

REGIONAL Personal Scorecard

Scenarios are scored, based on their performance within each category, Least-More-Most, as represented to the right.

LEAST

MORE

MOST

	LAND USE INPUTS	SCENARIO #1	SCENARIO #2	SCENARIO #3	NOTES
1	Share of growth in Center & Corridor Communities <i>(percent of new homes)</i>	19%	28%	37%	
2	Share of growth in Established Communities <i>(percent of new homes)</i>	27%	24%	23%	
3	Share of growth in Developing Communities <i>(percent of new homes)</i>	50%	45%	38%	
4	Share of growth in Rural Residential Communities <i>(percent of new homes)</i>	4%	3%	2%	
5	Share of growth in large-lot single-family homes <i>(percent)</i>	39%	33%	25%	
6	Share of growth in small-lot, single-family homes <i>(percent)</i>	30%	26%	23%	
7	Share of growth in attached homes <i>(percent)</i>	31%	42%	52%	
TRANSPORTATION INPUTS					
8	New or expanded roads <i>(lane miles, percent increase from 2008)</i>	25%	24%	14%	
9	Transit service <i>(Vehicle Service Hours, percent increase from 2008)</i>	50%	85%	122%	
10	Funding for transit <i>(\$ in billions)</i>	\$10.7	\$11.7	\$13.7	
11	Funding for road, bike and pedestrian maintenance and operations <i>(\$ in billions)</i>	\$10.9	\$11	\$11	
12	Funding for new road capacity <i>(\$ in billions)</i>	\$8.7	\$8	\$6.7	
13	Funding for bike and pedestrian street and trail improvements <i>(\$ in billions)</i>	\$2.8	\$2.9	\$3.0	
14	Funding for Programs (e.g., Community Design, Air Quality, Travel Demand Management) <i>(\$ in billions)</i>	\$1.5	\$1.6	\$1.7	
OUTCOMES					
15	Square miles of farmland converted to development <i>(4,166 square miles of farmland in 2008)</i>	93	70	50	
16	Square miles of vernal pools affected by development	9	8	7	
17	Share of new homes near high-frequency transit <i>(percent of new homes)</i>	20%	34%	44%	
18	Share of new jobs near high-frequency transit <i>(percent of new jobs)</i>	26%	35%	44%	
19	Transit costs recovered by ticket sales <i>(percent)</i>	38%	41%	51%	
20	Total homes in environmental justice areas near high-frequency transit <i>(percent of homes, 30% in 2008)</i>	43%	45%	47%	
21	Share of trips by transit, bike, or walk <i>(percent increase per capita from 2008)</i>	12%	22%	31%	
22	Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) <i>(percent change per capita from 2008)</i>	-6%	-8%	-9%	
23	Vehicle miles traveled in heavy congestion <i>(percent of total vehicle miles traveled)</i>	5%	6%	7%	
24	Travel time spent in car per capita <i>(percent change from 2008)</i>	-3%	-4%	-4%	
25	Weekday passenger vehicle CO ₂ emissions <i>(percent change per capita from 2005)</i>	-14%	-16%	-17%	

SCENARIO Themes

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION DESCRIPTION

OUTCOMES

SCENARIO #1

- Developing and Established communities receive highest share of region's growth
- Highest growth in Rural Residential Communities of all three scenarios
- New homes split fairly evenly between large-lot single-family homes, small-lot single-family homes, and attached homes
- Jobs/housing balance in major employment centers improves from 2008
- Fewest homes and jobs near high-frequency transit
- Highest investment in new roadway capacity compared to other modes of travel including a balance of investments in future and existing bottlenecks to reduce congestion
- Complete streets opportunities scaled down compared to other scenarios
- Least amount of transit service

El Dorado County variations from regional themes:

- Highest amount of jobs and housing growth
- Majority of new homes are large-lot single-family (with lot sizes ranging from 1/8 acre to over 10 acres)
- Total investment level for bicycle and pedestrian improvements is similar across the three scenarios due to the inclusion of these features in new or expanded road projects

- Highest amount of agricultural and natural resource lands affected by development
- Least amount of new development near high-frequency transit
- Largest decrease in congested vehicle miles of travel and delay
- Largest increase in commute carpooling
- Smallest increase in transit ridership (though much higher than 2008)
- Smallest increase in walk and bike trips
- Largest increase in household expenditures on transportation costs, compared to 2008
- Smallest decrease in VMT and transportation greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions per capita

El Dorado County variations from regional themes:

- Carpool commuting nearly even in all three scenarios
- Household expenditures on transportation costs nearly even in all three scenarios
- Transit ridership lower than Scenario 2

SCENARIO #2

- Established, Developing and Center & Corridor communities receive nearly even shares of growth
- More new homes attached versus small-lot and large-lot single-family
- Jobs/housing balance in major employment centers further improved
- More homes and jobs near high-frequency transit service (compared to Scenario 1) allow for greater realization of complete streets opportunities in Established and Developing communities
- Emphasis on a balance of roadway capacity and operational enhancements to address existing bottlenecks in Established Communities and Center & Corridor Communities
- Moderate level of funding for programs (e.g., Community Design, Air Quality, Transportation Demand Management)

El Dorado County variations from regional themes:

- Less job and housing growth than Scenario 1
- Established and Developing Communities receive highest share of growth
- Majority of new homes are large-lot single-family (with lot sizes ranging from 1/8 acre to over 10 acres)
- Jobs/housing balance in major employment center, Latrobe, less than Scenario 1, but better than 2008
- Highest investment in new commuter bus services between El Dorado County and Sacramento

- Performs "between" Scenarios 1 and 3 on most key metrics, including: non-auto travel; share of bike and walk trips; increase in household transportation costs; decrease in VMT and GHG emissions per capita

El Dorado County variations from regional themes:

- Carpool commuting nearly even in all three scenarios
- Household expenditures on transportation costs nearly even in all three scenarios
- Highest increase in transit ridership, due to higher commuter transit ridership

SCENARIO #3

- Center & Corridor Communities receive highest share of growth
- Half of all new homes are attached
- Least amount of growth in Rural Residential Communities in all three scenarios
- Jobs/housing balance in major employment centers most improved of all scenarios
- Highest amount of homes and jobs near high-frequency transit service
- Highest level of investment in new transit service including higher frequency bus, streetcar, light rail, and other rail services
- Greatest number of realized complete streets opportunities supported by more compact land uses and focused development in corridors with multiple transportation options
- Greatest reliance on operational enhancements for roadways (Intelligent Transportation Systems, operations-oriented projects) and Blueprint-supportive programs (e.g., Community Design, Air Quality, Transportation Demand Management)

El Dorado County variations from regional themes:

- Least amount of growth of the three scenarios
- Established and Developing communities receive highest share of growth
- Still more than half of all new homes are large-lot single-family, but single-family small-lot homes and attached homes increasing in their share of the growth (compared to Scenario 1 and 2)
- No rail investments are included in El Dorado County; however, improved bus transit access to the Folsom light rail line terminus of the Gold Line is included
- Middle level of total transit services. Emphasis is on expanding bicycle and pedestrian and local transit services more than expanding commuter bus services to Sacramento

- Least amount of agricultural and natural resource lands affected by development
- Highest amount of development near high-frequency transit
- Largest increase in non-auto travel
- Largest increase in walk and bike trips
- Smallest increase in household expenditures on transportation costs, compared to 2008
- Largest decrease in VMT and transportation GHG emissions per capita

El Dorado County variations from regional themes:

- Carpool commuting nearly even in all three scenarios
- Household expenditures on transportation costs nearly even in all three scenarios
- Transit ridership lower than Scenario 2