

Criterion	Abbreviated Description	Points Available	Evaluators Scores					E	Comments
			A	B	C	D			
								Acequias has statutory authority to access, construct, or even move diversion. Does NOT need TNC permission.	
1.a	Describe location and legal access	30	20	10	25	30	10	Would new construction be allowed under maintenance?	
1.b	Identify source of water	10	10	10	10	10	5	The members of the acequia have the water rights. Except as member of acequia and WR owner, TNC and FMI have no ownership.	
1.c	Quantify conserved or new water	4/10 af to 500	0	0	0	0	0	Rosgen less efficient than current diversions.	
1.d	Meets AWSA and CUFA	30	30	15	30	30	0	What water supply demand met?	
2.a	Technical and engineering studies and support	20	5	5	10	15	0	Both Dave Rosgen and William Miller Engineering concluded a Riosgen diversion not feasible.	
2.b	hydro, ecologic, geotec support	20	5	0	10	10	10	only one provided and no description of ecological support	
								Basis for estimates?	
3.a	Quantify est. planning/const. costs	10	10	5	10	10	2	Good idea but a lot of \$.	
3.b	Quantify ongoing admin, O&M costs	10	10	5	10	10	2	what about adm costs for local govts?	
3.c	Quantify enviro compliance and costs	10	10	2	8	5	2	description OK but costs not quantified	
3.d	Quantify AWSA funding sought for life of project	10	10	5	8	10	2	Basis for total and cost-share?	
4.a	Describe and quantify enviro impacts, listed species	10	5	5	8	10	5	Quantify? "very concerned" = mitigation?	
4.b	How mitigaste above	10	5	2	8	10	5	Need study to quantify	
4.c	How benefit environment	10	5	5	10	9	10	"environmental justice?" Need study to quantify described but only one specified	
4.d	List enviro statutes, regulations, how would comply	10	5	5	8	8	5	recognizes need for policy	
								Value as alternative to Gila diversion not valid.	
5.a	Estimate economic benefits	10	5	7	10	8	0	described and referenced but without estimated amount of water	
5.b	Estimate costs for planning, design, enviro, admin, etc.	10	10	5	10	10	5	Looks OK for a diversion that would withstand high flows but Rosgen won't and what's basis?	
5.c	Source and percentage local contribution	1 pt/1% up to 50	30	15	30	30	0	No commitment 30% "could be required", does not list any sources. Partial credit.	
6.a	Needs of historic, traditional uses and cultures	10	10	10	10	10	2	Doesn't incnase water supply,so how do irrigators get more plus ecology?	
6.b	Needs of current and future demands for water	20	10	8	20	20	2	Doesn't incnase water supply,so how do irrigators get more plus ecology?	
6.c	Flood control	20	5	8	5	15	0	Flood impacts would be little affected.	
6.d	Fire protection, prevention, suppression	20	0	2	5	10	0		
6.e	Recreation	20	5	10	5	10	2		
6.f	Environmental protection	20	5	15	20	18	2	Water users could still get all water unless diversion had mandatory leak – conflict with senior right.	
6.g	Other	10	0	5	10	5	0		
7	Other entity support for proposal	40	0	10	0	0	0	support letters not provided only ecology	
8	Counties benefitting	10/county to 40	10	10	10	10	10	ag, ranching, 5 pts for rec, 5 pts for other	

9 Economic growth or benefit for interests 10/interest to 50 20 30 50 30 10 Ecology, and irrigators but only if can divert all of water right.