

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
National Disaster Resilience Competition Phase TWO (Panelist)

FINAL SUMMARY OF CRITERION SCORES

Application Number: NRDR16000076-P Panel: 15
 Application Name: Military and Veterans Affairs, Alaska Department of
 State: AK City: JBER

Criteria	Max	
1.1.1. Past Experience of the Applicant	9	7
1.1.2. Policy Point: Regional	1	1
1.2.1. Management Structure	9	9
1.2.2. Policy Point: References Consistent with Proposal Capacity	1	1
2.1.1. Unmet Recovery Need and Target Geography	4	4
2.1.2. Policy Point: Wider Geography	1	1
2.2.1. Resilience Needs Within Recovery Needs	7	5
2.2.2. Policy Point: Wider Geography	1	1
2.3.1. Appropriate Approaches	6	6
2.3.2. Policy Point: Wider Geography	1	0
3.1.1. I. Sound Approach Description: Correspondence	9	9
3.1.2. Policy Point: NDRC Goal Alignment	1	1
3.2.1. II. Sound Approach Description: Increases Resilience	9	6
3.2.2. Policy Point: Wider Geography	1	1
3.3.1. III. Sound Approach Description: Model/Replicable/Holistic	9	9
3.3.2. Policy Point: Met Two or More Criteria	1	1
3.3.3. Scaling/scoping - Did the applicant provide scaling, scoping or phasing options for one or more proposed projects?	0	0
3.3.4. Scaling/scoping - Did the applicant provide a narrative	0	0

Criteria	Max	
describing its priorities if HUD adjusts funding amounts for its proposal?		
3.4.1. Program Schedule. Did the schedule describe the level of environmental review required for the project(s)?	1	0
3.4.2. Program Schedule. Did the schedule identify each task and significant activity required for completing each project, including procurement, environmental review and obtaining federal, state, and local permits?	1	1
3.4.3. Program Schedule. Did the schedule list the planned start and completion dates of all tasks and CDBG-NDR activities within the proposed project or program?	1	1
3.4.4. Program Schedule. Did the schedule specifically include a milestone(s) for the date(s) at which the applicant expects the project(s) to become functional and the expected benefits realized?	1	0
3.4.5. Program Schedule. Did the schedule earn all 4 points above?	1	0
3.5. Budget	3	3
3.6.1. Consistency with Other Planning Documents: Consolidated Plan and/or Regional Sustainability Plan	1	0
3.6.2. Consistency with Other Planning Documents: Mitigation Plan and/or Transportation Plan	1	0
4.1. Factor 4: Phase 2 Leverage	10	0
5.1.1. Long-term Commitment	7	7
5.1.2. Policy Point: Wider Geography	1	1
5.1.3. Policy Point: Significant New Action	1	1
5.1.4. Policy Point: Three or More Commitments	1	0
Total:	100	76
Average:		76.00

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
National Disaster Resilience Competition Phase TWO (Panelist)
FINAL SUMMARY OF CRITERION COMMENTS

Application Number: NRDR16000076-P Panel: 15
Application Name: Military and Veterans Affairs, Alaska Department of
State: AK City: JBER

Scoring Criteria

Page

1.1.1. Past Experience of the Applicant

Strength

The applicant has described how it has worked with various partner agencies to implement a disaster recovery and economic revitalization project. The applicant also briefly describes roles and expertise of partners. Page 2-10

2-10

Applicant describes relevant work in Galena and Newtok, primarily focused on recovery. Some descriptions of partner capacity are embedded within the descriptions.

Weakness

The applicant did not provide adequate detail regarding specific tasks undertaken and actual results achieved in terms of their capacity and community engagement. There was also a lack of detail for the results achieved of their partner#s capacity.

2-10

Scoring Criteria	Page
<u>1.1.2. Policy Point: Regional</u>	
Strength	
Applicant has demonstrated, as evidenced by Attachment D, Consultation Summary, its ability to engage the community in spite of the unique circumstances attached to Alaska's geography, terrain, and climate.	2-10
Weakness	
None	NA
<u>1.2.1. Management Structure</u>	
Strength	
Management structures appear reasonable, many structures included in the dropbox.	2-10
Weakness	
The applicant did not describe in detail a feasible contingency plan. Page 2-10	2-10
Role and responsibilities of management structure are not clear. Some capacity for sub activities was less clear.	2-10
<u>1.2.2. Policy Point: References Consistent with Proposal Capacity</u>	
Strength	
None	NA
Weakness	
Applicant or references did not support high management capacity.	2-10

Scoring Criteria	Page
<u>2.1.1. Unmet Recovery Need and Target Geography</u>	
Strength	
Applicant described disaster recovery, social, economic, geographic, infrastructure, and public health needs and challenges well. Applicant also describes the causal relationship between lack of infrastructure and health outcomes in Newtok. Page 2-15	2-15
Applicant clearly describes URN, particularly unrepaired damages, from the qualified disasters in the target areas of Galena, Newtok, Teller, and Emmonak. D 1-15	
Weakness	
None	NA
<u>2.1.2. Policy Point: Wider Geography</u>	
Strength	
Applicant quantifies URN for larger region, for example, on page 9, dollar figures from PWs for the TCC region are included.	9
Weakness	
None	NA

Scoring Criteria	Page
<u>2.2.1. Resilience Needs Within Recovery Needs</u>	
Strength	
Applicant described URN in most impacted vulnerable and distressed area. The applicant has also included general characteristics of the target populations (median income, unemployment rate, poverty rate, etc.) Some health and sanitation trends were also noted as well. Page 7	7
Applicant did a good job of tying together multiple types of resilience needs - particularly focusing on vulnerable populations and social and economic resilience. D1-15	
Weakness	
The applicant did not clearly discuss how the total investment in resilience could have limited the direct and indirect effects of the disasters. P 2-15	2-15
Applicant does not do a strong job of quantifying resilience needs beyond loss dollar figures from recent disasters. Some information along these lines is included in RF 3, however. D1-15	
<u>2.2.2. Policy Point: Wider Geography</u>	
Strength	
Applicant discusses recovery need for wider region. Page 9	9
Weakness	
None	NA

Scoring Criteria**Page**2.3.1. Appropriate Approaches**Strength**

The applicant has presented some practical, thoughtful, and culturally relevant approaches to meet its unmet recovery and revitalization needs through its relocation of Newtok project, and its elder food pantry and community garden projects. Page 8,15

8, 15

Applicant did a good job of explaining why relocation, protect in place, and energy cost reductions, in particular, are the appropriate approaches. Narrative and consultation documentation make it clear that community members were consulted in developing the proposal. Page D1-15

Weakness

None

NA

2.3.2. Policy Point: Wider Geography**Strength**

None

NA

Weakness

The response did not included thorough, evidence-based description of appropriate recovery or resilience approaches in a wider geographic area.

2-15

Scoring Criteria**Page**3.1.1. I. Sound Approach Description: Correspondence**Strength**

Some activities, as proposed, seem to be a practical, straightforward response to disaster recovery (ex: repair seawall, elevation of roads, extension of airport runway, community garden, water tank storage, fuel tank storage, etc.) Page 3-45

Many of the proposed projects clearly stem from the framed economic, flood, social, health, and energy resilience needs. The descriptions of Newtok and Teller-focused projects are particularly compelling as they showcase two approaches - relocation and protect-in-place that demonstrate careful analysis of risks balanced with the community needs. Page E1-45

3-45

Weakness

The descriptions for projects in Galena and Emmonak were more disconnected. The health implications for Galena were clear, but some of the built project repairs seemed less clear as to what was driving the needs. The Emmonak projects would have been stronger if it was more clear how area residents would benefit economically. Page E1-45

E1-45

In general, having a long list of activities made it more difficult to see the value of any one, individual project. Page E1-45

3.1.2. Policy Point: NDRC Goal Alignment**Strength**

None

Weakness

None

Scoring Criteria	Page
<u>3.2.1. II. Sound Approach Description: Increases Resilience</u>	
Strength	
Some of the proposed activities will most likely increase resilience to current and future disasters in the MID area. Page 3-45	3-45
Weakness	
The applicant has not discussed in detail the information and data that will need to be tracked, which agency will be responsible for collection, or whether the applicant incorporates periodic evaluation of program outcomes into the overall effort. Page 3-45	
Project metrics lack a clear measurement plan with assigned responsibilities and not all projects have clear baselines/ targets. E1-45, BCA .	3-45
BCA, not the narrative, clearly identifies metrics from each activity, even when they are not >50M. E1-45, BCA	
<u>3.2.2. Policy Point: Wider Geography</u>	
Strength	
The applicant demonstrates a wider geography with the Teller / State-wide planning work and climate adaptation process. E1-45	1-45
Weakness	
None	NA

Scoring Criteria**Page**3.3.1. III. Sound Approach Description: Model/Replicable/Holistic**Strength**

The applicant describes how some activities such as the Newtok relocation, and planning activities clearly represent new, thoughtful, and innovative ways of thinking. The applicant has also pointed out in this section how some activities are replicable in other parts of Alaska with similar characteristics. Page 2-45

2-45

Applicant makes a strong case that the decision-making framework that tribal communities must confront in assessing future risks and other issues to consider relocation vs. protection in place is a model for other places. They are already partnering with Louisiana to share best practices. In addition, the relocation and protection work itself is designed to be a replicable model. For example the work to plan a new community or to design sustainable, affordable, cold climate housing. Page E1-45

Weakness

The narrative describes how the relocation activity is replicable, but the panel had some uncertainty about the mechanism employed by the State to achieve replicability . Page 2-45

2-45

Some activities don't rise to the level specified by the criteria.

3.3.2. Policy Point: Met Two or More Criteria**Strength**

Some activities, as proposed, are replicable and are models such as the Newtok relocation. P 2-45

2-45

Yes, model (cold climate housing) and replicable (relocation, protection). Page E1-45

Weakness

None

2-45

Scoring Criteria **Page**

3.3.3. Scaling/scoping - Did the applicant provide scaling, scoping or phasing options for one or more proposed projects?

Strength

None NA

Weakness

None NA

3.3.4. Scaling/scoping - Did the applicant provide a narrative describing its priorities if HUD adjusts funding amounts for its proposal?

Strength

For Scaling and scoping: Project 2 very strong -Page 13, Project 4 strong -Page 30, Project 5 strong #Page 39, Project 3 Moderate #Page 23 Project 6 Moderate #Page 44, Project 1 activities need to be prioritized. 44

Weakness

The applicant did not provide scaling, scoping, or phasing options for one or more proposed projects. 2-45.

Only was clearly stated for the wider geography planning work. Page E1-45 2-45

The applicant did not describe its priorities if HUD adjusts funding amounts for its proposal. 2-45

Scoring Criteria**Page**3.4.1. Program Schedule. Did the schedule describe the level of environmental review required for the project(s)?**Strength**

None

NA

Weakness

The applicant did not describe the level of environmental review required for the projects. Dropbox:
ATTF/Schedules 3.4.2

ATTF

3.4.2. Program Schedule. Did the schedule identify each task and significant activity required for completing each project, including procurement, environmental review and obtaining federal, state, and local permits?**Strength**

The applicant identified each task and significant activity required for each project. Dropbox:
TTF/Schedules

ATTF/Schedule

Weakness

None

NA

3.4.3. Program Schedule. Did the schedule list the planned start and completion dates of all tasks and CDBG-NDR activities within the proposed project or program?**Strength**

The applicant listed planned start and completion dates of all noted tasks within the proposed projects.
Dropbox: ATTF/Schedules

ATTF/Schedule

Weakness

None

NA

Scoring Criteria**Page**

3.4.4. Program Schedule. Did the schedule specifically include a milestone(s) for the date(s) at which the applicant expects the project(s) to become functional and the expected benefits realized?

Strength

The schedule included milestones, but not for benefits realized. #Project Closeout# is not a synonym for benefits realized. Dropbox: ATTF/Schedules

ATTF

Weakness

None

NA

3.4.5. Program Schedule. Did the schedule earn all 4 points above?

Strength

None

NA

Weakness

The applicant did not describe the level of environmental review required for the projects. Dropbox: ATTF/Schedules

ATTF

3.5. Budget

Strength

None

NA

Weakness

Applicant refers reviewers in Exhibit E to various locations for budget information. Required information was present in the application, but was spread out and not presented in a summary fashion.

Exh E

Scoring Criteria	Page
<u>3.6.1. Consistency with Other Planning Documents: Consolidated Plan and/or Regional Sustainability Plan</u>	
Strength	
None	NA
Weakness	
Consistency with the ConPlan Certification or statement was not found	NA
<u>3.6.2. Consistency with Other Planning Documents: Mitigation Plan and/or Transportation Plan</u>	
Strength	
None	NA
Weakness	
References to the Long Range Transportation Plan and local Hazard Mitigation Plans found on page 23 and 30.	23-30
The applicant only attaches the plans its entirety (LRTP and HazMit plans found in DropBox Exhibit E) and not specific sections of the plan as required by the NOFA.	
<u>4.1. Factor 4: Phase 2 Leverage</u>	
Strength	
None	
Weakness	
None	

Scoring Criteria	Page
<u>5.1.1. Long-term Commitment</u>	
Strength	
Excellent examples - includes QAP (page 4) funding criteria, new standards for housing, energy efficiency work (Page 9).	9
Weakness	
None	NA
<u>5.1.2. Policy Point: Wider Geography</u>	
Strength	
QAP, for example Loudon and Galena Hazard Mitigation Plan is a multi-jurisdictional plan over a wider geography. (Dropbox file G35)	G35 DB
Weakness	
None	NA
<u>5.1.3. Policy Point: Significant New Action</u>	
Strength	
HMP update and approval by FEMA occurred after date of NOFA publication. (p. 2 and Dropbox file G35)	
Weakness	
None	NA

Scoring Criteria

Page

5.1.4. Policy Point: Three or More Commitments

Strength

Examples - includes Galena HMP update (page 2) and Higher Elevation Standards Page 3. Only two commitments so the policy point cannot be awarded.

2

Weakness

Date of action for City of Galena higher elevation standard vague, but taken after qualifying disaster. Page 3