

Evaluators Scores

| Criterion | Abbreviated Description | Points Available | A | B | C | D | E | Comments |
|-----------|--|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|
| | | | | | | 30 | | Should have used lands as ID'd on map pipeline location identified, access assumed. No location for storage or diversion need additional planning to determine legal access |
| 1.a | Describe location and legal access | 30 | 25 | 5 | 20 | | 15 | |
| 1.b | Identify source of water | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | |
| 1.c | Quantify conserved or new water | 4/10 af to 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | what is estimated storage capacity? |
| 1.d | Meets AWSA and CUFA | 30 | 30 | 15 | 30 | 30 | 30 | |
| 2.a | Technical and engineering studies and support | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 15 | 5 | Weak. Discusses previous projects. How about this project? |
| 2.b | hydro, ecologic, geotec support | 20 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 4 | |
| | | | | | | 9 | | exceeds available funds |
| 3.a | Quantify est. planning/const. costs | 10 | 10 | 8 | 10 | | 10 | land for storage/pump station? Can't tell if budget includes environmental compliance |
| 3.b | Quantify ongoing admin, O&M costs | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | NOT "federal funds." |
| 3.c | Quantify enviro compliance and costs | 10 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 | |
| | | | | | | 9 | | exceeds available funds |
| 3.d | Quantify AWSA funding sought for life of project | 10 | 10 | 8 | 10 | | 10 | timing of costs relative to tasks? |
| 4.a | Describe and quantify enviro impacts, listed species | 10 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 8 | questionable assumptions, defers responsibility Weak, other species besides SWWFC |
| | | | | | | 10 | | very brief, not comprehensive, SWFL is not only species to address; isn't water in storage intended to go to deming, not back to the river during drought? Not explained. |
| 4.b | How mitigate above | 10 | 0 | 2 | 10 | | 4 | |
| 4.c | How benefit environment | 10 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 6 | Weak, other species besides SWWFC |
| 4.d | List enviro statutes, regulations, how would comply | 10 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 6 | Project specific compliance requirements not yet known very brief, bens not estimated |
| 5.a | Estimate economic benefits | 10 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 2 | |
| 5.b | Estimate costs for planning, design, enviro, admin, etc. | 10 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | "Likely?" |
| | | | | | | 10 | | |
| 5.c | Source and percentage local contribution | 1 pt/1% up to 50 | 10 | 10 | 10 | | 0 | source for \$32.5 million match not identified |
| 6.a | Needs of historic, traditional uses and cultures | 10 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 8 | very brief, no history |
| 6.b | Needs of current and future demands for water | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 10 | No quantification of demands |
| 6.c | Flood control | 20 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | |
| 6.d | Fire protection, prevention, suppression | 20 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 10 | indirect |
| 6.e | Recreation | 20 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 20 | |
| | | | | | | 10 | | isn't water in storage intended to go to deming, not back to the river during drought? Not explained. |
| 6.f | Environmental protection | 20 | 5 | 5 | 10 | | 20 | ignores negative impacts to river between diversion and storage sites |
| 6.g | Other | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 7 | Other entity support for proposal | 40 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | |
| 8 | Counties benefitting | 10/county to 40 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 20 | 20 | |
| 9 | Economic growth or benefit for interests | 10/interest to 50 | 0 | 15 | 30 | 18 | 20 | municipal, 8 pts for ag (indirect) |