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## Road Map

- Prevalence of multiple-vehicle households
- "Contributions" to total fleet, vehicle use
- Why and how behavior differs from that of singlevehicle households
- Overview of our analysis
- Useful features of NHTS data
- Econometric complications and fixes
- Highlights of estimation results
- Where we're headed


## Multiple-Vehicle Households in the 2009 NHTS

| Number of <br> Vehicles | Sample <br> Size |  | Weighted Averages |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Household Size | \# of Drivers | Drivers per <br> Vehicle | Vehicle Age | Percent Rural |  |
| $\mathbf{1}$ |  | 1.8 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 8.4 | $16 \%$ |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ |  | 2.8 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 7.8 | $24 \%$ |  |
| $\mathbf{3}$ |  | 3.1 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 8.8 | $33 \%$ |  |
| $\mathbf{4}$ |  | 3.4 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 9.5 | $40 \%$ |  |
| $\mathbf{5 +}$ | 22,298 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 0.6 | 11.5 | $48 \%$ |  |
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## Households Vehicles by Number and Type
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## Role of Multiple-Vehicle Households

| Variable | Percent of Total Accounted for <br> by Multiple-Vehicle Households |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 <br> Vehicles | 3 <br> vehicles | $5+$ <br> vehicles | All |  |
| U.S. Households | $36 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $58 \%$ |
| Household Vehicles | $39 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| Light-Duty Vehicles | $35 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $74 \%$ |
| Household VMT | $42 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| Light-Duty VMT | $36 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $72 \%$ |
| Fuel Consumption | $31 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $64 \%$ |
| U.S. CO2 Emissions | $9 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
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## Why Do Multiple-Vehicle Households Behave Differently?

- Mix of vehicle types and sizes allows closer matching of vehicle attributes to size and composition of group traveling, purpose and duration of trip, etc.
- Seating capacity, passenger comfort, occupant protection
- Luggage-carrying, cargo, and towing capacity
- Reliability, safety, performance
- Differences in fuel economy provide flexibility in responding to variation in fuel prices
- More vehicles per driver accommodates "competitive scheduling" of household members' activities and travel
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## Objectives of Analysis

- Model household and vehicle characteristics affecting ownership and use of individual vehicles
- Household characteristics: size, income, drivers, location
- Vehicle attributes: type, age, fuel economy
- Test for differences in factors affecting vehicle use
- Between single- and multiple-vehicle households
- Among two-, three-, and four or more-vehicle households
- Utilize information provided by wide variation in vehicle use, including non-use of many vehicles on survey day
- Account for simultaneity among vehicle use, type, and fuel economy in vehicle purchase decisions
- Control for influence of survey-related factors
- Wide variation in fuel prices over survey period
- Travel differences between weekdays, weekends

[^1]U.S. Department of Transportation

## Useful Features of 2009 NHTS Data

- Wide variation in fuel prices throughout survey facilitates isolating effects of fuel prices and fuel economy
- Vehicle type and make/model identifiers provide controls for vehicle attributes
- Vehicle age and ownership duration variables support analysis of factors affecting purchase decisions
- Household location useful in identifying effects of intraurban and regional differences in travel behavior
- "Flags" help to assess reliability of estimated variables
- Large sample size enables precise estimation of many effects on vehicle use
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## Estimation Procedure

## Create dataset

Merge data from NHTS household, trip, and vehicle files to create a single record for each individual vehicle

Split by household type: one-, two-, three-, four-plusvehicle households

## Designate each vehicle in turn as "primary" in regression

Each vehicle's survey-day usage appears once as the dependent variable of an observation

Characteristics of other (alternative) household vehicles appear as explanatory variables in that observation

## Employ alternative measures of vehicle use

Estimated annual use (BESTMILE)

Daily VMT (sum of survey-day trip distances)

## Experiment with alternative MPG measures

EIADMPG is partly constructed from BESTMILE, so simultaneity is "definitional"

EPATMPG is notoriously poor predictor of on-road MPG for individual drivers

## Alternative approaches to control for vehicle type

Dummy variables assume "fixed effects": only constant term differs by vehicle type

Stratification allows effects of all explanatory variables to differ by vehicle type

## Basic Model Specification

| Determinants of Vehicle Use | Alternative Measures of Determinant |
| :---: | :---: |
| Operating cost | Fuel economy (miles per gallon) |
|  | Fuel price (\$ per gallon) |
|  | Fuel cost per mile (\$ per gallon / miles per gallon) |
| Vehicle attributes | Vehicle type |
|  | Vehicle age |
| Household characteristics | Income |
|  | Household size, composition, licensed drivers |
|  | Location (urban, suburban, rural), region |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { Substitutability } \\ \text { of other } \\ \text { vehicles } \end{array}$ | Vehicle type |
|  | Operating cost |
|  | Utilization |
| Control measures | Day of survey (weekday, weekend) |
|  | Month/season of year |

## Complications and Fixes

## Zero-VMT vehicles: <br> almost one-third of <br> vehicles not driven on survey day

- Discard zero-VMT vehicles and estimate using OLS
- Use Heckman sample selection model


## BESTMILE:

estimation procedures may result in varying reliability

- Use only vehicles with BESTMILE estimated from odometer
- Use all vehicles, check to see how results differ


## Endogeneity:

 fuel economy may depend on expected vehicle use- Use Hausman Test for endogeneity of fuel economy
- Use instrumental variable estimation procedures to reduce resulting bias, inconsistency in parameter estimates
- "Instrument" MPG with household income, fuel prices, etc.
- Estimate vehicle use and MPG equations jointly using 2SLS
- Particular problem with EIADMPG: construction of variable employs BESTMILE


## Model 1: Use Fuel Economy and Price Separately

| Variable | Functional Form | One-Vehicle HHs | Two-Vehicle HHs | Three-Vehicle HHs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fuel Economy (Primary Vehicle) | Log | 0.089 | 0.101 | 0.266 |
|  |  | 0.039 | 0.033 | 0.058 |
| Gas Price | Log | -0.261 | -0.350 | -0.273 |
|  |  | 0.124 | 0.109 | 0.191 |
| Vehicle Age | Linear | -0.024 | -0.090 | -0.092 |
|  |  | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.002 |
| Income | Log | 0.133 | - | - |
|  |  | 0.009 | - | - |
| Vehicles per Driver | Linear | -0.297 | -0.161 | -0.195 |
|  |  | 0.028 | 0.019 | 0.027 |
| Urban/Suburban | Dummy | -0.370 | -0.260 | -0.292 |
|  |  | 0.016 | 0.013 | 0.022 |
| Weekend | Dummy | -0.079 | -0.128 | -0.183 |
|  |  | 0.015 | 0.013 | 0.023 |
| Primary Vehicle Type = Van | Dummy | 0.138 | 0.118 | 0.073 |
|  |  | 0.026 | 0.022 | 0.039 |
| Primary Vehicle Type = SUV | Dummy | 0.155 | 0.037 | 0.095 |
|  |  | 0.021 | 0.018 | 0.031 |
| Primary Vehicle Type = Pickup | Dummy | 0.147 | -0.011 | 0.020 |
|  |  | 0.028 | 0.021 | 0.036 |
| N |  | 31,217 | 68,911 | 23,071 |
| Adjusted R-Squared |  | 0.054 | 0.090 | 0.083 |

## Model 2: Use Fuel Cost per Mile (= fuel price/mpg)

| Variable | Functional Form | One-Vehicle HHs | Two-Vehicle HHs | Three-Vehicle HHs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fuel Cost per Mile | Log | -0.006 | -0.247 | -0.335 |
|  |  | 0.020 | 0.026 | 0.049 |
| Vehicle Age | Linear | -0.025 | -0.089 | -0.091 |
|  |  | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.002 |
| Income | Log | 0.131 | - | - |
|  |  | 0.009 | - | - |
| Vehicles per Driver | Linear | -0.296 | -0.155 | -0.186 |
|  |  | 0.028 | 0.019 | 0.026 |
| Urban/Suburban | Dummy | -0.372 | -0.264 | -0.295 |
|  |  | 0.016 | 0.013 | 0.022 |
| Weekend | Dummy | -0.079 | -0.128 | -0.183 |
|  |  | 0.015 | 0.013 | 0.023 |
| Primary Vehicle Type = Van | Dummy | 0.121 | 0.149 | 0.088 |
|  |  | 0.025 | 0.021 | 0.039 |
| Primary Vehicle Type = SUV | Dummy | 0.134 | 0.082 | 0.117 |
|  |  | 0.019 | 0.017 | 0.029 |
| Primary Vehicle Type = Pickup | Dummy | 0.120 | 0.046 | 0.049 |
|  |  | 0.026 | 0.019 | 0.034 |
| N |  | 31,218 | 68,912 | 23,072 |
| Adjusted R-Squared |  | 0.054 | 0.089 | 0.083 |

Red indicates statistical significance at the 10 percent levell in a two-tailed t-test
Table omits interactions between alternative vehicle type and alternative vehicle fuel economy included in two- and three-vehicle household regressions

## Model 3: Include Use of Secondary Vehicles

| Variable | Functional Form | One-Vehicle HHs | Two-Vehicle HHs | Three-Vehicle HHs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fuel Economy (Primary Vehicle) | Log | 0.089 | 0.127 | 0.272 |
|  |  | 0.039 | 0.032 | 0.055 |
| Gas Price | Log | -0.261 | -0.184 | -0.200 |
|  |  | 0.124 | 0.104 | 0.181 |
| Vehicle Age | Linear | -0.024 | -0.068 | -0.068 |
|  |  | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.002 |
| Income | Log | 0.133 | - | - |
|  |  | 0.009 | - | - |
| Vehicles per Driver | Linear | -0.297 | -0.380 | -0.391 |
|  |  | 0.028 | 0.019 | 0.025 |
| Urban/Suburban | Dummy | -0.370 | -0.247 | -0.261 |
|  |  | 0.016 | 0.013 | 0.021 |
| Weekend | Dummy | -0.079 | -0.233 | -0.312 |
|  |  | 0.015 | 0.013 | 0.022 |
| Primary Vehicle Type = Van | Dummy | 0.138 | 0.176 | 0.151 |
|  |  | 0.026 | 0.021 | 0.037 |
| Primary Vehicle Type = SUV | Dummy | 0.155 | 0.080 | 0.120 |
|  |  | 0.021 | 0.017 | 0.029 |
| Primary Vehicle Type = Pickup | Dummy | 0.147 | 0.000 | 0.020 |
|  |  | 0.028 | 0.020 | 0.034 |
| Daily Use (Alternative 1) | Log | - | -0.083 | -0.090 |
|  |  | - | 0.001 | 0.002 |
| Daily Use (Alternative 2 ) | Log | - | - | -0.084 |
|  |  | - | - | 0.002 |
| N |  | 31,217 | 68,910 | 23,069 |
| Adjusted R-Squared |  | 0.054 | 0.176 | 0.180 |

## Heckman Sample Selection Model

| Variable | Functional Form | One-Vehicle HHs | Two-Vehicle HHs | Three-Vehicle HHs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inverse Mills Ratio | Linear | -2.317 | -0.784 | 0.471 |
|  |  | 0.119 | 0.068 | 0.181 |
| Fuel Economy (Primary Vehicle) | Log | 0.036 | 0.106 | 0.255 |
|  |  | 0.039 | 0.033 | 0.058 |
| Gas Price | Log | 0.022 | -0.476 | -0.254 |
|  |  | 0.124 | 0.109 | 0.192 |
| Vehicle Age | Linear | 0.013 | -0.062 | -0.125 |
|  |  | 0.002 | 0.003 | 0.013 |
| Income | Log | 0.087 | - | - |
|  |  | 0.009 | - | - |
| Vehicles per Driver | Linear | -0.255 | -0.055 | -0.226 |
|  |  | 0.028 | 0.022 | 0.029 |
| Urban/Suburban | Dummy | -0.377 | -0.267 | -0.290 |
|  |  | 0.016 | 0.013 | 0.022 |
| Weekend | Dummy | 0.157 | -0.046 | -0.229 |
|  |  | 0.019 | 0.015 | 0.029 |
| Primary Vehicle Type = Van | Dummy | 0.100 | 0.064 | 0.109 |
|  |  | 0.026 | 0.022 | 0.042 |
| Primary Vehicle Type = SUV | Dummy | 0.126 | 0.028 | 0.107 |
|  |  | 0.021 | 0.018 | 0.031 |
| Primary Vehicle Type $=$ Pickup | Dummy | 0.280 | 0.098 | -0.039 |
|  |  | 0.029 | 0.023 | 0.043 |
| N |  | 31,216 | 68,910 | 23,070 |
| Adjusted R-Squared |  | 0.066 | 0.092 | 0.083 |

## Highlights of Results

- Effects of fuel economy and price differ from each other, but variation by vehicle ownership is more pronounced
- Fuel economy "rebound effect" is prominent, but may be overstated due to simultaneity between use and MPG
- Main effect of household income on travel demand works through vehicle ownership, not vehicle use
- Association of use with age much stronger in multiplevehicle households: more old ones, but driven less
- Multiple vehicles in household function as substitutes, not complements
- "Censoring" of vehicle use (large number of zero-VMT vehicles) doesn't affect estimation results heavily
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## Frustrations

- Instruments for MPG do not adequately control for simultaneity between vehicle use and fuel economy
- Fuel prices at time of vehicle purchase, CAFE standards, and income should work, but don't yield robust results
- One-day survey produces surprisingly large fraction of unused vehicles, complicates identifying factors influencing extent of use
- Lack of fuel purchase data forces reliance on test MPG ratings and (possibly outdated) adjustments, but NHTS is not intended to duplicate RTECS
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## Next Steps

- Find appropriate instruments for fuel economy; test effect on estimated magnitude of elasticity
- Improve ability of "selection probability" model to predict which vehicles were driven on survey day
- Extend analysis to four-plus vehicle households
- Replicate all results using 2001 NHTS data
- Calculate composite (weighted average) elasticities of vehicle use with respect to fuel price, MPG, etc., for all households
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## Stratified Model Results: OLS Model 1

| Variable | Functional Form | Passenger Cars |  |  | SUVs |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | One-Vehicle HHs | Two-Vehicle HHs | Three-Vehicle HHs | One-Vehicle HHs | Two-Vehicle HHs | Three-Vehicle HHs |
| Fuel Economy (Primary Vehicle) | Log | 0.170 | 0.190 | 0.308 | 0.023 | 0.046 | 0.059 |
|  |  | 0.046 | 0.043 | 0.075 | 0.097 | 0.070 | 0.118 |
| Gas Price | Log | -0.096 | -0.421 | -0.322 | -0.705 | -0.173 | -0.419 |
|  |  | 0.150 | 0.153 | 0.274 | 0.296 | 0.217 | 0.378 |
| Vehicle Age | Linear | -0.024 | -0.087 | -0.094 | -0.020 | -0.099 | -0.101 |
|  |  | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.003 | 0.004 | 0.003 | 0.006 |
| Income | Log | 0.150 | - | - | 0.126 | - | - |
|  |  | 0.011 | - | - | 0.022 | - | - |
| Vehicles per Driver | Linear | -0.355 | -0.136 | -0.127 | -0.167 | -0.302 | -0.296 |
|  |  | 0.035 | 0.027 | 0.037 | 0.065 | 0.045 | 0.056 |
| Urban/Suburban | Dummy | -0.390 | -0.286 | -0.304 | -0.329 | -0.236 | -0.265 |
|  |  | 0.021 | 0.020 | 0.033 | 0.037 | 0.026 | 0.044 |
| Weekend | Dummy | -0.078 | -0.104 | -0.236 | -0.091 | -0.156 | -0.160 |
|  |  | 0.018 | 0.019 | 0.034 | 0.037 | 0.026 | 0.045 |
| N |  | 20,772 | 34,172 | 11,084 | 5,480 | 16,594 | 5,750 |
| Adjusted R-Squared |  | 0.054 | 0.094 | 0.092 | 0.033 | 0.075 | 0.075 |

## Stratified Model Results: OLS Model 2

| Variable | Functional Form | Passenger Cars |  |  | SUVs |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | One-Vehicle HHs | Two-Vehicle HHs | Three-Vehicle HHs | One-Vehicle HHs | Two-Vehicle HHs | Three-Vehicle HHs |
| Fuel Cost per Mile | Log | 0.004 | -0.312 | -0.309 | -0.081 | -0.170 | -0.274 |
|  |  | 0.024 | 0.036 | 0.066 | 0.049 | 0.055 | 0.097 |
| Vehicle Age | Linear | -0.025 | -0.086 | -0.094 | -0.019 | -0.097 | -0.098 |
|  |  | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.003 | 0.004 | 0.003 | 0.006 |
| Income | Log | 0.148 | - | - | 0.127 | - | - |
|  |  | 0.011 | - | - | 0.022 | - | - |
| Vehicles per Driver | Linear | -0.353 | -0.128 | -0.126 | -0.167 | -0.300 | -0.272 |
|  |  | 0.035 | 0.027 | 0.037 | 0.065 | 0.045 | 0.055 |
| Urban/Suburban | Dummy | -0.389 | -0.292 | -0.306 | -0.336 | -0.236 | -0.271 |
|  |  | 0.021 | 0.020 | 0.033 | 0.037 | 0.026 | 0.043 |
| Weekend | Dummy | -0.078 | -0.102 | -0.237 | -0.090 | -0.158 | -0.160 |
|  |  | 0.018 | 0.019 | 0.034 | 0.037 | 0.026 | 0.045 |
| N |  | 20,773 | 34,173 | 11,085 | 5,481 | 16,595 | 5,751 |
| Adjusted R-Squared |  | 0.054 | 0.093 | 0.092 | 0.032 | 0.074 | 0.074 |

## Stratified Model Results: OLS Model 3

| Variable | Functional Form | Passenger Cars |  |  | SUVs |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | One-Vehicle HHs | Two-Vehicle HHs | Three-Vehicle HHs | One-Vehicle HHs | Two-Vehicle HHs | Three-Vehicle HHs |
| Fuel Economy (Primary Vehicle) | Log | 0.170 | 0.260 | 0.341 | 0.023 | -0.047 | 0.054 |
|  |  | 0.046 | 0.041 | 0.071 | 0.097 | 0.067 | 0.111 |
| Gas Price | Log | -0.096 | -0.163 | -0.188 | -0.705 | -0.128 | -0.415 |
|  |  | 0.150 | 0.146 | 0.259 | 0.296 | 0.206 | 0.356 |
| Vehicle Age | Linear | -0.024 | -0.065 | -0.069 | -0.020 | -0.078 | -0.078 |
|  |  | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.003 | 0.004 | 0.003 | 0.006 |
| Income | Log | 0.150 | - | - | 0.126 | - | - |
|  |  | 0.011 | - | - | 0.022 | - | - |
| Vehicles per Driver | Linear | -0.355 | -0.350 | -0.321 | -0.167 | -0.505 | -0.478 |
|  |  | 0.035 | 0.026 | 0.036 | 0.065 | 0.044 | 0.053 |
| Urban/Suburban | Dummy | -0.390 | -0.274 | -0.277 | -0.329 | -0.227 | -0.236 |
|  |  | 0.021 | 0.019 | 0.031 | 0.037 | 0.025 | 0.041 |
| Weekend | Dummy | -0.091 | -0.266 | -0.297 | -0.091 | -0.266 | -0.297 |
|  |  | 0.037 | 0.025 | 0.043 | 0.037 | 0.025 | 0.043 |
| Daily Use (VMT of Alternative 1) | Log | - | -0.081 | -0.088 | - | -0.081 | -0.088 |
|  |  | - | 0.002 | 0.004 | - | 0.002 | 0.004 |
| Daily Use (VMT of Alternative 2) | Log | - | - | -0.084 | - | - | -0.084 |
|  |  | - | - | 0.004 | - | - | 0.004 |
| N |  | 20,772 | 34,171 | 11,082 | 5,480 | 16,593 | 5,748 |
| Adjusted R-Squared |  | 0.054 | 0.179 | 0.188 | 0.033 | 0.162 | 0.176 |

## Heckman Stage 1 Probit Model Variables

- Gas price (PADD 12 month trailing average)
- Vehicle age
- Household size
- Number of workers in household
- Weekend (dummy)
- Seasonal controls (dummies for spring and summer)
- Vehicle type (dummies for SUV, van, pickup)
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