

Oakland County Technology Planning Toolkit
CSS Focus Groups February 22, 2007

Summary of Issues

Session One 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

- Issues beyond NEPA, maintenance
- Safety First
- Early on Planning
- Different Interests/Stakeholders
- Maintenance provides some opportunities visual, restructuring of space to increase safety and capacity.
- Limitations/Constraints
 - Lack of Consistency
 - Lack of Funding
- Townships are divorced from the process lack of coordination
- Rural vs. Urban
- Provide county assistance to local communities for CSS
- Changing the culture regarding project development by RCOC
- CSS process opportunity to increase involvement in RCOC strategic plan
- Pre-scoping of projects prior to strategic plan meetings

Session Two 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

- Water shed planning and non-source point pollution
- Developer contributions
- Local Best Practices Examples in Oakland County
- Framework Plan/Context Plan as a basis for discussion about CSS and other related issues
- Definition of context and its components
- What is the local context and how is it communicated?
- Provide visual images related to the context
- CSS education at the local government level.
- General Public education
- Understanding the inherent flexibility of the AASHTO “green book”
- Non-traditional partners
- Interdisciplinary team - how do you construct it? Relevant to each project need.
- County Grant Coordinator
- Using the Joint Authority, i.e. Trails System
- Tri-Party Program Local, County and Road Commission
- Process must recognize the character, values, context and differing concerns with the county
- Customize the process for cities and townships
- Funding

- Where does the money come from
- Funding and the allocation based on a point system
- Provide incentive to use the CSS process on projects
- RCOC strategic planning process is not currently a forum to discuss projects in detail
- Lack of value placed on issues that are not capacity or safety related.
- Marketability