

| Criterion | Abbreviated Description | Points Available | A |
|------------------|--|-------------------------|----------|
| 1.a | Describe location and legal access | 30 | 30 |
| 1.b | Identify source of water | 10 | 10 |
| 1.c | Quantify conserved or new water | 4 pts/10 af to 500 | 140 |
| 1.d | Meets AWSA and CUFA | 30 | 30 |
| 2.a | Technical and engineering studies and support | 20 | 20 |
| 2.b | hydro, ecologic, geotec support | 20 | 20 |
| 3.a | Quantify est. planning/const. costs | 10 | 10 |
| 3.b | Quantify ongoing admin, O&M costs | 10 | 10 |
| 3.c | Quantify enviro compliance and costs | 10 | 8 |
| 3.d | Quantify AWSA funding sought for life of project | 10 | 10 |
| 4.a | Describe and quantify enviro impacts, listed species | 10 | 8 |
| 4.b | How mitigaste above | 10 | 8 |
| 4.c | How benefit environment | 10 | 8 |
| 4.d | List enviro statutes, regulations, how would comply | 10 | 8 |
| 5.a | Estimate economic benefits | 10 | 8 |
| 5.b | Estimate costs for planning, design, enviro, admin, etc. | 10 | 8 |
| 5.c | Source and percentage local contribution | 1 pt/1% up to 50 | 6.5 |
| 6.a | Needs of historic, traditional uses and cultures | 10 | 10 |
| 6.b | Needs of current and future demands for water | 20 | 10 |
| 6.c | Flood control | 20 | 0 |
| 6.d | Fire protection, prevention, suppression | 20 | 10 |
| 6.e | Recreation | 20 | 20 |
| 6.f | Environmental protection | 20 | 0 |
| 6.g | Other | 10 | 0 |
| 7 | Other entity support for proposal | 40 | 30 |
| 8 | Counties benefitting | 10/county to 40 | 10 |

Evaluators Scores

| B | C | D | E |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| | | 10 | |
| 10 | 10 | | 10 |
| | | 224 | |
| 224 | 188 | | 224 |
| 10 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| 20 | 20 | 18 | 20 |
| 20 | 20 | 18 | 20 |
| | | 9 | |
| 10 | 10 | | 10 |
| | | 9 | |
| 10 | 10 | | 10 |
| 10 | 10 | 5 | 5 |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | 8 |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 5 | 10 | 3 | 10 |
| 7 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 5 | 10 | 7 | 10 |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 6 | 6 | 6.24 | 6.24 |
| 8 | 10 | 10 | 15 |
| 10 | 20 | 18 | 20 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 0 | |
| 2 | 5 | | 10 |
| | | 0 | |
| 20 | 20 | | 15 |
| 2 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 30 | 40 | 20 | 20 |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |

10

40

15

20

Comments

Not clear what source or amount - even admit may not produce more water (pg 15 6b)

224 pts = $560/10*4$

Is this project is slated to receive \$4 million in second round of Tier 1 ONRT funding?

good responses but no differentiation between 2a and 2b

final proposal should contain current costs and not contradict within response and reference

this total (\$35,545.79) contradicts with the total provided in attachment II (\$45,571, from pg. ES-5)

I DO NOT see this listed as a task within the total budget; I also do not see an attachment titled "Bid Schedule" as referenced in this response

EID not provided – too big, Craig OK'd

keeps water in stream

unclear how estimates were calculated, no assumptions provided, no estimate for pump savings

only partially addresses

won't count anticipated golf course application - not part of proposal; am surprised proposers don't consider athletic fields recreational.

potential exists but not planned

No school irrigation?

no mention of water quality

potential exists but not planned

7a-c count as one supporter; NMED the second

municipal and 1/2 for ag (indirect)