

North Sub-Area Workshop #2 Segment Scoring Results

5/2/2014

Individual segment scoring – summary results

Workshop participants were asked to individually assign scores to segments A through D 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 A	Segment B	Segment C	Segment D
1. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	4.57	2.33	3.03	2.83
2. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	3.18	2.13	3.02	3.22
3. Least proximity to residential areas	4.05	2.17	2.70	3.42
4. Least proximity to mature vegetation	4.36	2.20	2.67	3.42
5. Maximizes opportunity areas	4.43	2.67	3.73	2.54
6. Most protective of health and safety	3.91	3.32	2.48	3.26
7. Least effect on aesthetics	4.16	2.25	3.07	3.14

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. 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 A – Individual

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	1	0	2	2	18	105/23 = 4.57
2. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	3	5	4	5	5	70/22 = 3.18
3. Least proximity to residential areas	1	2	2	7	10	89/22 = 4.05
4. Least proximity to mature vegetation	1	0	2	6	13	96/22 = 4.36
5. Maximizes opportunity areas	1	1	0	6	15	102/23 = 4.43
6. Most protective of health and safety	1	2	5	4	10	86/22 = 3.91
7. Least effect on aesthetics	1	0	4	4	10	79/19 = 4.16

Segment B – Individual

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	12	8	1	6	3	70/30 = 2.33
2. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	11	11	1	2	3	59.5/28 = 2.13
3. Least proximity to residential areas	12	7	7	2	2	65/30 = 2.17
4. Least proximity to mature vegetation	13	8	3	2	4	66/30 = 2.20
5. Maximizes opportunity areas	6	12	3	4	5	80/30 = 2.67
6. Most protective of health and safety	2	9	5	2	10	93/28 = 3.32
7. Least effect on aesthetics	12	5	6	2	3	63/28 = 2.25

Segment C – Individual

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	7	1	11	6	5	91/30 = 3.03
2. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	6	3	5	15	0	87.5/29 = 3.02
3. Least proximity to residential areas	9	3	11	2	5	81/30 = 2.70
4. Least proximity to mature vegetation	6	5	13	5	1	80/30 = 2.67
5. Maximizes opportunity areas	5	2	3	6	14	112/30 = 3.73
6. Most protective of health and safety	10	4	9	3	3	72/29 = 2.48
7. Least effect on aesthetics	10	0	4	6	8	86/28 = 3.07

Segment D – Individual

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	2	10	4	6	2	68/24 = 2.83
2. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	1	6	5	9	2	74/23 = 3.22
3. Least proximity to residential areas	2	2	9	6	5	82/24 = 3.42
4. Least proximity to mature vegetation	1	2	10	8	3	82/24 = 3.42
5. Maximizes opportunity areas	5	7	8	2	2	61/24 = 2.54
6. Most protective of health and safety	1	6	7	4	5	75/23 = 3.26
7. Least effect on aesthetics	2	4	8	3	4	66/21 = 3.14

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 A	Segment B	Segment C	Segment D
1. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	4.80	1.97	2.83	2.57
2. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	3.00	1.50	3.00	3.53
3. Least proximity to residential areas	4.20	2.17	2.67	3.93
4. Least proximity to mature vegetation	4.37	1.73	3.00	3.47
5. Maximizes opportunity areas	4.53	2.60	3.50	2.47
6. Most protective of health and safety	3.50	3.27	2.50	3.43
7. Least effect on aesthetics	4.48	2.03	3.17	3.37

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 A – Group

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	0	0	0	2	4	28.8/6 = 4.80
2. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	0	2	3	0	1	18/6 = 3.00
3. Least proximity to residential areas	0	0	1	3	2	25.2/6 = 4.20
4. Least proximity to mature vegetation	0	0	0	4	2	26.2/6 = 4.37
5. Maximizes opportunity areas	0	0	1	1	4	27.2/6 = 4.53
6. Most protective of health and safety	0	0	4	1	1	21/6 = 3.50
7. Least effect on aesthetics	0	0	0	3	2	22.4/5 = 4.48

Segment B – Group

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	3	1	1	1	0	11.8/6 = 1.97
2. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	3	3	0	0	0	9/6 = 1.50
3. Least proximity to residential areas	3	1	1	0	1	13/6 = 2.17
4. Least proximity to mature vegetation	3	2	1	0	0	10.4/6 = 1.73
5. Maximizes opportunity areas	0	3	2	1	0	15.6/6 = 2.60
6. Most protective of health and safety	0	2	1	2	1	19.6/6 = 3.27
7. Least effect on aesthetics	3	0	3	0	0	12.2/6 = 2.03

Segment C – Group

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	2	0	2	1	1	17/6 = 2.83
2. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	1	1	1	3	0	18/6 = 3.00
3. Least proximity to residential areas	2	0	3	0	1	16/6 = 2.67
4. Least proximity to mature vegetation	1	0	3	2	0	18/6 = 3.00
5. Maximizes opportunity areas	2	0	0	1	3	21/6 = 3.50
6. Most protective of health and safety	2	1	1	2	0	15/6 = 2.50
7. Least effect on aesthetics	1	1	1	2	1	19/6 = 3.17

Segment D – Group

Evaluation factor	Number of responses by score					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	0	4	1	1	0	15.4/6 = 2.57
2. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	0	0	4	1	1	21.2/6 = 3.53
3. Least proximity to residential areas	0	0	2	2	2	23.6/6 = 3.93
4. Least proximity to mature vegetation	0	0	3	3	0	20.8/6 = 3.47
5. Maximizes opportunity areas	0	4	1	1	0	14.8/6 = 2.47
6. Most protective of health and safety	0	0	3	3	0	20.6/6 = 3.43
7. Least effect on aesthetics	0	0	4	2	0	20.2/6 = 3.37