



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Members of the NMFA Legislative Oversight Committee  
**From:** Marquita D. Russel, NMFA Chief of Programs  
**Date:** December 1, 2016  
**Subject:** **Water Trust Board's Recommendation to the Legislature for Authorization  
2017 Water Project Fund Projects List  
ITEM 3**

---

The Water Project Finance Act provides that the New Mexico Finance Authority ("NMFA") may make loans and grants to projects recommended by the Water Trust Board ("WTB") and authorized by the Legislature. In April 2015, the WTB amended its rules to provide that applications submitted by qualified entities for qualified projects will be evaluated prior to the WTB recommending projects to the Legislature. Following the changes to its rules, the WTB finalized comprehensive policy amendments that streamlined the funding requirements, simplified the application process, increased access to the program by providing a sliding scale for determination of local match and increased transparency by including evaluation criteria for each project type within the policies.

For the 2017 cycle, staff anticipates that a maximum net total of \$16.38 million will be available: \$14.2 million from Severance Tax Bonds plus \$4 million from the Water Trust Fund distribution, less 10% to the Office of the State Engineer for adjudication. Pursuant to WTB policies, the maximum amount a single project can receive is 15%, which is expected to total \$2.457 million for the 2017 cycle.

By August 8, 2016, the NMFA received 80 Notices of Intent to File an Application. On October 6, 2016, 62 applications totaling more than \$60 million were filed; two of which were deemed ineligible and four of which were deemed incomplete largely due to non-submission of required planning documents. The final list of reviewed applications included 56 projects totaling approximately \$58 million. At its November 3<sup>rd</sup> Board meeting, the Water Trust Board heard presentations from representatives of 45 of the applications. Applicants or its representatives gave short presentations about their projects and answered questions from the Board.

Using the criteria set forth in the revised WTB Project Management Policies, a Project Management Team comprised of staff from seven agencies and the legislative finance committee evaluated the applications and provided its evaluations to the WTB. The recommendations included a portion of the flood prevention applications, all of the watershed projects and those projects that scored above average in the water storage and water conservation project categories.

The recommended project list totals 32 projects totaling \$29.3 million in adjusted funding requests. Currently, staff estimates that one-third of the 2017 applicants have potential expenditure issues that would likely stop them from receiving funds in the Spring. Because of this high number, the Project Management Team is recommending a larger list of projects than there is expected funding. Roughly one-quarter of the projects on the recommended list have been identified as having potential expenditure issues.

Project Category Type	Policy Targets	Applications Requested		Applications Recommended		
		# of Apps	Total Adjusted Request	# of Apps	Total Amount	%
Flood Prevention	Up to 10%	7	\$ 7,942,563	2	\$ 1,799,000	11%
Water Conservation or Treatment, Recycling or Reuse	15% - 30%	12	\$ 11,531,430	6	\$ 7,766,011	47%
Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery	50% - 75%	32	\$ 27,076,340	19	\$ 16,506,003	101%
Watershed Restoration and Management	<u>10% to 20%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>\$ 3,200,000</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>\$ 3,200,000</u>	<u>20%</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>56</b>	<b>\$ 49,750,333</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>\$ 29,271,014</b>	<b>179%</b>

Projects recommended to the Legislature will be invited to complete a Readiness Application which initiates a review of regulatory, policy, and executive order compliance, including mandatory spending of prior WTB awards. Applicants who have open WTB awards from 2015 and prior (those not yet certified as complete) must submit any requisitions by January 26, 2017 in order to be counted towards the final expenditures target as defined by WTB policies. Applicants will be notified by February 27, 2017 if they have any outstanding compliance issues and will be given until March 16th to either show evidence of compliance or submit a written policy waiver that provides a justification for the policy exception. Ultimately, the WTB will fund applications in the order in which they are prioritized. Projects not demonstrating policy compliance may be by-passed for a lower-ranked project that has demonstrated compliance.

County	# of Projects	Funding Requests
Colfax	2	\$ 1,100,000
Curry	2	\$ 4,914,000
Dona Ana	3	\$ 4,107,000
Eddy	1	\$ 2,000,000
Guadalupe	2	\$ 478,711
Harding	1	\$ 400,000
Lea	1	\$ 580,000
Luna	1	\$ 150,000
Quay	1	\$ 600,000
Rio Arriba	5	\$ 2,263,000
Roosevelt	2	\$ 3,182,872
San Juan	1	\$ 475,000
San Miguel	1	\$ 701,895
Santa Fe	3	\$ 3,435,843
Sierra	1	\$ 1,490,000
Taos	3	\$ 2,192,693
Torrance	2	\$ 1,200,000
<b>17 Counties</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>\$ 29,271,014</b>

Applicant	County	Project Type	Scope
Cimarron, Village of	Colfax	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Design
Eagle Nest, Village of	Colfax	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Design and Construction
Clovis, City of	Curry	Water Conservation or Treatment, Recycling or Reuse Project	Construction
Eastern New Mexico Water Utility Authority	Curry	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Design and Construction
Anthony, City of	Dona Ana	Flood Prevention Project	Construction
Lower Rio Grande PWWA	Dona Ana	Water Conservation or Treatment, Recycling or Reuse Project	Construction
Lower Rio Grande PWWA	Dona Ana	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Planning
Carlsbad, City of	Eddy	Water Conservation or Treatment, Recycling or Reuse Project	Construction
Santa Rosa, City of	Guadalupe	Water Conservation or Treatment, Recycling or Reuse Project	Design
Santa Rosa, City of	Guadalupe	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Design and Surveys
Ute Creek SWCD	Harding	Watershed Restoration and Management Project	Construction and Surveys
Jal, City of	Lea	Water Conservation or Treatment, Recycling or Reuse Project	Construction
Columbus, Village of	Luna	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Design and Surveys
Canadian River SWCD	Quay	Watershed Restoration and Management Project	Design, Surveys and Construction
Alcalde MDWC&MSWA	Rio Arriba	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Construction
Ancones MDWWCA	Rio Arriba	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Construction
East Rio Arriba SWCD	Rio Arriba	Watershed Restoration and Management Project	Construction and Surveys
Upper Rio Grande Watershed District	Rio Arriba	Flood Prevention Project	Plan and Design
Valley Estates WSA	Rio Arriba	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Construction
Elida, Town of	Roosevelt	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Construction
Portales, City of	Roosevelt	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Construction
North Star MDWCA	San Juan	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Design
El Creston MDWCA	San Miguel	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Design and Construction
Canoncito at Apache Canyon MDWCA	Santa Fe	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Construction
Santa Cruz Water Authority	Santa Fe	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Construction and Surveys
Santa Fe, City of	Santa Fe	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Construction
Truth or Consequences, City of	Sierra	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Design and Construction
Lower Arroyo Hondo MDWCA	Taos	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Construction
Red River, Town of	Taos	Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Project	Design and Construction
Trampas MDWCA	Taos	Water Conservation or Treatment, Recycling or Reuse Project	Design
Claunch Pinto SWCD (Rio Grande)	Torrance	Watershed Restoration and Management Project	Design, Surveys and Construction
Claunch Pinto SWCD (Estancia Basin)	Torrance	Watershed Restoration and Management Project	Design, Surveys and Construction

<b>FLOOD PREVENTION CRITERIA:</b>	
<b>Urgent to Meet the Needs of an ISC-Accepted Regional Water Plan (ISC)</b>	<b>5</b>
Yes	
No	
<b>Local Contribution: Existing Criteria (NMFA)</b>	
<b>Local Contribution: Existing Criteria (NMFA)</b>	<b>15</b>
Contributes hard match in excess of minimum required by greater than 300%	13-15
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 200% and 299%	10-12
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 100% and 199%	7-9
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 1% and 99%	4-6
Meets minimum match	3
Less than minimum	1-2
No verified match	0
<b>Readiness (OSE)</b>	<b>10</b>
Project is ready to proceed (other funding secured and all permits, licenses and authorizations are in place)	7-10
Project has secured all other funding and has identified, but not secured, all permits, licenses and authorizations	4-6
Project has not secured all other funding and has not yet identified all permits, licenses and authorizations	0-3
<b>Regionalization (NMED)</b>	<b>10</b>
Project mitigates flood damage to an area that represents >80% of the population	9-10
Project like above, but with 61-80% of the population substantively incorporated into the project	7-8
Project serves 41-60% of human population in the regional area of the project	5-6
Project serves 21-40% of human population in the regional area of the project	3-4
Project effects no substantial part of the surrounding area or <20% of regional human population	1-2
Project provides direct and indirect benefits to only a few people	0

<b>FLOOD PREVENTION CRITERIA:</b>	
<b>Health and Safety (NMED)</b>	<b>25</b>
The project specifically addresses imminent or existing catastrophic floods and threats to human health and safety.	21-25
The project specifically addresses imminent or existing floods conditions and threats to human health and safety.	16-20
Project specifically includes benefits for human health and safety that may range from indirect to basically addressed	11-15
Project has minimal human health and safety provisions when human health and safety could be addressed	6-10
Project has no aspects that promote human health and safety benefits and may even be detrimental in that regard	0-5
<b>Plan &amp; Design (NMED)</b>	<b>10</b>
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
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
Project is well planned, sets forth clear methodology for project selection, but design is not yet complete	4-5
Project is adequately planned and does not include a clear methodology for project selection	0-3
<b>Other: Economic Protection and/or Benefit (NMED)</b>	<b>25</b>
Project specifically addresses imminent or existing catastrophic conditions related to flooding that threaten economic vitality of an area	21-25
Project specifically addresses imminent or existing flooding conditions that threaten economic vitality of an area	16-20
Project specifically includes economic protection and/or benefits that range from indirect to basically addressed	11-15
Project has minimal economic protection and/or benefits when they could be addressed	6-10
Project has no aspects that promote economic protection and/or benefit and may even be detrimental in that regard	0-5

<b>WATER CONSERVATION OR TREATMENT, RECYCLING OR REUSE CRITERIA</b>	
<b>Urgent to Meet the Needs of an ISC-Accepted Regional Water Plan (ISC)</b>	<b>5</b>
Yes	
No	
<b>Local Contribution (NMFA)</b>	<b>15</b>
Contributes hard match in excess of minimum required by greater than 300%	13-15
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 200% and 299%	10-12
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 100% and 199%	7-9
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 1% and 99%	4-6
Meets minimum match	3
Less than minimum	1-2
No verified match	0
<b>Readiness (NMED)</b>	<b>10</b>
Project is ready to proceed (other funding secured and all permits, licenses and authorizations are in place)	7-10
Project has secured all other funding and has identified, but not secured, all permits, licenses and authorizations	4-6
Project has not secured all other funding and has not yet identified all permits, licenses and authorizations	0-3
<b>Regionalization (NMED)</b>	<b>10</b>
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.	9-10
Project like above, but with 61-80% of the population substantively incorporated into the project	7-8
Project serves 41-60% of human population in the regional area of the project	5-6
Project serves 21-40% of human population in the regional area of the project	3-4
Project effects no substantial part of the surrounding area or <20% of regional human population	1-2
Project provides direct and indirect benefits to only a few people	0

<b>Health and Safety (NMED)</b>	<b>25</b>
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	21-25
Project specifically and substantially addresses human health or safety benefits, especially beyond other project objectives	16-20
Project specifically includes benefits for human health and safety that may range from indirect to basically addressed	11-15
Project has minimal human health and safety provisions when human health and safety could be addressed	6-10
Project has no aspects that promote human health and safety benefits and may even be detrimental in that regard	0-5
<b>Plan &amp; Design</b>	<b>10</b>
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
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
Project is well planned, sets forth clear methodology for project selection, but design is not yet complete	4-5
Project is adequately planned and does not include a clear methodology for project selection	0-3
<b>Other: Emergency (NMED)</b>	<b>25</b>
Project specifically addresses imminent or existing catastrophic conditions related to water quality or quantity or cures severe violations related to water quality	21-25
Project specifically and substantially addresses imminent or existing catastrophic conditions, especially beyond other project objectives	16-20
Project specifically includes benefits for water quality or quantity that may range from indirect to basically addressed	11-15
Project has minimal human health and safety provisions where water quality or quantity could be addressed	6-10
Project has no aspects that promote water quality or quantity and may even be detrimental in that regard	0-5

<b>WATER STORAGE, CONVEYANCE AND DELIVERY CRITERIA</b>	
<b>Urgent to Meet the Needs of an ISC-Accepted Regional Water Plan (ISC)</b>	<b>5</b>
Yes	5
No	0
<b>Local Contribution: Existing Criteria (NMFA)</b>	
<b>Local Contribution: Existing Criteria (NMFA)</b>	<b>15</b>
Contributes hard match in excess of minimum required by greater than 300%	13-15
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 200% and 299%	10-12
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 100% and 199%	7-9
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 1% and 99%	4-6
Meets minimum match	3
Less than minimum	1-2
No verified match	0
<b>Readiness (NMED)</b>	
<b>Readiness (NMED)</b>	<b>10</b>
Project is ready to proceed (other funding secured and all permits, licenses and authorizations are in place)	7-10
Project has secured all other funding and has identified, but not secured, all permits, licenses and authorizations	4-6
Project has not secured all other funding and has not yet identified all permits, licenses and authorizations	0-3
<b>Regionalization (NMED)</b>	
<b>Regionalization (NMED)</b>	<b>10</b>
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.	9-10
Project like above, but with 61-80% of the population substantively incorporated into the project	7-8
Project serves 41-60% of human population in the regional area of the project	5-6
Project serves 21-40% of human population in the regional area of the project	3-4
Project effects no substantial part of the surrounding area or <20% of regional human population	1-2
Project provides direct and indirect benefits to only a few people	0



<b>WATER STORAGE, CONVEYANCE AND DELIVERY CRITERIA</b>	
<b>Health and Safety (NMED)</b>	<b>25</b>
Project specifically addresses identified threat(s) to human health and safety relative to water borne disease, Safe Drinking Water Act violations	21-25
Project specifically and substantially addresses human health or safety benefits, especially beyond other project objectives	16-20
Project specifically includes benefits for human health and safety that may range from indirect to basically addressed	11-15
Project has minimal human health and safety provisions when human health and safety could be addressed	6-10
Project has no aspects that promote human health and safety benefits and may even be detrimental in that regard	0-5
<b>Plan &amp; Design (NMED)</b>	<b>10</b>
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
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
Project is well planned, sets forth clear methodology for project selection, but design is not yet complete	4-5
Project is adequately planned and does not include a clear methodology for project selection	0-3
<b>Other: Emergency (NMED)</b>	<b>25</b>
Project specifically addresses imminent or existing catastrophic conditions related to water quality or quantity or cures severe violations related to water quality	21-25
Project specifically and substantially addresses imminent or existing catastrophic conditions, especially beyond other project objectives	16-20
Project specifically includes benefits for water quality or quantity that may range from indirect to basically addressed	11-15
Project has minimal human health and safety provisions where water quality or quantity could be addressed	6-10
Project has no aspects that promote water quality or quantity and may even be detrimental in that regard	0-5

<b>WATERSHED RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT CRITERIA</b>	
<b>Urgent to Meet the Needs of an ISC-Accepted Regional Water Plan (ISC)</b>	<b>5</b>
Yes	0
No	
<b>Local Contribution: Existing Criteria (NMFA)</b>	<b>15</b>
Contributes hard match in excess of minimum required by greater than 300%	13-15
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 200% and 299%	10-12
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 100% and 199%	7-9
Exceeds minimum required match component by between 1% and 99%	4-6
Meets minimum match	3
Less than minimum	1-2
No verified match	0
<b>Remainder of application reviewed by Dept. of Ag, Forestry Division, Game &amp; Fish and NMED Surface Water Quality Bureau and scores averaged</b>	
<b>Readiness</b>	<b>10</b>
Project is ready to proceed (other funding secured and all permits, easements, landowner agreements, licenses are in place and environmental compliance is complete)	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	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	0-3
<b>Regionalization</b>	<b>10</b>
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.	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	7-8
The proposed project is incorporated into a completed plan, involves critical area treatment or otherwise impacts the larger landscape.	5-6
The proposed project is not incorporated into a completed plan, but does not involve critical area treatment or impact a larger landscape.	3-4
Project is not part of a plan and addresses a small, isolated area.	0-2

<b>WATERSHED RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT CRITERIA</b>	
<b>Health and Safety</b>	<b>25</b>
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.	21-25
Project specifically and substantially addresses human health or safety benefits, especially beyond other project objectives	16-20
Project specifically includes benefits for human health and safety that may range from indirect to basically addressed	11-15
Project has minimal human health and safety provisions when human health and safety could be addressed	6-10
Project has no aspects that promote human health and safety benefits and may even be detrimental in that regard	0-5
<b>Plan &amp; Design</b>	<b>10</b>
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
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
Project is well planned, sets forth clear methodology for project selection, but design is not yet complete	4-5
Project is adequately planned and does not include a clear methodology for project selection or measurable results	0-3
<b>Other: Attention to Wildlife and Environmental Compatibility</b>	<b>10</b>
Project improves watershed ecosystem, including wildlife habitat (especially for threatened and endangered species), soil health and range or forest condition.	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
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
Project impacts to watershed flora and fauna are either not identified, or identified and not mitigated.	0-2
<b>Other: Water Quality Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
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.	<b>12-15</b>
Project improves water quality and/or employs highly effective mechanisms to adequately mitigate any impacts on water quality.	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.	4-7
Project impacts to water quality are either not identified, or identified and not mitigated.	0-3

Water Trust Board  
Applications Reviewed for 2017 Application Cycle

App ID	Applicant	County	Project Name	Requested Scope	Amount Requested	Maximum Amount per Policy	Reviewer Scores					
							NMFA Points (15)	NMED/OSE Points (80)	ISC Points (5)	TOTAL	Projects Recommended	
<b>Flood Prevention</b>												
WPF-4028	Upper Rio Grande Watershed District	Rio Arriba	Correcting URGWD flood control structures	Plan & Design		\$299,000	15	52	0	67		
WPF-4013	Anthony, City of	Dona Ana	4th Street flood prevention improvements	Construction		\$1,500,000	15	47	5	67	<b>2</b> <b>\$1,799,000</b>	
WPF-4016	Columbus, Village of	Luna	Altura Channel phase II	Construction		\$1,250,000	2	54	0	56		
WPF-4052	Santa Rosa, City of	Guadalupe	Santa Rosa Power Dam flood prevention project	Construction	\$ 5,931,922	\$2,457,000	0	51	5	56		
WPF-4050	Corrales, Village of	Sandoval	Salce Basin flood hazard mitigation	Design		\$299,879	15	36	0	51		
WPF-4042	Milan, Village of*	Cibola	Mirabal Park - multipurpose flood control facility	Construction		\$1,536,684	0	28	5	33		
WPF-4031	Sunland Park, City of	Dona Ana	Drainage master plan	Planning		\$600,000	15	14	0	29		
<b>7</b>	<b>Eligible and Complete Flood Prevention Projects</b>					<b>\$7,942,563</b>	<b>8.86</b>	<b>40.29</b>	<b>2.14</b>	<b>51.29</b>	<b>AVG</b>	<b>4</b> <b>\$ 5,506,000</b>
<b>Water Conservation</b>												
							NMFA Score (15)	NMED Score (80)	ISC Score (5)	TOTAL	Projects Recommended	
WPF-4056	Trampas MDWCA	Taos	Trampas MDWCA water treatment project	Design		\$80,900	15	67	5	87		
WPF-4024	Carlsbad, City of*	Eddy	Carlsbad WWTP effluent reuse phase 5B	Construction		\$2,000,000	5	57	5	67		
WPF-4038	Jal, City of	Lea	Jal Lake well project	Construction		\$580,000	0	54	5	59		
WPF-4061	Clovis, City of*	Curry	Water Conservation Project	Construction	\$2,800,000	\$2,457,000	0	56	0	56		
WPF-4027	Santa Rosa, City of	Guadalupe	City of Santa Rosa Reuse Project	Design		\$191,111	15	37	0	52		
WPF-4054	Lower Rio Grande PWWA*	Dona Ana	South Valley water supply & treatment project	Construction	\$3,745,790	\$2,457,000	1	51	0	52	<b>6</b> <b>\$7,766,011</b>	
WPF-4041	Eldorado Area WSD	Santa Fe	Meter replacement with cellular technology	Construction		\$371,252	7	38	0	45		
WPF-4065	Edgewood, Town of	Santa Fe	Water reclamation facility-Effluent Disposal system	Design and Construction		\$1,164,167	3	33	5	41		
WPF-4043	Los Alamos County*	Los Alamos	Non-potable water system expansion design	Design		\$450,000	3	33	5	41		
WPF-4018	Los Alamos County*	Los Alamos	Bayo Booster station tank 2	Construction		\$675,000	3	33	5	41		

Water Trust Board  
Applications Reviewed for 2017 Application Cycle

App ID	Applicant	County	Project Name	Requested Scope	Amount Requested	Maximum Amount per Policy	Reviewer Scores				
WPF-4048	Otis MDW	Eddy	Radio read meters installation	Construction		\$115,000	2	25	0	27	
WPF-4057	Lea SWCD	Lea	Treatment and beneficial use of produced water	Plan, design and construction		\$990,000	0	15	5	20	
<b>12</b>	<b>Eligible and Complete Water Conservation or Treatment, Recycling or Reuse Projects</b>					<b>\$11,531,430</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>41.58</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>49.00</b>	<b>AVG 6 \$ 7,766,011</b>
Water Storage							NMFA Score (15)	NMED Score (80)	ISC Score (5)	TOTAL	Projects Recommended
WPF-4032	ENMWUA*	Curry	Eastern New Mexico rural water system	Design and construction	\$ 5,000,000	\$2,457,000	15	61	5	81	
WPF-4051	Santa Cruz WA	Santa Fe	Santa Cruz water improvement - Phase 2	Construction and Surveys		\$500,000	15	66	0	81	
WPF-4017	Ancones MDWWCA*	Rio Arriba	Ancones MDWWCA Water System Improvements	Construction		\$484,000	0	74	0	74	
WPF-4023	Canoncito at Apache Canyon MDWCA	Santa Fe	Canoncito water system improvements Phase II	Construction		\$2,040,000	0	68	5	73	
WPF-4015	Alcalde MDWC&MSWA	Rio Arriba	Alcalde MDWCA water system improvements	Construction		\$305,000	0	65	5	70	
WPF-4040	Lower Arroyo Hondo MDWCA	Taos	Lower Arroyo Hondo MDWCA water system improvements	Construction		\$783,793	10	54	5	69	
WPF-4064	Lower Rio Grande PWWA*	Dona Ana	Water Master plan	Planning		\$150,000	10	53	5	68	
WPF-4059	Valley Estates WSA*	Rio Arriba	Valley Estates water storage tank	Construction		\$175,000	15	53	0	68	
WPF-4053	Santa Rosa, City of	Guadalupe	SCADA and water dist. System phase I (design)	Design and surveys		\$287,600	15	43	5	63	
WPF-4030	Red River, Town of	Taos	Distribution system improvements phase 1 & 2	Design and construction		\$1,328,000	15	42	5	62	
WPF-4026	Portales, City of*	Roosevelt	City of Portales water storage system improvements	Construction	\$ 3,000,000	\$2,457,000	5	56	0	61	
WPF-4067	Elida, Town of	Roosevelt	Water transfer line replacement	Construction		\$725,872	1	53	5	59	
WPF-4012	Columbus, Village of	Luna	440,000-gallon storage reservoir	Design and surveys		\$150,000	15	43	0	58	
WPF-4045	North Star MDWCA	San Juan	North Star water distribution improvements	design		\$475,000	0	53	5	58	
WPF-4066	Truth or Consequences, City of	Sierra	Water system imp. Phase 1-Cook St. treatment	Design and construction		\$1,490,000	3	50	5	58	
WPF-4063	Cimarron, Village of	Colfax	Water filter treatment plant	Design		\$400,000	0	57	0	57	
WPF-4062	Eagle Nest, Village of	Colfax	Water distribution system improvements-phase III	Design and construction		\$700,000	15	36	5	56	

Water Trust Board  
Applications Reviewed for 2017 Application Cycle

App ID	Applicant	County	Project Name	Requested Scope	Amount Requested	Maximum Amount per Policy	Reviewer Scores				
WPF-4019	Santa Fe, City of*	Santa Fe	BDD water treatment facility, 4MG storage tank	Construction		\$895,843	9	42	5	56	
WPF-4034	El Creston MDWCA*	San Miguel	El Creston MDWCA Distribution phase 2	Design and construction		\$701,895	0	55	0	55	<b>19 \$16,506,003</b>
WPF-4020	Buena Vista MDWCA	Mora	Buena Vista MDWCA water system improvements	Design and construction		\$499,249	15	33	5	53	
WPF-4070	Jal, City of	Lea	Westfield wells and transmission pipelines	Construction		\$900,000	0	48	5	53	
WPF-4069	Los Lunas, Village of	Valencia	Well No. 7	Plan & design		\$342,000	4	46	0	50	
WPF-4068	Tijeras, Village of*	Bernalillo	Well No. 3	Plan, design and construction		\$1,300,000	0	41	5	46	
WPF-4055	Eldorado Area WSD	Santa Fe	Torreon BPS-tank 4 water transmission line	Design		\$183,504	8	33	5	46	
WPF-4025	Chapelle MDWCA	San Miguel	Chapelle MDWCA water system improvements	Design		\$94,500	15	29	0	44	
WPF-4039	La Cueva MDWCA	San Miguel	La Cueva MDWCA water system improvements	Design and construction		\$743,576	5	38	0	43	
WPF-4047	Eldorado Area WSD	Santa Fe	Pressure Zone optimization	Design and construction		\$526,276	4	33	5	42	
WPF-4049	Rowe MDWCA*	San Miguel	Rowe MDWCA water system improvements project	Construction		\$499,999	0	41	0	41	
WPF-4029	Eldorado Area WSD	Santa Fe	Distribution pipeline replacement	Design and construction		\$841,608	4	33	0	37	
WPF-4035	EMWT Regional Water Association	Torrance	EMWT McIntosh system design	Design		\$450,000	4	32	0	36	
WPF-4044	Bernalillo County	Bernalillo	North Edith utility improvements	Design and construction	\$ 2,550,086	\$2,457,000	0	36	0	36	
WPF-4060	Angel Fire, Village of	Colfax	Village of Angel Fire water tank rehabilitation	Construction		\$1,732,625	2	29	0	31	
<b>32</b>	<b>Eligible and Complete Water Storage, Conveyance and Delivery Projects</b>					<b>\$27,076,340</b>	<b>6.38</b>	<b>46.75</b>	<b>2.66</b>	<b>55.78</b>	<b>AVG 19 \$ 16,506,003</b>

**Water Trust Board  
Applications Reviewed for 2017 Application Cycle**

App ID	Applicant	County	Project Name	Requested Scope	Amount Requested	Maximum Amount per Policy	Reviewer Scores						
Watershed Restoration and Management Projects							NMFA Score (15)	ALL AVG Score (80)	ISC Score (5)	TOTAL	Projects Recommended		
WPF-4021	East Rio Arriba SWCD	Rio Arriba	Building resiliency in the Rio Chama watershed	Construction and Surveys		\$1,000,000	6	64	5	75			
WPF-4036	Claunch Pinto SWCD (Estancia)*	Torrance	Estancia Basin Watershed health restoration and monitoring	Design, surveying, construction		\$600,000	15	50.5	5	70.5			
WPF-4037	Claunch Pinto SWCD*	Torrance	Greater Rio Grande watershed alliance	Design, surveying, construction		\$600,000	15	43.75	5	63.75			
WPF-4022	Canadian River SWCD*	Quay	Canadian River Riparian Restoration Project	Design, surveying, construction		\$600,000	15	36	5	56			
WPF-4058	Ute Creek SWCD*	Harding	Ute Creek watershed restoration project	Construction and Surveys		\$400,000	15	31.75	0	46.75	5	\$3,200,000	
5	Eligible and Complete Watershed Restoration and Management Projects					\$3,200,000	13.20	45.20	4.00	62.40	AVG	3	\$ 2,200,000

Policy Targets	Category	Total adjusted			Projects Scoring Above Average		Projects Recommended for Legislative Authorization		% of Rec- Recommended v. Expected Availability		
		Total Requests	Request	Total apps			As Requested	ommended	v. Expected		
Up to 10%	Flood Prevention	\$ 11,417,485	\$ 7,942,563	7	\$5,506,000	4	\$ 1,799,000	2	20%	6%	11%
15% - 30%	Water Conservation	\$ 13,163,220	\$ 11,531,430	12	\$7,766,011	6	\$7,766,011	6	23%	27%	47%
50% - 75%	Water Storage	\$ 30,255,426	\$ 27,076,340	32	\$16,506,003	19	\$ 16,506,003	19	52%	56%	101%
10% to 20%	Watershed	\$ 3,200,000	\$ 3,200,000	5	\$ 2,200,000	3	\$ 3,200,000	5	6%	11%	20%
	TOTAL	\$ 58,036,131	\$ 49,750,333	56	\$31,978,014	32	\$ 29,271,014	32	100%	100%	179%

\*Identified as project with anticipated spend-down issues

Six applications requested more than the expected maximum per project. Application request adjusted accordingly for a total net difference of \$8,285,798

Expected STB	\$ 14,200,000
WTF Distribution	\$ 4,000,000
Total	\$ 18,200,000
Less Adjudication	\$ (1,820,000)
Expected 2017 Funds	\$ 16,380,000
Estimated Maximum per Project	\$ 2,457,000