

Public meeting results, regarding weighting of the 8 concepts and choosing a priority watershed.

Each of the 8 concepts has its own page, below.

Additional comments appear on the last page.

Population growth had the highest average weight (8.5) so all results were divided by 8.5

10= High priority, 1=low priority...all were assumed to start at "10"

Weighting results from public meetings for Nitrogen Impairment Index	Participant's affiliation	Weight: Nitrogen Impairment Index	reasoning for weighting in previous column
Participant 1	NSGA Sugar Grove	10	Ches. Bay Program goals - improve WV waters will help Chesapeake Bay
Participant 2	Cargill Turkey Production LLC	6	matrix data is low for Pendleton Co. watersheds
Participant 3	Potomac Conservancy	9	These two are the problem, so let's put \$ towards the areas that stand to see the greatest improvement
Participant 4	Central Hampshire PSD	8	We use the water for our PSD
Participant 5	PVCD	8	
Participant 6	WVCA	10	if we get these under control, it will help with sediment
Participant 7	Potomac Headwaters RC&D	5	CBP target criteria
Participant 8	ICPRB	10	one of the goals
Participant 9	EPCD	10	data is available
Participant 10	Sleepy Creek W.A.	5	
Participant 11	NRCS	10	main goals of Bay program
Participant 12	BCC	10	no data to rely on
Participant 13	Farmer	3	
Participant 14	Eastern Panhandle CD, Farmer	6	
Participant 15	WV DOF	6	data still somewhat important
Participant 16	City of Martinsburg	10	high due to data
Participant 17	Knouse Foods	8	
Participant 18		7	one of the program's overarching goals to reduce
Participant 19		5	
Participant 20		10	major goal to decrease
Participant 21		10	
Participant 22		9	not clear
AVERAGE:		7.95	
Comte memb.1	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	10	hard to control
Comte memb.2	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	10	it's about N
Comte memb.3	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	10	put the most effort where water quality is the worst
Comte memb.4	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	9	
average of I.C. opinions		9.75	

10= High priority, 1=low priority...all were assumed to start at "10"

Weighting results from public meetings for Phosphorus Impairment Index	Participant's affiliation	Weight: Phosphorus Impairment Index	reasoning for weighting in previous column
Participant 1	NSGA Sugar Grove	10	Ches. Bay Program goals - improve WV waters will help Chesapeake Bay
Participant 2	Cargill Turkey Production LLC	5	matrix data is low for Pendleton Co. watersheds
Participant 3	Potomac Conservancy	9	These two are the problem, so let's put \$ towards the areas that stand to see the greatest improvement
Participant 4	Central Hampshire PSD	9	We use the water for our PSD
Participant 5	PVCD	10	Phos. Is tied to erosion/sedimentation
Participant 6	WVCA	10	if we get these under control, it will help with sediment
Participant 7	Potomac Headwaters RC&D	5	CBP target criteria
Participant 8	ICPRB	10	one of the goals
Participant 9	EPCD	10	data is available
Participant 10	Sleepy Creek W.A.	5	
Participant 11	NRCS	9	main goals of Bay program
Participant 12	BCC	10	no data
Participant 13	Farmer	3	
Participant 14	Eastern Panhandle CD, Farmer	6	
Participant 15	WV DOF	6	data still somewhat important
Participant 16	City of Martinsburg	9	due to data
Participant 17	Knouse Foods	9	
Participant 18		5	one of the program's overarching goals to reduce
Participant 19		6	
Participant 20		10	major goal to decrease
Participant 21		10	
Participant 22		8	not clear
AVERAGE:		7.91	
Comte memb.1	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	8	easier to control
Comte memb.2	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	10	it's about P
Comte memb.3	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	10	put the most effort where water quality is the worst
Comte memb.4	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	9	
average of I.C. opinions		9.25	

10= High priority, 1=low priority...all were assumed to start at "10"

Weighting results from public meetings for Impaired High-Quality Stream miles	Participant's affiliation	Weight: Impaired High Quality Stream (miles)	reasoning for weighting in previous column
Participant 1	NSGA Sugar Grove	8	start recovery soonest
Participant 2	Cargill Turkey Production LLC	4	matrix data is low for Pendleton Co. watersheds
Participant 3	Potomac Conservancy	6	
Participant 4	Central Hampshire PSD	8	We use the water for our PSD
Participant 5	PVCD	8	easier to prevent pollution than fix
Participant 6	WVCA		
Participant 7	Potomac Headwaters RC&D	10	need to return IHQS to unimpaired status
Participant 8	ICPRB	3	shouldn't have a very high N,P, S load
Participant 9	EPCD	1	no data available
Participant 10	Sleepy Creek W.A.	9	
Participant 11	NRCS	6	I am assuming this will include N, P, and sediment in this concept
Participant 12	BCC	1	HQS shouldn't be impaired
Participant 13	Farmer	4	
Participant 14	Eastern Panhandle CD, Farmer	8	
Participant 15	WV DOF	8	I think I want to benefit WV streams for use
Participant 16	City of Martinsburg	8	should start with most impaired and location
Participant 17	Knouse Foods	5	
Participant 18		3	want to keep the best streams in good condition and prevent problems
Participant 19		1	
Participant 20		2	minimal effect (high quality is the further upstream)
Participant 21		9	
Participant 22		6	not clear
AVERAGE:		5.62	
Comte memb.1	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	2	they're already good
Comte memb.2	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	5	most high quality streams are not impaired
Comte memb.3	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	1	might as well assume that all streams have the same inherent worth(?)
Comte memb.4	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	10	
average of I.C. opinions		4.50	

10= High priority, 1=low priority...all were assumed to start at "10"

Weighting results from public meetings for TMDL miles	Participant's affiliation	Weight: TMDL (miles)	reasoning for weighting in previous column
Participant 1	NSGA Sugar Grove	6	few TMDLs to "repair"; 10-for total distance within a watershed
Participant 2	Cargill Turkey Production LLC	3	matrix data is low for Pendleton Co. watersheds
Participant 3	Potomac Conservancy	5	
Participant 4	Central Hampshire PSD	9	We use the water for our PSD
Participant 5	PVCD	10	fix problem areas first
Participant 6	WVCA		
Participant 7	Potomac Headwaters RC&D	1	other \$ are available to treat TMDL waters
Participant 8	ICPRB	10	probably have very high N,P, or S loads
Participant 9	EPCD	1	no data available
Participant 10	Sleepy Creek W.A.	5	
Participant 11	NRCS	5	
Participant 12	BCC	1	
Participant 13	Farmer	4	
Participant 14	Eastern Panhandle CD, Farmer	8	
Participant 15	WV DOF	4	
Participant 16	City of Martinsburg	9	
Participant 17	Knouse Foods	5	
Participant 18		5	indicates problems exist
Participant 19		4	
Participant 20		2	TMDL seems to affect corporations more
Participant 21		8	
Participant 22		10	highest impaired lists off 303d list
AVERAGE:		5.48	
Comte memb.1	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	5	semi-reliable
Comte memb.2	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	8	most TMDLs do not deal with nutrients
Comte memb.3	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	1	reasons for TMDLs don't match our goals of N,P, and sediment reductions
Comte memb.4	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	9	
average of I.C. opinions		5.75	

10= High priority, 1=low priority...all were assumed to start at "10"

Weighting results from public meetings for BMP "saturation"	Participant's affiliation	Weight: Agricultural BMP Saturation/Likelihood of Landowner Participation	reasoning for weighting in previous column
Participant 1	NSGA Sugar Grove	10	good Ag BMP will decrease N, P, TMDL, Sediment
Participant 2	Cargill Turkey Production LLC	8	most cost effective solution; voluntary cooperation
Participant 3	Potomac Conservancy	10	if landowners won't engage, no amount of money will get the BMP on the ground
Participant 4	Central Hampshire PSD	5	Because there is less farming going on now
Participant 5	PVCD	3	participation will depend on funding
Participant 6	WVCA		
Participant 7	Potomac Headwaters RC&D	10	"treatment \$" to go to farmers
Participant 8	ICPRB	8	not clear how this is derived
Participant 9	EPCD	1	no data available
Participant 10	Sleepy Creek W.A.	9	
Participant 11	NRCS	4	
Participant 12	BCC	2	
Participant 13	Farmer	10	
Participant 14	Eastern Panhandle CD, Farmer	10	
Participant 15	WV DOF	10	cannot get it done without cooperation
Participant 16	City of Martinsburg	7	
Participant 17	Knouse Foods	3	
Participant 18		4	have the ability to reduce nitrogen, phosphorus, and ???
Participant 19		8	
Participant 20		5	participation will depend on operator profits. More assistance \$/rate will improve partic.
Participant 21		8	
Participant 22		5	not clear
AVERAGE:		6.67	
Comte memb.1	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	6	semi-reliable
Comte memb.2	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	5	because saturation does not indicate saturation of most important BMPs-filter(?)
Comte memb.3	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	5	we need to consider this, but after working with these numbers, I'm not confident you can accurately estimate this
Comte memb.4	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	9	
average of I.C. opinions		6.25	

10= High priority, 1=low priority...all were assumed to start at "10"

Weighting results from public meetings for Watershed Group Activity	Participant's affiliation	Weight: Watershed Group Activity	reasoning for weighting in previous column
Participant 1	NSGA Sugar Grove	5	Important, but groups to volunteer are few
Participant 2	Cargill Turkey Production LLC	2	most growers have already participated in cost share programs
Participant 3	Potomac Conservancy	7	
Participant 4	Central Hampshire PSD	8	We use the water for our system
Participant 5	PVCD	10	signifies positive interest
Participant 6	WVCA	9	
Participant 7	Potomac Headwaters RC&D	5	focus on WS that have interested people
Participant 8	ICPRB	9	not sure how this was derived
Participant 9	EPCD	1	no data available
Participant 10	Sleepy Creek W.A.	10	
Participant 11	NRCS	3	
Participant 12	BCC	3	need public involvement
Participant 13	Farmer	10	
Participant 14	Eastern Panhandle CD, Farmer	10	
Participant 15	WV DOF	8	emphasized by the people who live on the watershed
Participant 16	City of Martinsburg	3	
Participant 17	Knouse Foods	1	
Participant 18		3	have the ability to assist and be beneficial
Participant 19		2	
Participant 20		5	some incentive, not a major factor
Participant 21		7	
Participant 22		4	helpful
AVERAGE:		5.68	
Comte memb.1	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	4	some groups may be in already high quality watersheds
Comte memb.2	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	5	this will help, but landowners will ???
Comte memb.3	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	8	an important concept, but citizen participation changes from year to year
Comte memb.4	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	9	
average of I.C. opinions		6.50	

10= High priority, 1=low priority...all were assumed to start at "10"

Weighting results from public meetings for Population Growth	Participant's affiliation	Weight: Population Growth	reasoning for weighting in previous column
Participant 1	NSGA Sugar Grove	10	stormwater runoff pollutants
Participant 2	Cargill Turkey Production LLC	10	a lot of new growth (industry and residential)
Participant 3	Potomac Conservancy	8	
Participant 4	Central Hampshire PSD	9	We have a growing population
Participant 5	PVCD	5	
Participant 6	WVCA	10	most important for EP, b/c of land disturbance
Participant 7	Potomac Headwaters RC&D	10	excess storm water runoff -& high nutrient application to urban land
Participant 8	ICPRB	10	these watersheds would likely have the greatest loads, especially sediment
Participant 9	EPCD	1	no data available
Participant 10	Sleepy Creek W.A.	10	
Participant 11	NRCS	7	homeowner fertilizer/conservation activity
Participant 12	BCC	10	Berkeley Co. will double in size in 25 years.
Participant 13	Farmer	10	
Participant 14	Eastern Panhandle CD, Farmer	10	
Participant 15	WV DOF	10	I've seen more sediment from sewage installations land use changing, forest clearing for development
Participant 16	City of Martinsburg	8	
Participant 17	Knouse Foods	8	Needs to be concept: If no Pot W available & individual treatment on lot is installed, growth will not be unchecked if Pot W permitted and used.
Participant 18		4	added population could have impacts to environment
Participant 19		10	
Participant 20		10	attack new potential before they cause a problem
Participant 21		10	
Participant 22		7	important
AVERAGE:		8.50	
Comte memb.1	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	9	this is going to have a huge impact now and in future
Comte memb.2	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	10	the 800 lb. Gorilla
Comte memb.3	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	9	not quite as important as existing water quality data
Comte memb.4	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	9	
average of I.C. opinions		9.25	

10= High priority, 1=low priority...all were assumed to start at "10"

Weighting results from public meetings for Nitrogen Delivery Factor	Participant's affiliation	Weight: Nitrogen Delivery Factor	reasoning for weighting in previous column
Participant 1	NSGA Sugar Grove	6	distance to Bay
Participant 2	Cargill Turkey Production LLC	1	does not seem to be a factor for Pendleton Co.
Participant 3	Potomac Conservancy	3	
Participant 4	Central Hampshire PSD	8	It is important to know what or how much nitrogen is being put in the water after it gets used by the people.
Participant 5	PVCD	1	
Participant 6	WVCA		
Participant 7	Potomac Headwaters RC&D	5	best/most efficient use of \$ to help CBP
Participant 8	ICPRB	9	easternmost counties are experiencing the greatest growth and are closest to the Bay, "edge" of WV
Participant 9	EPCD	1	no data available
Participant 10	Sleepy Creek W.A.	1	
Participant 11	NRCS	2	
Participant 12	BCC	5	no data
Participant 13	Farmer		
Participant 14	Eastern Panhandle CD, Farmer	4	
Participant 15	WV DOF	1	streams/watersheds farther from the Bay need less priority.
Participant 16	City of Martinsburg		
Participant 17	Knouse Foods	6	
Participant 18		7	nitrates in drinking water is a health threat
Participant 19		1	
Participant 20		3	speaks for itself - closer to bay the more imp.
Participant 21		9	
Participant 22		3	help WV 1st, then Bay
AVERAGE:		4.00	
Comte memb.1	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	6	WV's goals more important than Bay's
Comte memb.2	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	9	primarily a Bay & cost issue, cost-benefit is important
Comte memb.3	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	9	I am funded by CBP so I have to have this as a priority, I suppose!
Comte memb.4	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	9	
average of I.C. opinions		8.25	

10= High priority, 1=low priority...all were assumed to start at "10"

Weighting results from public meetings for "other"	Participant's affiliation	Other, with weight	reasoning for weighting in previous column
Participant 1	NSGA Sugar Grove	8 - construction BMPs	stop sediment & support Phase II stormwater runoff
Participant 2	Cargill Turkey Production LLC	7 - Public water supply	
Participant 3	Potomac Conservancy		
Participant 4	Central Hampshire PSD		
Participant 5	PVCD		
Participant 6	WVCA		
Participant 7	Potomac Headwaters RC&D		
Participant 8	ICPRB		
Participant 9	EPCD		
Participant 10	Sleepy Creek W.A.	sediment	
Participant 11	NRCS	8 - sediment	
Participant 12	BCC		
Participant 13	Farmer		
Participant 14	Eastern Panhandle CD, Farmer		
Participant 15	WV DOF		
Participant 16	City of Martinsburg		
Participant 17	Knouse Foods	(see comments for pop. growth)	
Participant 18			
Participant 19		7 - public water supply	
Participant 20			
Participant 21			
Participant 22			
AVERAGE:			
Comte memb.1	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	8 - drinking water	Important to everyone
Comte memb.2	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee		
Comte memb.3	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee		
Comte memb.4	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee		
average of I.C. opinions			

results from public meetings: top-priority watershed...	Participant's affiliation	
Participant 1	NSGA Sugar Grove	
Participant 2	Cargill Turkey Production LLC	
Participant 3	Potomac Conservancy	two: Mainstem South Branch (#6) & Opequon
Participant 4	Central Hampshire PSD	South Branch of the Potomac
Participant 5	PVCD	
Participant 6	WVCA	In the EP, there are not that many active watersheds to do the work that needs to be done.
Participant 7	Potomac Headwaters RC&D	1st: 17 Back Creek, 2nd: 19 Opequon Creek
Participant 8	ICPRB	#24
Participant 9	EPCD	
Participant 10	Sleepy Creek W.A.	Direct Drains - closest to Potomac and people/public would be more empathetic (hopefully!)
Participant 11	NRCS	use the data to prioritize watersheds
Participant 12	BCC	
Participant 13	Farmer	
Participant 14	Eastern Panhandle CD, Farmer	two: (19) Opequon Creek, (16) Sleepy Creek
Participant 15	WV DOF	
Participant 16	City of Martinsburg	unknown
Participant 17	Knouse Foods	Can not respond based upon the limited information provided. Decision should be logic-based (including science) and not mere sentiment.
Participant 18		south branch
Participant 19		
Participant 20		one closer to the bay due delivery factor
Participant 21		I would look at watersheds with highest population growth - would provide people to pay for fix, would probably be where most impact is occurring
Participant 22		Divide into regions and prioritize by level of impairment and cost
AVERAGE:		
Comte memb.1	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	
Comte memb.2	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	rather than a watershed, I'll nominate grassy buffers as the most important BMP.
Comte memb.3	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	
Comte memb.4	Trib Strategy Implementation Committee	
average of I.C. opinions		

Other comments about Prioritization and this process	Participant's affiliation	
Participant 1	NSGA Sugar Grove	no construction BMPs? Stormwater Phase II-
Participant 2	Cargill Turkey Production LLC	
Participant 3	Potomac Conservancy	
Participant 4	Central Hampshire PSD	The cleaner our water supply is, the less we have to treat it at the water plant. The less we have to treat the water it is cheaper for our water customers.
Participant 5	PVCD	
Participant 6	WVCA	I believe the residents this evening's point was that it's hard for them to choose from the 3 counties which streams are high priority, because they would favor the ones in their own county. I think if they had had data on what other agencies have come up with and shows what streams are high priority
Participant 7	Potomac Headwaters RC&D	1. How do other states set the priorities of watersheds to be targeted? 2. How will these inputs be used to make final list of weighted concepts?
Participant 8	ICPRB	1. It would help to have the watershed scores as calculated (without i.e. before this weighting process), 2. Still need emphasis on particular streams, not just broad watershed areas, 3. Use this stakeholder weighing process only as general guidance.
Participant 9	EPCD	I believe that to do prioritizing at this point in time is premature! We do not have data to support prioritizing! Why don't we spend "the monies" that are available to gather data?
Participant 10	Sleepy Creek W.A.	
Participant 11	NRCS	Values can be assigned to nearly all of the concepts. Charleston has list of watershed groups, delivery factor can be assigned based on distance. Use real numbers for prioritization. Get most benefit for \$ cost/benefit ratio. Use science & data to justify actions. We must be accountable to taxpayers - guesses and gut feeling doesn't do that.*
Participant 12	BCC	Have some data available.
Participant 13	Farmer	
Participant 14	Eastern Panhandle CD, Farmer	
Participant 15	WV DOF	
Participant 16	City of Martinsburg	
Participant 17	Knouse Foods	1. Current (existing) population at risk by impaired water - potable water in takes and other uses should be a considered factor. 2. Only informed agency participants have the strength of their knowledge & experience to (??) 3. All 8 areas have value in this decision process and if examined in a layered model would identify the greatest value/benefit for each watershed and greatest likelihood of success.
Participant 18		
Participant 19		
Participant 20		I don't feel these comments may relate to the whole. Higher cost share rates will improve participation. Recent Fed. Cost/share rates have gone back toward 50%. This may not get BMP's that are most effective for water quality but low return to land operator.
Participant 21		
Participant 22		TMDL gives the data and studies the source. I wasn't fully understanding of the process of how to score the matrix. As others stated, it was very confusing, so I scored as 10, 9, 8, 7, etc.

* continuation of Participant 11's comments: From what I heard at the meeting sediment was not listed specifically because where N&P are involved and the BMPs that will correct them will greatly benefit sediment.

My opinion is you cannot make that assumption due to the vast # of sediment loads. Example - streambank erosion (primarily subsoil), grading of construction areas (again subsoil), dirt roads, road ditches are main sources of erosion/sediment but usually low in nutrients. Therefore I believe sediment should stand in a concept of its own. The amounts of sediment we hear being dumped into the Bay is how insignificant number.