

1 **THE LIGHT-DUTY-VEHICLE FLEET’S EVOLUTION:**
2 **ANTICIPATING PHEV ADOPTION AND GREENHOUSE GAS**
3 **EMISSIONS ACROSS THE U.S. FLEET**

4
5 Binny M. Paul
6 Graduate Research Assistant
7 The University of Texas at Austin – 6.508, E. Cockrell Jr. Hall
8 Austin, TX 78712-1076
9 binnympaul@gmail.com

10
11 Kara M. Kockelman
12 (Corresponding author)
13 Professor and William J. Murray Jr. Fellow
14 Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering
15 The University of Texas at Austin – 6.9 E. Cockrell Jr. Hall
16 Austin, TX 78712-1076
17 kkockelm@mail.utexas.edu
18 Phone: 512-471-0210 & FAX: 512-475-8744

19
20 Sashank Musti
21 Travel Demand Modeler
22 Cambridge Systematics
23 Oakland, California
24 sashankmnm@gmail.com

25
26 The following paper is a pre-print and the final publication can be found in
27 *Transportation Research Record No. 2252:107-117, 2011.*
28 Presented at the 90th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, January 2011

29
30 **ABSTRACT**

31 With environmental degradation and energy security as serious concerns for most countries, it is
32 important to anticipate how vehicle ownership and usage patterns – and associated petroleum use
33 and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions – can change under different policies and contexts. This
34 work relies on a stated and revealed preference survey of U.S. households to ascertain the
35 personal-vehicle acquisition, disposal, and use patterns of a synthetic population over time.

36 In addition to reporting on key summary statistics and behavioral model results using the
37 national sample, this work relies on microsimulation to anticipate future fleet composition,
38 usage, and GHG emissions under different gas price, PHEV pricing, feebate policy, and
39 demographic settings. 25-year simulations predicted the highest market share for PHEVs, HEVs,
40 and Smart Cars under an increased gas price (\$7 per gallon) scenario. Results under a feebate
41 policy scenario indicate a shift towards fuel efficient vehicles, but with vehicle miles traveled
42 (VMT) rising, thanks to lower driving costs. The fees collected under the feebate policy
43 significantly exceed rebates distributed to buyers of relatively efficient vehicles (assuming a 30
44 mi/gal pivot point), suggesting the need for a much higher pivot point, to motivate significant
45 behavioral shifts and a lower pivot point to achieve revenue neutrality, under current sales trends.

46 Excepting the low PHEV price and feebate policy simulations, all other scenarios predicted a
47 lower fleet VMT. Simulated fleet VMT and GHG emissions lowest under the \$7-per-gallon gas-
48 price scenario. The high-density scenario (where job and household densities were quadrupled),
49 resulted in the lowest total vehicle ownership levels, and thus lower VMT and emissions.

50 As expected, the low-PHEV-price scenario resulted in higher shares of PHEVs, but just
51 negligible GHG emissions impacts (relative to trend). Households with three or fewer members
52 were predicted to be the highest adopters of PHEVs and HEVs across all scenarios. While plug-
53 in vehicles are now hitting the market, their adoption and widespread use will depend on
54 thoughtful marketing, competitive pricing, government incentives, reliable driving-range reports,
55 and adequate charging infrastructure. Though just 29% of survey respondents (weighted to
56 reflect the U.S. population) stated support for a (specific) feebate policy, 35% indicated an
57 interest in purchasing a PHEV if it cost \$6,000 more than its gasoline counterpart. This work
58 helps highlight the impacts of various directions consumers may head with such vehicles.

59 **Key Words:** Plug-in electric vehicles, personal vehicle fleet, vehicle ownership,
60 microsimulation, travel behavior modeling, greenhouse gas emissions

61 INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION

62 Per-capita greenhouse gas emissions in the U.S. are four times the world average (WRI 2009),
63 with the transportation sector accounting for close to 30 percent of the nation's total (EPA 2009).
64 A variety of strategies exist to reduce such emissions, including automotive designs, fuel-source
65 alternatives, vehicle and gas pricing policies, and travel-demand management. Light-duty vehicle
66 ownership decisions impact fleet composition directly, total vehicle miles traveled (VMT), fuel
67 consumption, GHG emissions, congestion, tolling revenues, and road safety somewhat less
68 directly (see, e.g., Musti and Kockelman [2010] and Lemp and Kockelman [2010]). Thanks to
69 such linkages, transportation planners, engineers and policy makers should have great interest in
70 accurately forecasting future vehicle fleet attributes.

71 This study is inspired by Musti and Kockelman's (2010) modeling of the household vehicle fleet
72 in Austin, Texas, over a 25-year period. This work makes use of a very similar microsimulation
73 framework, with embedded transaction, vehicle choice and vehicle usage models, to forecast the
74 U.S. vehicle fleet's composition and associated GHG emissions, from 2010 to 2035, under a
75 variety of policy, technology, and gas-price scenarios. The following sections present recent
76 literature, data collection and model details, as well as the 25-year simulation results. The paper
77 concludes with a summary and recommendations for policy and future work.

78 PREVIOUS WORK

79 Most past studies of vehicle ownership have emphasized the impacts of vehicle attributes,
80 household characteristics and environmental variables (like fuel prices and taxes) on vehicle
81 choice decisions. Lave and Train (1979) estimated a multinomial logit (MNL) model for vehicle
82 choice, with household and vehicle characteristics, gasoline prices and taxes as explanatory
83 variables. Manski and Sherman (1980) estimated MNL models for one and two vehicle
84 households and concluded that most vehicle performance attributes have relatively little impact
85 on choice, while price and operating and transaction costs are practically (and statistically)
86 significant. Berkovec and Rust (1985) estimated nested logit (NL) models, and noted that

87 consumers are more likely to stick with past or current vehicle types, rather than replacing with a
88 different type. Findings from these studies are consistent with those of Mannering et al. (2002),
89 Mohammadian and Miller (2003a), Train and Winston (2007), and Nolan (2010).

90 Neighborhood attributes and owner attitudes can also play substantive roles. Potoglou et al.
91 (2008) found that transit proximity, diversity of land use, and home-to-work distances to be
92 significant determinants of vehicle ownership, after controlling for socio-economic
93 characteristics. Bhat et al. (2009) examined the effect of built environment characteristics, and
94 concluded that neighborhoods high in density of both residential and commercial uses are
95 associated with smaller size vehicles. Zhao and Kockelman (2001) found household size,
96 income, home-neighborhood population density, and vehicle prices to be important predictors of
97 household vehicle counts (by vehicle type).

98 Choo and Mokhtarian (2004) concluded that consumers' travel attitudes, personalities, lifestyles,
99 and mobility are helpful predictors of vehicle choice decisions. Kurani and Turrentine (2004)
100 concluded that households generally do not pay much attention to a given vehicle's fuel cost (per
101 mile, year, or lifetime) time unless they are operating under tight budgetary constraints; however,
102 they do pay attention to fuel prices (per gallon). Busse et al. (2009) found that market *shares* of
103 *new* vehicles (by fuel economy category) tend to adjust to offset gas-price shifts, while *used-*
104 *vehicle prices* adjust directly. Mannering and Winston (1985) estimated a dynamic model for
105 vehicle choice and use, reflecting past choices. Their results suggest that consumers go for a
106 vehicle with higher brand loyalty, *ceteris paribus*. Berkowitz et al. (1987) reported inertia effects
107 in (short-run) vehicle use and fuel consumption data, in response to energy-related policies. Feng
108 et al. (2005) estimated a NL choice model coupled with use model and predicted that higher
109 gasoline prices and rising registration taxes as vehicles (and their emissions control technologies)
110 age will lead to emissions reductions.

111 Vehicle choice and transaction models have been increasingly used for forecasting market shares
112 of alternative fuel vehicles and evaluating climate and energy policies. Mohammadian and Miller
113 (2003b) predicted changes in household size and job status (of household members) to be
114 significant determinants of transaction decisions. Gallagher et al. (2008) concluded that higher
115 gasoline prices and heightened preferences for energy security or environmental protection tend
116 to lead to greater rates of hybrid electric vehicles (HEV) adoption, rather than government
117 incentives (which often come after purchase, in the form of annual-income tax rebates, for
118 example). Musti and Kockelman (2010) estimated Austin's highest future PHEV-plus-HEV
119 share (19% by 2034) under a feebate policy scenario.

120 This work relies on the growing literature, described above, for specification of behavioral
121 models and the simulated scenarios. The model runs anticipate adoption of HEVs and PHEVs
122 across the U.S. personal-vehicle fleet over the next 25 years, under high gas prices, feebate
123 policy settings, and other scenarios.

124 **DATA DESCRIPTION**

125 Data were obtained via an online survey issued in the Fall of 2009, using a pre-registered sample
126 of households/respondents from across the U.S., as maintained by Survey Sampling International

127 (SSI). The questionnaire used by Musti and Kockelman (2010) for collection of Austin area data
128 was enhanced¹ for use in this national on-line survey.

129 **Household Synthesis and Vehicle Ownership Data**

130 Population weights were computed by dividing the sample into 720 categories, based on gender,
131 age, employment and student status, household size and household income categories. The ratios
132 of counts from the 2008 American Community Survey's (ACS 2008) microdata sample to the
133 survey's sample counts were normalized. Households in the survey sample were scaled up in
134 proportion to their corresponding weights, to construct a synthetic U.S. population of workable
135 size (50,016 synthetic households, to represent 115-million year-2010 households).

136 The survey included questions on respondents' current and past vehicle-holdings and vehicle-use
137 details, stated future vehicle choice elections, opinions on climate and energy policies, and
138 demographics. In the stated preference (SP) section, respondents were presented with 12 vehicle
139 choices covering wide range of price, fuel economy, and body types² under four different
140 scenarios. PHEVs³ were assumed to have a 30-mile⁴, all-electric range requiring about 250
141 watt-hours per mile, with an 11 gallon gas tank resulting in a total range of 500 miles. All other
142 attributes of the PHEV30 matched a Toyota Prius. The four scenarios presented to each
143 respondent consisted of a trend scenario, two increased-gas-price scenarios (\$5 and \$7 per
144 gallon, fuel costs were provided), and an external-costs scenario (with GHG and other emissions'
145 social-cost impacts estimated for each vehicle [assuming driving distances of 15,000 miles per
146 year, which is typical of new U.S. vehicles])). Other questions included opinions about potential
147 climate and energy policies and the respondents' willingness to adopt advanced vehicle
148 technologies under different fuel-cost and purchase-price scenarios. The final section requested
149 demographic details.

150 **Data Set Statistics**

151 Table 1 compares key demographic variables obtained in the national survey to U.S. ACS data
152 (which rely on 2006 through 2008 averages). The sample's household income is 19 percent
153 lower (\$59,882 vs. \$71,128) than the national average (perhaps due to the financial crisis that
154 began in 2007). And the average number of vehicles per household is about 15 percent less than
155 the ACS average (similar to the income effect). Nevertheless, the share of online respondents
156 holding a bachelor's degree or higher is 25 percent higher than the corresponding ACS

¹ For example, questions exhibiting higher non-response in the Austin survey were modified. A question on a Leaf BEV was added. Experts in the field of travel behavior analysis, vehicle fleet modeling, alternative fuels, energy policy, and transport-survey design were contacted, and their suggestions incorporated.

² Major body types were represented by the Honda Civic (Compact car category), Toyota Yaris (Small car), Nissan Maxima (Large car), Lexus ES 350 (Luxury car), Honda Odyssey (Minivan), Ford F-150 (Pickup), and Ford Escape (SUV).

³ The PHEV's effective fuel economy and purchase price were estimated using information from Kurani et al. (2009), Axsen and Kurani (2008), Markel (2006a), Markel (2006b), and CalCars.com. While the Chevrolet Volt is the first PHEV to hit the U.S. market, Toyota's Prius is already available to respondents, making the Prius PHEV a more realistic choice option for this SP experiment.

⁴ There may be greater variation beyond PHEV30, but incorporating those was beyond the scope of this work.

157 proportion. Each household record was appropriately weighted, to facilitate relatively unbiased
 158 model calibration and application.

159 **Table 1: Sample Summary Statistics (Unweighted) versus U.S. Population Average**


Variable	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	ACS Average
<i>Household variables</i>					
Male indicator	0	1	0.4685	0.4992	0.4931
Age of respondent (years)	20	70	46.49	15.17	47.51
Household (HH) size	1	9	2.463	1.293	2.613
Number of household workers	0	5	1.232	0.8930	1.220
Number of household vehicles	0	5	1.596	0.8227	1.842
Age of oldest household vehicle (years)	0	77	10.22	7.272	-
Annual VMT per household vehicle (miles)	500	60,000	11,183	7,671	-
Annual household income (\$/year)	10,000	200,000	59,882	41,045	71,128
Income per HH member	\$1,667	\$200,000	\$31,770	\$28,669	-
High income HH indicator (>\$75,000/year)	0	1	0.266	0.442	-
Large HH size indicator (5+ members)	0	1	0.082	0.28	-
<i>Location variables</i>					
Job density (# of jobs/sq mile in home ZIP code)	0.053	204,784	1,454	8,525	-
HH density (# of HHs/sq mile in home ZIP code)	0.187	37,341	1,039	2,095	-
<i>Attributes of owned vehicles</i>					
Fuel cost (\$/mile)	0.0543	0.1667	0.1057	0.0374	-
Purchase price (\$)	15,000	61,500	28,500	12,184	-
<i>Intended transaction decisions in the coming year</i>					
Acquire a vehicle	0	1	0.1775	0.3822	-
Dispose of currently held vehicle	0	1	0.0227	0.149	-
Replace a currently held vehicle	0	1	0.0538	0.2257	-
Do nothing	0	1	0.7317	0.4432	-

160 Note: All table values come directly from survey responses, except for Fuel cost, which is derived from fuel
 161 economies obtained in *Ward's Automotive Yearbook* (2007), and job and household counts by zip code, which come
 162 from the U.S. Census Bureau's ZIP Code Business Patterns (2007). The American Community Survey (ACS)
 163 average used comes from 2006-2008 data.

164 Figure 1 presents weighted responses for vehicle choices under different scenarios. Under the
 165 trend scenario, the most popular choices were compact cars and SUVs (at 23% and 19%
 166 weighted choice shares). Under the gas price scenarios of \$5 and \$7 per gallon, compact car and
 167 HEV received the most votes (22% and 19% at \$5 per gallon, respectively, and 23% and 24% at
 168 \$7 per gallon). Under the final, environmental-costs scenario, the Prius HEV dominated (21.5%),
 169 followed by compact cars (20.7%). There was not much variation in the shares of compact, sub-

170 compact, and Hummer classes across the four scenarios. Shares of van, SUV, CUV⁵, pickup
 171 truck, luxury, and large car options decreased under the higher-gas-price scenarios, while
 172 popularity of the Smart Car, HEV, and PHEV rose.

173 Of particular interest is the fact that the environmental-cost scenario's results closely mimic
 174 those of the \$5/gallon scenario, though the environmental costs (at just 6.4¢ per mile for the
 175 pickup option versus 0.5¢/mile for the PHEV) are far lower than the *added* gas costs of a
 176 \$5/gallon scenario (which range from 14¢/mile for the Hummer to just 0.5¢ for the PHEV
 177 [where much of the power is provided by electricity]). It appears that simple labeling or astute
 178 advertising may shift perceptions quickly in the direction of a cleaner fleet.




179

180 **Figure 1: Vehicle Selection under Different Scenarios (Weighted Responses)**

181 Figure 2 summarizes reasons that survey respondents gave for not buying the last two vehicles
 182 they had considered purchasing. Unsurprisingly, “too-high purchase price” dominated, followed
 183 by “less desired vehicle type”, and “too-low fuel economy” – garnering 27.3%, 11.5%, and 8.9%
 184 of the (weighted) responses, respectively. While Musti and Kockelman (2010) also found fuel
 185 economy to score third highest among Austin respondents’ criteria for a coming (not past)
 186 vehicle-acquisition event in Austin, and *number one* once all top-three ranks’ shares were added,
 187 consumers’ recognition of fuel economy remains an enigma: Greene’s (2010) extensive review
 188 reports a lack of consensus among existing studies regarding importance of fuel economy in
 189 households’ vehicle choice decisions. Of course, the U.S. population does differ from that of
 190 Austin (which boasts a highly educated and environmentally conscious population, as noted in
 191 Smith et al. [2009]), and used-vehicle purchase prices may much better reflect gas-price
 192 conditions (George et al. [1983], Kahn [1986], CBO [2008], Smith et al. [2009], Sallee et al.
 193 [2010])

⁵ Cross-over utility vehicles (CUVs) borrow features from SUVs but have a car platform for lighter weight and better fuel efficiency.



194

195 **Figure 2: Issues with Vehicles Not Bought During Recent Purchase (Weighted Responses)**

196 Only 29% of the respondents expressed their support for a specific feebate policy (with a
 197 fee/rebate of roughly \$200 per mpg below/above a 30 mpg pivot point), compared to 63%
 198 support in Musti and Kockelman’s (2010) Austin survey. But 41.5% (weighted) indicated that
 199 they would seriously consider buying a hybrid-electric (HEV) version of a standard vehicle
 200 model costing \$3,000 more; and 35.5% would consider buying a PHEV at \$6,000 more than a
 201 comparable gasoline-powered vehicle. Overall, 55.5% reported access to electricity in their
 202 garage or a carport near their residential unit.

203 **MODEL CALIBRATION**

204 Models underlying the microsimulation process were estimated using both the stated and
 205 revealed preference data sets. Covariate inclusion was decided on the basis of statistical
 206 significance (essentially a p-value under 0.10) following a process of stepwise addition and
 207 deletion. A model for numbers of vehicles owned was not required since this information came
 208 from survey data (used for constructing base population). Details of model calibration and
 209 application results are provided below.

210 **Vehicle Ownership Based on Revealed Preferences**

211 Survey respondents’ current vehicle holdings were grouped into nine vehicle types (choice set):
 212 CUV, large car, luxury car, midsize car, pickup truck, compact, subcompact, SUV, and van.
 213 MNL models controlled for demographic attributes, neighborhood densities, and generic
 214 attributes of the 9 alternatives (i.e., fuel cost and purchase price). Table 2 presents the weighted-
 215 MNL coefficient estimates of the 1,778 vehicles (from the 1,079-household data set). Among
 216 these, 18% are mid-size cars, 16.5% are compact cars, 16% are pickup trucks, 15.4% are SUVs,
 217 and the remaining 34.1% are comprised of CUVs, luxury cars, large cars, and vans.

218 The coefficients corresponding to fuel cost and vehicle purchase price are statistically significant
 219 and intuitive. Households with many vehicles are relatively likely to own a compact car. Those

220 of higher income are likely to own a compact car and/or SUV. Households with more workers
 221 are less likely to hold a CUV or compact car, and larger households prefer mid-size cars, pickup
 222 trucks, SUVs, and vans, probably due to seating capacity and storage space needs. Older male
 223 respondents have a higher tendency to own CUVs, ceteris paribus.

224 **Table 2: Vehicle-Type Ownership Model Parameter Estimates (Weighted MNL)**

Variable	Coefficient	T-stat
CUV	-1.690	-3.64
Large car	-0.7813	-7.05
Subcompact	-1.333	-8.18
Fuel cost (dollars per mile)	-4.448	-2.76
Purchase price (dollars) x 10 ⁻⁵	-3.392	-7.36
Male respondent x CUV	0.6311	2.92
Respondent age x CUV	0.0186	2.44
Number of workers x (CUV, Compact)	-0.3848	-5.51
Large household size (>4) indicator x (Midsize car, Pickup truck, Compact, SUV, Van)	0.9601	3.89
Household income x (Compact, SUV)	4.17E-06	5.02
Number of vehicles in household x Compact	0.1112	1.83
Job density x (CUV, Subcompact, Van)	-8.85E-05	-1.97
Household density x Van	-2.41E-04	-2.49
Household density x (Midsize car, Pickup truck, Compact, SUV)	1.06E-04	2.24
Log Likelihood at Constants	-3682.16	
Log Likelihood at Convergence	-3673.80	
Pseudo R ²	0.0596	
Number of Observations	1778	

Note: Luxury car is the base alternative.

225 **Vehicle Ownership based on Stated Preferences**

226 The online survey offers three special vehicle type categories: a Prius HEV, a Prius PHEV30
 227 (which does not yet exist), and a Mercedes Smart Car. Top choices of the 1,098 respondents
 228 were the compact car (22.8%, weighted), SUV (19%), HEV (16.5%), and pickup truck (10.8%).
 229 The remaining 30.9% elected a subcompact car, luxury car, large car, Hummer, van, Smart Car,
 230 or PHEV. MNL estimates for SP vehicle choice model are presented in Table 3.

231 **Table 3: SP Vehicle Type Choice Parameter Estimates (Weighted MNL)**

Variable	Coefficient	T-stat	Re-estimated ASCs
Subcompact	-0.6494	-3.31	-0.9147
Compact	-	-	-1.210
Large	-	-	-1.165
Luxury	-	-	-0.4314

Smart Car	-	-	-3.033
HEV	-	-	-1.878
PHEV	-	-	-0.4345
CUV	-	-	0.6566
SUV	-	-	-1.452
Pickup	-	-	-0.3442
Hummer	-	-	-3.058
Fuel cost (dollars per mile)	-5.206	-2.77	-
Purchase Price (dollars) x 10 ⁻⁵	-4.004	-5.61	-
Male respondent x (Hummer, Pickup truck)	1.208	6.49	-
Male respondent x (Large car, Luxury car)	0.4621	2.92	-
Male respondent x SUV	0.3287	2.2	-
Age of respondent x (HEV, Subcompact, SUV)	0.01122	5.09	-
Household size x Smart Car	-0.5978	-4.63	-
Large household indicator (>4) x Compact	0.6849	3.02	-
Large household indicator (>4) x Hummer	2.24	5.71	-
Number of workers x PHEV	-1.097	-4.01	-
Number of workers x Pickup truck	0.3651	3.91	-
Number of household vehicles x (Compact, CUV, HEV, Large car, Luxury car, SUV)	0.2331	3.18	-
Household Income (\$/Year) x Compact	1.03E-05	7.42	-
Household Income (\$/Year) x SUV	4.15E-06	2.45	-
High income indicator (>\$75k) x Luxury	0.3962	1.49	-
Income per member (dollars) x Pickup truck	6.02E-06	2.01	-
Job density (jobs per sq mile) x Compact	1.23E-04	4.14	-
Job density (jobs per sq mile) x Luxury car	7.20E-05	1.58	-
Household density (HHs per sq mile) x (PHEV, HEV)	1.40E-04	3.47	-
Log likelihood at constants	-2351.08		
Log likelihood at convergence	-2342.75		
Pseudo R ²	0.1517		
Number of observations	1,098		

Note: Van is the base alternative.

232 Coefficients on fuel cost and purchase price came out to be statistically significant, as expected.
233 Results suggest that households with many vehicles are likely to select a CUV, HEV, large car,
234 SUV, or a luxury car. Respondents from high-income households appear to prefer compacts,
235 CUVs, HEVs, large cars, luxury cars, and SUVs, while those with higher incomes per household
236 member seem to prefer a Smart Car, ceteris paribus. Larger households are more likely to choose
237 a compact or Hummer but are less likely to select a Smart Car, due to capacity considerations.
238 Results also suggest that older respondents are more likely to own an HEV, subcompact car, or
239 SUV, with male respondents displaying more of a preference for Hummers, pickup trucks, large
240 cars, luxury cars, and SUVs.

241 The predicted shares of vehicles from this model come from a relatively small data set and so
 242 cannot closely match recent U.S. sales patterns (according to Ward's Automotive Yearbook for
 243 2010 [which provides 2008 and 2009 model year sales numbers]. The purchase model over-
 244 predicted sales shares of HEVs, Compact cars, and SUVs and under-predicted Subcompact,
 245 CUV, and Pickup truck shares. Therefore, 11 alternative specific constants (ASCs) were adjusted
 246 to match the predicted sales pattern to the actual US sales pattern in the base year (as described
 247 in Train [2009]). These re-estimated ASCs are presented in Table 3's third column.

248 **Vehicle Transactions Model**

249 Survey respondents were given four choices for their intended transactions in the coming year:
 250 acquire a vehicle, dispose of one, replace a vehicle, or do nothing. Out of the 1,103 respondents,
 251 18% (weighted) indicated their intent to acquire an added vehicle in the coming year, 2.3%
 252 (weighted) felt they were likely to simply dispose of an existing vehicle, 5.5% (weighted)
 253 expected to replace a vehicle, and the remaining 74.2% planned to maintain their current fleet.
 254 Table 4 presents all parameter estimates. The ASCs were adjusted to match the vehicle-count
 255 growth rates in the US⁶. These adjusted ASCs are presented in Table 4's final column.

256 **Table 4: Annual Household Transactions Model Estimates (Weighted MNL)**

Variable	Coefficient	T-stat	Re-estimated ASCs
Acquire (indicator)	-	-	-1.022
Dispose (indicator)	-3.981	-16.78	-4.042
Replace (indicator)	-2.557	-13.67	-2.660
Male respondent x Replace	-0.7601	-2.69	-
Age of respondent x Acquire	-0.0335	-8.82	-
Number of children x Replace	0.4153	3.62	-
Number of workers x Acquire	0.3019	3.07	-
Number of vehicles in the household x Acquire	-0.5748	-4.37	-
Maximum age of vehicle in household x (Acquire, Dispose)	0.0551	5.35	-
Low income household (<\$30k) x Acquire	-0.5231	-1.88	-
Household density x Dispose	7.81-05	1.27	-
Log Likelihood at Constants	-921.0		
Log Likelihood at Convergence	-807.2		
Pseudo R ²	0.4721		
Number of households	1103		

Note: Do Nothing is the base alternative.

257 Results are quite intuitive, suggesting, for example, that households with many vehicles are less
 258 likely to acquire a new vehicle to maintain their current fleet. Households with many workers are
 259 more likely to acquire another vehicle in the coming year, ceteris paribus. Older respondents

⁶ Vehicle growth rates were obtained from Bureau of Transportation Statistics, for the years 2000 through 2008.
 (http://www.bts.gov/publications/national_transportation_statistics/html/table_01_11.html)

260 appear less likely to acquire, and male respondents are less likely to replace. Higher household
 261 density settings are associated with greater disposal likelihood. Low-income household seem less
 262 likely to acquire a new vehicle.

263 **Vehicle Usage and GHG Emissions Estimates**

264 The annual VMT estimates collected in the survey are simply respondent estimates of a year’s
 265 worth of mileage accumulation on each vehicle owned (rather than using odometer readings, for
 266 example) and did not give robust results. Therefore, the vehicle usage model was estimated on
 267 the extensive (n=196,606 vehicles) 2009 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) sample.
 268 The NHTS sample reported an average yearly VMT of 10,089 miles per vehicle (with $\sigma=9,244$
 269 miles). Table 5 presents the parameter estimates of this least-squares regression, with coefficients
 270 for variables of fuel cost and population density added (based on published estimates) to ensure
 271 more appropriate model sensitivities.

272 **Table 5: Annual VMT per NHTS 2009 Vehicle (Unweighted)**

Variable	Coefficient	T-Stat	Mean Elasticity
Constant	2.411	77.1	-
Pickup	-2.76E-02	-4.36	-
SUV	0.0987	14.92	-
Van	0.1108	12.02	-
Fuel cost (Dollars/mile)	-1.711	-	-0.25
HH density (#HHs/Sq mile)	-8.08E-05	-	-0.08
Household size	0.0644	28.12	0.1678
Number of workers in household	0.2011	64.12	0.2372
Number of vehicles in household	-0.1279	-60.53	-0.3389
Age of vehicle (years)	-0.0636	-184.43	-0.568
Household income (dollars)	3.17E-06	43.00	0.2212
R ²	0.2373		
Adjusted R ²	0.2373		
Number of observations	199,606		

Note: Dependent variable is Ln(VMT/1000). Elasticities were computed for each household and then averaged to provide mean sample elasticities.

273 Results are as expected, with vehicle age having negative impact on annual VMT – and with
 274 vehicle age enjoying the greatest practical significance. Household income, size, and number of
 275 workers also have statistically significant effects, but without as great practical significance as
 276 vehicle age. Fuel cost and residential density were the key variables missing from this model
 277 (due to a lack of detailed fuel-price and home-location information in the data set [and
 278 presumably little variability, across the U.S.]). These variables have important impacts on VMT
 279 and have been studied extensively. (See, for example, Haughton and Srakar [1996], Greene et al.
 280 [1999], Small and Dender [2007], Hughes, Knittel and Sperling [2008], Fang [2008],
 281 Brownstone and Golob [2009], National Research Council [2009], Musti and Kockelman


282 [2010].) Table 5's two added coefficients achieve elasticity values obtained in previous studies,
283 with the model's Constant term then adjusted to equate the average of predicted and observed
284 VMT values.

285 Table 5's parameters were used to predict annual VMT at the final year of simulation for each
286 household in the 2035 synthetic population (having grown to a total of 66,367 households).
287 These VMTs were translated into GHG emissions using EPA's (2007) standard (well-to-wheels)
288 conversion value (of 25.4 lbs of CO₂e per gallon of gasoline) and EIA's (2000) 1.34 lbs of CO₂e
289 per kWh of electricity generated (U.S. average). The share of PHEV miles on electric power
290 were estimated using utility factor curves (as found in Markel and Simpson (2006), Gonder et al.
291 (2009), Simpson (2006), and Kromer and Haywood (2007)).

292 In applying the calibrated models, the simulation anticipates each household's vehicle holding
293 (and use) decisions on a yearly basis, by relying on Monte Carlo draws. In the case of a
294 "buy/acquire" decision, the SP vehicle choice model was used to determine the type of vehicle
295 acquired by the household. For "disposal" decisions, the household vehicle with the lowest
296 systemic utility was removed. "Replace" decisions relied on both these actions. The following
297 section describes the results of these models' applications, in the simulation system.

298 **RESULTS OF FLEET SIMULATION**

299 Figure 3 provides the overall microsimulation framework. The number of households is
300 predicted to grow by 32.7% over the 25-year simulation period, with population rising by
301 27% and household size falling by 4.07%. Average household income is expected to increase at
302 a steady annual rate of 0.82%. These results are close to demographic trends observed via the
303 U.S. National Household Travel Survey (Hu and Reuscher 2004).



304

305

Figure 3: Modeling Framework

306 The synthetic U.S. households' vehicle fleet was evolved under several scenarios, including a
 307 GASPRICE\$7 scenario (where gas prices were raised to \$7 per gallon), a LOWPRICE scenario
 308 (where the base price of the PHEV option fell by \$4,100, to \$ 28,900, which is still \$3,900 more
 309 than a comparable ICE), a FEEBATE scenarios (rebates to vehicles with over-30 mpg, and fees
 310 otherwise [at a rate of roughly \$200 per mpg]), a HI-DENSITY scenario (where all household
 311 and job densities were quadrupled), a TREND (or base-case) scenario, and combination of
 312 FEEBATE and LOWPRICE scenarios with gas prices raised to \$5 per gallon). Results of all
 313 these scenarios are presented below.

314 **Fleet Composition**

315 Table 6 summarizes the fleet composition predictions for the final simulation year (2035). Under
 316 the TREND scenario, HEV market share was estimated to hit 5.68% by 2035, PHEV share came
 317 in at just 1.91% and a (standard) Smart Car under 1%. Interestingly, more than 75% of the HEV
 318 or PHEV are held by households with 3 or fewer vehicles by 2035.

319 Under the GASPRICE\$7 scenario, market shares of HEVs, PHEVs, and Smart Cars rose to
 320 11.08%, 3.45%, and 0.30%, respectively, as shares in Pickup trucks, SUVs, CUVs, and Vans
 321 fell. This scenario predicted the highest market share (14.83%) for PHEVs, HEVs and Smart car,
 322 across the seven scenarios examined here.

323 The LOWPRICE scenario did not predict any significant fleet share changes, versus TREND,
324 other than increasing the market shares of PHEVs slightly (to 2.33%, from 1.91% in the TREND
325 scenario). Households with three or fewer vehicles were predicted to own the majority (77%) of
326 the household fleets' PHEVs and HEVs. The majority (84%) of PHEVs are simulated to be
327 owned by households with 3 or fewer members.

328 Feebates prompted a shift toward more fuel efficient vehicles, with the combined HEV/PHEV
329 market share predicted to hit 9.2% by 2035. Market shares of Pickup trucks and Vans fell, while
330 other shares moved negligibly. This particular feebate policy resulted in fee collections
331 dramatically exceeding rebates, by a ratio of 4.91 (fees collected to rebates distributed) in year
332 2015, falling to 4.39 and 4.43 by 2025 and 2035, with 70% of rebates going toward HEV
333 purchases on average. The ratio of fees to revenues is high, in part, since just three of the vehicle
334 alternatives (just the HEV, PHEV, and Smart Car alternatives), among the 12 total, enjoyed fuel
335 economy values above the policy's pivot point threshold. Of course, the model also ignores the
336 technological improvements that may emerge over time, due to gas price changes, technology
337 innovations, and regulatory shifts that can impact vehicle purchase and use prices, vehicle
338 alternatives, and users' choices.

339 Inclusion of a \$5 per gallon gas price assumption in the FEEBATE scenario increased the shift
340 towards fuel efficient vehicles and produced higher market shares for HEVs, PHEVs, and Smart
341 cars. The LOWPRICE scenario along with \$5 per gallon gas price, as expected, increased the
342 share of PHEVs (from 1.91% in TREND to 3.31%).

343 Finally, the HI-DENSITY scenario predicted average vehicle ownership levels to fall to 1.98
344 vehicles per household (from 2.10 under TREND). Off course, vehicle ownership levels are not
345 expected to be this high under both scenarios, given the current growth rate of registered vehicles
346 in U.S. (1.35% between 2003 and 2008⁷) and household growth rate. Under this scenario the
347 share of compact cars, PHEVs, and HEVs increased noticeably, while those of CUVs, SUVs,
348 and Pickup trucks fell.

349 To summarize, while 25 years is a long period of time, and generally enough to flush a personal-
350 vehicle fleet almost entirely (thanks to an average U.S. light-duty-vehicle lifetime of roughly 15
351 years), the various, relatively reasonable policy scenarios tested here appear to have relatively
352 little impact on most vehicle sales shares, with the exception of HEV purchases under a \$7 gas-
353 price and high density scenario. More aggressive action appears needed. For example, the U.S.'s
354 current policy of a \$7.5k rebate for the first 200,000 PHEV and BEV sales could be tested, more
355 policies could be layered in the scenarios, including more aggressive feebate and density
356 scenarios. It would also be interesting to recognize California's decision to allow eligible low
357 emission vehicles⁸ into that state's high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes, and localities plans' for
358 preferential PEV parking spaces, though the analyst would have to guess at the base-utility
359 impacts of such a policy and of a BEV purchase, since these scenarios were not evaluated in the
360 online survey's design.

⁷ Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS), Available at :
http://www.bts.gov/publications/national_transportation_statistics/html/table_01_11.html

⁸ Details of eligible vehicles can be found at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/carpool/carpool.htm>

Table 6: Vehicle Fleet Composition Predictions (Counts and Percentages) for the Year 2035

	Base Year (2010)		Base Scenario (TREND)		Gas at \$7/gal (GASPRICE\$7)		Low PHEV Price (LOWPRICE)		Feebate Policy (FEEBATE)		Quadrupled Job & Household Density (HI-DENSITY)		Low PHEV Price + Gas at \$5/gal		Feebate + Gas at \$5/gal	
Subcompact	6291	7.98%	8,457	6.06%	12,847	9.26%	8,540	6.10%	8,920	6.46%	7,493	5.68%	10,850	7.80%	11,569	8.38%
Compact	13,115	16.64	33,368	23.91	34,478	24.86	33,567	23.98	33,660	24.38	36,603	27.74	33,962	24.43	34,614	25.07
Mid-size	14,768	18.73	10,513	7.53	9,987	7.20	10,462	7.48	10,543	7.64	9,387	7.11	10,319	7.42	10,180	7.37
Large	3,437	4.36	3,473	2.49	3,055	2.20	3,401	2.43	3,373	2.44	3,166	2.40	3,194	2.30	2,996	2.17
Luxury	6,878	8.73	9,711	6.96	8,095	5.84	9,545	6.82	9,097	6.59	9,328	7.07	8,644	6.22	8,140	5.90
Smart Car	-	-	149	0.11	411	0.30	187	0.13	217	0.16	146	0.11	235	0.17	328	0.24
HEV	-	-	7,934	5.68	15,361	11.08	7,980	5.70	9,496	6.88	9,051	6.86	11,573	8.33	13,690	9.92
PHEV	-	-	2,671	1.91	4,784	3.45	3,258	2.33	3,201	2.32	3,119	2.36	4,602	3.31	4,415	3.20
CUV	3,936	4.99	13,084	9.37	11,428	8.24	13,019	9.30	12,130	8.79	10,911	8.27	12,090	8.70	11,127	8.06
SUV	12,273	15.57	18,330	13.13	14,882	10.73	18,455	13.19	17,856	12.93	15,963	12.10	16,557	11.91	15,773	11.43
Pickup	11,524	14.62	23,711	16.99	17,377	12.53	23,370	16.70	21,591	15.64	21,037	15.94	19,860	14.29	18,312	13.27
Van	6,607	8.38	8,093	5.80	5,902	4.26	8,083	5.78	7,884	5.71	5,658	4.29	7,055	5.08	6,812	4.93
Hummer	-	-	87	0.06	92	0.07	86	0.06	93	0.07	88	0.07	73	0.05	88	0.06
Total #Vehs.	78,829		139,581		138,699		139,953		138,061		131,950		139,014		138,044	
Avg. #Vehicles per Household	1.59 Vehs/HH		2.10		2.09		2.11		2.08		1.98		2.10		2.08	

Note: These numbers are for the simulation's final-year synthetic population, of 66,367 households (representing a total U.S. population of 534 million)

Vehicle Miles Travelled and GHG Emissions

Table 7 presents Year 2010 and 2035 VMT and GHG-related emissions estimates across scenarios. NOx and VOC comprise 5 to 6% of total vehicle GHG emissions, while CO2 emissions account for the other 94 to 95% (EPA, 2005). Under the TREND scenario, U.S. household VMT is expected to rise by 65.4% versus the 2010 base year. GASPRICE\$7As expected, all scenarios with gas price increases produce a drop in total VMT, while the LOWPRICE and FEEBATE scenarios produce a rise thanks to lower vehicle operating costs. Emissions under all increased gas price scenarios are expected to fall, largely following the VMT trends. And, even though VMT is predicted to rise under the two FEEBATE scenarios, the emissions fall, thanks to a higher share of HEVs and PHEVs in the fleet. Finally, both VMT and emissions are simulated to fall under the HIDENSITY scenario, due to relatively low vehicle ownership.

While different vehicle types enjoy very different fuel economies⁹, the CO2e values largely follow the VMT shifts predicted. Clearly, far more dramatic fleet shifts (and scenarios) are needed if the U.S. is to reduce the GHG contributions of its personal-vehicle fleet over time.

⁹ Fuel Economy (mpg) assumptions: Compact (20.65), Subcompact (26.6), Large(17.57), Luxury (18.61), Smart (36), HEV (46), PHEV (45), CUV (18.08), SUV (15.1), Pickup (14.67), Van (15.18), Hummer (16), midsize (19)

Table 7: VMT and CO₂e Estimates (Total and per Vehicle) in 2035

	Base Year (2010)	Base Scenario (TREND)	Gas at \$7/gal (GASPRICE\$7)	Low PHEV Price (LOWPRICE)	Feebate Policy (FEEBATE)	High Job & Household Density (HI-DENSITY)	Feebate+Gas at \$5/gal	Low PHEV Price + Gas at \$5/gal
Total VMT (million miles)	1,210	2001	1,478	2,114	2,188	1,736	1,796	1,727
% change from TREND			-26.14%	+5.65%	+9.35%	-13.24%	-10.25%	-13.69%
Total CO ₂ e emissions (million pounds)	1,464	2,358	1,460	2,363	2,226	1,918	1,713	1,804
% change from TREND			-38.08%	+0.21%	-5.59%	-18.66%	-27.35%	-23.49%

Note: These numbers are for the final year (2035) synthetic population, of 66,367 households

1 SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

2 This work presented a microsimulation framework to evolve a synthetic population's personal
3 vehicle fleet in order to represent the U.S. population over a 25-year period (2010 through 2035).
4 Data were collected via an online survey eliciting information on respondents' current vehicle
5 holding and use, purchase decisions, and intended vehicle choice under different policy
6 scenarios. Revealed and stated preference vehicle-choice models were estimated, along with
7 transaction and use models.

8
9 Future market shares of PHEVs, HEVs, and vehicles like the Smart Cars are of interest to
10 manufacturers, policy makers, and many others. Predicted shares vary by scenario, with 14.8%
11 serving as their highest (total) predicted share by 2035, under the GASPRICE\$7 (\$7 per gallon)
12 scenario, with HEVs clearly dominating this share (with a predicted 11.1% share). While 14.8%
13 is clearly higher than the TREND's 7.7% share of these three relatively efficient vehicle types,
14 the GASPRICE\$7 scenario's reductions in fleetwide CO₂e emissions (38.1%) come mainly from
15 lower VMT. Similar trends were also predicted for other gas price scenarios..

16 The LOWPRICE scenario's results suggest a slight increase in the PHEV share (as compared to
17 TREND), with almost no change in VMT and GHG emissions. Under the FEEBATE policy,
18 PHEV shares rise, but so does VMT (very slightly), owing to a rebound effect (see, e.g., Small
19 and van Dender [2007]), but CO₂e emissions are forecast to fall by 5.59%, thanks to higher
20 shares of fuel efficient vehicles. Unfortunately, such numbers are far less than desired by
21 policymakers and nations hoping to moderate climate change and other environmental
22 implications of oil dependence, while addressing energy security, continuing trade deficits, high
23 military costs, and other concerns (see, e.g., Greene 2010, Sioshanshi and Denholm 2008,
24 Thompson et al. 2009).

25
26 While the FEEBATE scenario targets purchases of fuel-efficient vehicles, the series of
27 behavioral models used here suggests that a gas price of \$7 per gallon will have more of an
28 impact on ownership shares, as well as producing lower CO₂e emissions, across scenarios.
29 While only a 29% population-weighted-share of respondents expressed support for a feebate
30 policy (versus Austin's 63% [Musti and Kockelman 2010]), and only 35% (weighted) intend to
31 buy a PHEV if it costs just \$6,000 more than its gasoline counterparts (versus Austin's 56%),
32 greater support for such policies and more widespread use may emerge if marketing is strategic
33 and pronounced (e.g., alerting buyers to gasoline expenditures and external costs of their
34 vehicle's emissions, versus other vehicle options), government incentives remain in place longer
35 (e.g., the \$7,500 PEV rebate past the first million PEV sales), charging infrastructure is well
36 advertised, HOV-lane priorities and other perks are provided PEV owners, power pricing levels
37 facilitate vehicle-to-grid interactions, battery prices fall, and so forth. Perhaps feebate and such
38 policy will trigger technological improvements and in turn will affect the vehicle-mix shift
39 (Bunch 2010). Nonetheless, this work helps in anticipating how vehicle ownership and usage
40 patterns and associated emissions might change under different policies and contexts. The
41 methods and tools used in this study provide a framework for comparing various policy
42 scenarios. This work also helps highlight the impacts of various directions consumers may head
43 with such vehicles, and more scenarios may be tested. These include the addition of battery-
44 electric vehicle and plug-in SUV and large-car options, inclusion of a fuel-cost variable in the
45 vehicle use (VMT) model, and the impacts of stricter CAFE standards over time.

46

47 In addition, it would be meaningful to microsimulate the used-car market (and its pricing
48 dynamics, as in Selby and Kockelman [2010]), particularly since 40% (weighted) of survey
49 respondents expected to buy a used car next. A model reflecting unexpected vehicle loss (due to
50 thefts, malfunctions, and crashes) and delays in actual (versus intended) acquisitions should also
51 facilitate more realism. Estimation and application of simultaneous vehicle-choice-and-use
52 models (as in Mannering and Winston [1985]) may also help, by more directly linking ownership
53 and operating expenses. Finally, owners may exhibit greater variation in their vehicles' annual
54 use, by vehicle type and in response to other attributes (observed and latent) than our model
55 estimates suggest; moreover, range-limited BEVs may shape VMT choices. Incorporating such
56 details may improve VMT and CO₂e estimates. Of course, many such enhancements point to a
57 need for further data collection, to better emerging vehicle make-and-model options,
58 technologies, and traveler behaviors. The hope is that very solid markets exist, both in the U.S.
59 and abroad, for energy- and carbon-saving vehicles, with smaller environmental and physical
60 footprints. Models like those used here are one tool toward finding policies and vehicle designs
61 that enable communities to better evaluate their options and achieve their aspirations.

62 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

63 We would like to thank Patricia Mokhtarian, David Greene, Elaine Murakami, Sudeshna Sen,
64 Stacey Bricka, Philip Patterson, Tom Turrentine, Tony Markel, Dave Tuttle and Matt Bomberg
65 for their suggestions on enhancing the survey. We also want to thank the Southwest University
66 Transportation Center for financially supporting this study, and Annette Perrone for all her
67 support and administrative assistance.

68 **REFERENCES**

69 American Community Survey (ACS). 2008. National Level Housing and Population Data.
70 Accessed from http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/acs_pums_2008_1yr.html. on February 24,
71 2010.

72 Axsen, J., and K. Kurani. 2008. The Early U.S. Market for PHEVs: Anticipating Consumer
73 Awareness, Recharge Potential, Design Priorities and Energy Impacts. Institute of Transportation
74 Studies, University of California, Davis, Research Report UCD-ITS-RR-08-22. Available at
75 http://pubs.its.ucdavis.edu/publication_detail.php?id=1191.

76 Berkovec, J., and J. Rust. 1985. A Nested Logit Model of Automobile Holdings for One Vehicle
77 Households. *Transportation Research B*, 19 (4): 275-285.

78 Berkowitz M.K., N.T. Gallini, E.J. Miller, and R.A. Wolfe. 1987. Forecasting vehicle holdings
79 and usage with a disaggregate choice model. *Journal of Forecasting* 6 (4): 249-269.

80 Bhat, C. R., S. Sen, and N. Eluru. 2009. The Impact of Demographics, Built Environment
81 Attributes, Vehicle Characteristics, And Gasoline Prices on Household Vehicle Holdings and
82 Use. *Transportation Research B* 43 (1): 1-18.

- 83 Brownstone, D. and T. Golob. 2009. The Impact of Residential Density on Vehicle Usage and
84 Energy Consumption. *Journal of Urban Economics* 65(1): 91-98.
- 85 Bunch, D. S., and D.L. Greene. 2010. Potential Design, Implementation, and benefits of a
86 Feebate Program for New Passenger Vehicles in California: Interim Statement of Research
87 Findings. Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Davis, Research Report
88 UCD-ITS-RR-10-13. Available at http://pubs.its.ucdavis.edu/publication_detail.php?id=1400.
- 89 Busse, M.R., C.R. Knittel, and F. Zettelmeyer. 2009. Pain at the Pump: The Differential Effect of
90 Gasoline Prices on New and Used Automobile Markets. National Bureau of Economic Research
91 (NBER) Working Paper No. 15590. Cambridge Massachusetts. Available at
92 <http://www.nber.org/papers/w15590>.
- 93 Congressional Budget Office (CBO). 2008. Effect of Gasoline Prices on Driving Behavior and
94 Vehicle Markets. Accessed from [http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/88xx/doc8893/01-14-](http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/88xx/doc8893/01-14-GasolinePrices.pdf)
95 [GasolinePrices.pdf](http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/88xx/doc8893/01-14-GasolinePrices.pdf) on January 6, 2011.
- 96 Choo, S., and P. Mokhtarian. 2004. What Type of Vehicle Do People Drive? The Role of
97 Attitude and Lifestyle in Influencing Vehicle Type Choice. *Transportation Research A*, 38 (3):
98 201-222.
- 99 Davis, S.C., S.W. Diegel, and R.G. Boundy. 2009. Transportation Energy Data Book: Edition
100 28. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee. Available at <http://cta.ornl.gov/data>.
- 101 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2005. Emission Facts: Greenhouse Gas Emissions
102 from a Typical Passenger Vehicle. Report #: EPA420. Accessed from
103 <http://www.epa.gov/OMS/climate/420f05004.htm> on July 20, 2008.
- 104 EPA. 2009. Inventory of U.S Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2007. United States
105 Environmental Protection Agency, Washington D.C. Available at
106 http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/downloads09/GHG2007entire_report-508.pdf.
107 Accessed December 9, 2009.
- 108 Fang, H. A. 2008. A discrete–continuous model of households’ vehicle choice and usage, with
109 an application to the effects of residential density. *Transportation Research Part B* 42(9): 736–
110 758.
- 111 Feng, Y., D. Fullerton, and L. Gan. 2005. Vehicle Choices, Miles Driven and Pollution Policies.
112 National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) Working Paper No. 11553. Cambridge
113 Massachusetts. Available at
114 http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=don_fullerton.
- 115 Gallagher, K., and E. Muehlegger. 2008. Giving Green to Get Green? The Effect of Incentives
116 and Ideology on Hybrid Vehicle Adoption. Working Paper No rwp08-009. Available at
117 [http://ksghome.harvard.edu/~emuehle/Research%20WP/Gallagher%20and%20Muehlegger%20](http://ksghome.harvard.edu/~emuehle/Research%20WP/Gallagher%20and%20Muehlegger%20Feb_08.pdf)
118 [Feb_08.pdf](http://ksghome.harvard.edu/~emuehle/Research%20WP/Gallagher%20and%20Muehlegger%20Feb_08.pdf).

- 119 George, G.D. and T.H. Mayor. 1983. Reason and Rationality during Energy Crisis. *Journal of*
120 *Political Economy* 91(1): 168-181.
- 121 Gonder, J., A. Brooker, R. Carlson and J. Smart. 2009. Deriving In-Use PHEV Fuel Economy
122 Predictions from Standardized Test Cycle Results. Report No. NREL/CP-540-46251.
123 <http://www.nrel.gov/vehiclesandfuels/vsa/pdfs/46251.pdf>. Accessed June 20, 2010.
- 124 Greene, D.L. 2010. How Consumer Value Fuel Economy: A Literature Review. A Report
125 Prepared for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Available at
126 <http://www.epa.gov/oms/climate/regulations/420r10008.pdf>.
- 127 Greene, D.L. 2010. Measuring Energy Security: Can the United States Achieve Oil
128 Independence? *Energy Policy* 38 (4): 1614-1621.
- 129 Greene, D.L., James Kahn, and R. Gibson. 1991. Fuel Economy Rebound Effect for U.S.
130 Household Vehicles. *Energy Journal* 20(3): 1-31.
- 131 Haugton, J., and S. Sarkar. 1996. Gasoline Tax as a Corrective Tax: Estimates for the United
132 States, 1970-1991. *The Energy Journal* 17(2): 103-126.
- 133 Hughes, J., C. Knittel, and D. Sperling. 2008. Evidence in a Shift in the Short-Run Price
134 Elasticity of Gasoline Demand. *Energy Journal* 29(1): 113-134.
- 135 Hu P. S. and T. R. Reuscher. 2004. Summary of Travel Trends: National Household Travel
136 Survey (NHTS). 2001. Accessed from <http://nhts.ornl.gov/2001/pub/STT.pdf> on June 22, 2010.
- 137 Kahn, J.A. 1986. Gasoline Price and the Used Automobile Market: A Rational Expectations
138 Asset Price Approach. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 101(2): 323-340.
- 139 Kurani, K., and T. Turrentine. 2004. Automobile Buyer Decisions about Fuel Economy and Fuel
140 Efficiency. Final Report to United States Department of Energy and the Energy Foundation.
141 Accessed from http://pubs.its.ucdavis.edu/download_pdf.php?id=193 on May 24, 2010.
- 142 Kurani, K., R. Heffner and T. Turrentine. 2009. Driving Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicles:
143 Reports from U.S. Drivers of HEVs converted to PHEVs. Proceedings of the 88th Transportation
144 Research Board Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- 145 Lave, C.A., and K. Train. 1979. A Disaggregate Model of Auto Type Choice. *Transportation*
146 *Research Part A* 13(1): 1-9.
- 147 Lemp, J., and K. Kockelman. 2008. Quantifying the External Costs of Vehicle Use: Evidence
148 from America's Top-Selling Light-Duty Models. *Transportation Research Part D* 13 (8): 491-
149 504.
- 150 Lu, S. 2006. U.S. Department of Transportation. National Highway Traffic Safety
151 Administration. *Vehicle Survivability and Travel Mileage Schedules*. Report No. DOT HS 809
152 952, Washington D.C. Available at: <http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/809952.PDF>.

- 153 Mannering, F., and Winston C. 1985. A Dynamic Empirical Analysis of Household Vehicle
154 Ownership and Utilization. *Rand Journal of Economics* 16(2): 215-236.
- 155 Mannering, F., C. Winston, and W. Starkey. 2002. An Exploratory Analysis of Automobile
156 Leasing by US Households. *Journal of Urban Economics* 52(1): 154–176.
- 157 Manski, C. F., and L. Sherman. 1980. An Empirical Analysis of Household Choice among Motor
158 Vehicles. *Transportation Research A*, 14(5/6): 349-366.
- 159 Markel, T. 2006a. Plug-In HEV Vehicle Design Options and Expectations. National Renewable
160 Energy Laboratory Report No. NREL/PR-40630. Available at
161 <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy06osti/40630.pdf>.
- 162 Markel, T. 2006b. Plug-In HEV: Current Status, Long-Term Prospects and Key Challenges
163 National Renewable Energy Laboratory Report No. NREL/PR-40239. Available at
164 <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy06osti/40239.pdf>.
- 165 Markel, T., and A. Simpson. 2006. Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicle Energy Storage System
166 Design. Report No. NREL/CP-540-39614
167 <http://www.nrel.gov/vehiclesandfuels/vsa/pdfs/39614.pdf>. Accessed June 16, 2010.
- 168 McManus W., and R. Senter Jr. 2009. Market Models for Predicting PHEV Adoption and
169 Diffusion. A Report by Automotive Analysis Division, University of Michigan Transportation
170 Research Institute report, for the U.S. Department of Energy. Available at
171 <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/2027.42/64436/1/102399.pdf>.
- 172 Mohammadian, A., and E. J. Miller, 2003a. An Empirical Investigation of Household Vehicle
173 Type Choice Decisions. *Transportation Research Record* No. 1854: 99-106.
- 174 Mohammadian, A., and E. J. Miller, 2003b. Dynamic Modeling of Household Automobile
175 Transactions. *Transportation Research Record* No. 1831: 98-105.
- 176 Musti, S., and K.M. Kockelman. 2010. Evolution of the Household Vehicle Fleet: Anticipating
177 Fleet Composition and PHEV Adoption in Austin, Texas. Proceedings of the 89th Annual
178 Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C. Available at
179 http://www.cae.utexas.edu/prof/kockelman/public_html/TRB10VehicleChoice.pdf.
- 180 National Research Council, Committee on Relationships Among Development Patterns, Vehicle
181 Miles Traveled, and Energy Consumption. 2009. *Driving and the Built Environment: The Effects*
182 *of Compact Development on Motorized Travel, Energy Use, and CO2 Emissions*. Washington,
183 D.C. National Academies Press.
- 184 Nolan, A. 2010. A Dynamic Analysis of Household Car Ownership. *Transportation Research A*,
185 44 (6): 446-455.

- 186 Potoglou, D., and P.S. Kanaroglou. 2008. Modeling Car Ownership in Urban Areas: A Case
187 Study of Hamilton, Canada. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 16: 42-54.
- 188 Selby, Brent, and Kara Kockelman. 2010. Microsimulating Automobile Markets: Evolution of
189 Vehicle Holdings and Vehicle-Pricing Dynamics. Paper under review for publication in
190 *Transportation Research Record*.
- 191 Simpson, A. 2006. Cost-Benefit Analysis of Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicle Technology. Report
192 No. NREL/CP-540-40485. <http://www.nrel.gov/vehiclesandfuels/vsa/pdfs/40485.pdf>. Accessed
193 June 20, 2010.
- 194 Sioshanshi, Ramteen, and Paul Denholm. 2008. Emissions Impacts and Benefits of Plug-in
195 Hybrid Electric Vehicles and Vehicle to Grid Services. National Renewable Energy Laboratory
196 paper, available at http://www.iwse.osu.edu/ISEFaculty/sioshanshi/papers/PHEV_emissions.pdf.
- 197 Sallee, J.M., S. E. West and W. Fan. 2010. The Effect of Gasoline Prices on the Demand for Fuel
198 Economy in Used Vehicles: Empirical Evidence and Policy Implications. Working Paper.
199 Version 1.2.
- 200 Small, K. A., and K. Van Dender. 2007. Fuel Efficiency and Motor Vehicle Travel: The
201 Declining Rebound Effect. *Energy Journal* 28(1): 25-51.
- 202 Smith, C., M. Flower, E. Greene and C. Nielson. 2009. Carbon Emissions and Climate Change:
203 A Study of Attitudes and their Relationships with Travel Behavior. Presented at the 12th TRB
204 National Transportation Planning Application Conference, in Houston, Texas.
- 205 Thompson, Tammy, Michael Webber, and David Allen. 2009. Air quality impacts of using
206 overnight electricity generation to charge plug-in hybrid electric vehicles for daytime use.
207 *Environmental Research Letters* 4
- 208 Tirumalachetty, S. 2009. Microsimulation of Household and Firm Behaviors: Anticipation of
209 Greenhouse Gas Emissions- in Austin, Texas. Master's Thesis. Department of Civil Engineering,
210 The University of Texas at Austin.
- 211 Train, K.E., and C. Winston. 2007. Vehicle Choice Behavior and the Declining Market Share of
212 U.S. Auto Manufacturers. *International Economic Review*, 48(4): 1469-1496.
- 213 Train, K.E. 2009. *Discrete Choice Methods with Simulation*. Cambridge University Press, New
214 York, USA.
- 215 Ward's. 2007. *Ward's Automotive Yearbook 2007*. Ward's Communications, Detroit, Michigan.
- 216 Ward's. 2010. *Ward's Automotive Yearbook 2010*. Ward's Communications, Detroit, Michigan.
- 217 WRI. World Research Institute 2009. Climate Analysis Indicators Tool (CAIT) version 6.0.
218 Washington, D.C. World Research Institute. Available at <http://cait.wri.org>.

219 Zhao, Y., Kockelman, K.M. (2001) Household vehicle ownership by vehicle type: Application of
220 a multivariate negative binomial model. Presented at the Transportation Research Board's 81st
221 Annual Meeting, Washington D.C. Available at
222 http://www.ce.utexas.edu/prof/kockelman/public_html/TRB02VehOwn.pdf.