

APPLICANT NAME:	Existing	Proposed	
	Scale	Scale	
WATER STORAGE, CONVEYANCE AND DELIVERY CRITERIA			
Urgent to Meet the Needs of an ISC-Accepted Regional Water Plan (OSE)	5	5	
Yes	5	5	
No	0	0	
Local Contribution: Existing Criteria (NMFA)	15	15	Local Contributions: Proposed Criteria
Contributes hard match in excess of minimum required by greater than 30%	12-15	13-15	Contributes hard match in excess of minimum required by greater than 300%
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 20% and 29%	8-11	10-12	Exceeds minimum required match component by between 200% and 299%
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 10% and 19%	4-7	7-9	Exceeds minimum required match component by between 100% and 199%
Meets minimum match	1-3	4-6	Exceeds minimum required match component by between 1% and 99%
Less than minimum	0	3	Meets minimum match
		1-2	Less than minimum
		0	No verified match
Readiness (NMED)	15	10	
Project is ready to proceed (other funding secured and all permits, licenses and authorizations are in place)	10-15	7-10	
Project has secured all other funding and has identified, but not secured, all permits, licenses and authorizations	5-9	4-6	
Project has not secured all other funding and has not yet identified all permits, licenses and authorizations	0-4	0-3	
Regionalization (NMED)	15	10	
Project provides "regionalization" of several smaller water systems and/or provides regional service which replaces individual well-septic systems. Applicant has collaborated with all adjacent governmental, municipal interests, sanitation districts, water associations, and/or private ownerships within five miles of current service area. Project incorporates an area >80% of the population within an area. Project proposes to "share" infrastructure or manpower, equipment, processes, etc. Project has multiple partners who have entered into a Joint Powers Agreement for the proposed project.	13-15	9-10	
Project like above, but with 61-80% of the population substantively incorporated into the project	10-12	7-8	
Project serves 41-60% of human population in the regional area of the project	7-9	5-6	
Project serves 21-40% of human population in the regional area of the project	4-6	3-4	
Project effects no substantial part of the surrounding area or <20% of regional human population	1-3	1-2	
Project provides direct and indirect benefits to only a few people	0	0	
Health and Safety (NMED)	20	25	
Project specifically addresses identified threat(s) to human health and safety relative to water borne disease, Safe Drinking Water Act violations	17-20	21-25	
Project specifically and substantially addresses human health or safety benefits, especially beyond other project objectives	13-16	16-20	
Project specifically includes benefits for human health and safety that may range from indirect to basically addressed	9-12	11-15	
Project has minimal human health and safety provisions when human health and safety could be addressed	5-8	6-10	
Project has no aspects that promote human health and safety benefits and may even be detrimental in that regard	1-4	0-5	
Plan & Design (NMED)	10	10	
Project design concept is substantively complete, sets forth clear methodology for project selection and design, set forth clear objectives in an overall framework of infrastructure improvement and incorporates water saving technologies	8-10	8-10	
Project design concept is substantively complete, sets forth clear methodology for project selection and design, and sets forth clear objectives in an overall framework of infrastructure improvement	6-8	6-8	
Project is well planned, sets forth clear methodology for project selection, but design is not yet complete	4-5	4-5	
Project is adequately planned and does not include a clear methodology for project selection	1-3	0-3	
Other: Emergency (NMED)	20	25	
Project specifically addresses imminent or existing catastrophic conditions related to water quality or quantity or cures severe violations related to water quality	17-20	21-25	
Project specifically and substantially addresses imminent or existing catastrophic conditions, especially beyond other project objectives	13-16	16-20	
Project specifically includes benefits for water quality or quantity that may range from indirect to basically addressed	9-12	11-15	
Project has minimal human health and safety provisions where water quality or quantity could be addressed	5-8	6-10	
Project has no aspects that promote water quality or quantity and may even be detrimental in that regard	1-4	0-5	

APPLICANT NAME:	Existing Scale	Proposed Scale	
WATER CONSERVATION OR TREATMENT, RECYCLING OR REUSE CRITERIA			
Urgent to Meet the Needs of an ISC-Accepted Regional Water Plan (OSE)	5	5	
Yes	5		
No	0		
Local Contribution (NMFA)	15	15	Local Contributions: Proposed Criteria
Contributes hard match in excess of minimum required by greater than 30%	12-15	13-15	Contributes hard match in excess of minimum required by greater than 300%
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 20% and 29%	8-11	10-12	Exceeds minimum required match component by between 200% and 299%
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 10% and 19%	4-7	7-9	Exceeds minimum required match component by between 100% and 199%
Meets minimum match	1-3	4-6	Exceeds minimum required match component by between 1% and 99%
Less than minimum	0	3	Meets minimum match
		1-2	Less than minimum
		0	No verified match

Readiness (NMED)	15	10
Project is ready to proceed (other funding secured and all permits, licenses and authorizations are in place)	10-15	7-10
Project has secured all other funding and has identified, but not secured, all permits, licenses and authorizations	5-9	4-6
Project has not secured all other funding and has not yet identified all permits, licenses and authorizations	0-4	0-3

Regionalization (NMED)	15	10
Project provides "regionalization" of several smaller water systems and/or provides regional service which replaces individual well-septic systems. Applicant has collaborated with all adjacent governmental, municipal interests, sanitation districts, water associations, and/or private ownerships within five miles of current service area. Project incorporates an area >80% of the population within an area. Project proposes to "share" infrastructure or manpower, equipment, processes, etc. Project has multiple partners who have entered into a Joint Powers Agreement for the proposed project.	13-15	9-10
Project like above, but with 61-80% of the population substantively incorporated into the project	10-12	7-8
Project serves 41-60% of human population in the regional area of the project	7-9	5-6
Project serves 21-40% of human population in the regional area of the project	4-6	3-4
Project effects no substantial part of the surrounding area or <20% of regional human population	1-3	1-2
Project provides direct and indirect benefits to only a few people	0	0

Health and Safety (NMED)	20	25
Project specifically addresses identified threat(s) to human health and safety relative to water quantity where only a single source of water is available for drinking water	17-20	21-25
Project specifically and substantially addresses human health or safety benefits, especially beyond other project objectives	13-16	16-20
Project specifically includes benefits for human health and safety that may range from indirect to basically addressed	9-12	11-15
Project has minimal human health and safety provisions when human health and safety could be addressed	5-8	6-10
Project has no aspects that promote human health and safety benefits and may even be detrimental in that regard	0-4	0-5

Plan & Design	10	10
Project design concept is substantively complete, sets forth clear methodology for project selection and design, set forth clear objectives in an overall framework of infrastructure improvement and incorporates water saving technologies	8-10	8-10
Project design concept is substantively complete, sets forth clear methodology for project selection and design, and sets forth clear objectives in an overall framework of infrastructure improvement	6-8	6-8
Project is well planned, sets forth clear methodology for project selection, but design is not yet complete	4-5	4-5
Project is adequately planned and does not include a clear methodology for project selection	0-3	0-3

Other: Emergency (NMED)	20	25
Project specifically addresses imminent or existing catastrophic conditions related to water quality or quantity or cures severe violations related to water quality	17-20	21-25
Project specifically and substantially addresses imminent or existing catastrophic conditions, especially beyond other project objectives	13-16	16-20
Project specifically includes benefits for water quality or quantity that may range from indirect to basically addressed	9-12	11-15
Project has minimal human health and safety provisions where water quality or quantity could be addressed	5-8	6-10
Project has no aspects that promote water quality or quantity and may even be detrimental in that regard	0-4	0-5

APPLICANT NAME:	Existing Scale	Proposed Scale	
WATERSHED RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT CRITERIA			
Urgent to Meet the Needs of an ISC-Accepted Regional Water Plan (OSE)	5	5	
Yes	5	0	
No	0		
Local Contribution: Existing Criteria (NMFA)	15	15	Local Contributions: Proposed Criteria
Contributes hard match in excess of minimum required by greater than 30%	12-15	13-15	Contributes hard match in excess of minimum required by greater than 300%
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 20% and 29%	8-11	10-12	Exceeds minimum required match component by between 200% and 299%
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 10% and 19%	4-7	7-9	Exceeds minimum required match component by between 100% and 199%
Meets minimum match	1-3	4-6	Exceeds minimum required match component by between 1% and 99%
Less than minimum	0	3	Meets minimum match
		1-2	Less than minimum
		0	No verified match

Remainder of application reviewed by Dept. of Ag, Forestry Division, Game & Fish and NMED Surface Water Quality Bureau and scores averaged

Readiness	15	10
Project is ready to proceed (other funding secured and all permits, easements, landowner agreements, licenses are in place and environmental compliance is complete)	10-15	7-10
Project has secured all other funding and has identified, but not secured, all permits, easements, landowner agreements and licenses, or completed the environment compliance	5-9	4-6
Project has not secured all other funding and has not yet identified all permits, easements, landowner agreements and licenses and has not yet begun the environmental compliance	0-4	0-3

Regionalization	15	10
The proposed project is a substantial watershed restoration that is incorporated into a completed watershed, ecosystem restoration (include non-native phreatophyte and other ecosystem restoration projects), forest health or community wildfire project plan. The project is considered a priority in the watershed, ecosystem restoration, forest health or community wildfire protection plan. The project will complete, current or planned priority projects across the landscape.	13-15	9-10
The proposed project is a substantial watershed restoration that is incorporated into a completed watershed, ecosystem restoration (include non-native phreatophyte and other	10-12	7-8
The proposed project is incorporated into a completed plan, involves critical area treatment or otherwise impacts the larger landscape	7-9	5-6
The proposed project is not incorporated into a completed plan, but does not involve critical area treatment or impact a larger landscape.	4-6	3-4
Project is not part of a plan and addresses a small, isolated area.	0-3	0-2

WATERSHED RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT CRITERIA		
Health and Safety	20	25
The overall purpose of the project is to mitigate catastrophic fire and its threat to public and firefighter safety and damage to property or rehabilitate post-fire damage. Project proposals should consider all elements required to implement treatments on the ground, which includes conducting all consultations needed to complete plans and assessments.	17-20	21-25
Project specifically and substantially addresses human health or safety benefits, especially beyond other project objectives	13-16	16-20
Project specifically includes benefits for human health and safety that may range from indirect to basically addressed	9-12	11-15
Project has minimal human health and safety provisions when human health and safety could be addressed	5-8	6-10
Project has no aspects that promote human health and safety benefits and may even be detrimental in that regard	0-4	0-5
Plan & Design	10	10
There is a clear description of existing condition and associated problem. Project design concept is substantively complete, sets forth clear methodology for project selection and design, sets forth a clear description of how the project will improve the existing conditions and provides measurable results	8-10	8-10
Project design concept is substantively complete, sets forth clear methodology for project selection and design, and sets forth clear objectives in an overall framework of infrastructure improvement	6-8	6-8
Project is well planned, sets forth clear methodology for project selection, but design is not yet complete	4-5	4-5
Project is adequately planned and does not include a clear methodology for project selection or measurable results	1-3	0-3
Other: Attention to Wildlife and Environmental Compatibility	10	10
Project improves watershed ecosystem, including wildlife habitat (especially for threatened and endangered species), soil health and range or forest condition	8-10	8-10
Project has no negative effect on the watershed ecosystem, or employs highly effective mechanisms to adequately mitigate any impacts on threatened or endangered flora and fauna.	5-7	5-7
Project has serious impacts to watershed flora and fauna. These impacts are inadequately addressed by identifying only the most obvious ecosystem concerns or token mitigation measures.	3-4	3-4
Project impacts to watershed flora and fauna are either not identified, or identified and not mitigated.	0-2	0-2
Other: Water Quality Improvement	10	15
Project improves water quality in streams identified as impaired by the State of New Mexico, or extent of water quality protection of high-value water bodies	8-10	12-15
Project improves water quality and/or employs highly effective mechanisms to adequately mitigate any impacts on water quality.	5-7	8-11
Project has serious impacts to water quality. These impacts are inadequately addressed by identifying only the most obvious ecosystem concerns or token mitigation measures	3-4	4-7
Project impacts to water quality are either not identified, or identified and not mitigated.	0-2	0-3

APPLICANT NAME:	Existing Scale	Proposed Scale	
FLOOD PREVENTION CRITERIA:			
Urgent to Meet the Needs of an ISC-Accepted Regional Water Plan (OSE)	5	5	
Yes	5		
No	0		
Local Contribution: Existing Criteria (NMFA)	15	15	Local Contributions: Proposed Criteria
Contributes hard match in excess of minimum required by greater than 30%	12-15	13-15	Contributes hard match in excess of minimum required by greater than 300%
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 20% and 29%	8-11	10-12	Exceeds minimum required match component by between 200% and 299%
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 10% and 19%	4-7	7-9	Exceeds minimum required match component by between 100% and 199%
Meets minimum match	1-3	4-6	Exceeds minimum required match component by between 1% and 99%
Less than minimum	0	3	Meets minimum match
		1-2	Less than minimum
		0	No verified match
Readiness (OSE)	15	10	
Project is ready to proceed (other funding secured and all permits, licenses and authorizations are in place)	10-15	7-10	
Project has secured all other funding and has identified, but not secured, all permits, licenses and authorizations	5-9	4-6	
Project has not secured all other funding and has not yet identified all permits, licenses and authorizations	0-4	0-3	
Regionalization (NMED)	15	10	
Project mitigates flood damage to an area that represents >80% of the population	13-15	9-10	
Project like above, but with 61-80% of the population substantively incorporated into the project	10-12	7-8	
Project serves 41-60% of human population in the regional area of the project	7-9	5-6	
Project serves 21-40% of human population in the regional area of the project	4-6	3-4	
Project effects no substantial part of the surrounding area or <20% of regional human population	1-3	1-2	
Project provides direct and indirect benefits to only a few people	0	0	
Health and Safety (NMED)	20	25	
The project specifically addresses imminent or existing catastrophic floods and threats to human health and safety.	17-20	21-25	
The project specifically addresses imminent or existing floods conditions and threats to human health and safety.	13-16	16-20	
Project specifically includes benefits for human health and safety that may range from indirect to basically addressed	9-12	11-15	
Project has minimal human health and safety provisions when human health and safety could be addressed	5-8	6-10	
Project has no aspects that promote human health and safety benefits and may even be detrimental in that regard	0-4	0-5	
Plan & Design (NMED)	10	10	
Project design concept is substantively complete, sets forth clear methodology for project selection and design, set forth clear objectives in an overall framework of infrastructure improvement and incorporates water saving technologies	8-10	8-10	
Project design concept is substantively complete, sets forth clear methodology for project selection and design, and sets forth clear objectives in an overall framework of infrastructure improvement	6-8	6-8	
Project is well planned, sets forth clear methodology for project selection, but design is not yet complete	4-5	4-5	
Project is adequately planned and does not include a clear methodology for project selection	0-3	0-3	
Other: Economic Protection and/or Benefit (NMED)	20	25	
Project specifically addresses imminent or existing catastrophic conditions related to flooding that threaten economic vitality of an area	17-20	21-25	
Project specifically addresses imminent or existing flooding conditions that threaten economic vitality of an area	13-16	16-20	
Project specifically includes economic protection and/or benefits that range from indirect to basically addressed	9-12	11-15	
Project has minimal economic protection and/or benefits when they could be addressed	5-8	6-10	
Project has no aspects that promote economic protection and/or benefit and may even be detrimental in that regard	0-4	0-5	

APPLICANT NAME:	Existing	Proposed	
	Scale	Scale	
ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT CRITERIA			
Urgent to Meet the Needs of an ISC-Accepted Regional Water Plan (OSE)	5	5	
Yes	5	0	
No	0		
Local Contribution: Existing Criteria (NMFA)	15	15	Local Contributions: Proposed Criteria
Contributes hard match in excess of minimum required by greater than 30%	12-15	13-15	Contributes hard match in excess of minimum required by greater than 300%
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 20% and 29%	8-11	10-12	Exceeds minimum required match component by between 200% and 299%
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 10% and 19%	4-7	7-9	Exceeds minimum required match component by between 100% and 199%
Meets minimum match	1-3	4-6	Exceeds minimum required match component by between 1% and 99%
Less than minimum	0	3	Meets minimum match
		1-2	Less than minimum
		0	No verified match
Remainder of application reviewed by Dept. of Ag, Forestry Division, Game & Fish and NMED Surface Water Quality Bureau and scores averaged			
Project is ready to proceed (other funding secured and all permits, easements, landowner agreements, public agency agreements and environmental compliance is in place	10-15	7-10	
Project has secured all other funding and has identified, but not secured, all permits, easements, landowner agreement, public agency agreement and environment compliance is complete	5-9	4-6	
Project has not secured all other funding and has not yet identified all permits, easements, landowner agreements or public agency agreements and has not yet begun the environmental compliance	0-4	0-3	
Regionalization	15	10	
The proposed project substantially impacts the potential impact on population recovery within the project area. The project is considered a priority within the Endangered Species Act Implementation Plan.	13-15	9-10	
The proposed project substantially impacts the potential impact on population recovery within the project area, but is not considered a priority within the Endangered Species Act Implementation Plan.	10-12	7-8	
The proposed project is incorporated into a completed plan, involves critical area treatment or otherwise impacts the larger landscape	7-9	5-6	
The proposed project is not incorporated into a completed plan, but does not involve critical area mitigation	4-6	3-4	
Project is not part of a plan and addresses a small, isolated area.	0-3	0-2	
Health and Safety	20	25	
Project substantially impacts ESA mitigation	17-20	21-25	
Project positively impacts ESA mitigation, but does not represent a substantial mitigation	13-16	16-20	
Project specifically includes benefits for ESA may range from indirect to basically addressed	9-12	11-15	
Project has minimal ESA mitigation	5-8	6-10	
Project promotes human recreation and has little impact to ESA mitigation	0-4	0-5	
Plan & Design	10	10	
There is a clear description of existing condition and associated problem. Project design concept is substantively complete, sets forth clear methodology for project selection and design, sets forth a clear description of how the project will improve the existing conditions and provides measurable results.	8-10	8-10	
Project design concept is substantively complete, sets forth clear methodology for project selection and design, and sets forth a clear description of how the project will improve the existing conditions and provides measurable results.	6-8	6-8	
Project is well planned, sets forth clear methodology for project selection, but does not include a clear description of expected benefits or methodology for monitoring	4-5	4-5	
Project is adequately planned, but does not include a clear methodology for project selection or measurable results.	0-3	0-3	
Other: Habitat Recovery	20	25	
Project represents a substantial amount of habitat restored specific to the targeted species	15-20	19-25	
Project positively impacts a significant amount of habitat restored specific to the targeted species	9-14	12-18	
Project's impact to the restoration of habitat relative to the targeted species is unclear	4-8	6-11	
Project impacts to restoration of habitat relative to the targeted species is not identified.	0-3	0-5	