

BCA Debrief Summary: Alaska

Date: 12/2/2015

Applicant: Alaska

Name: AK - Resilient Mertarvik 2022

Applicant BCR: 1.94

NPV: \$57,522,000

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.

Newtok: Reviewers noted that the risk of implementing projects section was weak. They also felt that the applicant did not consider some key benefits. For example, the narrative section mentioned villagers dying in the night due to environmental risks at the existing village site, but this avoided costs was not considered in the BCA calculation. Even without the missing benefits, 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