

# Capacity Approaches

AT THE HOUSEHOLD, LOCAL, REGIONAL, AND STATE LEVELS



# Capacity Approaches

## ASSUMPTIONS:

WE ARE FOCUSING ON THE ~24 UNSERVED COMMUNITIES, MOST OF WHICH ARE IN YK, TCC AND NORTON SOUND

RESIDENTIAL UNIT, SELF-HAUL/RAINWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM, SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE, ECONOMIC VIABILITY, TECHNICALLY SOUND AND HIGH LEVEL OF COMPLEXITY, INTERNET CONNECTIVITY TO MONITOR PERFORMANCE, FUNDED BY FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES (ANTHC/ADEC INSTALLATIONS)

## TYPES OF CAPACITY:

MONITORING, O&M, REPAIR, BILLING/MANAGEMENT



# Capacity Approaches

## HOUSEHOLD

- What responsibility does the homeowner have? **Low level**
- O will have to maintain a wifi system in their home.
- Homeowner responsibility will be proportionate to level of service they are going to pay for.
- Risk of failure in terms of public health is too great to put the onus on the homeowner (=bathing children, washing vegetables, showering all could result in exposure). Liability. Need to consider this when deciding the level the homeowner engages.



# Capacity Approaches

## LOCAL

- NEED TO HAVE A LOCAL CONNECTION TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN ACTIVITIES



# Capacity Approaches

## REGIONAL

- Coop likely needs to be on a regional basis (at the least) to work
- Need to have a local connection to carry out certain activities
- Regional center building the units, creating work. Train people locally to do the maintenance.
- Funding would be based on user fees. "The Culligan Model" This will need outside funding/subsidization to get this off the ground.



# Capacity Approaches

## STATE

- Is a statewide cooperative viable? Probably not – discussed RMW program as a model—is statewide, but acts more like a regional coop, as resources used tend to be in the region (and the RMW reports back to the State).
- \*\*\* If only 24 communities, likely need to have a centrally managed coop to service all following the ARUC or RMW model (in order to take advantage of economy of scale)
- TCC region: could you privatize the coop to run it? (i.e., Lifewater, Northern Utilities)—then there will be incentive to make it profitable (where there is none in the other options)
- State could also apply revenue sharing specifically to graywater systems



# Capacity Challenges

SIMILAR CHALLENGES TO W&S BUT MORE TECHNICAL AND TECH IS CHANGING FASTER

- Homeowner needs to be able to identify when there is a problem (\*emphasizes the need for remote monitoring)
- Many types of systems instead of one or few
- Subsidy is likely needed to at least get things off the ground (or perhaps privatization will be needed) ARUC model? ANTHC? AN Corporations? Maniilaq model?



# Capacity Challenges

## FUNDING CHALLENGES

- How do you fund the coop when only a handful of units are online initially?
- New partnerships and funders need to be found—not all villages belong to CVRF, NSEDC, etc. – needs to be flexible and have multiple support inputs
- Medical funding source may be applied to if a proven connection between water quantity and health economics
- IHS has authorization for maintenance, but not funded for this