



## **TPT Advisory Committee Meeting Summary**

**October 6, 2006  
Downtown Resource Center  
17 S. Perry Street, Pontiac  
10:00 a.m.**

**Introduction** – see attendance list at end of summary.

Tammi Sheppard gave an update on the first goal of the Wireless Oakland initiative. The designated pilot areas will be completed by the years end. The entire County will be operable by spring 2008.

Brian Blaesing indicated that the Road Commission Oakland County (RCOC) is starting its Bi-Annual Strategic Planning in January. They will be visiting each community and would like to talk about CSS. Brian indicated that he would like to have some examples of before CSS & after CSS images for these meetings. It was suggested by Tammi Sheppard that the RCOC might be able to use some examples previously created by PEDS for this purpose. John Enos, CWA, asked that the RCOC provide feedback from their meetings with the local communities as input to the TPT.

Brian also mentioned that SEMCOG University is holding a Workshop on CSS on 10/27.

Ryan Dividock indicated that project agendas, review materials and highlights will be hosted on the County's website at:  
<http://www.oakgov.com/wireless/about/workarea.html>

The Committee went through the table of contents and discussed individual chapters, highlights below:

### **Planning For Technology**

#### **Tool #1 Master Plan Goal and Objectives**

JoAnn Browning noted that the outline in the table of contents did not show any model language under this chapter. John Enos indicated that it would be part of the Policies developed.

## **Tool #2 Tower and Wireless Communication Location, Design and Zoning Standards**

As indicated in other chapters perhaps this should be thought of as guidelines instead of an ordinance.

## **Tool #3 Road Right-of-Way Permitting, Regulation and jurisdictional Authority**

John Enos asked Brian Blaesing if the RC had any documents, other than the Master Right-of-Way Plan, that gives background information, how it is used, the purpose, etc. Brian indicated that there really wasn't any that they use while meeting with communities, some type of narrative might be needed. Dick Carlisle suggested that the RCOC should consider generating products to communicate and promote the importance of the RCOC Master Right-of-way plan to local communities.

Other issues brought up concerning right-of-way included maintenance issues and conflicts with utilities.

Jim Schafer asked if anyone from DTE Energy has been identified to participate on the Advisory Committee as they would be able to address many of the conflicts and issues in dealing with utilities within rights-of-way. Bret Rasegan indicated that Scott Oppmann was making contact with DTE Energy, but hasn't confirmed their participation yet.

## **Tool #4 Technology Standards for New Commercial, Industrial, Research, Office and Residential development**

Discussion on whether this chapter should be guidelines as opposed to an ordinance; we can't require anything beyond what the Michigan Building Code requires. This is seen as an economic development tool to be used cooperatively by building officials and developers.

## **Tool #5 Technology Standards for Adaptive Re-Use/Redesign of Existing Structures**

Discussion focused on this chapter being guidelines that are flexible and goal oriented. Jim Schafer indicated that in Madison Heights the private sector is driving this. There was some discussion on whether it made sense to run extra conduit during excavation for later use. It was not clear if Miss-dig identifies empty conduit.

## **Tool #6 Visualization Tools and Computer Applications**

The location of this tool in document may change; it will include information and recommendations for CSS also.

There was some discussion at to whether communities are requiring digital data for As-built development plans. Some communities do require both hardcopy and digital; however, not all Oakland County communities currently have the hardware, software, and technical expertise or budget capacity to require this. Additional issues include consistency and compatibility of required digital file formats (GIS vs. CAD, etc.).

### **Summary and Action Plan**

This section will include a plan for OC to make communities aware of tools through presentations/workshops.

### **Planning With Technology**

Tom Coleman, PB, passed out two handouts – an overview of CSS glossary terms that CWA will incorporate into the Glossary of Terms in the TPT draft. Tom also distributed a Community Context Audit and indicated that he would email an Excel spreadsheet that is used for audits for the committee to review.

There was some discussion on how we might use CSS at the County level and how CSS impacts RCOC funding. Ed Gardiner indicated that grants can be more costly than doing a road project without them. Also it can be a challenge to incorporate public involvement in this process because of time constraints, especially in the current budget climate; MDOT has five years to plan road projects while local may only have six months.

John Enos, CWA, asked that comments on document be directed to him. His email address is [jenos@cwaplan.com](mailto:jenos@cwaplan.com)

#### **Present:**

Dick Carlisle, CWA  
John Enos, CWA  
Tom Paison, CWA  
Jim Schafer, Madison Heights  
Bret Rasegan, PEDS  
Tom Coleman, PB  
Barbara McBeth, Novi  
Brian Blaesing, RCOC

Judit Wittbrodt, RCOC  
Tammi Sheppard, OCIT  
Bob Hagedorn, The Rehmann Group  
Ed Gardiner, Farmington Hills  
Ryan Dividock, PEDS  
JoAnn Browning, PEDS