#217306v2
4/4/14
KRY/EDL/KJM

DRAFT LIST OF CRITERIA FOR COMPARING SKETCH VISION 2050 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS

The following provides a list of possible measurable criteria being considered by the Commission staff, which would be estimated for use in comparing sketch land use and transportation scenarios. The criteria are being developed using a scenario planning tool (CommunityViz), which will allow assessment—as best as can be done with a general sketch scenario—of the extent to which each scenario is consistent with the initial vision described generally by the VISION 2050 Guiding Statements. The criteria are being designed to measure the relative benefits, costs, and impacts of the scenarios so they can be easily compared. Given the conceptual nature of the scenario comparison during this step of the process, the criteria will be estimated at a basic, sketch level. Moving forward into the next step of the process—the development and evaluation of detailed alternative land use and transportation plans—the estimates are likely to change as staff refines the calculations and develops alternative plans that are based on the scenarios, but include a higher level of detail.

Possible quantitative scenario comparison criteria:

- Job-housing balance (balance of wages and housing types)
- Use mix (score based on the mix of residential and commercial land uses)
- Walkability (index based on factors affecting the ability to walk to destinations)
- Transit service coverage area
- Population served by transit
- Households served by transit
- Jobs accessible by transit
- Average distance to transit (residential and non-residential)
- Average distance to commercial
- Average distance to parks and recreation
- Remaining farmland area
- Remaining open space
- Level of bicycle accommodation

- Travel time delay
- Vehicle-miles of travel (total and per capita)
- Trips per day (personal vehicle and transit)
- Greenhouse gas emissions (from vehicles and buildings)
- Energy use (residential buildings and non-residential buildings)
- Cost of housing and transportation
- Cost of new transportation infrastructure (capital and operating)
- Cost of new residential infrastructure (water, sewer, etc.)
- Cost of providing government services

Scenarios will also be compared with respect to:

- Population by subarea
- Employment by subarea
- Residential density
- Employment density
- Employees by type (retail and other)
- Residential by type (single family, multi-family, etc.)

Some scenario comparisons cannot be quantified or are very difficult to accurately quantify. For these comparisons, qualitative discussions would be used instead to assist in considering the tradeoffs between scenarios. Possible qualitative scenario comparison discussions:

- Benefits and impacts to minority and low-income populations
- Potential for attracting residents and businesses
- Impact on public health
- Effect of demographic shifts
- Resilience in adapting to rising fuel prices
- Ability to address issues related to climate change
- Ability to connect to nearby metro areas and leverage the value of those areas