



Volume 3, Issue 3
May 2026

The Lied Research Report

2026 Urban Sprawl Rankings: Las Vegas and Reno, Nevada

Understanding sprawl and density in Nevada's largest cities.

Lied Center for Real Estate · UNLV

Executive Summary

Urban sprawl is increasingly cited as a defining characteristic of Las Vegas, yet the empirical basis for that characterization is rarely directly examined.

To provide both the public and private sectors with a data-driven perspective, this brief summarizes the findings of Hamidi et al. (2026), *Who Sprawls the Most? Mapping Urban Sprawl and Assessing Its Impact on Everyday Life*, a national study from Johns Hopkins University that ranks 233 U.S. metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), representing 85% of the U.S. population, on a composite compactness-sprawl index.

In terms of density, the Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise, NV MSA ranks as the 16th most dense MSA out of 233, placing it in the top 7% nationally, ahead of the San Diego-Chula Vista-Carlsbad, CA MSA, the Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX MSA, and the Phoenix-Mesa-Chandler, AZ MSA. Similarly, on street connectivity, the Las Vegas MSA ranks 13th out of 233, placing it in the top 6% of the most connected metropolitan areas in the country. On the overall compactness index, the Las Vegas MSA ranks 69th out of 233, placing it in the top 30% of least sprawling metropolitan areas in the United States.

Contributing to these findings is the fact that roughly 88% of Clark County is managed by the federal government, which constrains outward expansion and concentrates development within a bounded footprint commonly referred to as the SNPLMA Disposal Boundary. This structural factor contributes to the metro's comparatively high-density profile.

The Las Vegas MSA ranks 125th out of 233 on land

¹ Ewing, R. & Hamidi, S. (2014). *Measuring sprawl and validating sprawl measures*. Washington, DC: Smart Growth America/USEPA.

use mix, reflecting a degree of separation between residential areas and employment and commercial corridors that characterizes much of the valley's development pattern. This is the one dimension on which the index places Las Vegas *below* the national average.

Turning to Northern Nevada, the Reno, NV MSA ranks 46th out of 233 on the overall compactness-sprawl index, placing it in the top 20% of least sprawling metros and 32nd on urban centering (top 14%).

This data brief presents index scores and rankings for both Nevada MSAs, contextualizes those findings relative to peer metropolitan areas, and provides the full 233-MSA dataset in the Appendix.

About the Data

The Hamidi et al. (2026) study (hereafter “The study”) led by researchers at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health covers 233 metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) representing a comprehensive update to a previous sprawl measurement study¹. The study assigns each MSA a composite compactness-sprawl index score built from four equally weighted dimensions:

- **Density:** Measures the intensity of residential and employment development. Indicators include population density, the share of population living at low versus high urban densities, gross employment density, and net population density² within urban places.
- **Land Use Mix:** Captures the degree to which homes, jobs, and services are integrated rather than

² Population divided by residential land.

Table 1: Nevada MSAs vs. Selected Peer Cities - Compactness Index Rankings

Rankings out of 233 MSAs. Rank from least sprawl (1) to most sprawl (233).

Metro Area	Density	Land Use Mix	Centering	Connectivity	Overall
Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise, NV MSA	#16 of 233 Top 7% Most Dense 128.7	#125 of 233 Top 54% 97.4	#68 of 233 Top 29% 109.7	#13 of 233 Top 6% 141.8	#69 of 233 Top 30% Most Compact 108.3
Reno, NV MSA	#62 of 233 Top 27% Most Dense 102.6	#146 of 233 Top 63% 91.9	#32 of 233 Top 14% 123.4	#88 of 233 Top 38% 106.0	#46 of 233 Top 20% Most Compact 115.9
Phoenix-Mesa-Chandler, AZ MSA	#28 of 233 Top 12% Most Dense 112.5	#112 of 233 Top 48% 101.5	#49 of 233 Top 21% 117.7	#31 of 233 Top 13% 125.0	#168 of 233 Top 72% Most Compact 85.5
Denver-Aurora-Lakewood, CO MSA	#19 of 233 Top 8% Most Dense 124.6	#51 of 233 Top 22% 120.0	#26 of 233 Top 11% 129.8	#17 of 233 Top 7% 135.5	#45 of 233 Top 19% Most Compact 116.0
Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX MSA	#35 of 233 Top 15% Most Dense 109.1	#135 of 233 Top 58% 95.5	#66 of 233 Top 28% 110.3	#44 of 233 Top 19% 121.1	#219 of 233 Top 94% Most Compact 69.9
Nashville-Davidson-Murfreesboro-Franklin, TN MSA	#144 of 233 Top 62% Most Dense 91.4	#217 of 233 Top 93% 62.7	#52 of 233 Top 22% 117.2	#205 of 233 Top 88% 72.6	#231 of 233 Top 99% Most Compact 57.4
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Alpharetta, GA MSA	#72 of 233 Top 31% Most Dense 100.9	#170 of 233 Top 73% 82.9	#20 of 233 Top 9% 133.4	#181 of 233 Top 78% 79.4	#232 of 233 Top 99% Most Compact 57.2

Source: UNLV Lied Center for Real Estate; Hamidi et al. (2026). Highlighted rows indicate Nevada MSAs. National mean index = 100. Rankings out of 233 MSAs.

separated. Measured through job-population balance, degree of job mixing, and average Walk Score.

- **Activity Centering:** Reflects the strength of downtowns and employment subcenters. Measured by variation in neighborhood population, employment density, and the share of population and jobs located within identifiable centers.

- **Street Connectivity:** Assesses connectiveness in the road network. Measured through average block size, share of small urban blocks, intersection density, and share of 4-or-more-way intersections.

The study then takes the four-dimension scores and combines them into a single composite index scaled to a national mean of 100³. Scores **above 100** indicate above-average compactness (less sprawl); **scores below 100** indicate more sprawling development. The full set of results is reproduced in the Appendix of this report.

Findings: Las Vegas, NV

Across multiple dimensions, Las Vegas ranks among the most compact and connected metropolitan areas in the United States. We summarize the data below:

- **Density:** 16th out of 233 MSAs (top 7%, score: 128.7). Las Vegas is denser than San Diego, Houston, and Phoenix. The city's density profile reflects, in part, federal land constraints that limit outward expansion and concentrate development within a bounded footprint.

- **Street Connectivity:** 13th out of 233 MSAs (top 6%, score: 141.8). Las Vegas scores among the

highest in the country on street connectivity, reflecting its largely grid-based road network. Only a small number of older, eastern metros score higher.

- **Activity Centering:** 68th out of 233 MSAs (top 29%, score: 109.7). Above the national average, reflecting meaningful employment and commercial activity distributed across the valley.

- **Overall Compactness:** 69th out of 233 MSAs (top 30%, score: 108.3). Las Vegas ranks above Phoenix (rank 168), Houston (rank 219), Nashville (rank 231), and Atlanta (rank 232) on the composite index.

- **Land Use Mix:** 125th out of 233 MSAs (score: 97.4). This is the one dimension where Las Vegas falls below the national average. The separation of residential areas from jobs and services is characteristic of the valley's development pattern and is where the data offers the most support for concerns about urban form.

Table 1 presents dimension-by-dimension scores and rankings for Nevada's two metro areas alongside selected peer cities.

Findings: Reno, NV

The Reno, NV MSA (hereafter Reno) ranks 46th out of 233 MSAs overall (top 20%, score: 115.9) – above the national average and above every major Sun Belt metropolitan area included in this analysis.

Its strongest dimension is activity centering, where it ranks 32nd nationally (top 14%, score: 123.4), consistent with a compact urban core anchored by an older street grid.

³ For a complete description of the methodology, please refer to the technical appendix of Hamidi et al. (2026), available [here](#).

Table 2: Las Vegas vs. Sun Belt Metros - Overall Compactness Rankings

Rankings out of 233 MSAs. Rank from least sprawl (1) to most sprawl (233).

Metro Area	Overall Rank (of 233)	Overall Score	National Percentile	Difference vs. Las Vegas
Reno, NV MSA	#46	115.9	Top 20% Most Compact	+7.6 points
Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise, NV MSA	#69	108.3	Top 30% Most Compact	Baseline
Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown, TX MSA	#139	93.2	Top 60% Most Compact	-15.1 points
Phoenix-Mesa-Chandler, AZ MSA	#168	85.5	Top 72% Most Compact	-22.8 points
Dallas-Plano-Irving, TX MSA	#174	84.5	Top 75% Most Compact	-23.8 points
Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL MSA	#202	75.6	Top 87% Most Compact	-32.7 points
San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX MSA	#217	70.7	Top 93% Most Compact	-37.6 points
Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX MSA	#219	69.9	Top 94% Most Compact	-38.4 points
Nashville-Davidson-Murfreesboro- Franklin, TN MSA	#231	57.4	Top 99% Most Compact	-50.9 points
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Alpharetta, GA MSA	#232	57.2	Top 99% Most Compact	-51.1 points

Source: UNLV Lied Center for Real Estate; Hamidi et al. (2026). Highlighted rows indicate Nevada MSAs. Difference shown relative to Las Vegas MSA overall score (108.3).

Density (rank 62, top 27%) and street connectivity (rank 88, top 38%) are both above the national average. Land use mix is Reno's lowest-ranked dimension – 146th out of 233 (score: 91.9) – a pattern consistent with the car-dependent commercial and residential growth corridors that have expanded along the I-80 corridor in recent years.

Las Vegas and Reno in the Sun Belt Context

The Las Vegas MSA is most commonly compared to other fast-growing Sun Belt metropolitan areas, which share similar growth trajectories, climate conditions, and development eras. Table 2 presents the overall compactness rankings for the Las Vegas MSA alongside those peer metros.

The Las Vegas MSA ranks above every Sun Belt metropolitan area included in the comparison. The margin is substantial in several cases: Las Vegas outranks the Phoenix MSA by 99 positions, the Houston MSA by 150 positions, the Nashville MSA by 162 positions, and the Atlanta MSA by 163 positions out of 233 total MSAs. The disparity is most pronounced on the two dimensions where Las Vegas scores highest. On density, the Las Vegas MSA ranks 16th nationally; the Phoenix MSA ranks 27th on density but 168th on the overall composite. The Houston, Dallas, and Atlanta MSAs all fall in the bottom quartile of the national distribution on the composite index.

Land use mix is the exception. On that dimension, the Austin MSA (rank 107), and the Phoenix MSA (rank 111) score modestly above the Las Vegas MSA (rank 125). This reflects a pattern of residential development that is disconnected from employment and commercial corridors that are common across rapidly growing western metros and contributes to elevated car dependence relative to what the density and connectivity scores alone might suggest.

Limitations

The study measures built environment characteristics – density, street connectivity, land use mix, and activity centering – but does not capture the full range of factors that shape transportation outcomes and resident experience. Three limitations are relevant to the interpretation of findings for the Las Vegas and Reno MSAs.

First, the index does not measure traffic congestion, commute times, or transit service quality. A metropolitan area can score well on street connectivity while still presenting significant challenges for daily travel. The Las Vegas MSA ranks 13th nationally on connectivity, reflecting the structure of its grid-based road network. This measure describes network geometry – not network performance, level of service, or the availability of viable non-automobile travel options, such as public transportation.

Second, MSA-level index scores represent metropolitan-wide averages and may mask sub-area variation. Within the Las Vegas MSA, built environment conditions differ substantially across the region, from high-density urban cores to low-density suburban development in Henderson, North Las Vegas, and unincorporated Clark County. The composite scores reported here reflect the metropolitan area as a whole but more spatially refined data at a sub-county level are available in the study dataset.

Third, the land use mix dimension is measured in part using Walk Score, an index that captures proximity to amenities but does not account for whether those amenities are affordable, physically accessible without a vehicle, or functionally used by residents on foot. In metropolitan areas characterized by significant automobile dependence, Walk Score-based measures may modestly overstate the degree to which land uses are integrated in daily practice.

These limitations provide relevant context for

interpreting the findings but do not appear to affect the directional conclusions: across the dimensions measured, both the Las Vegas and Reno MSAs rank above the national average on the composite compactness index and above the peer Sun Belt metropolitan areas included in this analysis.

Authors

Shawn J. McCoy, Ph.D.

Director, Lied Center for Real Estate and
Associate Professor, Department of Economics:
shawn.mccoy@unlv.edu

Nicholas B. Irwin, Ph.D.

Research Director, Lied Center for Real Estate
and Associate Professor, Department of
Economics: nicholas.irwin@unlv.edu

Disclaimer

Funding was not offered or provided to produce this report. The opinions expressed in this study represent those of the authors and the authors alone.

Cover Description

The front picture is from the NASA Visible Earth's "City Lights of the United States 2012" image.

About the Lied Center for Real Estate

The Lied Center for Real Estate was established in 1989 by the Lee Business School at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas to foster excellence in real estate education and research. Through partnerships with business and community leaders, the Lied Center strives to improve real estate business and effective public-policy practices in Southern Nevada. The center produces relevant and timely real estate market reports, supports educational programs in commercial real estate for students and professionals, and provides community outreach and continuing education.

References

Hamidi, S., Abdollahpour, S., Azimi, E., & Ewing, R. (2026). Who Sprawls the Most? Mapping Urban Sprawl and Assessing Its Impact on Everyday Life. *Center for Smart Transportation and the Bloomberg American Health Initiative*; Johns Hopkins University; Baltimore, MD. Retrieved from: <https://publichealth.jhu.edu/center-for-smart-transportation/who-sprawls-the-most>

Citation

McCoy, Shawn & Irwin, Nicholas (2026). 2026 Urban Sprawl Rankings: Las Vegas and Reno, Nevada. *The Lied Research Report*, 3(3), 1-16.

Appendix: 2026 Compactness Index Rankings — All 233 U.S. MSAs (Ranks 1–25 of 233)

Rank from least sprawl (1) to most sprawl (233). Nevada MSAs highlighted.

Overall Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area	Density Score	Land Use Mix Score	Centering Score	Connectivity Score	Overall Score
1	San Francisco-San Mateo-Redwood City, CA	229	160.9	238.9	170.9	242.9
2	New York-Jersey City-White Plains, NY-NJ	323.2	170.4	190.7	173	227.4
3	Philadelphia, PA	229.1	161.1	168.2	199.6	220.8
4	Miami-Miami Beach-Kendall, FL	173.4	133.5	127.3	177.4	158.4
5	Trenton-Princeton, NJ	132.9	120	122	128.8	152.2
6	Boston, MA	158.2	133.6	150.4	125.2	145.9
7	Chicago-Naperville-Evanston, IL	175.3	138.6	153	158.5	145.1
8	Santa Maria-Santa Barbara, CA	115.7	148.1	99.7	124.8	143.3
9	San Rafael, CA	108.9	150.7	94.1	105	141.7
10	Boulder, CO	106.3	121.7	122.8	118.7	141.7
11	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale, CA	183.5	160	123.8	154.8	137.7
12	Champaign-Urbana, IL	99	126.1	125	87.7	136.5
13	San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles, CA	94.5	143.2	104.5	104.3	135.4
14	Springfield, IL	88.7	87.5	151.1	104.3	135.2
15	Detroit-Dearborn-Livonia, MI	120.9	123.2	118	169.9	134.4
16	Anaheim-Santa Ana-Irvine, CA	154.3	148.6	96.8	155.4	132.7
17	Erie, PA	95.4	135	109.5	96.7	132.2
18	Charleston, WV	85.1	88.3	159.8	97.9	130.9
19	Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA	103.2	132.5	85.3	110.8	130.4
20	Oakland-Berkeley-Livermore, CA	140.4	142.4	110	148.8	130.3
21	Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach-Sunrise, FL	139.4	130.2	86.8	169.1	129.5
22	Atlantic City-Hammonton, NJ	96.2	89.2	130	114.5	129.3
23	Lincoln, NE	104.7	132.2	90.1	112.3	129
24	Eugene-Springfield, OR	98.7	137.8	117.5	89.7	128.5
25	Yakima, WA	89.8	119	132.1	81.5	127.6

Source: UNLV Lied Center for Real Estate; Hamidi et al. (2026).

Appendix: 2026 Compactness Index Rankings — All 233 U.S. MSAs (Ranks 26–50 of 233)

Rank from least sprawl (1) to most sprawl (233). Nevada MSAs highlighted.

Overall Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area	Density Score	Land Use Mix Score	Centering Score	Connectivity Score	Overall Score
26	Madison, WI	112.7	114.2	147.9	90.8	126.3
27	Yuma, AZ	91.7	71.4	138	106.8	126.2
28	San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	145.9	139.1	91	139.3	125.7
29	Columbia, MO	94.4	102.4	142.6	65.7	124.4
30	Reading, PA	104.8	118.4	107.7	104.4	123
31	Seattle-Bellevue-Kent, WA	140.6	120.2	140.8	125.8	122.2
32	Tuscaloosa, AL	83.4	90.1	156.4	78.8	121.3
33	College Station-Bryan, TX	96.9	98.5	104.5	108	121
34	Rochester, MN	97.1	85.9	143	72.3	120.4
35	Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	111.2	131.6	122	101.3	120.1
36	Burlington-South Burlington, VT	90.5	100.1	159.8	46.7	120
37	Amarillo, TX	90.6	105.2	96	113	119.8
38	Duluth, MN-WI	84.9	118.3	132.2	69.9	118.4
39	Laredo, TX	106.8	94.8	66.3	133.3	118.4
40	Cedar Rapids, IA	90.7	109.4	117	83.5	117.5
41	Spokane-Spokane Valley, WA	94.1	108.3	108.6	124.8	117.3
42	New Haven-Milford, CT	109.8	123.4	115	105.5	117
43	Salinas, CA	105.5	133.9	84.6	96.1	116.5
44	Las Cruces, NM	88.1	101	98.7	99.3	116.3
45	Denver-Aurora-Lakewood, CO	124.6	120	129.8	135.5	116
46	Reno, NV	102.6	91.9	123.4	106	115.9
47	Modesto, CA	108.9	147.7	58.3	114.1	115.7
48	Lexington-Fayette, KY	99.5	100.8	132.2	93	115.5
49	Fargo, ND-MN	102.9	126.4	87.6	72.2	114.8
50	Corpus Christi, TX	100.9	111.1	78.5	122.7	114.7

Source: UNLV Lied Center for Real Estate; Hamidi et al. (2026).

Appendix: 2026 Compactness Index Rankings — All 233 U.S. MSAs (Ranks 51–75 of 233)

Rank from least sprawl (1) to most sprawl (233). Nevada MSAs highlighted.

Overall Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area	Density Score	Land Use Mix Score	Centering Score	Connectivity Score	Overall Score
51	Rockford, IL	91.9	106.8	81.8	119.2	113.3
52	Salem, OR	95.7	121.3	100.9	91.6	112.5
53	Medford, OR	89.3	118.4	102	68.1	112.5
54	South Bend-Mishawaka, IN-MI	90.3	97.3	91.2	116.9	112.5
55	Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA	94.3	138	87	94.8	112.1
56	Lubbock, TX	95.3	116.5	77.4	104.6	111.9
57	New Orleans-Metairie, LA	104.5	117.1	95.9	141.7	111.9
58	Chico, CA	90.5	124.4	80.8	77.5	111.6
59	Salt Lake City, UT	119.8	120.1	92	124	110.9
60	Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA	117.2	133.6	112	125.5	110.6
61	Frederick-Gaithersburg-Rockville, MD	116	123.3	108.3	109	110
62	Milwaukee-Waukesha, WI	109.8	125.7	104	124.2	109.7
63	Stockton, CA	107.4	133.3	67.6	121.9	109.6
64	Binghamton, NY	90.3	116.2	103.3	64.6	109.2
65	Nassau County-Suffolk County, NY	117.2	141.7	86.1	146.8	109.1
66	Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	100.5	116.3	110.6	111.4	109
67	Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	106.7	131.8	74.1	118.3	108.5
68	Utica-Rome, NY	89.6	110.4	119.2	61.3	108.4
69	Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise, NV	128.7	97.4	109.7	141.8	108.3
70	Merced, CA	95.4	118.4	87.2	76.8	108.1
71	Appleton, WI	87.7	105.7	90.3	87	108
72	Manchester-Nashua, NH	97	102.5	107.8	89.5	107.9
73	Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA	91.1	117.5	88.5	113.6	107.8
74	Bellingham, WA	88.3	90.4	105.5	80.5	107
75	Olympia-Lacey-Tumwater, WA	90.7	78.7	120.2	87.1	106.8

Source: UNLV Lied Center for Real Estate; Hamidi et al. (2026).

Appendix: 2026 Compactness Index Rankings — All 233 U.S. MSAs (Ranks 76–100 of 233)

Rank from least sprawl (1) to most sprawl (233). Nevada MSAs highlighted.

Overall Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area	Density Score	Land Use Mix Score	Centering Score	Connectivity Score	Overall Score
76	Providence-Warwick, RI-MA	107.2	133.2	95.5	123.5	106.7
77	Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	100.4	118	83	125.3	106.4
78	Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	128.9	109.8	161.2	111.1	106.3
79	El Paso, TX	106.8	96.3	87.4	136.3	106.3
80	Albuquerque, NM	101.3	111.3	101.7	114.5	106
81	Cambridge-Newton-Framingham, MA	129.3	142	78.6	125.5	106
82	Tacoma-Lakewood, WA	106.5	96	102.7	123.7	105.9
83	Fort Collins, CO	93.6	101.6	88.9	99.2	105.6
84	Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH	83.3	83.5	123.7	91.9	105.2
85	Charlottesville, VA	92.7	100.3	123.7	42.5	105.2
86	Lancaster, PA	98.7	105.5	110.6	87.9	105.2
87	Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	93.8	106.7	96.3	108.8	105.1
88	Norwich-New London, CT	85.7	80.9	135.8	65.3	105
89	Vallejo, CA	105	114.5	60.4	111.6	104.5
90	Evansville, IN-KY	89.7	101.7	91.3	90.5	104.2
91	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Boynton Beach, FL	111.9	114.9	88.4	131.4	103.9
92	North Port-Sarasota-Bradenton, FL	97.7	98.1	91.3	131	103.5
93	Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL	90	124.3	59.4	107.2	103.4
94	Tyler, TX	83.7	68.9	109.5	94.7	103.3
95	Visalia, CA	93.5	128.5	76.9	90.7	102.9
96	Canton-Massillon, OH	87.2	102.3	76.1	116	102.9
97	Newark, NJ-PA	124.8	140.5	88	110.1	102.5
98	Peoria, IL	86.5	96.4	103.2	94.4	102.4
99	Bremerton-Silverdale-Port Orchard, WA	88.6	87.8	98.5	87.3	102.4
100	Sioux Falls, SD	96	102.2	92.5	71.2	102.1

Source: UNLV Lied Center for Real Estate; Hamidi et al. (2026).

Appendix: 2026 Compactness Index Rankings — All 233 U.S. MSAs (Ranks 101–125 of 233)

Rank from least sprawl (1) to most sprawl (233). Nevada MSAs highlighted.

Overall Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area	Density Score	Land Use Mix Score	Centering Score	Connectivity Score	Overall Score
101	Baltimore-Columbia-Towson, MD	114.3	117.8	122.3	117.7	101.8
102	Roanoke, VA	88	89.2	102	87.6	101.6
103	Ann Arbor, MI	103.6	94.5	98.4	77.6	101.3
104	Syracuse, NY	96.4	104	132.7	68.1	101.1
105	Kennewick-Richland, WA	92.7	96.8	75.4	98.4	100.9
106	San Diego-Chula Vista-Carlsbad, CA	125.7	126.8	102.4	121.8	100.8
107	Sacramento-Roseville-Folsom, CA	108.9	123.3	114.5	114.2	100.6
108	Wichita, KS	95.4	110.4	100.1	92.3	100.4
109	York-Hanover, PA	90.1	93	103.3	94.1	100
110	Waco, TX	86.6	81.2	78.8	109.2	99.5
111	Lake County-Kenosha County, IL-WI	97.1	103.6	87.3	122.5	99.4
112	Colorado Springs, CO	100.9	105.2	72.5	123.9	99.2
113	Charleston-North Charleston, SC	93.5	85.7	122.8	102.9	99.1
114	Houma-Thibodaux, LA	82.7	86.8	90.3	80.3	98.8
115	Boise City, ID	96.8	111	106.7	87	98.5
116	Tallahassee, FL	94.6	74.3	117.4	82.3	98.5
117	Wilmington, NC	91.4	98.6	66.8	97	98.3
118	Dayton-Kettering, OH	92.9	107.1	92.6	109.7	97.7
119	Buffalo-Cheektowaga, NY	104.9	126.4	93.5	94.6	97.6
120	Toledo, OH	91.9	116	87.8	95	97.6
121	Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA	98.8	116	90.8	89.5	97.4
122	Topeka, KS	86.9	100.9	84.5	69.5	97.3
123	Lake Charles, LA	84.7	88.7	88.5	77.6	97.3
124	Springfield, MA	98.2	118.6	90.9	84.5	96.5
125	Macon-Bibb County, GA	82.4	81.8	99.4	75.3	96.1

Source: UNLV Lied Center for Real Estate; Hamidi et al. (2026).

Appendix: 2026 Compactness Index Rankings — All 233 U.S. MSAs (Ranks 126–150 of 233)

Rank from least sprawl (1) to most sprawl (233). Nevada MSAs highlighted.

Overall Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area	Density Score	Land Use Mix Score	Centering Score	Connectivity Score	Overall Score
126	Tucson, AZ	102.6	93.2	99.8	114.3	96
127	Port St. Lucie, FL	92.3	79.1	92.9	109.4	96
128	Greeley, CO	87.2	93.9	85.4	88.3	96
129	Wilmington, DE-MD-NJ	101	106.1	75.8	109.9	95.7
130	Lafayette-West Lafayette, IN	93.1	97.5	74.4	70.8	95.7
131	Savannah, GA	88.9	72	100.7	102.3	95.6
132	Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX	83.7	78	92.1	106.5	94.5
133	Kalamazoo-Portage, MI	89.7	88.1	80.2	82.1	94.5
134	Camden, NJ	102.3	122.1	71.4	120.3	94.4
135	Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	96.2	110.2	113.8	77.5	93.9
136	Provo-Orem, UT	102.1	117.6	60.6	103	93.8
137	Gainesville, FL	90.5	78.5	91.1	90	93.5
138	Crestview-Fort Walton Beach-Destin, FL	87.5	80.7	88.6	84.6	93.2
139	Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown, TX	103.3	94.5	138.2	104.1	93.2
140	Fort Wayne, IN	91.6	90.6	88.3	88.5	93
141	Elkhart-Goshen, IN	84.7	75.1	66	98.1	92.4
142	Fresno, CA	104.1	130	66.8	96.7	91.8
143	Pittsburgh, PA	100.3	110.3	114.4	113.1	91.7
144	Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV	84.8	82.7	95.9	75	91.5
145	Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	101.5	103.5	102.2	117	91.4
146	Columbus, GA-AL	89	85	93.3	76.2	91.4
147	Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	93.8	79.5	84.5	125.5	91.4
148	Akron, OH	91.5	100.3	80.4	105.8	90.8
149	Monroe, LA	80.3	57	101	80.8	90.5
150	Lansing-East Lansing, MI	95.6	94.9	104.9	69.3	90.4

Source: UNLV Lied Center for Real Estate; Hamidi et al. (2026).

Appendix: 2026 Compactness Index Rankings — All 233 U.S. MSAs (Ranks 151–175 of 233)

Rank from least sprawl (1) to most sprawl (233). Nevada MSAs highlighted.

Overall Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area	Density Score	Land Use Mix Score	Centering Score	Connectivity Score	Overall Score
151	Asheville, NC	81.6	75.8	114.3	84.7	89.9
152	Montgomery, AL	87	86.7	97.4	75.7	89.7
153	Ogden-Clearfield, UT	99	114.3	62	99.3	89.7
154	New Brunswick-Lakewood, NJ	106.4	123.5	74.6	129.9	89.3
155	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	106.6	95.9	99.4	143.4	89.1
156	Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	111	110.9	122.2	105.8	88
157	Lafayette, LA	83.5	84.5	90.2	94	87.9
158	Durham-Chapel Hill, NC	89.9	75.4	135.9	65.6	87.8
159	Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	94.5	80	68.6	118.9	87.2
160	Gulfport-Biloxi, MS	82.4	71.4	97.9	91.5	87
161	Flint, MI	84.7	80.7	71.9	104.7	86.8
162	Bakersfield, CA	97.8	127.1	68	86.8	86.6
163	Gary, IN	92.7	108.2	55.5	112.1	86.5
164	Cleveland-Elyria, OH	103.2	117.2	100.6	97.7	86.3
165	Fort Smith, AR-OK	83	90.5	62.8	79.6	86.1
166	Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	86.6	64.6	103.3	96.1	86
167	Shreveport-Bossier City, LA	84	77.2	78.5	98.4	85.9
168	Phoenix-Mesa-Chandler, AZ	112.5	101.5	117.7	125	85.5
169	Ocala, FL	81	50.7	95.4	107.4	85.3
170	Richmond, VA	97.5	84	117.7	94.9	85.3
171	Hartford-East Hartford-Middletown, CT	98.9	102.9	110.6	77.9	85.3
172	Spartanburg, SC	79.8	60.7	101.6	85.3	85.1
173	Columbus, OH	100.5	103	113.6	98.8	84.8
174	Dallas-Plano-Irving, TX	112	92.2	122.2	130.3	84.5
175	Oklahoma City, OK	101.6	95.9	100.8	96.9	84.2

Source: UNLV Lied Center for Real Estate; Hamidi et al. (2026).

Appendix: 2026 Compactness Index Rankings — All 233 U.S. MSAs (Ranks 176–200 of 233)

Rank from least sprawl (1) to most sprawl (233). Nevada MSAs highlighted.

Overall Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area	Density Score	Land Use Mix Score	Centering Score	Connectivity Score	Overall Score
176	Worcester, MA-CT	98.2	107.3	97.4	73.9	84
177	Gainesville, GA	82.6	50.3	92.1	76.6	83.8
178	Birmingham-Hoover, AL	86.3	70.4	115.1	110.5	83.7
179	Indianapolis-Carmel-Anderson, IN	96.3	92	121.9	101.9	83.5
180	Elgin, IL	94.4	95.9	65	106.1	82.9
181	Portland-South Portland, ME	86.3	82	119.8	58	82.8
182	Louisville/Jefferson County, KY-IN	95.9	91.4	103.8	94.8	82.5
183	Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway, AR	85.4	74.3	109	91.3	82.4
184	Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	89.4	79.4	65.1	120.6	82.3
185	Rochester, NY	94.6	102.3	119.2	58.6	81.1
186	Johnson City, TN	81	47.5	77.6	89.5	81.1
187	Lake Havasu City-Kingman, AZ	84	71.6	64.5	76.5	80.9
188	Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	97.8	99.5	121	89.6	80.5
189	Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	84.5	102	67	86.4	80.5
190	Mobile, AL	86.7	82.1	72.3	87.8	80.5
191	St. Louis, MO-IL	96.3	102.1	106.3	113.2	80.3
192	Lynchburg, VA	80.7	79.4	97.4	45.9	79.8
193	Springfield, MO	87.7	93	74.1	76.8	79.7
194	Memphis, TN-MS-AR	96	79.9	111.9	92.8	79.6
195	McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX	95.4	70	79.5	115.1	79.5
196	Killeen-Temple, TX	86.7	70.9	72.6	100.5	79.3
197	Tulsa, OK	90.1	89.1	88	98.3	78.8
198	Fort Worth-Arlington-Grapevine, TX	102.2	96.3	84.7	123.7	78.1
199	Kansas City, MO-KS	98.1	103.7	95.2	102.3	77.7
200	Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	89.2	51.2	82.2	120.4	76.4

Source: UNLV Lied Center for Real Estate; Hamidi et al. (2026).

Appendix: 2026 Compactness Index Rankings — All 233 U.S. MSAs (Ranks 201–225 of 233)

Rank from least sprawl (1) to most sprawl (233). Nevada MSAs highlighted.

Overall Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area	Density Score	Land Use Mix Score	Centering Score	Connectivity Score	Overall Score
201	Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR	86.2	73.5	90.7	78.3	75.9
202	Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL	105.2	77.9	95.6	125	75.6
203	Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown, NY	90.8	98.6	79.7	70.2	75.5
204	Clarksville, TN-KY	84.9	52.8	102.2	58.3	73.8
205	Columbia, SC	88.3	73.6	103.2	78.2	73.8
206	Grand Rapids-Kentwood, MI	92.5	90.4	98.8	73.7	73.5
207	Salisbury, MD-DE	77.7	61.3	88.3	81.7	73.2
208	Jacksonville, FL	95.9	75.5	92	109.5	73
209	Longview, TX	78.1	78.8	65.7	67.9	72.9
210	Greensboro-High Point, NC	86.3	80.4	91.9	79.1	72.9
211	Montgomery County-Bucks County-Chester County, PA	97.1	116.9	68.5	100.7	72.7
212	Charlotte-Concord-Gastonia, NC-SC	93.7	79.1	138.1	85.1	72.6
213	Huntsville, AL	84.1	55.1	92.2	81	71.4
214	Chattanooga, TN-GA	85.6	61.2	89.4	82.4	71.3
215	Kingsport-Bristol, TN-VA	76.6	50.4	92.1	70.4	71.2
216	Raleigh-Cary, NC	95.2	82.8	91.6	92.1	71
217	San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX	99	85.3	95.4	109.4	70.7
218	Jackson, MS	82.8	64.9	100.6	69.9	70.2
219	Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX	109.1	95.5	110.3	121.1	69.9
220	Knoxville, TN	84.9	55.9	120.4	75	69.8
221	Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	84.8	66.1	91.3	75.6	69.4
222	Winston-Salem, NC	83.2	63.1	105.1	69.1	68.6
223	Warren-Troy-Farmington Hills, MI	96	103.4	81.3	95.5	65.2
224	Rockingham County-Strafford County, NH	82.6	75.3	71.7	62.3	65.1
225	Jacksonville, NC	79.6	44.4	61.8	65.5	63.7

Source: UNLV Lied Center for Real Estate; Hamidi et al. (2026).

Appendix: 2026 Compactness Index Rankings — All 233 U.S. MSAs (Ranks 226–233 of 233)

Rank from least sprawl (1) to most sprawl (233). Nevada MSAs highlighted.

Overall Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area	Density Score	Land Use Mix Score	Centering Score	Connectivity Score	Overall Score
226	Greenville-Anderson, SC	84.3	66.5	94.7	76.9	63.4
227	Baton Rouge, LA	88.4	68.9	72.1	88	62.5
228	Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC-NC	79.8	48.6	63.7	91.4	60
229	Fayetteville, NC	83.2	54.8	70.3	78.3	60
230	Hickory-Lenoir-Morganton, NC	76.3	43.1	77.8	67.2	57.9
231	Nashville-Davidson-Murfreesboro-Franklin, TN	91.4	62.7	117.2	72.6	57.4
232	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Alpharetta, GA	100.9	82.9	133.4	79.4	57.2
233	Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	102.8	108.7	66.1	98.4	54.3

Source: UNLV Lied Center for Real Estate; Hamidi et al. (2026).