



# APPENDIX B

# Sustainability Evaluation System Summary

## Button Rock Management Plan Initial Planning Meeting

March 8, 2019



The City of Longmont’s Sustainability Evaluation System (SES) is designated in the City’s Sustainability Plan as the tool for reviewing the sustainability aspects of projects, plans, and programs. An evaluation of the **Button Rock Management Plan** using the SES was completed on December 21, 2018 by a review team made up of representatives of Public Works & Natural Resources (Natural Resources/Open Space, Water Resources) and one of the consultants for the plan (DHM Design).

The SES has two modules. **Module 1** is used to review sustainability categories and topics to determine which topics are applicable to the project, plan or program under consideration, identify where there are gaps or where improvements that can be made and document any relevant comments or observations resulting from the review. **Module 2** is used to rate alternatives based on the applicable topics in Module 1. The categories and topics are aligned with and support the goals and policies in the Sustainability Plan, as well as the Envision Longmont Multimodal and Comprehensive Plan. The sustainability categories in the SES are:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Best Practices (Organizational)</b>            | <b>Community and Individual Well-being</b> |
| <b>Best Practices (Assets and Infrastructure)</b> | <b>Economic Vitality</b>                   |
| <b>Best Practices (Financial)</b>                 | <b>Materials and Waste</b>                 |
| <b>Buildings and Infrastructure</b>               | <b>Natural Environment</b>                 |
| <b>Energy</b>                                     | <b>Water Resources</b>                     |
| <b>Transportation</b>                             | <b>Water Quality</b>                       |

Each of the above categories contains related sustainability topics to help guide the discussion and evaluation of the project being reviewed. The topics are listed in the summary table, below. A copy of the SES review that shows all the categories and topics is also attached.

The **Button Rock Management Plan** is a guidance document that may include proposals for land management techniques or specific projects. As such, Module 1 of the SES is appropriate for the review of this plan. This SES review was done at the initial stage of the plan to help identify the sustainability topics that apply to and should be included or discussed in the plan. The review also documents comments from the review team. The SES review produces a numerical rating for each category normalized to a range of 1 to 5 (low to high), based on the number of applicable topics in each category. The rating is not an indication of the degree to which the topics in each category are being met. A lower rating for a category does not mean that it is unimportant, just that fewer topics in that category were found to be relevant to the project. If a topic was determined to be “not applicable” or “unknown” by the review team, the reasons were documented in the SES. Comments and observations from the review team for some topics deemed to be “applicable” were also recorded in the SES to explain or provide context for how the topics were viewed by the team.

The following table lists the sustainability categories in the SES, a list or brief description of the topics in the categories, a summary of the comments and observations from the review and recommendations from the review team for each category.

SES Category/ [Applicability Rating]	Topics	Comments/Observations
<b>Best Practices (Organizational)</b> [5.0; all 5 topics applicable]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment with other plans</li> <li>• Integration with other plans or projects</li> <li>• Partnerships</li> <li>• Stakeholder engagement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This plan is aligned with City and department policies and existing land management plans</li> <li>• A technical advisory committee is being formed that will include various stakeholders; see partnerships below</li> <li>• Possible partnerships include adjacent landowners, Boulder County, US Forest Service, Colorado State Forest Service, Colorado Parks &amp; Wildlife, Trout Unlimited</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan should include a description of the public and stakeholder engagement processes and how feedback from stakeholders will be considered</li> </ul>		
<b>Best Practices (Assets and Infrastructure)</b> [5.0; all 6 topics applicable]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adaptability</li> <li>• Commissioning</li> <li>• Monitoring and evaluation</li> <li>• Long-term maintenance and repair (asset management)</li> <li>• Reliability</li> <li>• Resilience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan will reflect changes in needs and the effects of increasing community population. GIS will be updated to reflect changing conditions</li> <li>• Initial verification of water-related infrastructure, and usage-related infrastructure (cameras, trail counters)</li> <li>• Confirm the ecological characteristics identified by and monitor impacts on the ecological characteristics identified by the Natural Heritage Program; continue or expand ongoing water quality monitoring</li> <li>• Maintenance and repair needs are an ongoing process; assessment of resource needs, compare to other facilities</li> <li>• Reliability of water sources, resilience of infrastructure</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insure that findings and recommendations of Natural Heritage Program assessments are incorporated into the plan, along with recommended methods for monitoring impacts on the ecology of the area</li> <li>• The plan should include some evaluation and estimate of ongoing resource needs for maintenance and repair</li> <li>• The plan should emphasize the requirement to have a reliable and resilient source of drinking water</li> <li>• The plan should include an initial assessment and verification of infrastructure related to water management and that related to usage (cameras, trail counters, etc.) and recommend any changes that would improve management of the preserve</li> </ul>		
<b>Best Practices (Financial)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Debt ratios</li> <li>• Capital cost funding</li> <li>• O&amp;M cost recovery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any debt incurred by implementation of the plan is unknown at this time; costs will depend on any projects identified as a result of the plan</li> </ul>



SES Category/ [Applicability Rating]	Topics	Comments/Observations
[3.8; 3 out of 4 topics applicable]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rate impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question about any general fund component that is applicable to capital and O&amp;M</li> <li>• O&amp;M budget and asset management are concerns. PW&amp;NR Operations also has a reservoir management budget in addition to specific Button Rock budget items</li> <li>• There could be rate impacts resulting from wildlife management recommendations in the plan</li> <li>• Discuss user fees, permits, resident vs non-resident fees, etc. Consider how to help low income populations</li> </ul>
<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan needs to address capital funding and replacement costs taking into account life cycle considerations</li> <li>• The plans should include an evaluation of the budget needs of O&amp;M/asset management, taking into account existing funding from other areas</li> <li>• The plan should include a discussion of cost-based management approaches, such as user fees (resident/non-resident), permits, etc. and also address minimizing those impacts on low income populations</li> </ul>		
<b>Buildings and Infrastructure</b> [3.3; 11 out of 15 topics applicable]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessibility</li> <li>• Light &amp; noise</li> <li>• Cultural/historic preservation</li> <li>• Development footprint</li> <li>• Floodplain protection</li> <li>• Heat island effect</li> <li>• Housing options</li> <li>• Indoor air quality</li> <li>• Infill or redevelopment</li> <li>• Public spaces</li> <li>• Low impact development</li> <li>• Public spaces</li> <li>• Scale and massing</li> <li>• Site compatibility</li> <li>• Vegetation</li> <li>• Wayfinding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessibility issues include WQ sampling locations, public access and use, ADA</li> <li>• Light and noise could be related to hours of operation for maintenance activities in area by various parties (USFS, etc.)</li> <li>• Housing options, infill/redevelopment, indoor air quality not applicable to this property or plan</li> <li>• Interpretive signs for historic conditions, archaeological findings, adjacent properties</li> <li>• LID could be used in updates to infrastructure, trails, etc.</li> <li>• There could be restrictions on whatever development might occur (such as connections to adjacent properties via trails, etc. based on wildlife and other considerations</li> <li>• Post flood facilities have been completed. Future facility needs unknown</li> <li>• Flood protection is enhanced by bank and stream restoration, forest management</li> <li>• Concerns about appropriate use of public amenities, special use requests</li> <li>• Non-urban location, but carrying capacity of park, parking lots, etc. could be affected by use &amp; development; effects on wildlife</li> </ul>



SES Category/ [Applicability Rating]	Topics	Comments/Observations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities and intentions for use of property, specifically water supply protection, access and parking</li> <li>• Vegetation :Monitoring, restoration, baseline conditions and inventory</li> <li>• Wayfinding issues - Staffing &amp; resource restrictions, providing alternative locations for passive recreation when conditions do not allow access to Button Rock; advance notice, trail reports</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan should discuss the type and availability of public information regarding access, trail reports, alternatives when the preserve is not open, etc.</li> <li>• Although the preserve is public property, the plan should clearly state the priorities and intentions for use, specifically water supply protection, and protection of the preserve through limitations on public access, including parking,</li> <li>• Carrying capacity restrictions should be noted with respect to effects on wildlife, impacts of development to accommodate parking and access</li> <li>• Any light and/or noise impacts from USFS or other operations should be assessed and any remedial activities or restrictions identified</li> <li>• The plan should outline the provisions for management of vegetation, including establishing an inventory and baseline conditions, monitoring of vegetation and any restoration procedures</li> </ul>	
<b>Energy [3.8; 3 out of 4 topics applicable]</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative fuels</li> <li>• Energy efficiency</li> <li>• Renewable and alternative energy</li> <li>• Embodied energy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible energy source from wood waste from forest thinning options, however energy used to transport materials might be high</li> <li>• Shuttle bus from parking lot is efficient use of energy</li> <li>• Could be solar or hydro potential</li> <li>• Energy from dog waste or wood chips</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan should evaluate if there are any energy savings related to minimizing transportation energy use or any possible alternative energy sources from materials (e.g. wood waste) that would reduce overall O&amp;M costs</li> </ul>	
<b>Transportation [5.0; 6 out of 6 topics applicable]</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bicycles and pedestrians</li> <li>• Freight delivery systems</li> <li>• Level of service</li> <li>• Parking</li> <li>• Transit</li> <li>• Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main issue is public access in general and conflicts between multiple uses (kayak, equestrian, etc.)</li> <li>• Public access needs cannot affect other priorities (water supply, watershed protection)</li> <li>• Freight or delivery concerns include removal of trees/timbers, sediment, deliveries to residents (LPG, construction activity, fish deliveries)</li> <li>• Resources limit level of service and management of parking, including possible use of shuttle buses</li> <li>• Increases in use of and access to preserve will increase VMT</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan should evaluate and recommend levels of access, parking, and other impacts associated with public use in light of the primary objectives of protecting water supply,</li> </ul>	



SES Category/ [Applicability Rating]	Topics	Comments/Observations
<p style="text-align: center;">maintaining the preserve for wildlife and allowing some level of public passive recreational use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resource needs to accommodate any changes to access or use (such as shuttle buses) need to be identified in the plan</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Community and Individual Well-being [3.5; 7 out of 10 topics applicable]</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Art and culture</li> <li>• Crime and law enforcement</li> <li>• Diversity and rights</li> <li>• Education</li> <li>• Environmental justice</li> <li>• Food and nutrition</li> <li>• Hazard mitigation</li> <li>• Health &amp; human services</li> <li>• Safety</li> <li>• Sense of community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is community culture supported by use of this preserve?</li> <li>• Use of property has crime &amp; regulatory implications</li> <li>• Access for different populations supports community diversity and rights</li> <li>• Opportunity to provide education about preserve features and primary use as water supply</li> <li>• Food topic not applicable because fishing is primarily a recreation program not a food supply; some takes from reservoir not creek</li> <li>• Hazards reduced by fire mitigation, hazards in preserve also related to good neighbor concerns, road conditions, deadfall trees &amp; rocks, resident vs. public road use</li> <li>• Health and human services issues not applicable to this plan</li> <li>• Safety features include signage, emergency evacuation provisions, access, fire roads</li> <li>• Environmental justice not applicable to this plan</li> <li>• Sense of community related to status as City-owned preserve, accessible to everyone, and also a major water source for Longmont</li> </ul>
<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan should discuss the relationship of the preserve and reservoir’s role as a major drinking water source and how that has supported the City’s development and status and sense of community</li> <li>• The plan should discuss the law enforcement and crime aspects of public access to the reservoir and recommend measures to limit these impacts</li> <li>• Maintenance of public access can be noted as supporting community equity and rights</li> <li>• The plan should address addition of educational features to inform the community about the primary uses and functions of the reservoir and preserve</li> <li>• The plan should identify and discuss hazards and hazard mitigation measures, including road access and maintenance, fire mitigation efforts, trees &amp; rocks, resident use of roads, etc. Safety features, both existing and proposed, should be included in the plan, including signage, emergency evacuation provisions, access roads, etc.</li> <li>• The plan should stress the positive aspects of managing and/or limiting the use of and access to the preserve, including hazard mitigation through forest thinning, protection of the water supply, minimization of erosion, maintaining and improving wildlife habitat and corridors by preserving natural flood plains</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Economic Vitality [2.0; 2 out of 5 topics applicable]</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business development*</li> <li>• Affordable housing*</li> <li>• Jobs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business development, affordable housing and economic resilience not related to this plan</li> <li>• The plan should identify potential for use of local materials and labor.</li> </ul>



SES Category/ [Applicability Rating]	Topics	Comments/Observations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local commodities and services</li> <li>Economic resilience*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More staff could be needed depending on decisions for use of preserve, which would add some local jobs</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan should include some language about supporting use of local services and supplies.</li> </ul>		
<b>Materials and Waste [5.0; 2 out of 3 topics applicable]</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deconstruction/reuse</li> <li>Use of environmentally responsible materials</li> <li>Waste management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forestry management &amp; use of associated waste materials</li> <li>Human and dog waste concerns</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan should identify any reuse potential for materials generated by forest management activities; more discussion about this can be in review committee meetings</li> <li>The plan should discuss the human and dog waste problems and recommend methods for dealing with them</li> </ul>		
<b>Natural Environment [5.0; 9 out of 9 topics]</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agricultural lands</li> <li>Air quality</li> <li>Aquatic habitat</li> <li>Climate adaptation</li> <li>Ecological connectivity</li> <li>Natural floodplains</li> <li>Greenhouse gas emissions</li> <li>Tree canopy</li> <li>Wildlife and habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All topics in this category are applicable to this management plan</li> <li>Some grazing use in watershed on private and County land</li> <li>Reducing traffic/access improves air quality and reduces GHGs</li> <li>Aquatic habitat is protected by limiting pollutant impacts in preserve and downstream</li> <li>Forest health is a major focus of plan</li> <li>Ecological connectivity supported by USFS, Boulder County, state forest</li> <li>Management of tree canopy in preserve improves forest health and water quality and reduces fire danger</li> <li>Wildlife and habitat considerations include Identification of critical areas and minimizing use/development to insure connectivity, corridors, ecological; appropriate vegetation to promote diversity</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan needs to emphasize and discuss all of the environmentally-related reasons for managing the reservoir and preserve, focusing on forest health and the priorities for protecting wildlife, habitat and water quality (for both aquatic habitat and water supply)</li> </ul>		
<b>Water Resources [2.5; 2 out of 4 topics applicable]</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water efficiency (irrigation, conservation)*</li> <li>Water source protection</li> <li>Water resource management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water source protection is a major focus of and reason for plan</li> <li>Could be staffing issues related to management of supplies, releases and downstream stream flow</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As noted in other categories, the plan needs to strongly emphasize that protection of Longmont's water supply is a major focus of the plan and a primary reason for any recommendations in the plan</li> <li>The plan should identify any resource/staffing needs associated with new or expanded activities related to water management</li> </ul>		

SES Category/ [Applicability Rating]	Topics	Comments/Observations
Water Quality [5.0; 3 out of 3 topics]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Watershed health</li> <li>• Pollution control</li> <li>• Stormwater management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major influence on water supply, uses of watershed can affect health</li> <li>• Dog waste , ash, herbicides (IPM),</li> <li>• Erosion control, fire concerns; managing forest health can help control erosion</li> </ul>
<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan should emphasize the relationship between watershed health and water quality and how management of the reservoir and preserve can protect the environment and the safety of Longmont’s drinking water supply by controlling or eliminating pollutant sources and preventing erosion</li> </ul>		





# Button Rock Management Plan Sustainability Evaluation March 8, 2019



Category	Discuss and determine the applicability of the following topics to the project, plan or program.	Response	Evaluation Notes & Other Details	Comments
<b>Best Practices</b> <i>Organizational</i>	<b>Alignment</b>	Yes		
	<b>Integration</b>	Yes		Technical advisory committee of various stakeholders
	<b>Partnerships</b>	Yes		Adjacent landowners, County, USFS, CSFS, CPW, TU (members of TAC)
	<b>Stakeholder engagement</b>	Yes		Description of public process and engagement
<b>Best Practices</b> <i>Assets and Infrastructure</i>	<b>Adaptability</b>	Yes		Reflect changes in needs, community population increases, GIS will be updated to reflect changing condition
	<b>Commissioning</b>	Yes		Water-related infrastructure, also usage-related infrastructure (cameras, trail counters)
	<b>Ongoing monitoring &amp; evaluation</b>	Yes		Confirm and monitor impacts on Natural Heritage Society , ongoing water quality monitoring
	<b>Long-term maintenance and repair</b>	Yes		Maintenance and repair needs are an ongoing process; assessment of resource needs, compare to other facilities



	<b>Reliability</b>	Yes		Reliability of water sources,
	<b>Infrastructure Resilience</b>	Yes		
<b>Best Practices</b> <i>Financial</i>	<b>Debt ratios</b>	Not Applicable		Management plan, not applicable at this time
	<b>Funding of capital costs</b>	Yes	Question about if there is a general fund component that is applicable to capital and O&M	Plan needs to address capital funding, replacement costs/life cycle considerations
	<b>Operations &amp; Maintenance (O&amp;M) cost recovery</b>	Yes	O&M also has reservoir management budget in addition to specific Button Rock budget items	O&M budget considerations, asset management
	<b>Rate impacts</b>	Yes		Discuss user fees, permits, resident vs non-resident fees, etc. Consider how to help low income populations
<b>Buildings and Infrastructure</b>	<b>Accessibility</b>	Yes		WQ sampling locations, public access and use, ADA
	<b>Ambient light and noise</b>	Yes		Possible hours of operation for maintenance activities in area by various parties (USFS, etc.)
	<b>Cultural and historic preservation</b>	Yes		Interpretive signs for historic conditions, archaeological findings, adjacent properties

<b>Development footprint</b>	Unknown	Restrictions on development based on wildlife and other considerations ; connections to adjacent properties (trails, etc.	Post flood facilities have been completed. Future facility needs unknown
<b>Floodplain protection</b>	Yes		Bank and stream restoration, forest management
<b>Heat island effect</b>	Not Applicable		No effect
<b>Housing options</b>	Not Applicable		Not in control of city land use
<b>Indoor air quality</b>	Not Applicable		No identified impact
<b>Infill or redevelopment</b>	Not Applicable		not urban location
<b>Low impact development (LID)</b>	Yes		Updates to infrastructure, trails, etc.
<b>Public spaces</b>	Yes		Appropriate use of public amenities, special use requests
<b>Scale and massing</b>	Yes		Non urban location, but carrying capacity of park, parking lots, etc. could be affected by use & development; effects on wildlife
<b>Site compatibility</b>	Yes		Priority use and intentions for use of property, specifically water supply protection, access and parking

	<b>Vegetation</b>	Yes		Monitoring, restoration, baseline conditions and inventory
	<b>Wayfinding</b>	Yes	Staffing & resource restrictions	Providing alternative locations for passive recreation when conditions do not allow access to Button Rock; advance notice, trail reports
<b>Energy</b>	<b>Alternative fuels</b>	Not Applicable	Energy used to transport is a concern	Forest thinning options, possible use of wood waste
	<b>Energy use &amp; efficiency</b>	Yes		Shuttle bus from parking lot
	<b>Renewable energy</b>	Yes		Solar or hydro potential
	<b>Embodied energy</b>	Yes		Dog related energy use, mulch/wood chips
<b>Transportation</b>	<b>Bicyclists and pedestrians</b>	Yes	Main issue is public access in general and conflicts between multiple uses (kayak, equestrian, etc.)	Public access needs cannot affect other priorities (water supply, watershed protection)
	<b>Freight delivery systems</b>	Yes		Freight or delivery concerns include removal of trees/timbers, sediment, deliveries to residents (LPG, construction activity, fish deliveries)
	<b>Level of service</b>	Yes		Resource needs
	<b>Parking</b>	Yes		Availability, resource needs to manage, shuttle bus



	<b>Transit</b>	Yes		
	<b>Vehicle miles traveled (VMT)</b>	Yes		Increase in use =increased VMT
<b>Community and Individual Well-being</b>	<b>Arts and culture</b>	Yes		Is community culture supported by use of this preserve?
	<b>Crime and law enforcement</b>	Yes		Use of property has crime & regulatory implications
	<b>Diversity and rights</b>	Yes		Access for different populations
	<b>Education</b>	Yes		Education about preserve features and primary use as water supply
	<b>Environmental justice</b>	Not Applicable		No effect
	<b>Food and nutrition</b>	Not Applicable		Fishing is primarily a recreation program; some takes from reservoir not creek
	<b>Hazard mitigation</b>	Yes		Fire mitigation, good neighbor concerns, road conditions, deadfall trees & rocks, resident vs. public road use
	<b>Health and human services</b>	Not Applicable		N/A
	<b>Safety features</b>	Yes		Signage, emergency evacuation, access, fire roads



	<b>Sense of community</b>	Yes		City-owned preserve, accessible to everyone, major water source
<b>Economic Vitality</b>	<b>Business development</b>	Not Applicable		No effect
	<b>Affordable housing</b>	Not Applicable		Does not apply to this plan
	<b>Jobs</b>	Yes		Could need more staff depending on ultimate use decisions
	<b>Local commodities and services</b>	Yes		Statement in plan re use of local services and supplies
	<b>Economic resilience</b>	Not Applicable		Not for this plan
<b>Materials and Waste</b>	<b>Deconstruction/Reuse</b>	Unknown	Forestry management & use of materials	Discuss in technical committee review meeting
	<b>Environmentally responsible materials</b>	Yes		
	<b>Waste</b>	Yes		Dog & human waste, trash, trees
<b>Natural Environment</b>	<b>Agricultural lands</b>	Yes		Some grazing use in watershed on private and County land
	<b>Air quality</b>	Yes		Reducing traffic



	<b>Aquatic habitat</b>	Yes		Protection from pollutant impacts in preserve and downstream
	<b>Climate adaptation</b>	Yes	Healthy forest is key	Forest health is major focus
	<b>Ecological connectivity</b>	Yes		USFS, Boulder County, state forest connections for wildlife etc.
	<b>Natural floodplains</b>	Yes		Forest health is major focus
	<b>Greenhouse gas emissions (GHG)</b>	Yes		Forest health is major focus
	<b>Tree canopy</b>	Yes		In context of forest health and water quality, fire danger
	<b>Wildlife and habitat</b>	Yes		Identification of critical areas and minimizing use/development to insure connectivity, corridors, ecological services; appropriate vegetation to promote diversity
<b>Water Resources</b>	<b>Irrigation efficiency</b>	Not Applicable		No irrigation impacts
	<b>Water conservation</b>	Not Applicable		No irrigation impacts
	<b>Water source protection</b>	Yes		Major focus of management plan!!!!
	<b>Water management</b>	Yes		Could be staffing issues related to management of supplies, releases and downstream stream flow

<b>Water Quality</b>	<b>Watershed health</b>	Yes		Major influence on water supply, uses of watershed can affect health
	<b>Pollution control</b>	Yes		Dog waste , ash, herbicides (IPM),
	<b>Stormwater management</b>	Yes	Forest health and management can help control erosion	Erosion control, fire concerns



## Button Rock Management Plan SES Evaluation Summary

	Raw Score
<b>Best Practices - Organizational</b>	5.0
<b>Best Practices - Assets and Infrastructure</b>	5.0
<b>Best Practices - Financial</b>	3.8
<b>Buildings and Infrastructure</b>	3.3
<b>Energy</b>	3.8
<b>Transportation</b>	5.0
<b>Community and Individual Well-being</b>	3.5
<b>Economic Vitality</b>	2.0
<b>Materials and Waste</b>	3.3
<b>Natural Environment</b>	5.0
<b>Water Resources</b>	2.5
<b>Water Quality</b>	5.0
<b>Total (Out of 5)</b>	<b>3.9</b>

