

EQUITY EVALUATION OF MILEAGE-BASED USER FEES IN TEXAS

Mark Burris & Lisa Larsen

Texas A&M University

June 12, 2011

3rd Annual Symposium on Mileage-Based User Fees

INTRODUCTION

- Texas State Gas Tax: 20.0 cents per gallon since 1991
- Federal Gas Tax: 18.4 cents per gallon since 1993
- Issues:
 - Inflation
 - Increased Vehicle Fuel Efficiency
 - Population and VMT Increasing
 - Aging Infrastructure
- One potential solution:
 - Change to a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Fee System



RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

 Develop, test, and analyze four VMT fee scenarios with respect to equity

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

- Use 2009 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) data to assess the equity impacts of four VMT fee scenarios
 - Scenario 1: Flat VMT Fee
 - Scenario 2: Flat VMT Fee for Added Revenue
 - Scenario 3: Three-Tier VMT Fee to Encourage "Green" Vehicles
 - Scenario 4: Urban and Rural VMT Fee
- Examined (a) assuming no change in travel behavior (static) and (b) assuming some change (dynamic)



- Version 2.1 of 2009 NHTS released mid-February 2011
- Key variables we used:
 - ANNMILES (Self-reported annualized mile estimate)
 - EIADMPG (EIA derived miles per gasoline-equivalent gallon estimate)
 - FUELTYPE (Type of fuel)
- Texas paid for an additional 20,000 household surveys
- Began with 21,410 households with 45,122 vehicles
- Filtered down to 14,595 households with 29,162 vehicles

WEIGHTING NHTS DATA

- Weighted the data (14,595 households) to reflect all vehicleowning Texas households in the year 2008, disaggregated by:
 - A) Household Income Level (5 classes)
 - B) Household Size (1 to 4+)
 - C) Number of Household Employees (0,1,2+)
 - D) Household Geographic Location (Urban, Rural)
- Represent Texas's 7.9 million vehicle-owning households



PRICE ELASTICITIES

Household Income Level (\$1,000s)	Urban	Rural
<20	-0.447	-0.254
20-40	-0.280	-0.159
40-60	-0.259	-0.147
60-100	-0.335	-0.191
100+	-0.373	-0.212

Adopted from Wadud, Graham and Noland, 2009

SCENARIO 1: FLAT VMT FEE

- Calculated a flat VMT fee that would generate same net revenue as Texas state gas tax
- Accounted for VMT fee system costs, resulting in VMT fees approximately 42% greater
- Static Scenario 1: \$0.01426 per mile
- **Dynamic Scenario 1:** \$0.01442 per mile

SCENARIO 2: FLAT VMT FEE FOR ADDED REVENUE

- Designed to generate \$14.3 billion additional net revenue annually (2030 Texas Transportation Needs Committee)
- Scaled version of Scenario 1
- Static Scenario 2: \$0.1156 per mile fee
- **Dynamic Scenario 2:** \$0.1503 per mile fee

SCENARIO 3: THREE-TIER VMT FEE TO ENCOURAGE "GREEN" VEHICLES

Average Vehicle Fuel Economy	Median Vehicle Fuel Economy
21.02 MPG	19.60 MPG

Static Model

- Fuel Econ. < Median
- Fuel Econ. between Median and Mean
- Fuel Econ. > Mean
- Dynamic Model
 - Fuel Econ. < Median
 - Fuel Econ. Between Median and Mean
 - Fuel Econ. > Mean

\$0.1541 \$0.1156 \$0.0771

\$0.1974 \$0.1480 \$0.0987

SCENARIO 4: URBAN AND RURAL DISTINCTION

Cost Type	Description	Annual Amount (\$)
Urban Cost	Urban Mobility	7.8 Billion
Rural Cost	Rural Mobility and Safety	0.9 Billion
Shared Cost	Pavement Maintenance	4.0 Billion
Shared Cost	Bridge Maintenance	1.6 Billion

Static Model under 80/20 Assumption

- Urban Roadway Fee: \$0.1325 per mile fee
- Rural Roadway Fee: \$0.08621 per mile fee Dynamic Model under 80/20 Assumption
- Urban Roadway Fee: \$0.1799 per mile fee
- Rural Roadway Fee: \$0.1072 per mile fee

PERCENT INCREASE IN THE AVERAGE ANNUAL AMOUNT ASSESSED PER HOUSEHOLD IN THE FORM OF A VMT FEE VERSUS THE STATE GAS TAX FOR THE STATIC MODELS (%)

Household Income Level	Scen	ario 1	Scenario 2 Scenario 3		Scenario 4 80/20 Assumption			
(\$1,000s)	Urb	Rur	Urb	Rur	Urb	Rur	Urb	Rur
<20	41.3	38.6	1,045	1,023	1,030	1,062	1,121	827
20-40	44.8	36.3	1,073	1,005	1,033	1,051	1,151	812
40-60	43.4	39.9	1,062	1,034	1,042	1,058	1,139	837
60-100	43.1	39.3	1,059	1,029	1,056	1,074	1,136	833
100+	43.3	40.2	1,061	1,036	1,059	1,069	1,138	838
Total	43.3	39.1	1,061	1,027	1,047	1,065	1,138	831

VERTICAL EQUITY GINI COEFFICIENT (G)



Households Based on Income

Accumulated Proportion of Tax Burden

VERTICAL EQUITY RESULTS: GINI COEFFICIENT

Scenario	Gini Coefficient (G)	Description of Results
Static Scenario 3	0.1734	Most Progressive
Dynamic Scenario 3	0.1712	
Static Scenario 1	0.1697	
Static Scenario 2	0.1697	
Dynamic Scenario 1	0.1692	
Gas Tax	0.1687	
Dynamic Scenario 2	0.1684	
Static Scenario 4, 70/30	0.1672	
Static Scenario 4, 80/20	0.1670	
Dynamic Scenario 4, 70/30	0.1661	
Dynamic Scenario 4, 80/20	0.1656	Most Regressive

VERTICAL EQUITY RESULTS

- Differences in Gini Coefficients are small
- Texas state gas tax near the mid-point

HORIZONTAL EQUITY

- Scenario 4 : Inherently horizontally equitable
- VMT fees associated with urban roadways go towards addressing urban roadway needs (similar for rural areas)
- Scenarios with urban/rural household revenue distributions most distant from those under Scenario 4 are the least horizontally equitable

HORIZONTAL EQUITY: STATIC RESULTS

Scenario	Percentage of Revenue Collected from Urban Households	Percentage of Revenue Collected from Rural Households	Comments	Percent Difference in Rural Household Revenue versus Scenario 4 (80/20)
Static Scenario 4	77.4	22.6	Horizontally Equitable	0
Static Scenario 2	72.6	27.4		4.8
Static Scenario 1	72.6	27.4		4.8
State Gas Tax	72.0	28.0		5.4
Static Scenario 3	71.7	28.3	Rural Households Affected Most Negatively	5.7

RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

- Road-type travel breakdown by both urban households and rural households based on educated estimate (seems reasonable based on some TTI research using GPS data estimates)
- Only gasoline-run household vehicles included (excluded only 1.6 percent of vehicles)
- Actual installation costs, operating costs, and leakage costs unknown

CONCLUSIONS

- Using NHTS data from 14,595 Texas Households, weighted to reflect all vehicle owning Texas Households, we investigated the equity impacts of replacing the state gas tax with a VMT fee under four scenarios and found:
 - Small differences in vertical equity impacts for the VMT scenarios versus the current state gas tax
 - Some negative horizontal equity impactions for rural households under most scenarios...but most were more equitable than the current state gas tax
 - The scenario favoring fuel efficient vehicles (#3) was the least horizontally equitable but most progressive (vertical equity)