# VMT Mitigation Strategies Worksheet

## 1. Pricing
Gas prices/taxes
- Parking pricing
  - parking fees
  - unbundled parking costs
  - limit parking supply
  - parking permitting
- Road user pricing
  - facility tolling
  - cordon tolling
  - distance pricing

## 2. Programs/Education
Voluntary travel behavior change programs
- media/communication campaigns
- travel feedback programs
Telecommuting
Employer-based trip reduction programs
- rideshare facilitation
- vanpool/shuttle
- transit subsidy
- rideshare subsidy
- financial incentive for active commuters
- facilities for active commuters
- parking cash-out
- price workplace parking
- alternate work schedules

## 3. Land Use
Employment density
- revise floor-area ratios
- revise minimum parking requirements
Residential density
- increase minimum lot size requirements
- increase allowable densities
- zoning
- public finance mechanisms
Transit access
- service expansion
- increase frequency/headways
- service optimization
- fare reductions
Land use mix (diversity)
- project-level diversity
- area-level diversity
Regional accessibility
Jobs/housing balance
Affordable housing

## 4. Transportation
Transit services/access
- service expansion & adjustments
- BRT
Bicycle facilities
- lanes, trails, routes
- parking
- bike share
- end-of-trip facilities
Pedestrian strategies
- infrastructure (sidewalks, paths)
- street lighting, trees, furniture
- traffic calming
Car-sharing
### 1. Pricing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Change in VMT*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gas Prices/Taxes</strong></td>
<td>0 – 2.72% decrease per 1% increase in gas price over the long run¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification of gas price via policy. Short run travel behavior may change to increase fuel economy and/or decrease vehicle trips. Long run travel behavior may change through vehicle, housing, and/or employment choice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Pricing</strong></td>
<td>0.12 – 12.5% decrease per 1% increase in parking priceii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing existing parking prices, or charging for parking that is currently offered for free, which can encourage mode switching by increasing the cost of private vehicle trips. Parking policies can include unbundled parking costs from property costs, market-based public parking (e.g. Pasadena), permitting, etc. Elasticities were measured for urban contexts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road User Pricing</strong></td>
<td>Decrease per 1% increase in road price:iii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Road user pricing aims to affect the amount, time, or place that people travel. It takes three basic forms: (1) link or point charging (e.g., toll roads and bridges), (2) cordon toll (e.g., drivers charged when crossing boundary of predefined area), and (3) distance charging (e.g., users pay according to distance driven on predefined road network). | 1. 0.03 – 0.36%  
2. 12 – 30%  
3. 9 – 19% |

* The change in VMT per “unit of strategy” is called elasticity. For example, for a 1% increase in parking pricing, VMT has been measured to decrease by 0.12 to 12.5%.
Discussion of Pricing Strategies

a) **Effectiveness** - How well will this family of strategies work to mitigate VMT in various places in the region? Why? Reference individual strategies as necessary.

b) **Technical feasibility** - What questions do you have about the technical implementation of the strategies?

c) **Expense/cost** – What are your thoughts on the expense of implementing certain strategies relative to other strategies or families of strategies?

d) **Credibility** - How is this family of strategies, or individual strategies, perceived by your constituents/constituencies?
e) **Political acceptability** - How acceptable is this family of strategies to your constituency? To the wider region? Reference individual strategies as necessary.

f) **Geopolitical acceptability** - Where in the SCAG region will this family of strategies work best to reduce VMT? Reference individual strategies as necessary.

g) **Other comments** - Any issues or ideas that address VMT mitigation that don’t fit in the categories above.

h) **Unanswered questions** - Note unanswered questions, or points of major disagreement here for reference later as needed.
## 2. Programs/Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Change in VMT*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary Travel Behavior Change Programs</strong></td>
<td>5 – 12% decrease as result of VTBC program&lt;sup&gt;iv&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These are a range of travel demand management techniques that are designed to change the behavior of travelers without changing the options available to them. They fall into two broad categories: communication campaigns and travel feedback programs. TFPs use information such as travel diaries to encourage participants to actively examine their travel behavior and its impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telecommuting</strong></td>
<td>48 – 90.3% decrease per telecommuter per telecommute day&lt;sup&gt;v&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The practice of working from home or other nearby location by employees who have a regular work place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employer-Based Trip Reduction Programs</strong></td>
<td>1 – 15% decrease in commute VMT as result of trip reduction program&lt;sup&gt;vi&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typically include some combination of the following elements, usually chosen by firms to suit their specific context: rideshare or vanpool facilitation, transit subsidy, carpool subsidy, financial incentive for bicycle or pedestrian commuters, parking “cash-out”, facilities (e.g. showers) for active commuters, alternate work weeks, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The change in VMT per “unit of strategy” is called elasticity. For example, a 1% increase in employer-based trip reduction programs was correlated with a 1-15% decrease in commute VMT.
Discussion of Programs/Education Strategies

a) **Effectiveness** - How well will this family of strategies work to mitigate VMT in various places in the region? Why? Reference individual strategies as necessary.

b) **Technical feasibility** - What questions do you have about the technical implementation of the strategies?

c) **Expense/cost** - What are your thoughts on the expense of implementing certain strategies relative to other strategies or families of strategies?

d) **Credibility** - How is this family of strategies, or individual strategies, perceived by your constituents/constituencies?
e) **Political acceptability** - How acceptable is this family of strategies to your constituency? To the wider region? Reference individual strategies as necessary.

f) **Geopolitical acceptability** - Where in the SCAG region will this family of strategies work best to reduce VMT? Reference individual strategies as necessary.

g) **Other comments** - Any issues or ideas that address VMT mitigation that don’t fit in the categories above.

h) **Unanswered questions** - Note unanswered questions, or points of major disagreement here for reference later as needed.
### 3. Land Use Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Change in VMT*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Density</strong></td>
<td>-0.11 – +0.07% per 1% increase in employment density (see source)⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment density is usually measured as the ratio of the number of employees divided by land area (e.g., employees per acre or employees per square mile). Employment density can be measured at different scales (e.g. census tract, traffic-analysis zone (TAZ), neighborhood, or city).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Density</strong></td>
<td>0.07 – 0.14% decrease per 1% increase in population density⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density policies include direct changes to land use, such as relaxing minimum lot size requirements, increasing the density of allowed development, and encouraging urban infill. More broadly, officials can encourage higher density through combinations of infrastructure, zoning, or public finance policies that, for example, focus development around transportation nodes (including transit stations) or raise land prices and hence encourage smaller lot sizes as a result of impact fees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance to Transit (Transit Access)</strong></td>
<td>0.8 – 13.3% decrease per 1 mile closer to transit station (see source)⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit agencies can increase transit access by providing new service or reroute existing services to new areas, thereby bringing transit closer to potential users. Transit access also increases when communities increase the density of housing and other land-uses within walking distance of stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land-Use Mix (Diversity)</strong></td>
<td>0.01 – 0.17% decrease per 1% increase in land-use mix (see source)¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land-use mix or mixed-use development can be defined as the practice of accommodating more than one type of function within a building, a set of buildings, or a specific area. These functions include residential, office, retail, and personal services, as well as parks and open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network Connectivity</strong></td>
<td>(See source)¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the transportation standpoint, network connectivity is defined with respect to the directness of connections to potential destinations. The structure of the street network, defined in terms of the patterns of streets and intersections, determines the directness of these connections, which often differ by mode (e.g. vehicles versus bicycles).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Accessibility</td>
<td>(See source)\textsuperscript{xii}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This can be defined as the ease with which destinations can be reached throughout a region. The proximity of a residence to potential destinations, such as jobs, shopping, and leisure-time activities, and the nature of the transportation links to those destinations together determine accessibility. Community types (e.g. urban, compact infill, suburban center, etc.) commonly used as proxy for regional accessibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs-Housing Balance</th>
<th>(See source)\textsuperscript{xiii}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a transportation policy tool, this metric is premised on the idea that when residence and work locations are closer together, people’s travel distance to and from work will be reduced. Jobs-housing balance is typically measured by the ratio of the number of jobs divided by either the number of employed residents, persons, or houses in a geographic area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incorporation of Affordable Housing</th>
<th>0.04 – 1.2% decrease per affordable housing unit \textsuperscript{xiv}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income is still a significant factor in the likelihood of someone to walk or take transit to work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The change in VMT per “unit of strategy” is called elasticity. For example, a 1% increase in residential population density, independent of other strategies, was correlated with a 0.07 to 0.14% decrease in VMT.
Discussion of Land Use Strategies

a) **Effectiveness** - How well will this family of strategies work to mitigate VMT in various places in the region? Why? Reference individual strategies as necessary.

b) **Technical feasibility** - What questions do you have about the technical implementation of the strategies?

c) **Expense/cost** - What are your thoughts on the expense of implementing certain strategies relative to other strategies or families of strategies?

d) **Credibility** - How is this family of strategies, or individual strategies, perceived by your constituents/constituencies?
e) **Political acceptability** - How acceptable is this family of strategies to your constituency? To the wider region? Reference individual strategies as necessary.

f) **Geopolitical acceptability** - Where in the SCAG region will this family of strategies work best to reduce VMT? Reference individual strategies as necessary.

g) **Other comments** - Any issues or ideas that address VMT mitigation that don’t fit in the categories above.

h) **Unanswered questions** - Note unanswered questions, or points of major disagreement here for reference later as needed.
4. Transportation Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Change in VMT*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Service/Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit-related strategies include three general categories: service and headway/frequency increases, system expansion/optimization, and fare reductions.</td>
<td>0.17 – 1% increase in bus ridership per 1% increase in transit (see source)\textsuperscript{xv}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies that facilitate increased bicycle use fall into two main categories: (1) infrastructure projects that improve bicycle accessibility, safety, and convenience, either while traveling or at the end of the trip, and (2) programs that promote bicycling directly or indirectly through education, community events, advertising, and other activities.</td>
<td>1) 0.3 – 3.2% increase in bicycle commuting per 1% increase of infrastructure; 2) 25-100% increase in bicycling after program\textsuperscript{xvi}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to improve the walking environment include pedestrian infrastructure, street trees and lighting to make walking more comfortable, traffic calming techniques, and promotional programs (e.g. Safe Routes to School).</td>
<td>0.09 – 2% increase in walking trips/mode share per pedestrian strategy (see source)\textsuperscript{xvii}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carsharing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carsharing refers to a specific type of service that offers members short-term vehicle access. Example networks include Zipcar, City CarShare, Car2go, Scoot (scooters), et cetera.</td>
<td>26 – 68% decrease in VMT per carshare member\textsuperscript{xviii}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The change in VMT per “unit of strategy” is called elasticity. For example, a 1% increase transit service/access was shown to result in a 0.17 – 1% increase in bus ridership.
Discussion of Transportation Strategies

a) **Effectiveness** - How well will this family of strategies work to mitigate VMT in various places in the region? Why? Reference individual strategies as necessary.

b) **Technical feasibility** - What questions do you have about the technical implementation of the strategies?

c) **Expense/cost** - What are your thoughts on the expense of implementing certain strategies relative to other strategies or families of strategies?

d) **Credibility** - How is this family of strategies, or individual strategies, perceived by your constituents/constituencies?
e) **Political acceptability** - How acceptable is this family of strategies to your constituency? To the wider region? Reference individual strategies as necessary.

f) **Geopolitical acceptability** - Where in the SCAG region will this family of strategies work best to reduce VMT? Reference individual strategies as necessary.

g) **Other comments** - Any issues or ideas that address VMT mitigation that don’t fit in the categories above.

h) **Unanswered questions** - Note unanswered questions, or points of major disagreement here for reference later as needed.
Endnotes:

i arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/gasprice/gasprice_brief.pdf
ii arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/pricing/parking_pricing_brief.pdf
iii arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/pricing/road_pricing_brief.pdf
iv arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/vtbc/vtbc_brief120313.pdf
v arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/telecommuting/telecommuting_brief120313.pdf
vi arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/ebtr/ebtr_brief.pdf
vii arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/empldens/employment_density_brief.pdf
viii arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/density/residential_density_brief.pdf
ix arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/transitaccess/transit_access_brief120313.pdf
x arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/mix/lu-mix_brief.pdf
xi arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/connectivity/network_connectivity_brief.pdf
xii arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/regaccess/regional_accessibility_brief120313.pdf
xiii arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/jhbalance/jhbalance_brief.pdf
xv arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/transitservice/transit_brief.pdf
xvi arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/bicycling/bicycling_brief.pdf
xvii arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/ped/walking_brief.pdf
xviii arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/carsharing/carsharing_brief.pdf