HDP Institutional Mechanism Options
DRAFT
November 19, 2007

	Institutional Method	Description	Fee Collection/ Funding	Implementation Management	Pros		Cons		Vote
					Transportation-related	Drainage-related	Transportation-related	Drainage-related	
1	One HDP Rural Road and Drainage Service Area (HRDSA)	* Entire HDP area incorporated into one new RSA * Existing LRSAs dissolved * State roads remain state (similar to Chugiak-Eagle River)	* All HDP residents * Collected by MOA	* Create new Board * Work contracted out but administered by MOA	* Enables funding of CIPs. * Maintains some local autonomy. * Spreads fee collection pain but could implement drainage CIPs and fee collection by watershed within the HDP. * Economy of scale for admin, construction and maintenance. * 'Tried and true' method (Chugiak Eagle River).	* Maintains rural service area structure appreciated by Hillside residents but provides a watershed-based framework for planning, implementing, and maintaining drainage CIPs.	* Resident perception that they may be paying for problems that are not their own. * Dissolving of existing LRSAs would result in loss of localized control. * Mil levy goes up. * Improvements aren't controlled locally.		
2	One HDP RRSA overlay with existing LRSAs for maintenance	* Entire HDP area covered by Rural Road and Drainage Service Area. * Existing LRSAs remain for snow removal activities.	* All HDP residents pay for CIP program. * Local and area-wide board. * LRSAs continue to collect for plowing and grading.	* New district wide RSA conducts CIP construction and maintenance program. * Existing LRSAs continue with plowing and grading.	*Maintains rural service area structure appreciated by Hillside residents but provides a framework for planning, implementing, and maintaining CIPs.	* Maintains rural service area structure appreciated by Hillside residents but provides a framework for planning, implementing, and maintaining drainage CIPs. * Benefit assessments in certain areas could be combined.	* Mil levy goes up. * No local control over primary roads.		
3	Expand ARDSA (3a)	* Entire HDP area included in ARDSA. * All existing LRSAs dissolved.	* All MOA residents pay for CIPs.	* ARDSA administers, manages, and maintains systems	* Strong management entity that has the capacity and capability to administer, manage, and maintain the program elements.	* Strong management entity for planning, constructing, and maintaining drainage CIPs.	* Hillside residents will lose the 'local' control they now have with service areas and therefore may be difficult to adopt. * CIPs would need to compete with all MOA CIPs.	* Hillside CIPs would be ranked with all other MOA CIPs, making it less likely for selection.	
	Expand ARDSA (3b)	* Include collectors, arterials, DOT&PF roads and drainage ways in ARDSA. * All other roads and local drainage systems remain under existing maintenance structures.	* All MOA residents pay for CIPs. * CIPs still developed on a watershed basis.	* Drainage implemented by ARDSA	* Strong management entity that has the capacity and capability to administer, manage, and maintain the program elements.		* CIPs would need to compete with all MOA CIPs * Difficult to assign costs.	* Complicated structure making it more difficult to implement drainage management on a watershed level. * Difficult to assign costs.	
	Expand ARDSA (3c)	* Similar to 3b, with some of the ARDSA boundary extending uphill a ways. *Expand ARDSA into higher density areas. * Expand ARDSA to collector and arterial road network, take over DOT&PF roads and include drainage ways. * Expand RSAs to incorporate all remaining areas. * New bounds are defined based on watersheds and travelsheds.	* MOA collects fees for RSAs.	* Expand role of MOA in administration and management of RSA efforts.	* May be middle ground approach that appeals to most Hillside residents		* More complicated than the single entity approaches and therefore likely more difficult to implement.	* Most complicated structure of the suboptions, making it more difficult to implement drainage management on a watershed level.	
4	Multiple RSAs or Watershed Districts (Expand/consolidate RSAs)	* Entire HDP area incorporated into multiple RSAs. *New bounds are defined based on watersheds and travelsheds. * Ad-hoc areas are eliminated.	* Fees collected by MOA within each RSA. * Combined or separate funding structures.	* MOA continues to collect money for the numerous RSAs. * Numerous boards contract CIP work.	* Maintains rural service area structure appreciated by Hillside residents		* May be difficult to convince ad-hoc areas to join. * Higher administration costs.	* Most complicated structure of the alternatives, makes it difficult to plan, construct, and maintain drainage CIPs on a watershed basis. * Higher administration costs.	
5	Priority Watersheds (Benefit Assessment District Concept)	* Implement program only on priority watersheds. Develop new utility to implement the programs.	* Fees collected within watershed only.	* Watershed utility board with MOA support.		* May be easier to gain acceptance and approval by public. * Allows for development of equitable rate structures. *Stepping stone for development of a possible future combined district-wide management entity. * Works very well with watershed approach to drainage management.	* Only a portion of the HDP area receives benefits.		
6	Do Nothing / Status Quo	* Do not modify existing service area roles or configuration.	* No change in current fee collection structure	* No change in existing maintenance or management structure	* No tax increases.	* No tax increases.	* Does not solve traffic problems * Infrastructure would continue to degrade, continue to be overwhelmed.	* Does not solve drainage-related problems. * Infrastructure would continue to degrade, continue to be overwhelmed.	
Other Ideas?									