer four items to consider as amendments to the Resolution:

i) The Title (lines 8 & 9) and content of the Resolution put much emphasis on Historical and Aesthetic considerations. However, while it is mentioned in passing, the new regulations and laws also allow local

government to consider Safety and General Welfare in their approval process. These provisions may bear significant weight in evaluating Small Wireless Facilities.

I therefore submit that it is worthwhile to amend the Resolution at line 69 to replaced the final clause "; and" with "and protect the Safety and General Welfare of the people; and".

ii) in support of I) above, line 101 should insert, before the final word "and", the phrase "protect the Safety and General Welfare of the people, ".

iii) while line 108 does allow for "any other Department" to be involved in the Task Group process, I suggest that the Resolution be explicitly amended to specifically enumerate Department of Administrative Services Economic Development Division. I am told that the Division (Adam Stehly specifically) is charged with managing SWFs on all County Property which is NOT Highways and is NOT Parks. Since there is much County Land which falls under this moniker, that body should be included. Moreover, since the County Website's description for EconDev says "We are also charged with managing air-space and cell-tower leases and developing strategies for the efficient management of leasing in county government", it sure seems like they should have two cents worth to contribute.

Finally,

iv) Line 13 is blatantly incomplete and inaccurate. To say that Small Wireless Facilities "are small antennas attached to an existing utility infrastructure for the provision of wireless service" is precisely what duped the Legislature and the FCC to pell-mell approve their rules. In fact, experience shows that VERY FEW of the SWF implementations actually use or replace existing Utility, Street Light, or Traffic Light poles. Utility, City, and County personnel have ALL told me that that 'colocation' is hardly ever implemented because of the logistical nightmares between the various pole users. If your job was to replace lightbulbs in streetlights, would you really feel safe knowing that there is a very high power, very high frequency radiation source nuking your organs two feet away from you?? Do you really want to work on buried electric cable when there's fiber cable right next to it that causes huge repair expenses if accidentally cut? In the case of many areas, the poles are not structurally sound enough to support the cellular equipment.

Rather than innocuously adding antennae and support equipment to the top of preexisting poles, or replacing them, Cellular Operators are instead using the new regulations to build NEW, INDEPENDENT, PROPRIETARY TOWERS. This can readily be seen in the proposed Bradford Beach tower, or on the already-implemented North Point tower (picture submitted).

Moreover, the subject of Small Wireless Facilities includes more than antennae; there are the radio enclosures themselves, as well as nearby Electric Meter Pedestals (and nearby Buried Cable Warning Monuments) which further clutter the air- and land-scape in support of the antennae.

Finally, while SWFs are often thought of as "5G Towers", this is a misconception. Most SWFs are just that... small (under 50 foot) towers. Period. They frequently carry ONLY current 4G (e.g. LTE) or other already-implemented signal types. "Don't Believe The Hype".

Therefore, Lines 12 through 14 should be replaced with:

"WHEREAS, small cell wireless facilities (SWF) are a type of wireless broadband infrastructure and are small antennas and associated equipment attached or in immediate proximity to an existing or new utility infrastructure for the provision of wireless telecommunications service, including (but not limited to) fifth-generation cellular wireless (5G); and"

3) My proposals are submitted to refine, define, and protect the efforts of the Task Force; I regret not having seen earlier drafts to make these suggestions during drafting. If these modifications cannot be implemented in time for July Adoption by the County Board, then the Resolution should nevertheless be passed, because Time Is Of The Essence. Let's Get'Er Done!

Sincerely,
Douglas R Bomberg, CPCU