

Evaluators Scores

Criterion	Abbreviated Description	Points Available	A	B	C	D	E	Comments
1.a	Describe location and legal access	30	30	25	30	30	30	
1.b	Identify source of water	10	5	10	10		4	Ownership of new wellfield WR's? Legal with block administration? Mimbres already fully appropriated - what good declaration at new ellfield?
1.c	Quantify conserved or new water	4/10 af to 500	220	377	500	377.2	367	943/10*4 = 367
1.d	Meets AWSA and CUFA	30	30	15	30	30	30	
						10		"will be developed"
2.a	Technical and engineering studies and support	20	15	10	20		10	no engineering design
						15		"The first document demonstrates that 99% of effluent discharged by the Silver City wastewater treatment plant is returned to the regional aquifer and recommends that the Town apply for a return flow credit with OSE. The Town is currently making that application." 99%?
2.b	hydro, ecologic, geotec support	20	20	20	20		20	
3.a	Quantify est. planning/const. costs	10	10	10	10	10	10	
3.b	Quantify ongoing admin, O&M costs	10	10	10	10	10	10	
3.c	Quantify enviro compliance and costs	10	10	10	10	10	10	(where is the \$564K in Table 1 - planning?)
3.d	Quantify AWSA funding sought for life of project	10	10	10	10	10	10	
4.a	Describe and quantify enviro impacts, listed species	10	5	7	10	10	6	Mangas provides 40% of Gila base flow. Effects of pumping in Mangas?
4.b	How mitigaste above	10	5	5	10	10	6	only mitigation provides env bens
4.c	How benefit environment	10	5	7	10	5	6	
4.d	List enviro statutes, regulations, how would comply	10	10	10	10	10	8	Discharge permit?
						10		Only Mimbres near Silver applicable. Shouldn't bring in Gila Diversion, Gila water value, deming value, etc.
5.a	Estimate economic benefits	10	10	10	10		6	
5.b	Estimate costs for planning, design, enviro, admin, etc.	10	10	10	10	10	10	
5.c	Source and percentage local contribution	1 pt/1% up to 50	50	50	50	50	50	Only lists <i>possible</i> source of match + 6% in-kind
6.a	Needs of historic, traditional uses and cultures	10	10	10	10	8	10	
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	10	5	0	20	10	facilities would receive water resources without project
6.e	Recreation	20	0	0	20	0	0	wellfield provides no environmental protections
6.f	Environmental protection	20	0	5	20	0	0	
6.g	Other	10	0	0	10	8	0	
7	Other entity support for proposal	40	40	30	40	40	30	Most in County, GRIP, GCC, UGWA really same.
8	Counties benefitting	10/county to 40	10	10	10	10	10	municipal, 1/2 points for ag
9	Economic growth or benefit for interests	10/interest to 50	10	10	50	15	10	