

# HOW DO LAND USE PATTERNS AFFECT OWNERSHIP AND USE OF SELF-DRIVING VEHICLES?

**Adam T. Nodjomian**

Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering  
The University of Texas at Austin  
anodjomian@utexas.edu

**Dr. Kara Kockelman\***

Dewitt Greer Professor of Transportation Engineering  
Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering  
The University of Texas at Austin  
kkockelm@mail.utexas.edu  
Phone: 512-471-0210

Presented at the 98<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., January 2019 and published in *J of Transport Geography* 78: 115-134 (2019).

## ABSTRACT

Connected and automated (self-driving) vehicles (CAVs and AVs) will soon become a viable mode option. Past work has shown the rate at which AVs are implemented depends on several factors, such as individual and household demographics and technology costs. This research analyzes another group of attributes that help predict the adoption of new vehicle technologies: land use characteristics.

Here, the results of two large-scale preference surveys are used to estimate how land use characteristics impact Americans' perceptions of, interest in, and willingness to pay for AV technology, while controlling for demographic attributes. Both surveys were conducted in 2017 and together represented over 4,000 U.S. households.

Statistical models like the ordered probit and multinomial logit are used to estimate the impacts of demographics and land use characteristics on AV-related behavior. Diversity of land uses in a neighborhood and the quality of access to destinations for households in that neighborhood are the most significant predictors of one's expected use of AVs. Namely, a poor mix of land uses and limited access to key destinations are associated with higher levels of interest in AVs, higher anticipated use of AV technology, higher likelihood of utilizing DRS, and increased willingness-to-pay (WTP) for self-driving capability.

This research provides metrics of practical (not just statistical) significance of a suite of land use variables, relative to common demographic predictors, to identify for planners, engineers, policymakers, and others where AV deployments may go fastest, first.

## BACKGROUND

The relationship between land use and transportation is inter-related and complex. One's environment informs his or her transportation decisions and vice versa.

1 The purpose of this analysis is to predict how self-driving vehicle technology may be used and  
2 acquired in the future. Such a complex and advanced form of technology is already garnering  
3 interest from large segments of the population. Anticipating who may adopt this technology, how  
4 much they are willing to pay for it, and how their travel behavior may change as a result is of keen  
5 interest to those parties mentioned previously, but also firms and manufacturers in the business of  
6 transportation.

7 Density, diversity of land uses, urban design, destination accessibility, and distance to transit  
8 comprise a set of land use variables commonly referred to as the “5D’s” of development. Their  
9 prevalence (or lack thereof) in a neighborhood has been shown to inform one’s transportation  
10 decisions. For example, households located in regions with high job density and a good mix of  
11 land uses tend to produce less vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) than those in areas which are  
12 exclusively residential. Since urban form dictates travel patterns, it is likely those same built  
13 environment characteristics affect interest in and perception of new vehicle technology as well.

14 Examples of land use influencing transportation decisions have been investigated previously. For  
15 example, Zhang (2004) found characteristics like density and diversity of land uses were  
16 influential in predicting one’s mode choice. It stands to reason that the same variables could be  
17 used to predict one’s use of self-driving vehicle technology.

## 18 **The Use of Self-Driving Vehicles**

19 The idea of a self-driving vehicle is not new. Visions of vehicles without a human driver have been  
20 the source of intrigue since the early days of the automobile (The Milwaukee Sentinel, 1926).  
21 More recent efforts are making what was once a dream into a reality. Established automobile  
22 manufactures like General Motors, and new market entrants like Waymo (a member of Google’s  
23 parent company, Alphabet) are racing to bring AVs to consumers (Navigant Research, 2018).  
24 Opinions vary on how soon this technology will penetrate the market. Bansal and Kockelman  
25 (2017) suggest fully automated vehicles could have anywhere from 25 to more than 80% market  
26 share by 2045. Recognizing such an introduction is no far-off fantasy, the last decade has seen a  
27 concerted effort by researchers and practitioners to predict and plan for the rise of the self-driving  
28 vehicle.

29 A wrinkle in the world of AVs is the idea of shared automated vehicles (SAVs). This transportation  
30 mode operates like contemporary transportation network companies (TNCs), such as Lyft and  
31 Uber, by providing on-demand travel services, but without the presence of a driver. Fagnant and  
32 Kockelman (2016) found that one SAV may be able to substitute for approximately 10 privately-  
33 owned vehicles when they modeled a fleet in the Austin, Texas market. That being said, the model  
34 used in this research limited its analysis region to a 12 by 24-mile area. In doing so, many household  
35 trips were not accounted for. A later study by Liu et al. (2017) expanded the area of interest to the  
36 entire Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s (CAMPO) 6-county region, accounting  
37 for approximately 8.8 million person-trips. They found that by pricing SAVs at \$1 to \$1.25 per  
38 mile, each SAV could replace 7.7 privately-owned human driven vehicles. Loeb et al. (2018)  
39 furthered this research by considering electric SAVs (SAEVs) on the 6-county network. With  
40 average wait times near 7 minutes, one SAEV could serve 7 passengers. Wait times vary with  
41 charging time as well, ranging from 10.1 to 4.4 minutes at 4-hour and 30-minute charge times,  
42 respectively.

1 Dynamic ride-sharing (DRS) is a method already being employed by TNCs (i.e., Uber Pool and  
2 Lyft Line) wherein passengers share a portion of their vehicle and trip with strangers headed in the  
3 same general direction. DRS will also likely be employed on SAVs to maximize the number of  
4 service a single vehicle can provide and limit empty or single-occupant vehicles.

### 5 **Self-Driving Vehicles and Land Use**

6 Past work has been aimed at predicting how transportation and land use relationship will be  
7 affected by AVs. It is possible the lower cost of driving will lead to further VMT increases and  
8 sprawl (Fagnant and Kockelman, 2015). Those with longer commutes tend to be more likely to  
9 adopt SAVs, potentially increasing overall VMT as empty vehicles roam empty waiting for  
10 passengers (Haboucha et al., 2017).

11 Meyer et al. (2017) found that introduction of AVs in exclusively exurban areas (characterized by  
12 limited access highways) increased accessibility between 10 and 14%. Accessibility calculates the  
13 connectedness of an activity to the transportation system by weighting opportunities with costs. In  
14 the case of widespread, private AV use, much of the “positive” gains in accessibility were offset  
15 by the “negative” of increased travel demand due to empty trips. Meyer et al. (2017, p. 90) note  
16 “well-connected rural municipalities experience the strongest increase in accessibility, whilst the  
17 effect in city centers is much less strong or even negative.” Such a result indicates households may  
18 become more interested in locating far from the urban core. The work here seeks to understand  
19 whether AVs will be more in demand by households already far from the urban core or perhaps  
20 those wishing to relocate there.

### 21 **Measuring Land Use Variables**

22 The connection between land use and transportation and land use has been widely studied. Meta-  
23 analyses by Ewing and Cervero (2001 & 2010) and Stevens (2017) investigated the effects of the  
24 “5D’s” on vehicle-miles traveled (VMT). They found destination accessibility and design of the  
25 transportation network to be the most important factors in determining the amount of travel one  
26 partakes in. Stevens (2017) also identified job accessibility and population density as important  
27 indicators of VMT. A notable conclusion drawn from this research was that impacts were location  
28 specific and often inter-related, no matter the variable in question. For example, it is unlikely to  
29 find a dense development with only a single land use type. Past work shows how CAV technology  
30 is intertwined with land use. The work here looks at the land use and transportation relationship  
31 from another angle. It is particularly interested in how the built environment characteristics of  
32 one’s neighborhoods informs his or her interest in new vehicle technologies.

### 33 **SURVEY DATA**

34 The stated preferences expressed in these results come from two nationwide surveys. The first,  
35 from Quarles and Kockelman (2018) focused on consumer interest and WTP for AV technology  
36 and electric vehicles. In addition to demographic data from the survey, location data provided by  
37 survey respondents were attributed to land use data from the EPA’s Smart Location Database  
38 (SLD).

39 An early first step was to “clean” the survey data for any contradictory or nonsensical responses.  
40 Part of this process involved ensuring all respondents gave location data. After removing those  
41 households who did not provide their location, 1,423 responses remained.

1 The second survey was similarly interested in new vehicle technologies and consumers'  
2 willingness to pay for them, but also posed questions related to ethics and long-distance travel  
3 Gurumurthy and Kockelman (2018). Households across the United States were surveyed and a  
4 cleaning process similar to that discussed above resulted in 2,588 responses.

5 One should approach these results with a degree of caution. Because AV technology is perceived  
6 as futuristic and inaccessible to most, the responses given in choice experiments may not be  
7 entirely accurate (Krueger et al., 2016; Bansal and Kockelman, 2017). People are fascinated by  
8 the idea of self-driving vehicles even if they are not yet ready to adopt the technology or trust it  
9 yet (Kyriakidis et al., 2015). While some show great enthusiasm for AV technology, a large  
10 percentage of the population have concerns related to safety, legal issues and cost.

### 11 **Population Weighting**

12 No survey can be expected to capture a perfect sample of the population. To best represent  
13 preferences across the country, population weighting was applied to the responses. For example,  
14 in the first survey, women were over-sampled (i.e., they comprised 63% of survey responses,  
15 whereas only represent 51% of the U.S. population). In addition to gender, various other  
16 demographic attributes were used as benchmarks to weight each response. Based on weighting  
17 from the U.S. Census Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS), an iterative process was used to  
18 bring the sample statistics as close as possible to actual conditions. Weights were applied at both  
19 the household and individual levels.

### 20 **LAND USE DATA**

21 The “5D” variables used for this analysis came from the SLD. Variables are presented in this  
22 database at the census block group level. Conversely, survey respondents gave their location at the  
23 zip code level. 5-digit zip codes were associated with census tracts via a relationship file provided  
24 by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)<sup>1</sup>. Census tracts and  
25 zip codes do not overlay perfectly, as zip codes are delineated in such a way as to minimize delivery  
26 time of mail whereas census tracts are drawn to capture approximately equal portions of the  
27 population. That being said, they are sufficiently linked so as to provide valuable urban form data.  
28 Since the land use variables in the SLD are at the block group level and location data was at the  
29 tract level, a weighted average of all block groups within a tract was taken for each variable. This  
30 population-based weighted average was tied to the results of the 2016 American Community  
31 Survey (ACS).

32 Density, the first of the “5Ds” is represented by housing, population, and job density. All three  
33 variables are measured in terms of units per unprotected acre (EPA, 2014). Protected lands are  
34 designated as such to conserve them, often for ecological reasons, and therefore are ineligible for  
35 development.

36 Measuring diversity of land uses is considerably more complicated than doing so for density. It  
37 would be an extremely arduous task to evaluate the exact land use of every parcel in every census  
38 block group in the United States. Instead, the developers of the SLD used existing data to make  
39 assumptions about each region of interest (EPA, 2014). For example, when looking at the balance  
40 between housing and jobs (a common measure of diversity of land uses), a simple ratio of housing

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/usps\\_crosswalk.html](https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/usps_crosswalk.html)

1 units to jobs within the entire block group was taken. As noted in the SLD User Guide, this is  
2 potentially problematic as such a ratio does not provide any insight into the spatial distribution of  
3 jobs and housing units within a block group. Another measure used to evaluate diversity is the  
4 ratio of trips departing a block group to those entering. An index, named trip equilibrium, uses trip  
5 generation values provided by the Institute of Transportation Engineering (ITE) Trip Generation  
6 Manual to calculate the number of vehicle trips created by households in a block group and the  
7 number of trips attracted there by the available employment opportunities (EPA, 2014). Finally, a  
8 regional diversity index was calculated by considering the total population and employment within  
9 a block group.

10 Design measures refer to the physical make-up of a region. For example, the measure of network  
11 density evaluates the number of transportation facility miles per acre within a block group (EPA,  
12 2014). These facilities may be auto-focused, multi-modal or pedestrian-focused. Another design  
13 measure is intersection density. As the name implies, this is calculated by taking a weighted sum  
14 of all intersections within a block group. The weights are based on which facility types are  
15 intersecting. Notably, intersections which connected multiple auto-centric facilities were given a  
16 weight of zero because they often impede non-motor vehicle transportation modes. Due to this  
17 weighting, the intersection density variable can be used as somewhat of a proxy for “walk scores”  
18 or other similar pedestrian-focused land use variables. “Walk scores” can vary greatly across a zip  
19 code and therefore using it as an explanatory variable for this analysis was not feasible. Instead,  
20 through use of intersection density, the researchers have sought to understand how conditions for  
21 active transport (i.e., walking and cycling) may impact one’s adoption and use of AVs.

22 Evaluating the fourth “D” variable, distance to transit, can be tricky. For one, many regions in the  
23 United States lack access to transit in any form. Furthermore, even if transit is present, there is no  
24 guarantee the service provided by a nearby transit stop is reliable or efficient enough to serve as a  
25 viable mode alternative. For the purposes of this project, transit accessibility was measured by  
26 finding the shortest distance from the population center of a census block group to a transit stop  
27 (so long as it was less than 0.75 miles) (EPA, 2014).

28 Destination accessibility, the final of the “5D’s” was evaluated in two similar, yet distinct, ways.  
29 One variable looks at the number of jobs available within a 45-minute automobile trip. This was  
30 calculated by summing the jobs in all census block groups that had a centroid within a 45-minute  
31 automobile trip (EPA, 2014). The second measure is very similar. The only difference is that it  
32 sums job accessible within a 45-minute transit trip. As mentioned previously, this is not an option  
33 for all communities, a fact which is reflected in the data.

34 Some land use variables were directly asked. In survey by Quarles and Kockelman (2018),  
35 respondents were asked the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop, grocery store, their  
36 place of work or school, and downtown. The first is a “D” variable itself. The others examples of  
37 destination accessibility, each related to different trip purposes. For example, a trip to the grocery  
38 store is considered personal business, whereas a trip downtown may be for work or recreation.

39 Finally, the data for average household income by census block group was retrieved from the 2016  
40 ACS.

## 41 **SUMMARY STATISTICS**

1 Most of the summary statistics in Table 1 come from the SLD. The first half covers land use  
 2 variables associated with data from the survey by Quarles and Kockelman (2018) whereas the  
 3 second is in reference to the survey by Gurumurthy and Kockelman (2018). Note the asterisked  
 4 variables came directly from survey respondents and average household income is based on results  
 5 from the 2016 ACS.

6 **TABLE 1 Summary Statistics for Land Use Variables**

<i>n</i> = 1,423 survey respondents					
<b>“D” Variable of Interest</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
<b>Density</b>	Housing Units per Acre	3.42	12.30	0	233.44
	People per Acre	7.35	22.58	0	275.84
	Jobs per Acre	5.54	44.43	0	889.80
<b>Diversity of Land Uses</b>	Jobs per Household	72.23	847.77	0	20,619
	Trip Equilibrium	0.37	0.22	0	0.96
	Regional Diversity	0.18	0.18	0	0.99
<b>Density</b>	Road Network Density (facility miles/acre)	11.17	8.63	0.02	49.72
	Intersection Density (number of intersections per block group)	45.04	54.27	0	636.25
<b>Distance to Transit</b>	Distance to Transit (miles)	44.5	26.5	0	62.1 (constrained)
	Self-reported Distance to Nearest Transit Stop (miles)*	7.59	14.54	0	130.76
<b>Destination Accessibility</b>	Jobs within a 45min Automobile Trip	116,128	179,609	64.25	1,365,189
	Jobs within a 45min Transit Trip	6,571	27,944	0	356,152
	Self-reported Distance to Nearest Grocery Store (miles)*	5.01	7.67	0.03	103.48
	Self-reported Distance to Work or School (miles)*	7.92	13.97	0	179.45
	Self-reported Distance to Downtown (miles)*	10.22	14.32	0	156.58
	Average Household Income (\$/year)+	78,799	44,310	0	437,929
<i>n</i> = 2,588 survey respondents					
<b>“D” Variable of Interest</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
<b>Density</b>	Housing Units per Acre	2.27	7.53	0	233.44
	People per Acre	5.37	15.78	0	275.30
	Jobs per Acre	3.11	28.27	0	1,168
<b>Diversity of Land Uses</b>	Jobs per Household	112.79	1,019	0	20,619
	Trip Equilibrium	0.35	0.22	0	1.00
	Regional Diversity	0.18	0.18	0	0.99

<b>Density</b>	Road Network Density (facility miles/acre)	10.63	8.05	0.11	46.05
	Intersection Density (number of intersections per block group)	40.92	45.05	0	636.25
<b>Distance to Transit</b>	Distance to Transit (miles)	49.3	24.0	0	62.1 (constrained)
<b>Destination Accessibility</b>	Jobs within a 45min Automobile Trip	102,623	135,658	0	1,420,953
	Jobs within a 45min Transit Trip	3,850	18,571	0	359,681
	Average Household Income (\$/year)+	78,798	45,051	0	447,880
*Question was asked directly of survey respondents +Data from 2016 ACS All other data comes from the EPA’s Smart Location Database					

1

2 Further summary statistics from the surveys used in this analysis can be found in work by Quarles  
 3 and Kockelman (2018) and Gurumurthy and Kockelman (2018).

4 **RESULTS**

5 The focus of this paper is on the potential land use may have in influencing the adoption and use  
 6 of self-driving vehicles. The analyses detailed in these results include demographic explanatory  
 7 variables originating from the surveys of interest. For the sake of brevity and in the interest of a  
 8 focused report, these variables will not be discussed in this paper. For more detailed investigation  
 9 of these variables please refer to Quarles and Kockelman (2018) and Gurumurthy and Kockelman  
 10 (2018).

11 In addition to presenting the statistical significance of each explanatory variable, practical  
 12 significance is also given. This was calculated in one of two ways. For continuous variables, like  
 13 density, the variable for each respondent in the dataset was increased by 1 standard deviation. This  
 14 adjusted value was placed into the regression function (y) produced by the applicable model, which  
 15 was then recalculated. For binary responses, like possession of a driver’s license, all respondents  
 16 were given a value of 1. That is to say, the practical significance measure the impact of the entire  
 17 population becoming licensed drivers. For both methods, a population-weighted average of the  
 18 resulting y-values was taken. The difference between this average and the unchanged one was  
 19 normalized by dividing by the standard deviation (Equation 1).

20 
$$\Delta Y \text{ w. r. t. SD} = \frac{\bar{y}_{changed} - \bar{y}_{unchanged}}{\sigma} \quad (1)$$

21 **Interest in AVs**

22 The first area of focus in understanding the adoption and expected behavioral patterns associated  
 23 with self-driving vehicles is simply the interest one has in acquiring the technology. The results  
 24 seen in Table 2 explore this question. Respondents were first asked their interest in owning or  
 25 leasing a completely self-driving vehicle. They were given the opportunity to respond on a 4-point  
 26 scale ranging from “not interested” to “very interested.” Due to the nature of the question and the

1 possible responses, an ordered probit model was used to determine the impact of explanatory  
2 variables on one's interest in an AV.

3 In terms of land use, some key results can be gleaned. The strongest predictor, as indicated by its  
4 practical significance, is job accessibility. This highlights the fact that those with existing access  
5 to career opportunities appear to see less of a need for automated vehicle technology. This is related  
6 to the significance of the trip equilibrium index. A neighborhood's higher mismatch of trip  
7 producers and attractors is shown as a potential boost to AV interest. Those who cannot walk to  
8 nearby diverse land uses may see AVs as more advantageous. The next strongest predictor is  
9 network density. A neighborhood with a higher concentration of transportation facilities is more  
10 likely to see households expressing interest in AVs. Housing density is also predictive of one's  
11 interest. Based on these findings, the denser the neighborhood, the more likely one is to show  
12 interest in ownership of a self-driving vehicle. The link between dense development and dense  
13 transportation networks is apparent to anyone who has visited a large city's downtown area.  
14 Finally, as one's access to transit decreases, their interest in AVs follows suit. It is possible that  
15 those used to using an alternate mode like transit are more inclined to explore the possibility of  
16 travel via AV.

17 The next piece of analysis investigates whether survey respondents identified a high number of  
18 benefits related to AVs, which may influence their adoption of the technology. Respondents could  
19 select any number of the following reasons for why they might see self-driving technology as  
20 beneficial: enhanced safety, congestion relief, the ability to partake in other activities instead of  
21 driving, the reliability of a self-driving car, its role as a convenient alternative to public transit due  
22 to the ability to be dropped off closer to one's destination, and the ability to self-park. If the  
23 respondents showed interest in at least three of these potential benefits, they were assigned a high  
24 level of interest in the benefits of self-driving technology. To analyze if a respondent showed such  
25 interest, a binomial logit model was used.

26 The results in Table 2 indicate those in areas with a good mix of land uses see the greatest benefit  
27 originating from self-driving vehicles. Both the trip equilibrium index and regional diversity index  
28 appear as significant predictors of this mindset. This may be because those living in neighborhoods  
29 with diverse land uses see the benefit in advances like congestion management, transit alternatives,  
30 and self-parking. AVs have the potential to de-clog crowded streets, deliver one to their doorstep  
31 instead of a transit stop a few blocks away, and eliminate the need to "cruise"  
32 for parking. At first glance it may appear the two measures of land use diversity are at odds. In  
33 fact, they are telling the same story. A higher value in the regional diversity index indicates a good  
34 mix of land uses, whereas a trip equilibrium index close to 1 is associated with the same conditions.  
35 This is because a good mix of land uses can be expected to produce and attract approximately the  
36 same number of trips.

37 Respondents identifying at least three areas of concern were labeled as expressing high levels of  
38 trepidation towards AV technology. Respondents could indicate their concern regarding the (yet  
39 unproven) safety benefits provided by self-driving cars, faulty software in self-driving cars, the  
40 mixture of human-driven and self-driven cars, the decreased privacy in a self-driving car, or the  
41 possibility of being tracked in a self-driving car. For the same reasons indicated in the previous  
42 analysis, a binomial logit model was used for this regression.

43 Here the only land use variable of significance is density. As the number of people in a given area  
44 increase, the concern towards AVs decreases. This may be because those in denser urban areas



1 tend to be more tech-savvy. Many of the concerns associated with AVs are similar to those  
 2 associated with any new innovation. This is at odds with housing density, which tells the opposite  
 3 story. As the number of housing units per acre increase, the likelihood one expresses high levels  
 4 of concerns regarding self-driving vehicles also increases. A possible root of this discrepancy is  
 5 that housing density accounts for all housing, regardless of occupancy and therefore includes  
 6 vacant dwellings in its count.

7 **TABLE 2 Model Estimation Results for Self-Driving Vehicle Interest**

<b>Interest in owning or leasing a completely self-driving vehicle? (n = 1,422)</b>			
<b>Explanatory Variable</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>ΔY w.r.t. SD</b>
Housing Units Per Acre	0.005	0.185	+6.4%
Trip Equilibrium Index	0.285	0.033	+6.4%
Network Density	1.69E-02	0.000	+15.0%
Distance to Transit	-1.39E-06	0.094	-6.2%
Jobs within a 45min Transit Trip	-2.71E-06	0.120	-50.2%
Is Not Disabled?	-0.235	0.035	<b>Y:</b> -1.6%
Household Size	0.082	0.013	+11.1%
Age of Respondent (in years)	-0.014	0.000	-21.8%
Is Male?	0.329	0.000	+19.7%
Possess a U.S. Driver's License?	0.455	0.001	<b>Y:</b> +2.7%
Is Caucasian?	-1.68E-01	0.030	<b>Y:</b> -4.6%
Number of Children in Household	0.080	0.103	+7.7%
Household Income	2.36E-06	0.001	+11.7%
Possess a College Degree?	0.090	0.164	<b>Y:</b> +4.9%
Is Employed?	0.157	0.015	<b>Y:</b> +7.3%
	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>Std Error</b>	
Ψ <sub>1</sub>	0	[constrained]	
Ψ <sub>2</sub>	0.676	0.033	
Ψ <sub>3</sub>	1.408	0.045	
<b>McFadden's R-Square: 0.108</b>			
<b>McFadden's adjusted R-Square: 0.101</b>			
<b>Does the respondent identify a high number of benefits related to AVs? (n = 2,588)</b>			
<b>Explanatory Variable</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>ΔY w.r.t. SD</b>
Constant	0.385	0.074	
Trip Equilibrium Index	-0.381	0.057	-11.0%
Regional Diversity Index	0.706	0.005	+16.2%
Is Male?	-0.220	0.006	<b>Y:</b> +14.8%
Possess U.S. Driver's License?	-0.421	0.011	<b>Y:</b> -5.7%
Household Income	1.55E-06	0.074	+9.5%
Is a Student?	0.340	0.059	<b>Y:</b> +41.1%
<b>Pseudo R-Square: 0.008</b>		<b>Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: 28.35</b>	
<b>Does the respondent identify a high number of concerns related to AVs?</b>			

(n = 2,588)			
Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	ΔY w.r.t. SD
Constant	-0.784	0.002	
Housing Units per Acre	0.020	0.197	+17.4%
People per Acre	-0.013	0.101	-24.0%
Age of Respondent	0.004	0.156	+7.4%
Is Male?	0.137	0.092	Y: -8.0%
Possess a U.S. Driver's License?	0.327	0.057	Y: +3.8%
Is Caucasian?	0.151	0.138	Y: +6.5%
Possess a College Degree?	-0.138	0.097	Y: -10.1%
Is Employed?	-0.201	0.022	Y: -10.8%
<b>Pseudo R-Square: 0.009</b>		<b>Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: 32.58</b>	

2

### 3 Autonomous Vehicle Usage

4 Another key area of interest related to AV technology is how much self-driving vehicle owners  
 5 expect to use the technology available to them. Respondents were asked to predict the percentage  
 6 of time they anticipated having their vehicle in self-driving mode (assuming the option was  
 7 available to them). Because not all respondents indicated an interest in having a self-driving option  
 8 on their vehicle in the first place, a hurdle model was used. The selection model first evaluates  
 9 whether a respondent will put their vehicle in self-driving mode more than 0% of the time, then  
 10 using an exponential regression model, those respondents with a non-zero response are evaluated  
 11 to predict their percentage of time spent in the mode.

12 The results of this analysis are shown in Table 3. A number of land use variables arise as  
 13 significant. Three variables related to destination accessibility (distance to the nearest grocery  
 14 store, work or school, and downtown) are the strongest and indicate that those living further from  
 15 such important destinations expect to use their AV technology more frequently. Dense  
 16 development is also associated with a higher amount of expected time spent in self-driving mode.  
 17 Perhaps this is because those living in denser areas are more used to traffic congestion and hope  
 18 to enjoy the ability to partake in other activities instead of driving once the technology becomes  
 19 available. Finally, similar to the results found when investigating interest in AVs, those living in  
 20 areas with a poorer mix of land uses expect to utilize AVs more frequently.

21 A hurdle model is also used to predict one's expected use of dynamic ride-sharing (DRS). Those  
 22 respondents expressing at least some interest in using DRS are evaluated using the exponential  
 23 regression model.

24 Here as well, those living in a neighborhood with a poor mix of land uses anticipate utilizing DRS  
 25 more frequently than those with a rich one. Living further from one's destination is correlated with  
 26 a higher likelihood of using DRS. These results are not extremely surprising but they do highlight  
 27 a potentially important result. There appears to be a connection between those willing to use DRS  
 28 and those willing to pay more for (and show interest in) self-driving vehicle technology. This is  
 29 potentially advantageous because if AV users can be encouraged to complete a considerable  
 30 portion of their trips via DRS, there is potential for decreasing the number of vehicles on the road,

1 therefore mitigating the possible higher degrees of congestion expected as driving becomes easier  
 2 with AVs.

3 **TABLE 3 Model Estimation Results for Predicting Self-Driving Technology Usage**

<b>Expected Percentage of Time Spent in Self-Driving Mode (n = 1,422)</b>			
<i>Exponential Regression Model</i>			
<b>Explanatory Variable</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>ΔY w.r.t. SD</b>
Constant	4.614	0.000	
Housing Units per Acre	0.005	0.164	+1.3%
Trip Equilibrium Index	0.496	0.019	+2.4%
Regional Diversity Index	-5.07E-01	0.046	-2.0%
Distance to Nearest Grocery Store	0.014	0.026	+2.4%
Distance to Work or School	0.009	0.011	+2.9%
Distance to Downtown	0.019	0.000	+6.0%
Household Size	-0.228	0.000	-6.7%
Age of Respondent (in years)	-0.025	0.000	-8.5%
Is Male?	7.32E-01	0.000	<b>Y: +9.6%</b>
Is Caucasian?	-1.360	0.000	<b>Y: -7.4%</b>
Household Income	5.87E-06	0.000	+6.2%
Possess a College Degree?	-1.065	0.000	<b>Y: -12.0%</b>
Is Married?	0.173	0.084	<b>Y: +1.8%</b>
<i>Selection Model</i>			
<b>Explanatory Variable</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>ΔY w.r.t. SD</b>
Constant	1.929	0.000	
Jobs per Household	-7.06E-05	0.089	-3.1%
Age of Respondent (in years)	-0.009	0.007	-7.3%
Is Caucasian?	-0.509	0.001	<b>Y: -7.8%</b>
Children in Household	0.086	0.149	+4.2%
Possess a College Degree?	0.270	0.003	<b>Y: +7.8%</b>
<b>Pseudo R-Square: 0.053</b>		<b>Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: 512.99</b>	
<b>Expected Percent of Travel Completed via Dynamic Ride-Sharing assuming a 40% Discount on Shared Autonomous Vehicle Fares (n = 1,422)</b>			
<b>Exponential Regression Model</b>			
<b>Explanatory Variable</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>ΔY w.r.t. SD</b>
Constant	3.501	0.000	
Trip Equilibrium Index	0.476	0.039	+2.5%
Distance to Nearest Grocery Store	0.024	0.002	+4.6%
Distance to Work or School	0.012	0.006	+4.0%
Distance to Downtown	0.015	0.001	+5.1%
Average Household Income	1.54E-06	0.176	+1.7%
Household Size	-0.338	0.000	-10.8%

Age of Respondent (in years)	-0.034	0.000	-12.9%
Is Male?	0.964	0.000	Y: +13.7%
Possess a U.S. Driver's License?	0.547	0.019	Y: +0.8%
Is Caucasian?	-1.372	0.000	Y: -8.6%
Children in Household	0.190	0.024	+4.3%
Household Income	5.85E-06	0.000	+6.8%
Possess a College Degree?	-9.95E-01	0.000	Y: -12.5%
Is a Student?	0.780	0.009	Y: +18.2%
<i>Selection Model</i>			
<b>Explanatory Variable</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>ΔY w.r.t. SD</b>
Constant	1.704	0.000	
Jobs per Household	-6.2E-05	0.148	-5.2%
Distance to Transit	1.98E-06	0.086	+8.3%
Number of Jobs within a 45min Auto Trip	9.33E-07	0.009	+16.5%
Is Not Disabled?	-0.461	0.008	Y: -3.0%
Workers in Household	0.147	0.001	+13.8%
Age of Respondent (in years)	-0.010	0.000	-15.7%
Is Caucasian?	-0.248	0.026	Y: -6.2%
<b>Pseudo R-Square: 0.073</b>		<b>Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: 523.00</b>	

1 **Willingness-to-Pay**

2 In exploring one's WTP for self-driving capabilities to be added onto a new vehicle, a hurdle  
 3 model was used for similar reasons to those described previously. As some respondents indicated  
 4 no desire to pay a premium of any kind for this technology, the selection model first evaluates  
 5 those expressing an interest in paying a non-zero premium. From there, the exponential regression  
 6 model seeks to understand what may predict the value of said premium.

7 The density variables in this analysis are at odds. The results indicate those living in neighborhoods  
 8 with a high concentration of housing stock will pay more for self-driving technology whereas those  
 9 living in areas with a high concentration of people will pay progressively less. This discrepancy  
 10 may be due to the housing vacancy issue discussed prior to Table 2. As with previous results, those  
 11 in more monotonous developments express greater interest in AVs (this time in the form of greater  
 12 interest in paying for the technology). A higher number of jobs within reach of a neighborhood is  
 13 associated with a higher willingness to pay for self-driving technology. It is possible the higher  
 14 number of accessible opportunities gives one the ability to seek out a better-paying job and  
 15 therefore gain more income to spend on the technology. Notably, the demographic explanatory  
 16 variable of household income possesses a positive correlation with the same willingness to pay  
 17 response variable. Also similar to the previous result, as distance to key destinations like work,  
 18 school, or the downtown area increase, one's willingness to pay for self-driving capabilities  
 19 follows suit. Those with longer travel times to their destinations likely see the advantage (and  
 20 therefore place a higher value) on the benefits afforded by the ability to partake in activities other  
 21 than driving.

22 **TABLE 4 Model Estimation Results for WTP for Self-Driving Vehicle Technology**

<b>Willingness to Pay for Full Self-Driving Capabilities (n = 1,422)</b>			
<i>Exponential Regression Model</i>			
<b>Explanatory Variable</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>ΔY w.r.t. SD</b>
Constant	8.139	0.000	
Housing Units per Acre	0.016	0.091	+3.0%
People per Acre	-0.010	0.054	-3.4%
Trip Equilibrium Index	0.253	0.177	+0.8%
Jobs Within a 45min Auto Trip	4.22E-07	0.147	+1.1%
Distance to Work or School	8.96E-03	0.010	+1.9%
Distance to Downtown	0.019	0.000	+4.1%
Household Size	-0.118	0.015	-2.3%
Age of Respondent (in years)	-0.021	0.000	-5.0%
Is Caucasian?	-0.266	0.012	<b>Y:</b> -0.4%
Children in Household	0.131	0.049	+1.8%
Household Income	3.94E-06	0.000	+2.8%
<i>Selection Model</i>			
<b>Explanatory Variable</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>ΔY w.r.t. SD</b>
Constant	2.313	0.000	
Jobs per Household	-6.1E-05	0.152	-2.6%
Network Density	0.014	0.009	+6.3%
Distance to Transit	-0.004	0.134	-2.9%
Average Household Income	-1.87E-06	0.041	-4.2%
Is Not Disabled?	-0.531	0.011	<b>Y:</b> -0.0%
Age of Respondent (in years)	-0.014	0.000	-11.1%
Is Caucasian?	-0.185	0.149	<b>Y:</b> -2.6%
Possess a College Degree?	0.180	0.035	<b>Y:</b> +4.9%
<b>Pseudo R-Square: 0.12</b>		<b>Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: 254.08</b>	

1

4 **Long-Distance Travel**

5 The next set of analyses look at how respondents expect to conduct their long-distance travel in  
6 the presence of self-driving vehicles. The base case is existing modes of transportation (i.e. cars,  
7 buses, trains, and airplanes). A multinomial logit model was used to investigate whether  
8 respondents would instead show interest in self-driving vehicle options for their long-distance  
9 travel. Respondents were asked about their preferences for trips of three distances (50-100, 100-  
10 500, and 500+ miles). Further, for each of the distances, they were asked about their expected  
11 choices for vacation or recreational, personal, and business travel.

12 First, for the lowest length of travel, one’s access to transit diminished the expected use of a  
13 personal AV for recreational travel. Conversely, a high number of jobs in relative close proximity  
14 has the opposite effect. Similar to previous analyses, the high number of nearby jobs may indicate  
15 a higher amount of income to spend on a self-driving car. For personal travel (e.g. shopping), this  
16 access to jobs variable is similarly statistically significant. There were no land use variables which

1 were statistically significant when it came to predicting one's use of an SAV for recreational or  
2 personal travel at this distance, nor for predicting one's business travel through a shared mode or  
3 otherwise.

4 At the next level of distance traveled, job accessibility remains a significant predictor for  
5 recreational or vacation travel via AV, likely for the same reasons discussed above. With regards  
6 to shared vehicle travel, the opposite is true. As job access opportunities diminish, the likelihood  
7 of using an SAV increases. Perhaps the decreased access to career opportunities can be associated  
8 with a desire to cut costs by sharing rides. In terms of personal travel, intersection density becomes  
9 slightly significant, indicating living in a more walkable community leads to a higher desire to use  
10 a personal AV for this form of long-distance travel. Intersection density moves in the opposite  
11 direction for shared vehicles. A less walkable neighborhood is associated with higher interest in  
12 sharing trips, perhaps because of the limited alternative modal options at one's disposal. For  
13 business trips at this distance, access to transit appears as statistically significant. Somewhat  
14 counter-intuitively, as one's distance from transit increases, interest in using a personal AV for  
15 long-distance travel decreases. Perhaps, these households are used to driving their own vehicle for  
16 long-trips (due to a lack of transit options) and do not see as much of a need for AV travel. For  
17 shared vehicle travel, density appears as statistically significant. This may be because denser  
18 development could result in decreased wait times for SAV pick-up. Also, similar to the case of  
19 vacation and recreation travel, a higher number of jobs within reach of one's location diminishes  
20 the likelihood of selecting SAV for travel.

21 Finally, for very long-distance travel (500+ miles), some important indicators arise as significant.  
22 For vacation/recreation travel, the model predicts higher levels of jobs in a neighborhood to be  
23 associated with a higher likelihood of selecting the private AV travel mode. For both personal and  
24 business travel, distance to transit and job accessibility are key explanatory variables. As one's  
25 distance from transit decreases, their likelihood of using a personal AV increases. These align with  
26 findings for other distances. Job accessibility is significant for all trip purposes, likely due to the  
27 same reasons discussed previously.

1

**TABLE 5 Model Estimation Results for Long-Distance Travel**

Mode Choice for Long-Distance <i>Vacation/Recreation</i> Travel of 50-100 miles				Mode Choice for Long-Distance <i>Personal</i> Travel of 50-100 miles			
<i>n</i> = 2,588							
<i>Personal AV</i>							
Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	ΔY w.r.t. SD	Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	ΔY w.r.t. SD
Constant	-0.790	0.049		Constant	-0.528	0.072	
Distance to Transit	-2.36E-06	0.198	-2.8%	Number of Jobs within a 45min Auto Trip	1.35E-06	0.001	+6.5%
Number of Jobs within a 45min Auto Trip	1.59E-06	0.002	+6.7%	Age of Respondent (in years)	0.019	0.000	+11.3%
Age of Respondent (in years)	0.018	0	+9.0%	Possess a U.S. Driver's License?	-0.498	0.022	Y: -1.8%
Is Male?	0.165	0.16	Y: -2.6%	Is Caucasian?	-0.522	0.000	Y: -7.0%
Possess a U.S. Driver's License?	-0.617	0.004	Y: -2.0%	Household Income	-4.15E-06	0.004	-7.0%
Is Caucasian?	-0.502	0.001	Y: -5.8%	Possess a College Degree?	-0.243	0.003	Y: -8.2 %
Household Income	-5.58E-06	0	-8.1%	Is Employed?	-0.525	0.001	Y: -5.9%
Possess a College Degree?	-0.243	0.043	Y: -4.9%	Is a Student?	-0.869	0.019	Y: -28.6%
Is Employed?	-0.522	0.001	Y: -7.6%	Is Retired?	-0.340	0.072	Y: -9.8%
Is a Student?	-0.928	0.012	Y: -26.5%				
Is Retired?	-0.327	0.072	Y: -8.1%				
<i>Shared AV</i>							
Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	ΔY w.r.t. SD	Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	ΔY w.r.t. SD
Constant	0.701	0.034		Constant	0.355	0.149	
Age of Respondent (in years)	-0.023	0	-30.2%	Age of Respondent (in years)	-0.017	0.000	-26.5 %
Is Caucasian?	-0.260	0.024	Y: -7.8%	Household Income	2.08E-06	0.036	+9.4%
Household Income	1.89E-06	0.059	+7.1%	Possess a College Degree?	0.165	0.087	Y: +10.3%
Possess a College Degree?	0.126	0.193	Y: +6.5%				
Is Retired?	0.368	0.024	Y: +23.6%				
Pseudo R-Square: 0.041 Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: 215.10				Pseudo R-Square: 0.035 Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: 186.75			

2

Mode Choice for Long-Distance <i>Vacation/Recreation</i> Travel of 100-500 miles				Mode Choice for Long-Distance <i>Personal</i> Travel of 100-500 miles				Mode Choice for Long-Distance <i>Business</i> Travel of 100-500 miles			
<i>n</i> = 2,588											
<i>Personal AV</i>											
Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	ΔY w.r.t. SD	Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	ΔY w.r.t. SD	Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	ΔY w.r.t. SD
Constant	-0.943	0.008		Constant	-0.788	0.028		Constant	-0.578	0.072	
Number of Jobs within a 45min Auto Trip	8.45E-07	0.028	+3.2%	Intersection Density	0.002	0.136	+2.1%	Distance to Transit	-2.43E-06	0.124	-2.7%
Age of Respondent (in years)	0.021	0.000	+9.9%	Age of Respondent (in years)	0.019	0.000	+8.3%	Age of Respondent (in years)	0.025	0.000	+11.7%
Is Male?	0.274	0.018	Y: -4.0%	Possess a U.S. Driver's License?	-0.552	0.009	Y: -1.5%	Is Male?	0.407	0.000	Y: -6.0%
Possess a U.S. Driver's License?	-0.563	0.007	Y: -1.6%	Is Caucasian?	-0.487	0.000	Y: -4.9%	Children in Household	-0.096	0.067	Y: -2.7%
Is Caucasian?	-0.447	0.002	Y: -4.8%	Household Income	-4.52E-06	0.002	-5.7%	Household Income	-3.04E-06	0.006	-4.1%
Household Income	-6.42E-06	0.000	-8.5%	Possess a College Degree?	-0.380	0.001	Y: -6.6%	Possess a College Degree?	-0.352	0.001	Y: -6.5%
Possess a College Degree?	-0.317	0.007	Y: -5.8%	Is Employed?	-0.462	0.002	Y: -5.8%	Is Employed?	-1.106	0.000	Y: -15.0%
Is Employed?	-0.536	0.000	Y: -7.2%	Is a Student?	-0.649	0.109	Y: -16.1%	Is a Student?	-0.517	0.023	Y: -13.7%
Is a Student?	-0.716	0.032	Y: -18.7%	Is Retired?	-0.289	0.028	Y: -6.2%	Is Retired?	0.739	0.07	Y: +17.1%
Is Retired?	-0.433	0.016	Y: -9.9%								
<i>Shared AV</i>											
Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	ΔY w.r.t. SD	Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	ΔY w.r.t. SD	Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	ΔY w.r.t. SD
Constant	0.184	0.551		Constant	0.446	0.146		Constant	-0.368	0.404	
Number of Jobs within a 45min Auto Trip	-8.78E-07	0.023	-6.1%	Intersection Density	-0.019	0.000	-11.2%	People per Acre	0.008	0.073	+4.3%
Age of Respondent (in years)	-0.020	0.000	-17.0%	Household Income	1.66E-06	0.100	+7.4%	Number of Jobs within a 45min Auto Trip	-1.62E-06	0.044	-7.4%
Household Income	2.17E-06	0.034	+5.2%	Possess a College Degree?	0.179	0.072	Y: +10.9%	Age of Respondent (in years)	-0.015	0.007	-8.4%
Is a Student?	-0.369	0.086	Y: -17.3%	Is Employed?	-0.196	0.113	Y: -8.7%				
Pseudo R-Square: 0.041 Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: 209.68				Pseudo R-Square: 0.036 Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: 188.89				Pseudo R-Square: 0.141 Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: 684.8			

1

Mode Choice for Long-Distance <i>Vacation/Recreation</i> Travel of 500+ miles	Mode Choice for Long-Distance <i>Personal</i> Travel of 500+ miles	Mode Choice for Long-Distance <i>Business</i> Travel of 500+ miles
---	--	--



<i>n</i> = 2,588											
<i>Personal AV</i>											
Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	$\Delta Y$ w.r.t. SD	Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	$\Delta Y$ w.r.t. SD	Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	$\Delta Y$ w.r.t. SD
Constant	-1.234	0.002		Constant	-1.49	0		Constant	-0.604	0.082	
Jobs per Acre	0.003	0.174	+1.9%	Distance to Transit	-3.23E-06	0.058	-3.7%	Distance to Transit	-2.27E-06	0.148	-2.4%
Household Size	0.069	0.143	+2.2%	Number of Jobs within a 45min Auto Trip	1.44E-06	0.002	+5.8%	Number of Jobs within a 45min Auto Trip	6.06E-07	0.189	+2.2%
Age of Respondent (in years)	0.026	0	+10.0%	Household Size	0.079	0.087	+3.2%	Age of Respondent (in years)	0.029	0	+13.0%
Is Male?	0.288	0.009	Y: -3.5%	Age of Respondent (in years)	0.024	0	+11.6%	Is Male?	0.446	0	Y: -6.2%
Possess a U.S. Driver's License?	-0.554	0.006	Y: -1.3%	Is Male?	0.199	0.066	Y: -3.0%	Possess a U.S. Driver's License?	-0.27	0.198	Y: -0.7%
Is Caucasian?	-0.389	0.005	Y: -3.5%	Possess a U.S. Driver's License?	-0.576	0.005	Y: -1.7%	Number of Children in Household	-0.079	0.129	-2.1%
Household Income	-9.10E-06	0	-10.1%	Is Caucasian?	-0.326	0.016	Y: -3.6%	Household Income	-3.55E-06	0.001	-4.5%
Possess a College Degree?	-0.402	0	Y: -6.1%	Household Income	-6.65E-06	0	-9.2%	Possess a College Degree?	-0.416	0	Y: -7.2%
Is Employed?	-0.462	0.001	Y: -5.1%	Possess a College Degree?	-0.417	0	Y: -8.0%	Is Employed?	-1.11	0	Y: -14.2%
Is a Student?	-0.865	0.009	Y: -18.9%	Is Employed?	-0.42	0.003	Y: -5.9%	Is a Student?	-0.521	0.019	Y: -13.0%
Is Retired?	-0.42	0.015	Y: -23.5%	Is a Student?	-0.857	0.009	Y: -23.4%	Is Retired?	0.778	0	Y: +16.9%
				Is Retired?	-0.269	0.116	Y: -6.4%				
<i>Shared AV</i>											
Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	$\Delta Y$ w.r.t. SD	Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	$\Delta Y$ w.r.t. SD	Explanatory Variable	Coeff.	P-value	$\Delta Y$ w.r.t. SD
Constant	-0.353	0.359		Constant	0.129	0.751		Constant	0.111	0.836	
Number of Jobs within a 45min Auto Trip	-1.99E-06	0.001	-8.5%	Number of Jobs within a 45min Auto Trip	-2.00E-06	0.002	-11.7%	Number of Jobs within a 45min Auto Trip	-1.25E-06	0.168	-6.0%
Household Size	0.147	0	+6.3%	Household Size	0.128	0.001	+7.5%	Age of Respondent (in years)	-0.017	0.012	-9.7%
Age of Respondent (in years)	-0.015	0.001	-8.0%	Age of Respondent (in years)	-0.018	0	-12.7%	Household Income	-3.37E-06	0.08	-5.6%
Household Income	-3.32E-06	0.013	-4.9%	Household Income	-1.78E-06	0.162	-3.6%	Is a Student?	-0.654	0.046	Y: -21.5%
Possess a College Degree?	-0.173	0.127	Y: -3.5%	Possess a College Degree?	-0.194	0.0178	Y: -5.4%				
Is a Student?	-0.709	0.005	Y: -20.7%	Is a Student?	-0.637	0.008	Y: -25.4%				
<b>Pseudo R-Square: 0.057</b> <b>Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: 273.13</b>				<b>Pseudo R-Square: 0.050</b> <b>Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: 245.96</b>				<b>Pseudo R-Square: 0.160</b> <b>Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: 738.22</b>			

1 **Home Location Choice**

2 The final analysis area of interest is home location choice. Mostly, this section of the research is  
 3 concerned with where respondents intend to locate their new homes upon the introduction of self-  
 4 driving vehicles. The sample sizes for these analyses are considerably smaller than those discussed  
 5 above. This is because these questions were only posed to those respondents considering a move  
 6 within the next year. Therefore, because of the relatively small sample size, the results should be  
 7 taken with a grain of salt.

8 The analysis in this section was regressed using a binomial logit model. The model investigates  
 9 what may cause a household to move closer to the city center once AVs are available. Both  
 10 variables of significance are related to destination accessibility. It has been well-established that  
 11 one’s decision of where to locate their home is heavily tied to travel time to important destinations  
 12 like work (Waddell et al., 2007; Prashker et al., 2008). Therefore, it stands to reason that those  
 13 living further from their workplace (or school) would express a greater interest in moving closer  
 14 to the city center. Conversely, those already close to downtown probably do not feel the same  
 15 draw, as they already enjoy most of the amenities the city provides.

16 **TABLE 6 Model Estimation Results for Home Location Choice with Self-Driving Vehicles**

<b>Do You Intend to Move Closer to the City Center Upon the Introduction of AVs?</b> (n = 365)			
<b>Explanatory Variable</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>ΔY w.r.t. SD</b>
Constant	-0.027	0.973	
Distance to Work or School	0.023	0.025	+10.4%
Distance to Downtown	-0.025	0.104	-11.9%
Is Not Disabled?	-1.31	0.002	<b>Y:</b> -2.8%
Household Size	-0.463	0.048	-19.8%
Number of Workers in Household	0.332	0.091	+10.4%
Age of Respondent (in years)	-0.032	0.041	-16.2%
Is Male?	1.086	0.000	<b>Y:</b> +2.1%
Number of Children in Household	0.816	0.001	+24.9%
Possess a College Degree?	0.788	0.015	<b>Y:</b> +13.7%
Is Retired?	1.058	0.178	<b>Y:</b> +26.9%
<b>Pseudo R-Square: 0.177</b>		<b>Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: 62.46</b>	
<b>Do You Intend to Move Farther from the City Center Upon the Introduction of AVs?</b> (n = 365)			
<b>Explanatory Variable</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>ΔY w.r.t. SD</b>
Constant	-3.003	0.000	
Jobs per Household	0.001	0.055	+24.7%
Regional Diversity Index	-2.20	0.063	-21.1%
Network Density	0.032	0.069	+15.2%
Household Size	0.390	0.037	+27.9%
Number of Children in Household	-0.506	0.046	-25.8%
<b>Pseudo R-Square: 0.058</b>		<b>Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: 14.50</b>	

1

## 2 CONCLUSIONS

3 While not all of the “D” variables appear to have a significant influence on one’s indicated self-  
4 driving vehicle usage, it is clear that there is a correlation between the built environment and one’s  
5 expected use of this new mode of transportation. Through the above analyses some key land use  
6 variables arise as predictive of self-driving vehicle adoption and behavior. The two “D” variables  
7 which appear most often and show high levels of practical significance are diversity of land uses  
8 and destination accessibility. With regards to diversity of land uses, a common thread is that those  
9 respondents living in neighborhoods with a poor diversity of land uses express greater interest in  
10 AV technology. A limited mix of land uses is associated with higher levels of interest in AVs,  
11 higher anticipated use of AV technology, higher likelihood of utilizing DRS, and increased WTP  
12 for self-driving capability. It is possible that those living in neighborhoods without a good mix of  
13 land uses currently have to travel longer distances and therefore are more interested in the how  
14 AVs may improve their travel experience.

15 Closely related to the diversity of land uses, destination accessibility to non-residential land uses  
16 appears to be an important indicator of AV-related behavior as well. If one has limited ability to  
17 reach their workplace, the grocery store, or downtown they appear to shower higher levels of  
18 interest in AV technology, expect to spend more time in self-driving mode, expect to make greater  
19 use of DRS, and are WTP more for AV technology. With regards to job accessibility, no matter  
20 the purpose of long-distance travel, it appears when one can reach a greater number of jobs, he or  
21 she is more likely to use a personal AV. This may be because those with access to a greater number  
22 of jobs can seek out better-paying opportunities and therefore are willing to explore the option of  
23 AV travel for lengthy trips.

24 Home location choice in the presence of AVs is similarly influenced by land use diversity and  
25 destination accessibility. Those who are already in areas with a limited mix of uses expect to move  
26 farther from the city center, where they will likely encounter similar development patterns.  
27 Conversely, those currently living far from their desired destinations anticipate moving closer to  
28 the city center. These results are slightly at odds and highlight a need for future research into how  
29 land use patterns (like home location) may change upon the introduction of AVs.

30 The results of the analyses discussed above are useful to a wide range of stakeholders. Planners  
31 and engineers can use this information to plan for AVs in the appropriate neighborhoods. For  
32 example, this work suggests single-use developments are likely to see AVs before those with  
33 multiple uses. Furthermore, manufacturers of AVs may be able to use this information to target  
34 potential buyers of their products. This work suggests the focus should be on those who have  
35 longer trips from their home to important destinations. Finally, policymakers can use this  
36 information to similarly prepare for a future with AVs. Anticipating the spatial introduction of  
37 AVs to a region’s transportation network assists local and state governments in preparing for their  
38 potential impacts on parking, congestion, and ride-sharing conditions.

39

**1 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION**

2 Study conception and design: K. Kockelman

3 Data collection: A. Nodjomian

4 Analysis and interpretation of results: A. Nodjomian

5 Draft manuscript preparation: A. Nodjomian, K. Kockelman

6 All authors reviewed the results and approved the final version of the manuscript.

**7 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

8 The authors would like to thank Scott Schauer-West, Neil Quarles, and Krishna Murthy  
9 Gurumurthy for their assistance on this project. Additional thanks are extended to the National  
10 Science Foundation's Sustainable Healthy Cities Research Network for its support.

**11 REFERENCES**

12 Bansal, P., & Kockelman, K. M. (2017). Forecasting Americans' long-term adoption of  
13 connected and autonomous vehicle technologies. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and  
14 Practice*, 95, 49-63.

15 Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] (2014). *Smart Location Database: Version 2.0 User  
16 Guide*. [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-03/documents/sld\\_userguide.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-03/documents/sld_userguide.pdf)

17 Ewing, R., & Cervero, R. (2001). Travel and the Built Environment: A Synthesis. *Transportation  
18 Research Record* (1780), 87-114.

19 Ewing, R., & Cervero, R. (2010). Travel and the Built Environment. *Journal of the American  
20 Planning Association*, 76(3), 265-294.

21 Fagnant, D. J., & Kockelman, K. M. (2014). The travel and environmental implications of shared  
22 autonomous vehicles, using agent-based model scenarios. *Transportation Research Part C:  
23 Emerging Technologies*, 40, 1-13.

24 Fagnant, D. J., & Kockelman, K. (2015). Preparing a nation for autonomous vehicles:  
25 Opportunities, barriers and policy recommendations. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and  
26 Practice*, 77, 167-181.

27 Fagnant, D. J., & Kockelman, K. M. (2016). Dynamic ride-sharing and fleet sizing for a system of  
28 shared autonomous vehicles in Austin, Texas. *Transportation*, 45(1), 143-158.

29 Gurumurthy, M., & Kockelman, K., (2018). Modeling Americans' autonomous vehicle  
30 preferences: A focus on dynamic ride-sharing, privacy & long-distance mode choices. Under  
31 review for publication in *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*.  
32 [https://www.caee.utexas.edu/prof/kockelman/public\\_html/TRB18CAVsurveyMurthy.pdf](https://www.caee.utexas.edu/prof/kockelman/public_html/TRB18CAVsurveyMurthy.pdf)

33 Haboucha, C. J., Ishaq, R., & Shiftan, Y. (2017). User preferences regarding autonomous  
34 vehicles. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 78, 37-49.

35 Kondor, D., Zhang, H., Tachet, R., Santi, P., & Ratti, C. (2017). Estimating savings in parking  
36 demand using shared vehicles for home-work commuting. *ArXiv E-prints*. Retrieved from  
37 <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1710.04983.pdf>.

38 Krueger, R., Rashidi, T. H., & Rose, J. M. (2016). Preferences for shared autonomous vehicles.  
39 *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 69, 343-355.

- 1 Kyriakidis, M., Happee, R., & Winter, J. D. (2015). Public opinion on automated driving:  
2 Results of an international questionnaire among 5000 respondents. *Transportation Research Part*  
3 *F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 32, 127-140.
- 4 Liu, J., Kockelman, K. M., Boesch, P. M., & Ciari, F. (2017). Tracking a system of shared  
5 autonomous vehicles across the Austin, Texas network using agent-based  
6 simulation. *Transportation*, 44(6), 1261-1278.
- 7 Loeb, B., Kockelman, K. M., & Liu, J. (2018). Shared autonomous electric vehicle (SAEV)  
8 operations across the Austin, Texas network with charging infrastructure  
9 decisions. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 89, 222-233.
- 10 Meyer, J., Becker, H., Bösch, P. M., & Axhausen, K. W. (2017). Autonomous vehicles: The next  
11 jump in accessibilities? *Research in Transportation Economics*, 62, 80-91.
- 12 Navigant Research. (2018, January 29). Navigant Research Leaderboard: Automated Driving  
13 Vehicles. Retrieved April 16, 2018, from [https://www.navigantresearch.com/research/navigant-](https://www.navigantresearch.com/research/navigant-research-leaderboard-automated-driving-vehicles)  
14 [research-leaderboard-automated-driving-vehicles](https://www.navigantresearch.com/research/navigant-research-leaderboard-automated-driving-vehicles)
- 15 Prashker, J., Shiftan, Y., & Hershkovitch-Sarusi, P. (2008). Residential choice location, gender  
16 and the commute trip to work in Tel Aviv. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 16(5), 332-341.
- 17 Quarles, N., & Kockelman, K., (2018). Americans' plans for acquiring and using electric, shared,  
18 and self-driving vehicles. Under review for publication in *Transportation Research Record*.  
19 [https://www.cae.utexas.edu/prof/kockelman/public\\_html/TRB18surveyFleetEvolution.pdf](https://www.cae.utexas.edu/prof/kockelman/public_html/TRB18surveyFleetEvolution.pdf)
- 20 Stevens, M. R. (2017). Does compact development make people drive less? *Journal of the*  
21 *American Planning Association*, 83 ( 1 ), 7 – 18.
- 22 The Milwaukee Sentinel. (1926, December 8). *The Milwaukee Sentinel*, p. 4. Retrieved April 15,  
23 2018, from [https://news.google.com/newspapers?id=unBQAAAAIIBAJ&sjid=QQ8EAAAIAIBAJ&pg=7304,](https://news.google.com/newspapers?id=unBQAAAAIIBAJ&sjid=QQ8EAAAIAIBAJ&pg=7304,3766749)  
24 [3766749](https://news.google.com/newspapers?id=unBQAAAAIIBAJ&sjid=QQ8EAAAIAIBAJ&pg=7304,3766749)  
25
- 26 Waddell, P., Bhat, C., Eluru, N., Wang, L., & Pendyala, R. M. (2007). Modeling Interdependence  
27 in Household Residence and Workplace Choices. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the*  
28 *Transportation Research Board*, 2003(1), 84-92.
- 29 Zhang, M. (2004). The Role of Land Use in Travel Mode Choice: Evidence from Boston and  
30 Hong Kong. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70(3), 344-360.
- 31 Zhang, W., & Guhathakurta, S. (2017). Parking Spaces in the Age of Shared Autonomous  
32 Vehicles. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2651,  
33 80-91.