

BCA Debrief Summary: Alaska

Date: 12/3/2015

Applicant: Alaska

Name: The Resilient Emmonak Transportation Improvement Project

Applicant BCR: 1.72

NPV: \$65,959,891

HUD BCR:

Reviewer Confidence:

Sensitivity Analysis:

Alternative Discount Rates:

Qualitative Section Contribution:

Narrative Section Contribution:

Rating: Benefits > Costs

General Discussion:

Panel Notes: Overall Discussion: Reviewers mentioned that we can't bring mainland assumptions (especially about costs) to Alaska projects. Also mentioned that AK showed the highest per capita need in Phase 1 MID-URN reviews.

Emmonak: Reviewers felt that the applicant missed discussing co-benefits in this BCA. Reviewers also wished they had tackled benefits from a working port or airport. Even with these weaknesses, the reviewers felt that the Benefits > Costs (1).

If competition can only fund some elements, reviewers felt that Newtok has first priority; Galena has second and Emmonak third.

Final Score: Benefits > Costs