

Evaluators Scores

| Criterion | Abbreviated Description | Points Available | A | B | C | D | E | Comments |
|-----------|--|------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|
| 1.a | Describe location and legal access | 30 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 30 | 5 | individual homeowners would support? |
| 1.b | Identify source of water | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | |
| | | | | | | 250 | | "[A] vegetable garden for the average home that will be watered for free, without depleting our precious groundwater resources." If the water that normally goes down the street to a sewer or aquifer or stream is intercepted (harvested) instead to water trees or a lawn or a garden, how is the water supply in the system "extended?" The concept that intercepting water at one point and evaporating or transpiring it to the atmosphere at that point instead of letting continue through the hydrologic system to be consumed elsewhere only changes the place and possibly the type of consumption. Nothing is "free" and nothing saved. |
| | | | | | | | | The OSE can allow only the amount of water that would normally evaporate (be lost to the system) from the catchment area. The normal hydrograph can't be decreased. This means generally no significant increase in ET from new lawns, gardens, plantings, "huge trees," etc. Irrigation of "natural" vegetation might be OK. NO new outside water use in the Gila Basin from any source (1964 USSC Decree). |
| | | | | | | | | In any event, assumes all households have same parameters taken from municipal. Over-inflated salvage. Gave 200 as best guess, but still bothered by change of use and place -- doesn't really save anything, even though I do it myself. |
| | | | | | | | | Number seem contrived to gain max points. |
| 1.c | Quantify conserved or new water | 4/10 af to 500 | 200 | 250 | 500 | | 200 | estimate of 3625 projects in ten years equals ~1 project per day for ten yrs. I don't |
| 1.d | Meets AWSA and CUFA | 30 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 30 | |
| 2.a | Technical and engineering studies and support | 20 | 10 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 10 | |
| 2.b | hydro, ecologic, geotec support | 20 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 2 | Misses rest of hydro cycle entirely. |
| 3.a | Quantify est. planning/const. costs | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | | 10 | Costs high due to assumption everyone will participate? |
| | | | | | | | 6 | very broad-brushed estimates |
| | | | | | | | 10 | Costs look low for admin, include benefits? No maintenance costs? Who will bear? |
| 3.b | Quantify ongoing admin, O&M costs | 10 | 0 | 7 | 10 | | 2 | these kinds of projects require maintenance |
| | | | | | | | 10 | Focus entirely on project footprint – never here or other places considers impacts downstream. |
| 3.c | Quantify enviro compliance and costs | 10 | 5 | 5 | 10 | | 2 | |
| 3.d | Quantify AWSA funding sought for life of project | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | |
| | | | | | | | 5 | Focus entirely on project footprint – never here or other places considers impacts downstream. |
| 4.a | Describe and quantify enviro impacts, listed species | 10 | 0 | 5 | 5 | | 0 | no species mentioned |
| | | | | | | | 10 | Focus entirely on project footprint – never here or other places considers impacts downstream. |
| 4.b | How mitigaste above | 10 | 0 | 5 | 10 | | 0 | |
| 4.c | How benefit environment | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | |
| | | | | | | | 10 | Focus entirely on project footprint – never here or other places considers impacts downstream. |
| 4.d | List enviro statutes, regulations, how would comply | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | | 0 | response doesn't address the question |
| 5.a | Estimate economic benefits | 10 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 4 | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|-------------------|----|----|----|----|----|--|
| 5.b | Estimate costs for planning, design, enviro, admin, etc. | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | |
| 5.c | Source and percentage local contribution | 1 pt/1% up to 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | response unacceptable, need to demo partnerships that would collaborate on project. Stating that maintenance depts will "change their practices" is speculative |
| 6.a | Needs of historic, traditional uses and cultures | 10 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 3 | |
| 6.b | Needs of current and future demands for water | 20 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 15 | 5 | "Water is wasted as runoff goes directly into a stream." – Unfortunate reasoning, exactly the same parochial view used by big water developers such as Dominy or Mulholland. |
| 6.c | Flood control | 20 | 5 | 0 | 5 | | 5 | very local |
| 6.d | Fire protection, prevention, suppression | 20 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 2 | |
| 6.e | Recreation | 20 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 2 | |
| 6.f | Environmental protection | 20 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 7 | |
| 6.g | Other | 10 | | 2 | 10 | 5 | | |
| 7 | Other entity support for proposal | 40 | 40 | 10 | 40 | 40 | 40 | |
| 8 | Counties benefitting | 10/county to 40 | 40 | 10 | 40 | 40 | 40 | |
| 9 | Economic growth or benefit for interests | 10/interest to 50 | 0 | 10 | 50 | 25 | 0 | municipal, residential ag only (5pts), recreation indirect (5pts), other-stormwater mgt (5pts) |