1. **Introductions.** Those present introduced themselves.

2. **Study Purpose.** **Sheila Selkregg** opened the meeting. She provided background information on the project scope for the benefit of people who were not involved in its development and indicated the relationship of this project to the State Energy Plan. Sheila stressed that there was no intent to rewrite the scope of work at this meeting. The intent is to get the project started.

3. **Integration with State Energy Plan.** **Lamar Cotten** said that the State energy plan covers electricity and bulk fuel issues only. The two projects are integrated in the sense that they involve essentially the same group of people. The rural portion of the State energy plan is supposed to be completed around Christmas 2000, versus February 2001 for the Phase 2a study, i.e. Efficient Utilities for Rural Alaska. In addition, the Alaska Energy Authority is undertaking an updated inventory of electric utility systems in Alaska, initially for 30 villages. That data should be available within the next two weeks. Inventories of another 100 or so villages are scheduled to get underway in July 2000.

4. **Work Plan Overview.** **Steve Colt** said that the scope of work includes a lengthy set of tasks. He will try to outline how ISER has interpreted the intent of each task and how it proposes to carry them out. He said he would welcome comments and suggestions.

   - **Task A -- Statement of Purpose.** A copy of the Sponsors’ Statement of Purpose was passed out to all present. **Steve Colt** noted that the study will address economic, technical, social and physical elements in the provision of rural Alaska utilities. The five major overall goals are to provide a better understanding of costs (Item A); to identify socially and culturally appropriate and cost efficient public policy incentives associated with rural utilities (Item B); to examine and develop management, operation and maintenance approaches for core utility services, and to identify and define existing management structures that promote the development, maintenance and operation of socially appropriate, reliable, sustainable and cost efficient rural utilities (Item C); to define policy options, improved ordinances, and best practices designed to help improve utility management, operations, maintenance and efficiencies in rural Alaska villages, and to present the findings in a list of policy recommendations, utility operational models and best service practices that are understandable to village residents, policy makers and service providers (Item D); and to provide a list of service alternatives from minimum service (individual) to community based services (Item E). **Sheila Selkregg** noted that “best practices” is a key issue.

   - **Task B -- Background Information.** **Steve Colt** pointed out that the language in italics in the Work Plan was developed by the project sponsors. That in regular text is ISER’s response. Steve noted that ISER has a lot of data on hand, plus data from ongoing work. USDA Rural Development has also developed some information.

   - **Task C -- Inspect and Inventory Utility Facilities.** **Steve Colt** said that utility facilities will be inspected at the chosen villages. However, the key issues need to be narrowed down first, before travel to the villages takes place. The current plan is to zero in on picking villages during the next two months as more background work is completed. Site visits will take place in early fall, after fishing is over (although there may be some conflicts with hunting activities). Another reason for
holding back a bit is that since the scope of work written, some new State data collection efforts have got underway. ISER is working with Lamar Cotten and Dick Emerman (Alaska Energy Authority) on this. The plan is to not only inspect the physical facilities but also to look more carefully at managerial, fiscal and other capacities needed to run utilities and to determine why existing situations exist? Mike Black asked who would be tasked with this – many different types of utilities. Who will be physically examining? Steve Colt said the work will be done by Mark Foster, himself, and Amy Wiita. Mike Black said he assumes that ISER will coordinate with others involved in this type of work. Mike said there is quite a documented history of the individual utilities. Steve Colt agreed that there is a lot of existing information. He said that another key task, which ISER has used in previous sanitation system evaluation work, is a follow-up visit to make sure that all the needed information is obtained. For this project, ISER has budgeted and plans follow-up visits to all 6 selected pilot communities.

- **Task D – Fiscal, Demographic and Economic Outlook.** Steve Colt said that this task involves a look at the wider fiscal, demographic and economic outlook picture. What is happening over the next 10-15 years in terms of economic and population growth and fiscal situation? Will it affect the ability of any group to run a utility? Task D also includes the role of subsistence in the economy and the lives of people involved in providing utility services. Another key identified item that needs to be looked at carefully is the different roles of local versus regional employment. ISER recognizes that for many villages, local employment is their top priority. Changes in utility organization may result in no change in jobs at the regional level, but could be dramatic at the local level. ISER’s approach to Task D will be straightforward. ISER already uses its econometric model to do statewide projections. However, ISER will need to prepare regional projections. There is existing literature and results from ISER’s Arctic Sustainability project, plus labor rosters, which can be applied to this task. Steve added that ISER wants to take a look at actual staffing levels of existing utilities. Pat Poland asked how, with just six pilot communities, will the subject of village differences be covered? Steve Colt said that this task is a statewide, high level view of the larger forces that will affect utility issues. The task has been delegated to Scott Goldsmith (ISER) as an independent, stand-alone piece. The type of issues it might address is that if community X decides to solve its utility problems by devoting all Municipal Revenue Sharing funds to operations and maintenance, the solution will not work for others because of changes in the Municipal Revenue Sharing program. Steve noted that there is a trend away from the state to the federal government in terms of funding. Sheila Selkregg said that it is critical that the ISER report build on other base data. All of the people around the table have engaged in research in more than six villages and it is important to integrate that work. Study conclusions should be based on a broad range of available information as well as from work in the six pilot communities. Mike Black said that each village is unique and we will be criticized if conclusions are drawn on the basis of work in just six communities. It needs to be clarified that the six communities cover the range of situations. Sheila Selkregg said that everyone present can contribute to this. Steve Colt said that ISER will use an iterative process and will be asking for input. He noted that one of the problems is that there are more than six directions, e.g. big/small, far/near/ permafrost/non-permafrost, etc. Sheila Selkregg said that there needs to be a review of a lot of existing work, but ultimate knowledge is the integration of all studies. Steve Colt commented that ISER has just completed work on 35 villages for the Alaska Native Tribal Health Board and has the luxury of being able to use six villages as a way of rounding out that research.

- **Task E -- Institutional Overlays.** Steve Colt said that this task will identify and describe existing utility-related institutional structures including local city, tribal governments and village corporations; regional governments, non-profits, cooperatives, school districts, and utilities; state and federal agencies; cooperatives and private utility companies; and individually owned systems. There is a need to fully appreciate the matrix of institutions and the various incentives offered to a community or utility. There is also a need to review existing literature and conduct interviews with key informants.

- **Task F -- Document Outside Service Use.** Steve Colt said that ISER will document/estimate outside services used or needed, e.g. RUBA and RMW, and will determine how outside services
are provided. There is a need to define these services and their scale. For example, maintenance services provided by Remote Maintenance Workers would never be seen as an expense of the utility, but they are part of the real cost. There is a lot of literature on how these programs work. However, there is also a need to interview the various outside service providers.

- **Task G -- Utility-Related Village and Regional Issues.** Steve Colt said that there is a need to take careful account that rural Alaska is a unique physical and cultural environment. Amy Wiita (ISER) is doing work on underdeveloped and more developed countries, but we are really in a unique situation because of factors such as remoteness and very small community size, plus an indigenous culture that is still alive. There are potential trade-offs between a more efficient regional operation versus local employment issues. Such concerns and issues need to be woven into all of the other tasks. Jill Smythe asked if this is where EPA-mandated capacity issues would be addressed. Joe Sarcone spoke about EPA standards. Sheila Selkregg said it is important to stay connected to that effort and asked Dan Easton for assistance. Dan Easton said there is a phasing issue, with the EPA rule requiring faster action. Mike Black said that RUBA has been invited to participate in the efforts being undertaken by the Citizen Advisory Board to the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation. Dan Easton said that the advisory board group has deadlines to meet and added that the ramifications of not regulating capacity fall more on the State than on the individual utilities. He said that the advisory board group is moving ahead. Mike Black said that certain criteria have been established to evaluate capacity. DEC has used an inter-agency and interdisciplinary group to identify that, plus a listing of communities that meet or do not meet those criteria. Key contacts in this effort are Keven Kleweno (DEC) and Dennis Wagner (EPA). Joel Neimeyer noted that the capacity issue applies only to water/sewer utilities. Mike Black also noted that the focus of capacity efforts is not strictly rural. It also applies to small independent utilities in places like Anchorage. Steve Colt said that the regulatory outlook should be added to Task D.

- **Task H -- Compare and Contrast Alternative OMM Structures.** Steve Colt said that one of the key purposes of this task was to see if can learn from other jurisdictions and models. He referred to a list of other places that ISER thinks may be relevant, e.g. Finland, and noted that Canada is at the top of the list. Steve said that Charlie Walls has good contacts that will be followed up on. He added that the purpose of looking at alternative structures is not to say they do it this way somewhere else and seems to work and therefore we will do it. However, it does provide some realistic benchmarks for comparison with Alaska’s situation. Steve said ISER thinks the Canadian example is so important that travel has been budgeted either to the Northwest Territories or to have someone travel from there to Alaska. Mike Black said that one place missing from the list is the Texas/Mexico border, where “colonias” have recently received a lot of attention. He commented that a lot of what you see in sanitation in Canada is not directly applicable because of a different governmental structure. A place, such as the Texas/Mexico border in the Lower 48, may be more appropriate. Jamie Kenworthy said that the telephone infrastructure in Alaska might be another model, with lessons to be learned from changes. Joel Neimeyer said that there could also be a lesson in relation with cable TV where some villages cut off cable service to ensure payment of water/sewer bills. Steve Colt said that cross-tying of utilities may not be strictly legal. Sheila Selkregg said there might be ways around that as a constructive tool. Steve Colt said that ISER was interested in looking at First Nations operations in the Northwest Territories. Jill Smythe said that there are few power companies in Canada, typically one per province. Joe Sarcone said that EPA people involved in Texas/Mexico border issues (Sylvia Bell and Dennis Nederburg) will be in Alaska soon. Dennis Wagner (EPA) is tasked with putting that trip together.

- **Task I -- Incentives and Disincentives Analysis.** Steve Colt said that this task will include an analysis of incentive structures that individuals, utilities, governments, leaders, etc. face when they make decisions and try to run utilities. The first item is to clearly identify what those incentive structures are. For water and waste projects, communities can get 100% of the capital cost funded, with operations and maintenance being a 100% local responsibility. To some extent, the opposite applies for power, since PCE provides an ongoing source of support for operations and
maintenance. ISER wants to pin down the major points in a clear way, and show how they differ across utilities and how they might be working at cross-purposes to each other. There is a need to think about how the structures could be improved, e.g., standardized designs, although engineering firms may regard this as a disincentive. Steve Weaver said that architects and engineers are hired either on a lump sum or on a time and materials basis. In terms of gross percentages, a good rule of thumb is 15% for design and development. He noted that there will be greater opportunities for standardization through tribal management because federal procurement regulations make standardization much more difficult. There is no such thing as a one-time design. For example, a washeteria for Noatak cannot be replicated in Mekoryuk because an engineer needs to re-validate the design. Everything has to be recalculated and re-validated. Jamie Kenworthy said that it might not be the eventual answer, but there is a need to see if there are standard designs that can be used. Steve Colt said that standardization is the goal, but it has never worked because of variations in site conditions, e.g., climate, soils, and access. Steve Weaver said that there are standard components that create more standardized outcomes to narrow the focus. ANTHC looking at standardization of segmented pieces, but there is no such thing as an Alaska standard detail. Mark Foster said that engineers make money by standardizing their own internal processes. He said that he will talk about some places where incentives can be created and get more effectiveness out of the design process, including standardization. Steve Colt said that Matt Berman (ISER) will be tasked at looking at this issue. He will start with a clean slate and write down which incentives conflict, identify linkages, and then see how those theories apply to the realities of rural Alaska utilities. ISER plans to bring this element as a work in progress at next Steering Committee meeting. At that time, ISER will have a preliminary work product and will invite more discussion on the subject.

- Task J - Review Acceptable Levels of Service for Utility Delivery Services on a Statewide Basis. Steve Colt reviewed the use of the words “acceptable” and “appropriate”. Steve defined the word “acceptable” as meaning acceptable to community residents. However, perhaps other stakeholders, e.g., funders, should also be included. In that case “appropriate” might be a better word. Sheila Selkregg said that her view was broader. For example, in very small communities it is very difficult to provide piped water/sewer systems. Is flush/haul the most appropriate level of service for certain sizes of communities? Discussion of the expense per capita for systems above flush/haul could be helpful. What society and the state can afford needs to be considered in the context of what the community wants. This is an area where policy makers might enter to establish standards. Steve Weaver said that Canadians prescribe a level of infrastructure support based on community size for a range of public services, e.g., water/sewer, hockey rinks, etc. Steve Colt said that he and Sheila are in agreement on this issue. The choice of service level is at least partly a community decision, at least for the reason that they typically pay for all of the operations and maintenance costs. As we all know, the costs of providing different levels of service are shared, depending on which utility being talked about. Therefore, selection of systems should be a joint decision. Steve said he also thinks it is important that benefits of more water are pretty much the same, but there are dramatic differences in cost, for example between Noorvik and Anchorage. Sheila Selkregg commented that health issues also need to be addressed. Mike Black said that Mekoryuk selected the flush/haul system because the community wanted a system but had bad feelings about piped systems because an earlier piped system in Mekoryuk froze up. Dan Easton said that Mekoryuk now wants a piped system. Steve Weaver asked to what extent service levels are already covered in Mike Black’s existing planning manual. Mike Black said they are covered, but it is an interesting topic. Steve Weaver said that Canada subsidizes water/sewer systems at 87 cents on the dollar. In Canada, they look at life cycle costs, whereas the U.S. does not. Mike Black said that Canada also has not rejected honeybuckets as inappropriate whereas Alaska has. For very small places the honeybucket is deemed all that is appropriate in Canada. Joe Sarcone said that there has been a cursory effort made for community involvement in recent years on desired levels of service. However, he questions if decisions on levels of desired service are truly derived from community input or are predetermined. Capacity and appropriate level of service issues are now pretty straightforward. In order for a community to have a water system, it needs a trained operator, plus some level of fiscal responsibility, etc. Before project funding is obtained, Village Safe Water’s CIP process is used to make an evaluation and determination of capacity and
appropriate level of service. The community is asked what it wants, but it may be told that this really can’t be done because there aren’t enough houses, and the ratio of cost per house will eliminate a community for eligibility for the desired kind of system. From a public health standpoint, things are looked at a different way. Canada uses an international public health model, where the biggest increment of public health benefit is from water quantity. Quality gives another increment, but the giant step is quantity. Joe said that the whole acceptable level of service topic is a “thicket”. Sheila Selkregg said that the issues nevertheless need to be articulated. Joe Sarcone said the State and IHS determine the capacity entry point on when a community can secure funding, but this is something that is in a continuum, which changes constantly. Joel Neimeyer questioned Joe’s assumptions regarding VSW/IHS lack of regard for local desires. Steve Weaver said that things can always be done better, but public health can only be reached through sustainable operations. Sheila Selkregg said that Joe Sarcone is talking about a cultural shift that needs to be integrated into the report.

- **Task K -- Identify Evaluation Measures to Apply to Alternative OMM Structures.** Steve Colt said that this task is where ISER will start to apply information from the previous tasks. Tasks K and L look at alternatives and evaluate them. First, ISER needs to sit down and think not only about sustainability, reliability, cost efficiency, etc. but also how they should be measured and what criteria will be needed. This task will be led by Scott Goldsmith to come up with criteria that can be applied in Task L to the various alternative OMM structures. ISER will bring these measures back to the Steering Committee for review before they are finalized. Sheila Selkregg said she thought this would be critical.

- **Task L -- Technical and Cost Analysis of Alternative OMM Structures.** Steve Colt said that this task will look at alternative structures and run them through an engineering and cost assessment. It is a reality check. Life-cycle costs of alternatives will be estimated. The task is an engineering technical reality check and a cost assessment. Cost is not necessarily the end of the story, but it is one component. Impacts on reliability (hardiness) will also be evaluated.

- **Task M -- Evaluate Alternative Structures.** Steve Colt said that this task will examine and evaluate alternative Operations/Maintenance/Management structures statewide. Alternative OMM structures for the six case study villages will also be identified. Steve noted that findings for six villages will obviously not be the end of the story. Opportunities for standardization will be identified and examined. Additional analysis will be undertaken to consider standardization of system components. Want to have criteria set up so they can be applied. Steve Weaver asked where will you find the human relationships, trust level, etc. with different organizations. Human pieces make people want to cede or aggregate local control? Steve Colt said that a real challenge will be to come up with one or more evaluative criteria that speak to this issue. Steve Weaver cited tribal vs. municipal authority and said that goals may be set through relationships among organizations. He said that it is the relationships in villages that typically determine feasibility far more than the technical pieces. Sheila Selkregg said that we can offer a menu of how other villages have solved the situation. Communities are resolving similar issues in different ways and giving examples could be helpful. Steve Colt agreed that highlighting successful models/success stories is the way to go. Types of criteria relating to Steve Weaver’s point could be how flexible or resilient is this structure to changes/shifts in local governing bodies, although, hopefully, it will be possible to be more specific than that. Sheila Selkregg said that it should also have an outcome in best practices. Steve Colt said that everyone present knows of cases where such issues have been resolved more or less successfully. Jamie Kenworthy said that once we know what the kWh costs are, there is a need to set standards for reliability or costs as benchmarks for success. Steve Colt said he would hesitate to answer this. He said that Charlie Walls (AVEC) has achieved almost continuous improvements in diesel efficiency but he didn’t think it was because AVEC had set a benchmark. Jamie Kenworthy said that Charlie Walls measures his success, but the smaller villages do not. Jamie said he thinks that a measure of success needs to be established. What do we think success is? If not cost and reliability and full life-cycle costs, what is it? There is a need to benchmark where we are, and set up some standards. Jamie said that he would like to see an explicit discussion of success. Steve Weaver said there is economic and public health success. He
noted that the State Legislature is much more interested in economic success, while public health people are probably more interested in public health. Pat Poland said that the community needs to be part of the evaluation of success. Lamar Cotten said that success has to be measured by management issues (cost, etc.) Measurement could be tried with ranges rather than finite numbers. Lamar said that this would be hard to do, with the devil being in the details. Nevertheless, he felt an effort to do that had to be made, at least for political reasons. We want to demonstrate to funders that certain standards are being met. Mike Black said that this is the crux of the issue. He cited a Tanana Chiefs’ business plan prepared by Wilson Wilson that profiled piped water/sewer systems in 8 to 10 communities. (Not all of them were strictly rural. For example the City of North Pole was one system profiled). Every one of the board managers said that their objective was to keep the costs to their consumers as low as possible, while still providing the service. A review of the same systems by certified public accountants saw chronic under-funding of maintenance and operations as a way of minimizing the to consumers. Locals saw this situation as successful, whereas we would not. Jamie Kenworthy said that ISER might also want to check the health measures. Pat Poland said that the unique aspect of public services in employment in rural Alaska needs to be recognized. Sheila Selkregg said those measures of success are critical and Scott Goldsmith needs to sit down with team before he drafts the standards. Steve Colt said that his inclination would still be for Scott to take a first pass at the subject. He added that he may want to have a work session with at least part of the group in August on this subject.

- **Task N -- Recommended Staffing Levels.** Steve Colt said that this task will identify types of outside resources and how they might be provided. Recommendations will be completely integrated into the management structure of a utility. Steve said that Mark Foster has a lot of experience looking at staffing levels and will lead this task. He will draw heavily on existing best practices (such as AVEC staffing levels). Appropriate staffing has to relate to other goals relating to employment and village versus regional structures and full-time versus part-time employment.

- **Task O -- Book Costs vs. True Costs.** Steve Colt said that there is a need to get a clear understanding of the costs of running the various utilities. True costs can include things that are being done but are not on the books, e.g. grant funded projects vs. replacement costs. True costs could also be things that are deferred or ignored, i.e. transfer of the maintenance issue to system failure. True costs can also be passed on to others in terms of unreliable service. Steve said he sees a very heavy involvement by the Steering Committee in this task. He said that ISER will not spend much time on question of whether user fees/rates cover what is or is not on the books. He noted that he does not see this task as being focused on existing revenues and measures of cost. Steve Weaver said that the Bush infrastructure would go away if it were not grant-sustained. Is the goal to change the funding basis in Washington, D.C.? Sheila Selkregg said it is important to help the Legislature and Congressional delegation understand that as capital infrastructure is built, there are associated OMM issues. Currently, much money being expended for capital costs, but there is an opportunity to make better policy if OMM issues are better understood. Steve Weaver said that there is more than $1 billion invested in infrastructure in the Bush. Jamie Kenworthy asked if the answer was to increase the bang for the buck by seeing if there is a better way to structure the capital money? Steve Weaver commented that politicians find it attractive to fund capital projects. Pat Poland expressed some fear about generating this type of information as it could provide many legislators with an excuse not to fund projects. Sheila Selkregg said that there are many ways to present this information. Jill Smythe asked if true utility costs would include RMWs, RUBAs, circuit riders and agency engineering and administrative staff. Steve Colt said that they would. Mike Black asked that if ISER is not going to look at rates, etc. in relation to costs, is this work being done somewhere else. Steve Colt said that ISER is about to publish work by Sharman Haley on this issue. More to the point, Steve said that he does not read the scope of work to include that. Mike Black said there is a relationship between how systems are managed and the revenue stream. He said that AVEC’s revenue stream was greater than it would be if those systems were individually managed. Collections, debt collection, etc. can typically be done more efficiently with a cooperative than with an individual organization. Steve Colt said that the ability to collect debts will be a key criterion in previous tasks but ISER does not intend to further
quantify the gap between user fees and costs, in part because the gap depends on what one counts as “costs,” which is precisely the focus of this task. Mike Black said he agreed, but without the analysis, then you get into pure theory. If you can’t look at what revenue case study communities have or can generate in relation to keeping the lights on, you are missing the most important question in judging success. There is a need to collect this type of data in all of the six pilot communities. Steve Weaver said that there is a capital costs agenda vs. a life cycle costs agenda. If you identify the problem, you will have a tiger by the tail unless you identify the solution, using life cycle costs, and compare the two. Life cycle and stop are the two choices. The third choice is capital expenditure. Steve Colt said that ISER will present the material on this question. He said that a lot of research has been done on the issue of “rates” versus “costs”, but very little research on what costs they are covering. He cited the individual utilities vs. AVEC situations – AVEC covers more of its total costs than a utility using grant-funded generators. Mike Black noted that many rural utility systems are not sustainable under any measure. He said that he thought that when alternative management and rate structures are looked at, we will not derive a model that will keep systems even minimally operable. If costs are being put on one side of the equation, then revenues must be put on the other. He said that he believes the results will imply the need for some change somewhere, possibly regional management or some other solution.

• Task P -- Cost Components Analysis. Steve Colt said that Task P was a more specific version of Task O, looking at components of costs for each utility. Again, ISER will be looking at discrepancies between book and real costs. Steve said that this is one of areas where ISER clearly needs to work with Hart Hodges (Northern Economics) to look at areas where technology is evolving and costs may be changing. Pat Poland asked Mike Black about issues involving schools, noting that rural schools often pay a disproportionate cost of utility costs. Mike Black said that it is often the strategy of small communities is to get revenue from the least painful source. Steve Colt said that ISER has been asked to look at that issue in detail. Steve noted that there is a perception that several schools have decided to self-generate, and ISER will document the extent of this practice. Lamar Cotten cited the Lake and Peninsula Borough as an example. Mike Black said that the issues has also been raised by some schools for water/sewer systems because of reliability problems. He noted that the school district has taken over the entire water system operation in Scammon Bay because of reliability issues. Steve Weaver said that IHS also has information on this subject. Steve Colt said that the issue will be looked at. He noted that the cost side will be looked at rather than rate side. In other words, is it really cheaper for schools to self-generate? Or, are they perhaps motivated to self-generate because the utility is trying to charge them a very high price for power.

• Task Q -- Conclusions. Steve Colt said that ISER will make a clear distinction between conclusions drawn from research and analysis, and what actions should be taken. Task Q will tie together what has been learned, with special attention to the question of where the theoretical meets the practical. Joel Neimeyer said he would be interested in recommendations being included. Steve Weaver said that Task Q parallels a separate piece in ANTHC’s proposed demonstration project for a regional utility organization. Sheila Selkregg said that recommendations for overcoming challenges should be included. Steve Colt said that this would be a very small part of any overall recommendations. For example, regionalizing utilities would save costs, but there are other considerations. Three items to be included per the chart are opportunities for improved utility OMM, practical challenges to the implementation of those opportunities, and recommendations for overcoming challenges. Sheila Selkregg said some time needs to be spent after the work is done to make sure it is articulated clearly enough for people to understand. There is a need to bring forward some solid information connected to very political issues. Sheila added that it makes sense to include some recommendations. Joel Neimeyer asked if ISER is uncomfortable in making policy recommendations and suggested that at the end of the project, there should be meetings to make choices. Sheila Selkregg said that this will be done. This work will provide information around which policy decisions will be made. Steve Colt said it is important to separate conclusions of the study from policy recommendations. He noted that credibility is critical to any next steps.
- **Task R -- Policy Options.** Steve Colt said that the key issue is to establish who needs to do what by when. Policy options will come in bundles. ISER will suggest which policies have to be packaged together in order to succeed.

- **Task S -- Steering Committee Meetings.** Steve Colt said that ISER hopes to have three more meetings of the full Steering Committee. As presently established, they will be on Thursday, September 14 (all day), Thursday November 30 (all day) and February 15, 2001 (morning only). Steve said he would send an e-mail message to Steering Committee members on these dates so people can check their schedules for potential conflicts. Steve said he would also send around ISER’s project website address. He said that the last few tasks on ISER’s official list are to write and circulate a draft report by February 5, 2001. That report will include an executive summary. He noted that a pretty long comment period is built into the project. Also built into the scope of work are four briefings, with sponsors to determine the appropriate briefing audiences and specific locations (Juneau, Fairbanks and Anchorage possibly). Sheila Selkregg said that village people need to be included in next meeting and that the Rural Alaska Sanitation Coalition. Steve Colt said that the final report and executive summary are scheduled to be completed by April 2001.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 12:30 PM.