

1  
2  
3  
4 **Micro-Simulation Models of Urban Regions: Anticipating Greenhouse Gas Emissions**  
5 **from Transport and Housing in Austin, Texas**  
6

7 Sumala Tirumalachetty  
8 Graduate Research Assistant  
9 Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering  
10 The University of Texas at Austin  
11 6.9 E. Cockrell Jr. Hall  
12 Austin, TX 78712  
13 [sumala@mail.utexas.edu](mailto:sumala@mail.utexas.edu)  
14

15 Kara M. Kockelman  
16 (Corresponding author)  
17 Associate Professor and William J. Murray Jr. Fellow  
18 Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering  
19 The University of Texas at Austin  
20 6.9 E. Cockrell Jr. Hall  
21 Austin, TX 78712  
22 [kkockelm@mail.utexas.edu](mailto:kkockelm@mail.utexas.edu)  
23

24 Saurabh Kumar  
25 Travel Demand Forecaster  
26 Cambridge Systematics, Inc.  
27 9015 Mountain Ridge Drive, Suite 210  
28 Austin, TX 78759  
29 [skumar@camsys.com](mailto:skumar@camsys.com)  
30

31 To be presented at the 88<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board and under  
32 review for publication in *Transportation Research Record*  
33

34 **ABSTRACT**

35 Anthropogenic greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are largely attributable to household and firm  
36 travel and building decisions. This paper demonstrates the development and application of a  
37 microsimulation model for household and firm evolution and location choices overtime, along  
38 with evolution of the light duty vehicle fleet, residential building stock and travel decisions of  
39 persons and businesses. A case study of the Austin, Texas region provides estimates of energy  
40 demands and CO2 emissions through the year 2030, as a function of several policies. Year 2005  
41 population and point-based employment data coupled with a wide variety of other data sets are  
42 used. Lack of control totals for population forecasting creates issues, certainly, which is a key  
43 finding of this work. Scenario simulation results suggest an 81% increase in the Austin  
44 households and an evolution toward wealthier households, much larger firm sizes and a  
45 somewhat more efficient fleet of personal vehicles. GHG emissions from personal and  
46 commercial travel are predicted to nearly double in the business as usual case, but 74 percent and  
47 60 percent under urban growth boundary and strict gas and road toll scenarios, respectively  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

1  
2  
3 (where the latter scenario assumes a \$3-per-gallon gas tax increase and road tolls of 10 cents per  
4 vehicle-mile traveled).  
5

## 6 **INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION**

7  
8 Energy security and climate change are top issues in today's world and require immediate  
9 attention. The majority of anthropogenic GHG emissions are generated via transport of persons  
10 and goods plus building demands. The U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA 2006)  
11 estimates that the nation's transportation and residential sectors contribute at 28% and 17% of  
12 total U.S. emissions, respectively. U.S. GHG emissions rose 13% between 1990 and 2003, while  
13 those from the transportation sector rose 24% (Brown et al. 2005), which can be largely  
14 attributed to increasing vehicle ownership levels and trip distances, as well as greater trade  
15 (Polzin 2006).  
16

17 Recently, U.S. gas prices have more than doubled (from \$1.50 per gallon in January 2003 to  
18 nearly \$4 in January 2008 [EIA 2008]). While travelers may adjust driving habits in the near  
19 run<sup>1</sup>, over the long term, vehicle ownership and location choice decisions are more likely to shift.  
20 For example, for the first time in over two decades, share of new passenger cars increased by  
21 2.4% in California between 2004 and 2006, reversing the decline seen since 1980 (CBO 2008).  
22

23 In addition to transportation, households use electricity, natural gas and other sources of energy  
24 regularly for space conditioning and powering household devices. A closer look at American  
25 Housing Survey data (AHS 2005) reveals that single-family home sizes have risen by more than  
26 50% over the past few decades. Accompanied by household size reductions (from 3.11 in 1970  
27 to 2.59 in 2000 [Polzin 2006]), this has led to higher GHG emissions from the residential sector.  
28 Hence, a proper understanding of household demographic dynamics, travel behavior and land  
29 use patterns is a critical component in devising urban transportation and land use policies.  
30 Managing urban sprawl to reduce VMT and GHG emissions could yield significant co-benefits  
31 of reduced pollution and congestion.  
32

33 Microsimulation offers a convenient platform for anticipating these emissions at a disaggregate  
34 level. Several researchers have focused on behavior of the agents involved, especially  
35 households and, to a lesser extent, firms, and their land use and transport interactions (see, e.g.  
36 Miller et al. 1998, Timmermans 2003, Waddell et al. 2003, Salvini et al. 2005, and Maoh et. al.  
37 2005). Hensher (2007) used an integrated transport, land use simulator to assess carbon  
38 emissions from the transportation sector. However, existing literature lacks studies on household  
39 and firm behavior in an integrated framework. Kumar and Kockelman (2008) focused on firm  
40 behavior and its interaction with land use and transport. This paper is an extension of the same,  
41 wherein households are tracked in conjunction with firms via a simulation model that forecasts  
42 future travel demand, location choices and changing demographic patterns (of households and  
43 firms), and the associated GHG emissions.  
44

45 Microsimulation's key advantage stems from our desire to analyze the impacts of policies at the  
46 individual level. However, such advantages should be viewed in the context of added complexity  
47

---

48 <sup>1</sup> Bomberg and Kockelman (2007) note from a survey of residents in Austin that trip chaining and driving at steadier  
49 speeds were the most common responses to the gas spike in 2005.  
50  
51  
52

1  
2  
3 and increased data and computational requirements (Goulias and Kitamura, 1992). More and  
4 more aspects of travel behavior, involving both temporal and spatial dimensions, are being  
5 applied in a microsimulation framework (Miller et al., 2004). The absence of special panel  
6 surveys required to model life-cycle transitions has resulted in very few models tracking  
7 household evolution in great detail. Of course, the ability to correctly forecast the future spatial  
8 distribution of population is critical for appreciating the interaction of land use and transport  
9 systems. Most location choice models (of existing and relocating households) rely on  
10 multinomial logit models (see, e.g., Bhat and Guo 2004 and Bina et al. 2006), while a greater  
11 variety of vehicle purchase models have been estimated (see, e.g., Zhao and Kockelman 2000,  
12 Mohammadian and Miller 2003 and Mannering et al. 2002).  
13

14 The model specified here is used to anticipate the evolution of households and firms in Austin,  
15 Texas over a 25-year period (from 2005 to 2030). A microsimulation approach is used to track  
16 10% of households (scaled up to 100%) and 100% of firms over time and space. The simulation  
17 approach seeks to tie evolutionary models of households and firms with models of travel  
18 behavior to provide robust forecasts of land use, transport, vehicle ownership, energy use, and  
19 GHG emissions patterns. The model of life-cycle transitions for households and firms has been  
20 estimated using a variety of available data sets. Lack of quality data is a serious issue for such  
21 studies. However, the aim of this study is to develop and demonstrate the application of an  
22 integrated modeling framework for land use, and travel demand and carbon emission forecasts in  
23 a microsimulation environment and simply the ability to code and run such models using  
24 standard software and hardware is a valuable exercise.  
25

## 26 **DATA DESCRIPTION**

27  
28 In the absence of panel data for the Austin households and firms area, this study develops a  
29 microsimulation model to forecast demographic and firmographic characteristics using various  
30 national and local, aggregate and disaggregate data sets and under various assumptions about  
31 life-cycle events. This section briefly describes these different data sets; more details on many  
32 can be found in Kumar (2007).  
33

### 34 **Household Data Sets**

35  
36 McWethy (2006) synthesized base year (2005) data using the Census 2000 5-percent Public Use  
37 Microdata Sample (PUMS) for Austin's three counties (Travis, Williamson and Hays), as the  
38 block-group level. Seven person types were defined: preschool children (0 – 4 years), pre-driving  
39 age school children (5 – 15 years), driving age school children (16 – 18 years), non-working  
40 adults, student adults, part-time working adults (1 – 39 hours of work per week) and working  
41 adults (40+ hours of work per week). In the year 2005, the average Austin household enjoyed an  
42 annual income of \$59,496 ( $\sigma = \$51,542$ ) and owned 1.94 vehicles ( $\sigma = 0.95$ ).  
43

44 Other data sets of interest, primarily for household evolution are the National Vital Statistics  
45 Reports (NVSR) and the U.S. Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID)<sup>2</sup>. Information on TAZ  
46 level land use type and aggregate demographic data was obtained for the year 1997 from the  
47

---

48  
49 <sup>2</sup> The PSID is primarily sponsored by the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Aging, and the  
50 National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and is conducted by the University of Michigan.  
51  
52

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO). That data set also provides year-2007 estimates of all demographic attributes. Data from 1997 and 2007 were used to impute TAZ-based population and jobs estimates for the year 2005. These data sets rely on a population-equivalent density (PED<sup>3</sup>) measure to classify TAZs as rural, suburban, urban, and CBD.

Data from the 1996-97 Austin Travel Survey (ATS) was used to estimate parameters for the various travel demand models (described in detail in model specifications). More recent ATS data (from a 2005-2006 survey) were used to calibrate the vehicle ownership model which is rather central to this study (thanks to fuel economy). These are described here now.

### Vehicle Ownership and Transactions Model

Nearly 1500 households from the Austin region participated in this survey. Data on 2007 model year purchase prices, engine size (in liters), were obtained for each make/model from *Ward's Automotive Yearbook* (2007). After excluding zero-vehicle households and records with missing information, the final sample set included 2346 vehicles from 1342 households. The average number of vehicles per household is 1.91, which is slightly lower than the national average of 2.06 (NHTS 2001). Vehicles have been classified into nine broad classes: (1) luxury cars, (2) large car, (3) mid-size cars, (4) sub-compacts (5) compacts, (6) pickups, (7) sports utility vehicles (SUVs), (8) cross-over utility vehicles (CUVs), and (9) minivans. Pickup trucks accounted for 26% of all the vehicles in this household fleet, which is significantly higher than the national share of 18% (NHTS 2001). Passenger cars (luxury, large, mid size, small) constitute about 44% of the vehicle fleet, while minivans, SUVs, CUVs constitute the remainder.

Vehicle acquisitions and use models capture holdings in dynamic context, along with household level changes. Data from the Toronto Area Car Ownership Study (TACOS), a retrospective survey conducted by the University of Toronto (Roorda et. al. 2000), was used. TACOS contains information on household vehicle transactions over nine years (from 1990 to 1998). Miller et al (2003) use a mixed logit model for modeling vehicle transactions using TACOS data at the level of "decision making unit<sup>4</sup>". This study models vehicle transactions at the household level. Out of TACOS's 4096 household years, 79% neither lost nor acquired a vehicle in that year, 11% lost and gained at least a vehicle and 8% added a vehicle to their fleet and the remaining 2% lost or gave up a vehicle.

### Development of New Housing Units

Parcel-level land use files for 2003 were provided by the City of Austin's Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department (NPZD) for the area under its jurisdiction. For the base year, 2005, the Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) provided similar information for the three-county region. Housing units of various types (single family, 2 to 4-unit multi-family

---

<sup>3</sup> Austin's zone designations are based on a population-equivalent density (PED), equaling  $[\text{ZonePop} + (\text{RegionalPop}/\text{RegionalEmp} * \text{ZoneEmp})]/(\text{ZoneAcres})$ . A zone with  $\text{PED} \geq 15$  is coded as CBD,  $8 \leq \text{PED} < 15$  is coded as Urban,  $1 \leq \text{PED} < 8$  is designated Suburban, and  $\text{PED} < 1$  is defined as Rural.

<sup>4</sup> Miller et al. (2003) defined the decision making unit as any set of persons within a household that make vehicle ownership decisions cooperatively.

1  
2  
3 structures, and 5+ multi-family structures) in all TAZs for years 2003 and 2005 were obtained  
4 from these files (by spatial joining operations), along with undeveloped land information. In this  
5 way, new housing units were located. Census figures for square footage age and type of dwelling  
6 units were also used, to assign existing households to specific housing units.  
7

### 8 **Businesses Data Sets**

9  
10 Point-location data for all firms in the three-county region was provided by the Texas Workforce  
11 Commission and geocoded by CAMPO. The study region, spread over 1074 TAZs contained  
12 32,063 firms employing 655,722 full- and part-time workers in 2005. The Statistics of U.S.  
13 Businesses (SUSB) provides annual data on the number of firms, additions and losses of firms  
14 (births and deaths) for various employment size categories by industry. SUSB's firm data from  
15 year 1998 to 2004 were used to generate Markov transition matrices of firm growth. New firm  
16 birth and death data from year 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 were used to model firm births and  
17 deaths. Kumar and Kockelman' (2008) specifications and parameters were used.  
18

19 Austin's 2006 Commercial Vehicle Survey data as acquired from the Texas Department of  
20 Transportation was used to estimate commercial trip generation and distribution models. Kumar  
21 (2007) provides a detailed description of various data sets used to model firm location, growth  
22 and travel behaviors.  
23

### 24 **Energy Demands by Households and Firms**

25  
26 Household energy demand was estimated using the 2001 Residential Energy Consumption  
27 Survey (RECS), conducted by the EIA. RECS provides information on the consumption of  
28 different kinds of energy sources including electricity, natural gas and fuel oil in residential  
29 housing units. The data set contains information on the household demographics, dwelling unit  
30 attributes, weather characteristics (heating degree days [HDD] and cooling degree days [CDD])  
31 from 4822 households. Average annual household consumption (national) of electricity and  
32 natural gas are expected to be 10,590 kWh and 44,865 BTUs, respectively. Based on National  
33 Center for Climatic Data (NCDC 2006) estimates HDD and CDD values for the region are 1674  
34 and 2974; these values are assumed constant throughout the simulation period (though climate  
35 changes may actually impact them).  
36

### 37 **MODEL ESTIMATION**

38  
39 The synthetic household population can be taken through various life cycle transition models to  
40 predict the future. Figure 1 illustrates the complete microsimulation structure of household and  
41 firm synthesis and evolution. The transitions are applied annually based on a set of interwoven  
42 models. The set of rules for household evolution closely mimics Caliper's STEP2 model (Caliper  
43 Corporation 2003) for Clark County, as described below.  
44

### 45 **Base Year Population**

46  
47 As noted earlier a synthetic household population was generated using PUMS seeds, providing  
48 household and person records, along with household location TAZ and vehicle ownership and  
49  
50  
51  
52

1  
2  
3 income. A multinomial logit (MNL) model of vehicle class holdings was used to assign vehicle  
4 type or classes to each household, based on the household size, number of workers, fuel price  
5 and vehicle prices, relative to income and neighborhood attributes (Table 1). Another MNL  
6 model was used to model the choice among single-family units and the two types of multi-family  
7 units mentioned earlier. The type of housing units is assigned by adjusting to the available  
8 housing units by Monte Carlo methods.  
9

## 10 **Household Transitions**

11  
12 Following Kumar (2007), household transition models anticipate births and deaths for each  
13 household. Using probabilities of death by age and gender from the U.S. National Vital Statistics  
14 Report, along with Monte Carlo simulation, dying individuals were identified and removed from  
15 the population. For child birth, marriage and divorce, binary logistic models were estimated  
16 using the 2005 wave of the U.S. PSID (Table 2). Income, a key determinant of several household  
17 decisions, is updated via a symmetric triangular distribution of annual percentage income  
18 increases (ranging, from -9% to +11% income growth per household per year). New households  
19 are formed by people moving into the region and young adults leaving home. The region's year-  
20 2005 net rate of increase in population (per year) is used through year 2035. This is done by  
21 drawing households randomly from the population and duplicating them, due to data constraints.  
22 New locations and housing units are assigned to these households based on a location choice  
23 model, based on several control factors (including logsum accessibility indices across all  
24 destination and mode choice). Of course, location choice depends on land prices, which are not  
25 specifically tracked, representing a short coming of the current specification. Demographics of  
26 out-migrating and in-migrating households could be quite different, however. Based on the  
27 observed frequency of 22 year old adults living alone, such persons were randomly selected to  
28 form new households  
29

30 Auto acquisition and retirement decisions were predicted using a MNL model, estimated using  
31 the TACOS data (described earlier). When acquired, new vehicles classes are allocated based on  
32 an MNL model for ownership patterns, as described earlier.  
33

## 34 **Firm Transitions**

35  
36 The firm population is updated every year by running a sequence of sub-models. A model of  
37 firm death/exit is applied first, and exiting firms are removed from the population. This is  
38 followed by an expansion/contraction model for remaining firms in the population, based on a  
39 Markovian decision process. All existing firms are allowed to relocate based on utility  
40 differentials at their current location and the ten other TAZs offering the highest systematic  
41 utility values to that firm. New firms are added (based on the birth model) and their locations are  
42 chosen based on the location choice model using results from a Poisson regression model.  
43 Kumar and Kockelman (2007) provide a detailed description of the firm evolution models.  
44

## 45 **Travel Demand Model**

46  
47 Household and commercial trip counts are modeled as negative binomial random variables in  
48 order to account for over-dispersion (where the distribution's variance exceeds its mean) and  
49  
50  
51  
52

1  
2  
3 latent heterogeneity (across zones) in trip counts, and an MNL model for destination choice is  
4 used for the trip distribution model. The choice set for estimation of the trip-distribution model  
5 consists of 30 randomly selected destinations plus the chosen destination. Household trips  
6 increase with household size, vehicles, and income. Commercial trips originating from each TAZ  
7 were regressed on the number of firms, CBD distance and others. Demographic attributes and  
8 firm and employment counts at all destination TAZs serve as explanatory variables, in the  
9 destination choice models, along with trip times and distances. External-internal and external-  
10 external trips were exogenous to the simulation model and added to the OD matrix for traffic  
11 assignment.  
12

### 13 **Emissions Estimates**

14  
15 Standard ordinary least squares regression was used to anticipate annual electricity and natural  
16 gas consumption by households. As shown in Table 3, age and type of housing unit, along with  
17 several household demographics, serve as key explanatory variables for both forms of energy  
18 demand. CO2 equivalents for these forms of energy in Texas are 1.46 lbs CO2 per kWh (EIA  
19 2002) and 117.8 lbs CO2 per Btu for natural gas (EIA 2005).  
20

21 Computing times when using microsimulation models is always a concern, and proved to be a  
22 challenge in this work. Since tracking 450,103 households over a span of 25 years is a tedious  
23 task, 10 percent of the households were sampled randomly for simulation purposes (and each  
24 was assumed to represent 9 others like it, in the same zone). A full run for the reduced population  
25 took 3 days on a standard desktop machine (3 GB RAM and 2.4 GHz processor).  
26

### 27 **MODEL RESULTS**

28  
29 Microevolution of all Austin firms and 10 percent of the regions households (then scaled up by a  
30 factor of 10) was carried out in MATLAB using yearly transitions. Travel demand modeling was  
31 performed externally once every five years, and three scenarios were evaluated: (1) a business as  
32 usual or BAU case (2) Imposition of an urban growth boundary (UGB) restricting location  
33 alternatives of all new households and firms to the 617 (out of 1,074) TAZs that enjoyed at least  
34 two job equivalents per acre in 2005 or were contiguous with such zones, and (3) a pricing  
35 scenario, with gas prices set to \$5 per gallon (rather than the \$3/gallon base).  
36

37 Table 4 shows population attributes for the simulation period for years 2015, 2030 and the base  
38 year (2005). Households and population are forecasted to grow by 81% and 61% respectively,  
39 over the 25-year period; average vehicle ownership (per household) is simulated to rise just 7%.  
40 Figure 2 illustrates the location patterns of households for the base year and in the 2030 BAU  
41 and UGB scenarios. As expected, the models predict greater household density in the centrally  
42 located zones when a growth boundary policy is implemented as compared to the normal growth  
43 scenario.  
44

45 Figure 3 shows the firm density distribution for the base year 2005 and 2030. Predictions suggest  
46 greater concentration in central regions than presently exists, as firms are expected to favor urban  
47 and CBD zones. During the simulation period, firms are expected to grow at 32% (Table 5) with  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

1  
2  
3 a steady increase in number of firms in all sectors. However, the increase in basic and retail firms  
4 is much less than that seen in education and service firms.  
5

6  
7 The base area had 4 million trips generating over 80 million VMT. Table 6 provides year 2030  
8 predictions. VMTs generated under the three scenarios are reported in Table 6. In the business as  
9 usual case, VMT is predicted to double. Implementation of UGB restricts the rise in VMT (and  
10 travel's associated carbon emissions) to 74%, and the pricing scenario restricts it further (to a  
11 predicted 60% increase in VMT by 2030). The effect of the \$3-per-gallon gas tax is somewhat  
12 apparent in the composition of year-2030 vehicles, as slight reductions in the shares of large cars  
13 and pickups allow for a higher percentage of small cars (compact and subcompact) and SUVs.  
14 The net result is an estimated doubling in transport-related GHG emissions for the BAU  
15 scenario, a 74% increase for UGB scenario, and a 60% increase when the gas tax and toll are  
16 introduced. Growing wealth really chips away at the opportunity for GHG savings; more  
17 stringent policies are needed than a \$3 per gallon gas tax (as discussed in Kockelman et al.  
18 2008).

19  
20 Energy consumption for homes and businesses is forecasted to increase at a much lower rate than  
21 VMT (Table 7). Overall electricity consumption is estimated to increase by nearly 40% by 2030  
22 in the business-as-usual and road-pricing/gas - scenarios, in contrast to 28% in the UGB  
23 scenario, mainly due to more multi-family units in the UGB case.

## 24 **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

25  
26 Households and firms are key agents of urban growth, and systems-based modeling techniques  
27 help anticipate their long-term location choices, building design decisions, and travel patterns,  
28 thereby facilitating analysis of a range of meaningful policies. This paper develops and  
29 demonstrates a microsimulation framework for tracking all these behaviors in an attempt to  
30 predict regional carbon emissions, and thus inform climate change policy. Perhaps most  
31 importantly, the work demonstrates that a microsimulation model of firms and households is  
32 feasible using largely existing datasets and standard desktop computing. The models predict  
33 greater spatial concentration than presently exists in the Austin region, with firms growing faster  
34 than is reasonable. Nevertheless, the UGB policy appears to be effective for curbing GHG  
35 emissions via both the transportation and residential sectors.  
36

37  
38 This work pulls together a variety of models estimated using multiple data sources, but – as is  
39 often the case in urban systems modeling – imperfect data give rise to many simplifying and  
40 sometimes heroic assumptions. Examples here include a constant in-migration rate for  
41 households, a Markovian transition process for firm changes, and a lack of supply constraints on  
42 built space for businesses. Certainly, panel data sets on individuals (persons and firms), vehicles  
43 land and buildings would resolve many of these issues. More detailed travel demand modeling  
44 (both commercial and personal, short distance and long distance) will also make a useful (and  
45 easy to undertake) enhancement. No control totals are specified here: population forecasting is  
46 entirely based on evolving processes – births, deaths, migration and relocation models. This kind  
47 of flexibility creates issues (i.e., jobs out numbering available workers and higher auto ownership  
48 levels) certainly, which is a key finding of this work. In the end, key challenges for accurate  
49 prediction seem to be the long-term behavior of Markovian processes underlying the firm  
50  
51  
52

1  
2  
3  
4 transitions – resulting in relatively few, excessively large firms, along with a lack of  
5 understanding of how offices and other commercial buildings may respond to higher energy  
6 prices. Imposition of control totals and/or synchronization of the jobs and household count  
7 models would constrain the model somewhat, but help avoid certain unreasonable long-run  
8 estimates.

9  
10 GHG emissions from transportation and residential sectors continue to rise, while offering  
11 multiple opportunities for carbon reductions. Taxes and tolls are likely policies, but must be  
12 designed carefully. Though both data and computing-intensive, microsimulation of urban  
13 systems provides a flexible tool for analyzing the impacts of various policy decisions along with  
14 demographic, environmental and other system changes. This work demonstrates that such tools  
15 are within our reach, and thoughtful model design and parameter estimation are likely key to  
16 their success.

## 17 18 REFERENCES

19  
20 Bhat, C.R., and J. Y. Guo. 2004. A Mixed Spatially Correlated Logit Model: Formulation and  
21 Application to Residential Choice Modeling. *Transportation Research Part B* 38(2):147-168  
22 2004.

23  
24 Bina, M., D. Suescun, and K. Kockelman. 2006. Location Choice vis-à-vis Transportation: The  
25 Case of Recent Home Buyers. Proceedings of the 85th Annual Meeting of the Transportation  
26 Research Board, Washington, D.C. 12-15 January 2006.

27  
28 Bomberg, M., and K. Kockelman. 2007. Traveler Response to the 2005 Gas price spike.  
29 Proceedings of the 86th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board Washington  
30 D.C., 12-15 January 2007.

31  
32 Brown M. A., F. Southworth, and T. K. Stovall. 2005. Towards a built climate friendly  
33 environment, Pew Center. [http://www.pewclimate.org/docUploads/Buildings\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.pewclimate.org/docUploads/Buildings_FINAL.pdf)  
34 Accessed 25th October 2007

35  
36 Caliper Corporation. 2003. STEP2 for Clark County: Household Microsimulation for  
37 Transportation Policy Analysis prepared for Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition

38  
39 CBO. 2008. Effect of Gasoline Prices on Driving Behavior and Vehicle Markets.  
40 <http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/88xx/doc8893/01-14-GasolinePrices.pdf> Accessed 12<sup>th</sup> April 2008.

41  
42 EIA. 2002. Updated State-level Greenhouse Gas Emission Coefficients for Electricity  
43 Generation 1998-2000 <http://www.eia.doe.gov/pub/oiaf/1605/cdrom/pdf/e-supdoc.pdf> Accessed  
44 14<sup>th</sup> June 2008.

45  
46 EIA. 2005. Voluntary Reporting of Greenhouse Gases Program (Fuel and Energy Source Codes  
47 and Emission Coefficients) <http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/1605/coefficients.html> Accessed 20th  
48 June 2008.  
49  
50  
51  
52

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

EIA. 2006. Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the United States for 2006. Report #: DOE/EIA-0573(2006) [http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/1605/ggrpt/pdf/enduse\\_tbl.pdf](http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/1605/ggrpt/pdf/enduse_tbl.pdf) Accessed December 27, 2007.

EIA. 2008. Retail Gasoline Historical Prices Available at [http://www.eia.doe.gov/oil\\_gas/petroleum/data\\_publications/wrgp/mogas\\_history.html](http://www.eia.doe.gov/oil_gas/petroleum/data_publications/wrgp/mogas_history.html), and accessed June 15, 2008.

Goulias, K. G., and R. Kitamura, 1992. Microsimulation for Travel Demand Forecasting: A Dynamic Model System of Household Demographics and Mobility. Institute of Transportation Studies Research Report, UCD-ITS-RR-92-4, University of California, Davis.

Kockelman, K., M. Thompson and C. Whitehead. 2008. Americas' Travel Choice and Their Relative Contributions to Climate Change: What Near-Term Behavioral Shifts Will Buy Us and Opportunities for Meeting Carbon Targets. Submitted for Presentation at the 88<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board and Publication in the *Transportation Research Record Series*.

Kumar, S., 2007. Micro simulation of Household and Firm Behaviors: Coupled Models of Land Use and Travel Demand in Austin, Texas. Master's Thesis. Department of Civil Engineering, University of Texas at Austin.

Kumar, S. and K. M. Kockelman. 2008. Tracking the Size, Location and Interactions of Businesses : Micro-simulation of firm Behavior in Austin , Texas. Proceedings of the 87th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, Washington DC, 12-15 January 2008.

Maoh, H.F., Kanaroglou, P.S. and Buliung, R.N. 2005 Modeling the location of firms within an integrated transport and land-use model for Hamilton, Ontario. CSpA Working Paper 006. Centre for Spatial Analysis. McMaster University. Available at <http://sciwebservice.science.mcmaster.ca/cspa/papers/CSpA%20WP%20006.pdf>

Mannering, F., C. Winston, and W. Starkey. 2002. An Exploratory Analysis of Automobile Leasing by US Households. *Journal of Urban Economics* 52: 154-176.

McWethy, L. M. 2006. Comparing Microscopic Activity-Based and Traditional Models of Travel Demand: An Austin Area Case Study. Master's Thesis. Department of Civil Engineering, University of Texas at Austin.

Miller, E. J., and P. A. Salvini. 1998. The Integrated Land Use, Transportation, Environment (ILUTE) Modeling System: A Framework. Proceedings of the 77th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, Washington DC, 12-15 January 1998.

Miller, E.J., J.D. Hunt, J.E. Abraham and P.A. Salvini. 2004. Microsimulating Urban Systems. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* special issue, "Geosimulation: Object-Based Modeling of Urban Phenomena" 28: 9-44.

1  
2  
3 Mohammadian, A., and E. J. Miller. 2003. Empirical Investigation of Household Vehicle Type  
4 Choice Decisions. *Transportation Research Record* 1854: 99-106.  
5

6 NCDC .2006. *Comparative climatic data for the United States through 2006*. National Climatic  
7 Data Center. Available at [http://www1.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/ccd-data/CCD-2006\\_fixed.pdf](http://www1.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/ccd-data/CCD-2006_fixed.pdf),  
8 and accessed February 18, 2008.  
9

10 Polzin, S. E. .2006. The Case for Moderate Growth in Vehicle Miles of Travel: A Critical  
11 Juncture in U.S. Travel Behavior Trends Center for Urban Transportation Research, University  
12 of South Florida, National Household Travel Survey, U.S. Department of Transportation  
13 Available at <http://nhts.ornl.gov/publications.shtml>, and accessed July 5, 2008.  
14

15 Roorda, M., A. Mohammadian, and E. J. Miller. 2000. Toronto Area Car Ownership Study: A  
16 Retrospective Interview and Its Applications. *Transportation Research Record*, 1719: 69-76.  
17

18 Salvini, P.A., and E. J. Miller. 2005. ILUTE: An Operational Prototype of a Comprehensive  
19 Microsimulation Model of Urban Systems. *Networks and Spatial Economics* 5: 217-234.  
20

21 Timmermans, H. 2003. The Saga of Integrated Land Use-Transport Modeling: How Many More  
22 Dreams Before We Wake Up? Presented at 10th International Conference on Travel Behaviour  
23 Research, Lucerne, Switzerland, 2003  
24

25 Waddell, P.A., A. Borning, M. Noth, N. Freier, M. Becke, and G. Ulfarsson. 2003.  
26 Microsimulation of Urban Development and Location Choices: Design and Implementation of  
27 UrbanSim. *Networks and Spatial Economics* 3 (1): 43-67.  
28

29 Ward's .2007. *Ward's Automotive Yearbook*. Ward's Communications, Detroit, MI.  
30

31 Zhao, Y., and K. Kockelman. 2000. Household Vehicle Ownership by Vehicle Type:  
32 Application of a Multivariate Negative Binomial Model. Proceedings of the 81<sup>st</sup> Annual  
33 Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, Washington D.C.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **List of Figures**  
7

8 FIGURE 1 Overview of Simulation Framework  
9

10 FIGURE 2 Household Density (a) Base year (2005), (b) 2030 for BAU scenario, (c) 2030 for  
11 UGB scenario  
12

13 FIGURE 3 Firm Density (a) Base year (2005) & (b) 2030 for BAU scenario  
14

15 **List of Tables**  
16

17 TABLE 1 Vehicle Ownership Model  
18

19 TABLE 2 Birth, Marriage and Divorce Models  
20

21 TABLE 3 Household Energy Consumption Model  
22

23 TABLE 4 Evolution of Austin's Population Attributes Over time  
24

25 TABLE 5 Evolution of Austin's Firm Attributes Over time  
26

27 TABLE 6 Composition of Vehicle Fleet (%)  
28

29 TABLE 7 Predicted Residential Energy Consumption and Carbon Emissions  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52






FIGURE 1 Overview of Simulation Framework


1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52



2(a) 2005 Base Year



2 (b) 2030 BAU



2(c) 2030 UGB

HH density - # per square mile






FIGURE 2 Household Density (a) Base year (2005) (b) 2030 BAU (c) 2030 UGB

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52



3(a) Base year 2005



3(b) Year 2030

Firm density - # per square mile




FIGURE 3 Firm Density (a) Base year (2005) & (b) 2030 for BAU scenario

**TABLE 1 Vehicle Ownership Model**

Variable	Coefficients	t-statistics
Fuel Price/Income x 10 <sup>4</sup>	-0.603	-2.46
Price of vehicle/Income	-0.104	-1.78
HH Size x (Sub-Compact, Compact, Mid Size Cars)	-0.221	-5.72
HH Size x (Large Cars , Luxury Cars)	-0.178	-4.70
Number of employees in HH x Mid size cars	0.122	1.99
High Income(>75k) x Luxury Cars	0.291	1.70
Age of House Head x Large Cars	0.024	3.88
No of Female Drivers x Sub-Compact Cars	0.307	3.83
Presence of Preschool children x Van	-0.463	-3.07
Rural x Pickups	0.178	1.58
Sub urban x Large Cars	0.200	1.39
Density of HH in zone x Small Car * 10 <sup>-3</sup>	0.009	1.71
Density of HH in zone x SUV *10 <sup>-3</sup>	-0.103	-1.53
Retail firms within 5 miles x SUV *10 <sup>-4</sup>	-0.125	-2.06
Retail firms within 5 miles x Van *10 <sup>-4</sup>	-0.093	-1.53
Multi Family Housing Unit x Pickup	-0.479	-3.05
Log Likelihood	-4649.22	
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.0981	

Data Source: ATS 2006.

**TABLE 2 Birth, Marriage and Divorce Models**

Explanatory variable	Child Birth Model		Marriage Model		Divorce Model	
	Coef.	t-stat.	Coef.	t-stat.	Coef.	t-stat.
Constant	0.591	1.13	-1.869	-10.63	-1.437	-6.85
Household size			0.129	4.27	-0.281	-5.75
Age of household head			-0.032	-8.82	-0.028	-6.81
HH head's emp. status	0.666	1.89	0.027	2.63		
Age of mother	-0.110	-7.35				
Number of children	1.893	14.67				
Age of youngest child	-1.618	-10.81				
Pseudo r-square	0.4522		0.1409		0.1326	
No. of observations	2,127		3,504		4,028	

Data Source: 2005 U.S. Panel Study of Income Dynamics.

**TABLE 3 Household Energy Consumption Model Parameter Estimates**

Data Source: RECS 2001

	Natural Gas (BTU/year)		Electricity (kWh/year)	
	Coefficients	t-statistics	Coefficients	t-statistics
(Constant)	161.4	3.06	14433	23.64
\$ /btu (natural gas) or \$ /kwh (electricity)	-8666	-10.68	-78788	-24.63
Cooling Degree days(CDD) to base 65	-0.027	-2.451	0.255	1.687
Heating Degree days (HDD)to base 65	0.043	5.649	-0.019	-0.208
Northeast Indicator	-82.96	-2.539	751.5	1.48
Midwest Indicator			-1342	-2.919
West Indicator	-134.6	-4.619	-2703	-11.26
Indicator for city			-2935	-12.62
Indicator for town			-2036	-7.661
Indicator for sub urban			-2417	-9.325
Indicator > 5 units dummy	-297.4	-14.86	-832.9	-3.533
Indicator 2-4 units dummy	-55.08	-2.394	-626.4	-2.22
Household Size	46.67	10.32	1514	19.25
No of kids	-42.46	-1.366	-1900	-4.779
No of persons > 65 years	46.69	4.372	-712.2	-5.78
Income (\$ '000)	0.00096	3.74	0.037	11.95
Age of home	4.149	11.8	-19.46	-4.411
Total sqft – Basement and Garage areas	0.048	2.989	-1.136	-4.522
Total heated sqft* Northeast	0.104	5.383	-0.747	-3.124
Total heated sqft* West	0.049	3.023		
Total sqft * HDD	1.40E-05	3.612	1.47E-04	4.245
Total sqft*CDD			8.84E-04	15.02
R Square	0.48		0.50	

**TABLE 4 Evolution of Austin's Population Attributes over Time**

	Year 2005		Year 2015		Year 2030	
# of Households	451,003		561,190		828,110	
# of Persons	1,148,177		1,402,970		1,970,900	
	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev
HH size	2.55	1.47	2.5	1.39	2.38	1.23
Vehicles	1.94	0.95	2.06	0.9692	2.14	1.078
Income	\$59,496	\$51,542	\$61,271	\$52,279	\$62,085	\$53,268
<b>Fraction of households with...</b>						
Pre-School age children	0.15	0.36	0.18	0.38	0.15	0.36
Pre-driving children	0.23	0.42	0.22	0.41	0.18	0.38
Driving age children	0.06	0.24	0.05	0.22	0.05	0.21
Non-working adults	0.2	0.4	0.19	0.39	0.17	0.38
Student adults	0.15	0.35	0.15	0.36	0.14	0.35
Part-time working adults	0.34	0.47	0.32	0.47	0.28	0.45
Full-time working adults	0.68	0.47	0.66	0.47	0.63	0.48

**TABLE 5 Evolution of Austin's Firm Attributes over Time**

	2005		2030	
	No.	%	No.	%
No of Firms	32,063		42,176	
Basic	6,944	21.66	7,282	17.27
Retail	6,203	19.35	6,980	16.55
Educational	650	2.03	1,083	2.57
Service	18,266	56.97	26,831	63.62
Size of Firms				
1-4	16,641	51.90	15,102	35.80
5-9	5,815	18.13	9,454	22.42
10-19	4,153	12.95	6,171	14.63
20-99	4,417	13.78	6,369	15.10
100 – 499	876	2.73	3,281	7.78
≥ 500	161	0.50	1,799	4.26

**TABLE 6 Vehicle Fleet Composition Predictions (%)**

	<b>2005</b>	<b>Year 2030</b>		
	<b>BAU</b>	<b>BAU</b>	<b>UGB</b>	<b>Pricing *</b>
<b>VMT (per day)</b>	112.3 million	223.9 million	195.1 million	180.2 million
<b>Fleet Composition (%)</b>				
<b>Small Cars**</b>	8.09%	8.53	8.94	8.83
<b>Mid-Size Cars</b>	17.24	17.27	17.66	17.68
<b>Large Cars</b>	7.42	6.86	6.97	6.77
<b>Luxury Cars</b>	13.62	12.78	12.91	12.90
<b>Pickups</b>	19.79	18.28	17.62	17.86
<b>Passenger Vans</b>	15.96	17.56	17.86	17.56
<b>SUV/CUV</b>	17.97	18.14	17.99	18.21

\*\* Compact and sub-compact cars

**TABLE 7 Predicted Residential Energy Consumption and Carbon Emissions in BAU scenario**

	2005	2015		2030	
	Estimate	Estimate	% change from 2005	Estimate	% change from 2005
<b>Total electricity consumed ('000 kWh per year)</b>	6,866,971	7,420,615,	8.06	9,517,468	38.60
<b>Total lbs of CO2 from electricity ('000 per year)</b>	10,025,778	10,834,098	8.06	13,895,503	38.60
<b>kWh energy per household per year</b>	15,226	13,223	<b>(-13.16)</b>	11,493	<b>(-24.52)</b>
<b>Total CCF of natural gas consumed (per year)</b>	115,358,720	140,858,690	22.10	202,912,456	75.90
<b>Total lbs of CO2 from natural gas ('000 per year)</b>	1,384,304	1,690,304	22.10	2,434,949	75.90
<b>CCF of natural gas per household per year</b>	255.78	251.00	<b>(-1.87)</b>	245.03	<b>(-4.20)</b>