

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			TRANSPORTATION INPUTS			OUTCOMES		
	SCENARIO #1	SCENARIO #2	SCENARIO #3	SCENARIO #1	SCENARIO #2	SCENARIO #3	SCENARIO #1	SCENARIO #2	SCENARIO #3
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%					
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			NOTES					
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 region's growth
- Highest growth in Rural Residential communities of all three scenarios
- New homes split fairly even 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

Yolo County variations from regional themes:

- Lowest amount of jobs and housing growth between all three scenarios
- Majority of new homes are attached and small-lot single-family
- A small amount of roadway capacity expansion compared to other counties and relatively similar between all three scenarios
- Smallest investment in new bridges/river crossings compared to other scenarios

- 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

Yolo County variations from regional themes:

- Highest amount of agricultural and natural resource lands affected by development is in Scenario 2 (primarily due to more growth in the county in Scenario 2 than in Scenario 1)
- One general variation on congestion: Region is flat-to-declining per capita congested travel—Yolo County increases. Increase is lowest for Scenario 1

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)

Yolo County variations from regional themes:

- More job and housing growth than Scenario 1
- Highest investment in new commuter bus services between Yolo 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

Yolo County variations from regional themes:

- Highest amount of agricultural and natural resource lands affected by development (primarily due to more growth in the county in Scenario 2 than in Scenario 1)
- One general variation on congestion: Region is flat-to-declining per capita congested travel—Yolo County increases. Increase is slightly higher for Scenario 2 and 3

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 quality transit
- Highest level of investment in new transit service including higher frequency bus, streetcar, lightrail, and other rail services
- Greatest number of realized complete streets opportunities supported by more compact land uses and focused development in multi-modal corridors
- 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)

Yolo County variations from regional themes:

- Highest amount of growth of the three scenarios within the county
- 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
- 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

Yolo County variations from regional themes:

- None; Yolo County performance generally follows the regional trend
- One general variation on congestion: Region is flat-to-declining per capita congested travel—Yolo County increases. Increase is slightly higher for Scenario 2 and 3