





















- Current Car Ownership Rate = 0.5 car/hh
- Future Car Ownership Rate = 1.0 car/hh

Growth Factor F = 1.0/0.5 = 2

Future Trip Production = 2.0 \* 2125 = 4250 trips/day











| Model 1   |                      |                      |             |
|-----------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------|
|           | Low Income           | Med Income           | High Income |
| HH Size 1 | 1000 hh<br>2500 trip | 1000 hh<br>4000 trip |             |
|           | Rate = 2.5           | Rate = 4             |             |
| HH Size 2 |                      |                      |             |
| HH Size 3 |                      |                      |             |
| HH Size 4 |                      |                      |             |
|           | •                    |                      |             |

| Low and Med Income   | High Income                         |                                     |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
|                      |                                     |                                     |
| 2000 hh<br>6500 trip |                                     |                                     |
| Rate = 3.25          |                                     |                                     |
|                      |                                     |                                     |
|                      |                                     |                                     |
|                      |                                     |                                     |
|                      | 2000 hh<br>6500 trip<br>Rate = 3.25 | 2000 hh<br>6500 trip<br>Rate = 3.25 |

In the target year
1000 hhs low income and family\_size\_1
1700 hhs mid income and family\_size\_1
Model 1
Total trips = 1000\*2.5 + 1700\*4.0 = 9300
Model 2
Total Trips = 2700 \* 3.25 = 8775



- Independent of the zone system of the study area
- No need to make assumption about the relationship between no of trips and independent variables
- If combined with the regression technique, a different relationship could be used for each cell

|           |            |                              | 1           | 1 |
|-----------|------------|------------------------------|-------------|---|
|           | Low Income | Med Income                   | High Income |   |
| HH Size 1 | Z = ax+by  | Z = ax+(b/2)y <sup>1.5</sup> |             |   |
| HH Size 2 |            |                              |             |   |
| HH Size 3 |            |                              |             |   |
| HH Size 4 |            |                              |             |   |

## Disadvantages

• The methodology does not allow extrapolation beyond the calibration strata

e.g., If the model considered classes with income up to \$100,000, we can not predict the trip rate for households with income greater than \$100,000.



- It needs large sample size for calibration. Otherwise, some cells are not reliable to use their rate in predictions.
- There is no effective way to choose among variables for classification, or to choose the groupings of a given variable.













































- Zone Totals
- Depends on the size of the zone.
- Heterocedasticity (variability of the variance) is likely to occur.
- Tend to have higher intercorrelation between the independent variables

- Zone Rates
- Independent of the zone size.
- Reduces heterocedasticity
- Less intercorrelation between the independent variables

## Household-based Regression

- More expensive in terms of data collection and calibration
- More sampling error is expected











