

Central Sub-Area Workshop #2 segment scoring results

5/5/2014

Individual segment scoring – summary results

Workshop participants were asked to individually assign scores to segments D through K2 for each evaluation factor identified in Workshop #1, on a scale of 1 to 5 (where “1” does not meet the factor at all and “5” best meets the factor). The table below displays the average from all scores assigned by individual participants in this exercise.

Key: White = 1.0-1.99; light blue = 2.0-2.99; medium blue = 3.0-3.99; dark blue = 4.0-4.99

Evaluation factor	Segment D	Segment E	Segment F	Segment G1	Segment G2	Segment H	Segment I	Segment J	Segment K1	Segment K2
1. Least proximity to residential areas	2.94	2.00	2.60	2.56	2.90	2.35	2.69	1.23	2.29	2.38
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	2.38	2.51	2.55	2.33	2.33	2.39	2.97	1.84	2.42	2.48
3. Most protective of health and safety	2.76	1.63	2.73	2.53	2.61	2.64	2.89	1.28	2.58	2.62
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	2.14	2.45	2.50	2.27	2.54	2.80	2.55	1.41	2.20	2.14
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	2.76	2.00	2.50	2.41	2.35	2.17	2.77	1.62	2.22	2.18
6. Least effect on aesthetics	2.37	2.28	2.58	2.66	2.71	2.59	2.63	1.25	2.53	2.56

Individual segment scoring – detailed results

To indicate how average scores were calculated, the tables below show the number of times individuals assigned a particular score (on a scale of 1 to 5, where “1” does not meet the factor at all and “5” best meets the factor) to each evaluation factor by segment. Average scores for evaluation factors were calculated by dividing the total points assigned by the total number of scores individuals provided.

Note: Some individuals did not assign a score to certain segments or evaluation factors within a segment, therefore the number of times each evaluation factor was scored varies.

Segment D – Individual

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	21	2	6	3	19	150/51 = 2.94
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	26	2	6	9	7	119/50 = 2.38
3. Most protective of health and safety	22	3	3	9	13	138/50 = 2.76
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	27	5	8	1	8	105/49 = 2.14
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	22	2	5	6	14	135/49 = 2.76
6. Least effect on aesthetics	26	1	9	4	9	116/49 = 2.37

Segment E – Individual

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	27	8	11	2	4	104/52 = 2.00
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	23	5	7	1	13	123/49 = 2.51
3. Most protective of health and safety	35	6	3	1	4	80/49 = 1.63
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	25	4	4	10	8	125/51 = 2.45
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	26	9	8	3	4	100/50 = 2.00
6. Least effect on aesthetics	27	3	8	3	9	114/50 = 2.28

Segment F – Individual

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	25	3	2	12	10	135/52 = 2.60
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	21	2	13	9	6	130/51 = 2.55
3. Most protective of health and safety	22	2	7	8	12	139/51 = 2.73
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	21	8	8	6	9	130/52 = 2.50
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	20	6	11	5	8	125/50 = 2.50
6. Least effect on aesthetics	21	4	10	5	10	129/50 = 2.58

Segment G1 – Individual

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	25	2	7	2	14	128/50 = 2.56
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	24	4	6	8	6	112/48 = 2.33
3. Most protective of health and safety	23	2	5	8	9	119/47 = 2.53
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	23	8	7	4	7	111/49 = 2.27
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	23	3	11	4	8	118/49 = 2.41
6. Least effect on aesthetics	22	3	5	3	14	125/47 = 2.66

Segment G2 – Individual

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	24	1	3	2	21	148/51 = 2.90
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	24	4	8	7	6	114/49 = 2.33
3. Most protective of health and safety	24	1	5	8	11	128/49 = 2.61
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	22	2	9	6	9	122/48 = 2.54
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	24	2	9	10	4	115/49 = 2.35
6. Least effect on aesthetics	23	3	4	3	16	133/49 = 2.71

Segment H – Individual

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	25	5	11	6	7	127/54 = 2.35
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	28	5	6	2	13	129/54 = 2.39
3. Most protective of health and safety	21	5	9	8	10	140/53 = 2.64
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	20	6	8	7	14	154/55 = 2.80
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	24	12	8	5	5	117/54 = 2.17
6. Least effect on aesthetics	22	5	10	7	10	140/54 = 2.59

Segment I – Individual

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	27	3	10	13	12	175/65 = 2.69
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	27	1	7	3	25	187/63 = 2.97
3. Most protective of health and safety	25	2	9	11	17	185/64 = 2.89
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	25	10	11	7	12	166/65 = 2.55
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	26	3	10	12	14	180/65 = 2.77
6. Least effect on aesthetics	27	6	10	8	14	171/65 = 2.63

Segment J – Individual

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	58	3	0	0	3	79/64 = 1.23
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	40	6	10	1	6	116/63 = 1.84
3. Most protective of health and safety	51	4	3	1	1	77/60 = 1.28
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	55	1	3	1	4	90/64 = 1.41
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	47	5	2	6	3	102/63 = 1.62
6. Least effect on aesthetics	57	2	3	0	2	80/64 = 1.25

Segment K1 – Individual

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	24	4	10	10	3	117/51 = 2.29
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	25	4	5	7	9	121/50 = 2.42
3. Most protective of health and safety	23	3	5	10	9	129/50 = 2.58
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	23	7	11	5	4	110/50 = 2.20
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	25	4	11	8	3	113/51 = 2.22
6. Least effect on aesthetics	23	3	6	8	9	124/49 = 2.53

Segment K2 – Individual

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	22	4	11	9	4	119/50 = 2.38
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	24	4	5	8	9	124/50 = 2.48
3. Most protective of health and safety	22	4	5	9	10	131/50 = 2.62
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	24	6	11	7	2	107/50 = 2.14
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	23	8	9	7	3	109/50 = 2.18
6. Least effect on aesthetics	23	4	5	8	10	128/50 = 2.56

Table group segment scoring – summary results

Workshop participants were asked to repeat the same scoring exercise in table discussion groups. The table below displays the average scores resulting from the group worksheets.

Evaluation factor	Segment D	Segment E	Segment F	Segment G1	Segment G2	Segment H	Segment I	Segment J	Segment K1	Segment K2
1. Least proximity to residential areas	2.70	2.10	2.40	2.10	2.70	1.82	2.63	1.08	2.36	2.73
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	2.20	2.40	2.20	2.30	2.50	2.09	3.17	2.00	2.45	2.82
3. Most protective of health and safety	2.60	2.00	2.40	2.50	2.70	2.18	2.83	1.58	2.64	2.73
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	1.80	2.50	2.35	2.50	2.45	2.27	2.46	1.75	2.45	2.41
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	2.50	2.10	2.30	2.50	2.30	1.73	3.04	1.83	2.09	2.45
6. Least effect on aesthetics	2.30	2.40	2.30	2.70	2.65	2.14	2.79	1.38	2.82	2.55

Table group segment scoring – detailed results

To indicate how average scores were calculated, the following tables show the number of times table groups assigned a particular score (on a scale of 1 to 5, where “1” does not meet the factor at all and “5” best meets the factor) to each evaluation factor by segment. Average scores for evaluation factors were calculated by dividing the total points assigned by the total number of scores individuals provided.

Note: Some individuals did not assign a score to certain segments or evaluation factors within a segment, therefore the number of times each evaluation factor was scored varies. Additionally, some individuals assigned scores with decimals (e.g. 2.5); these scores are captured as such within the total scores and included in average calculations, though are tallied with the nearest whole number score.

Segment D – Group

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	5	0	1	1	3	27/10 = 2.70
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	6	0	1	2	1	22/10 = 2.20
3. Most protective of health and safety	5	0	1	2	2	26/10 = 2.60
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	7	0	1	2	0	18/10 = 1.80
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	5	1	0	2	2	25/10 = 2.50
6. Least effect on aesthetics	6	0	0	3	1	23/10 = 2.30

Segment E – Group

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	6	1	0	2	1	21/10 = 2.10
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	5	1	1	1	2	24/10 = 2.40
3. Most protective of health and safety	5	2	1	2	0	20/10 = 2.00
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	5	0	1	3	1	25/10 = 2.50
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	5	1	3	0	1	21/10 = 2.10
6. Least effect on aesthetics	5	0	2	2	1	24/10 = 2.40

Segment F – Group

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	5	1	1	1	2	24/10 = 2.40
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	6	0	1	2	1	22/10 = 2.20
3. Most protective of health and safety	5	1	1	1	2	24/10 = 2.40
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	5	1	1	2	1	23.5/10 = 2.35
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	5	1	0	4	0	23/10 = 2.30
6. Least effect on aesthetics	6	0	1	1	2	23/10 = 2.30

Segment G1 – Group

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	6	1	0	2	1	21/10 = 2.10
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	5	1	0	4	0	23/10 = 2.30
3. Most protective of health and safety	5	0	1	3	1	25/10 = 2.50
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	5	0	1	3	1	25/10 = 2.50
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	5	0	1	3	1	25/10 = 2.50
6. Least effect on aesthetics	5	0	1	1	3	27/10 = 2.70

Segment G2 – Group

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	5	0	0	3	2	27/10 = 2.70
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	5	1	0	2	2	25/10 = 2.50
3. Most protective of health and safety	5	0	0	3	2	27/10 = 2.70
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	5	0	3	0	2	24.5/10 = 2.45
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	5	1	2	0	2	23/10 = 2.30
6. Least effect on aesthetics	5	0	2	0	3	26.5/10 = 2.65

Segment H – Group

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	7	0	3	1	0	20/11 = 1.82
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	6	1	2	1	1	23/11 = 2.09
3. Most protective of health and safety	5	2	1	3	0	24/11 = 2.18
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	5	2	1	2	1	25/11 = 2.27
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	7	1	2	1	0	19/11 = 1.73
6. Least effect on aesthetics	6	2	1	0	2	23.5/11 = 2.14

Segment I – Group

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	5	1	2	2	2	31.5/11 = 2.63
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	5	0	0	2	5	38/12 = 3.17
3. Most protective of health and safety	5	0	1	4	2	34/12 = 2.83
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	5	2	1	3	1	29.5/11 = 2.46
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	5	0	1	2	4	36.5/11 = 3.04
6. Least effect on aesthetics	5	0	2	3	2	33.5/11 = 2.79

Segment J – Group

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	11	1	0	0	0	13/12 = 1.08
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	6	4	0	0	2	24/12 = 2.00
3. Most protective of health and safety	8	2	1	1	0	19/12 = 1.58
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	8	1	1	2	0	21/12 = 1.75
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	8	1	0	3	0	22/12 = 1.83
6. Least effect on aesthetics	10	0	2	0	0	16.5/12 = 1.38

Segment K1 – Group

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	5	2	1	1	2	26/11 = 2.36
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	5	2	0	2	2	27/11 = 2.45
3. Most protective of health and safety	5	0	2	2	2	29/11 = 2.64
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	5	0	3	2	1	27/11 = 2.45
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	5	2	3	0	1	23/11 = 2.09
6. Least effect on aesthetics	5	0	2	0	4	31/11 = 2.82

Segment K2 – Group

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to residential areas	5	0	1	3	2	30/11 = 2.73
2. Maximizes opportunity areas	5	0	0	4	2	31/11 = 2.82
3. Most protective of health and safety	5	0	0	5	1	30/11 = 2.73
4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	5	0	4	1	1	26.5/11 = 2.41
5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	5	1	1	3	1	27/11 = 2.45
6. Least effect on aesthetics	5	0	3	1	2	28/11 = 2.55