

Evaluators Scores

Criterion	Abbreviated Description	Points Available	A	B	C	D	E	Comments
1.a	Describe location and legal access	30	25	30	30	30	20	"no land required" dodges the question – is there legal access/ability?
1.b	Identify source of water	10	10	10	10	5	5	<p>doesn't ID the source of water or if the communities listed are interested in participating</p> <p>Doesn't say what measures would be used, no calcs. "demand" in the AMEC report does not equate to use only refers to the amount pumped, not to consumption!</p> <p>Silver City's treated effluent goes 99% (?) to recharge water source – see Grant County Water Commission proposal, 2.b. If 99% of effluent goes back to aquifer, then no real savings from low flow toilets or shower heads because the water ends up right back in the aquifer anyway.</p> <p>Saves pumping and treatment costs, but low flow appliances do not really save water or meet a water supply demand. If all water that goes down the drain goes through the treatment plant and then into the aquifer, then only reductions in outdoor water use will save or extend the water supply . That is only discussed as potential, but cost is \$121K?</p> <p>80% of high flow toilets replaced in Santa Fe because of requirement for new construction to replace multiple toilets in existing homes, but less ("too low to count" -- from City of Santa Fe) participate in xeriscaping programs. In Albuquerque, average participation in low-flow appliance rebates averages about 0.5% per year. Xeriscaping total over 15 years of program is 4,264 participants out of 600,000 in service area = less than 1%. Albuquerque and Santa Fe already are experiencing the water shortage problems that Silver and Deming will face in the future. Unless Silver and Deming are anomalies, participation would be very low with questionable water savings, but worth a</p>
1.c	Quantify conserved or new water	4/10 of to 500	500	500	500	500	320	
1.d	Meets AWSA and CUFA	30	30	15	30	30	30	
2.a	Technical and engineering studies and support	20	15	20	20	20	10	<p>WTB funding for other projects does not imply this project would be successful. Rate increases need no AWSA support. Outdoor watering reduction good. Leak repair only saves water if leaks don't return to a water source.</p> <p>ECO northwest study flawed. AMEC report said "demand" (pumping) could be reduced, NOT consumption. SF's demand has been reduced 40%. Consumption much less because treated water returned to SF river. ABQ has reduced demand by 33%, consumption reduced essentially only by reduction of outside watering. This proposal incorrectly identifies reduced demand as reduced consumption.</p>
2.b	hydro, ecologic, geotec support	20	15	10	8	20	5	
3.a	Quantify est. planning/const. costs	10	10	10	10	10	2	<p>"Cost-effectiveness" is NOT a criterion. No guarantee all communities and all households will participate. \$ saved very optimistic. Planning and administrative \$ high. If saves so much \$ (cost effectiveness very high, savings 10 times cost), why need AWSA money? If benefits so high, why didn't WTB already fund? Water savings from low-flow appliances NOT equal to difference in volume (e.g., 3.5 gal - 1.5 gal for low-flow toilet), water savings only equal to gain in entire system. If Silver city, for instance, returns 99% of effluent to aquifer, then really zero net gain: greater flush volume just returned through system to aquifer. Leakage, etc., more a function of pressure and time, not volume pumped through system.</p>

Outdoor watering ordinances cost \$? How does saving water cost \$? Where are actual leak fix costs? "Lordsburg can save 139 acrefeet/year for a total cost of \$358,000 (amortized over 20 years)." That's \$2,575/af?? Savings of 3679 af = what \$?

Albuquerque funds its entire water conservation program, including rebate costs, for \$1.2 million per year. Their customer base is 600,000. Why would it cost the approximately the same for a service area not even 1/10th as populous? No costs for environmental review by administering agency?

3.b	Quantify ongoing admin, O&M costs	10	10	8	10	10	4	Outdoor watering ordinances cost \$? How does saving water cost \$? Where are actual leak fix costs? "Lordsburg can save 139 acrefeet/year for a total cost of \$358,000 (amortized over 20 years)." That's \$2,575/af?? Savings of 3679 af = what \$?
3.c	Quantify enviro compliance and costs	10	8	8	5	10	5	Albuquerque funds its entire water conservation program, including rebate costs, for \$1.2 million per year. Their customer base is 600,000. Why would it cost the approximately the same for a service area not even 1/10th as populous? No costs for environmental review by administering agency?
3.d	Quantify AWSA funding sought for life of project	10	10	8	2	10	5	Expect no need, not definitive answer Where did the 30% cost share come from?
4.a	Describe and quantify enviro impacts, listed species	10	10	10	8	8	9	Not broken down by year to year
4.b	How mitigate above	10	10	10	10	10	10	no mention of species
4.c	How benefit environment	10	10	10	8	10	5	Does nothing to mitigate current negative impacts to Gila ecology.
4.d	List enviro statutes, regulations, how would comply	10	5	7	8	5	8	
5.a	Estimate economic benefits	10	10	10	10	10	5	If benefits exceed costs by order of magnitude, why need AWSA funding?
5.b	Estimate costs for planning, design, enviro, admin, etc.	10	10	10	10	10	5	Very high
5.c	Source and percentage local contribution	1 pt/1% up to 50	30	20	30	30	0	Cost share "could be built into grant process." Is it?
6.a	Needs of historic, traditional uses and cultures	10	10	10	10	8	5	Many won't like to dry up lawns, use low-flow fixtures, high water rates, etc.
6.b	Needs of current and future demands for water	20	20	20	20	18	15	
6.c	Flood control	20	0	0	0	0	0	
6.d	Fire protection, prevention, suppression	20	0	0	0	0	0	
6.e	Recreation	20	20	15	5	0	0	The development of Gila water could actually improve recreation opportunities through lake fishing, more dependable and minimum environmental flows, and enhancement of riparian vegetation for bird-watching, etc. Municipal conservation not really connected, anyway.
6.f	Environmental protection	20	15	20	20	15	15	
6.g	Other	10	10	10	10	10	0	Not connected to Gila water development.
7	Other entity support for proposal	40	40	40	40	40	30	
8	Counties benefitting	10/county to 40	40	40	40	40	40	
9	Economic growth or benefit for interests	10/interest to 50	20	30	50	25	10	municipal and ag/ranching, 5 for future gens