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Background

- The Swedish Road Administration wants a *dynamic* strategic urban transport model.
- We convinced them to also consider a “person-centric” approach.
- The only way to convince them was to somehow wire this into their existing models and show that it is feasible.

- One project later, they are comfortable with the idea of a dynamic microsimulation.
- But to adopt it in their practice, they need to be able to perform consistent CBA.
Overview
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Layered structure

• Each individual has sociodemographics and a home location.
• upper level choices:
  ▶ activity “pattern”
  ▶ mode
  ▶ locations (~1000 zones)
• lower level choices:
  ▶ time
  ▶ route
  ▶ (network flows, travel times, etc.)
Ideal world utility functions

• ideal upper level utility function

\[ U_{ni} = \left[ V^{\text{upper}}(z_n, x_i) + \varepsilon_{ni}^{\text{upper}} \right] + S^{\text{lower}}(z_n, i) \]

\( i \in C_n^{\text{upper}} \) = activities, modes, locations

\( z_n, x_{ni} \) = attributes of decision maker, alternative

\( S^{\text{lower}} \) = summary of lower-level experience

• lower level utility function

\[ U_{nj} = V^{\text{lower}}(z_n, x_j) + \varepsilon_{nj}^{\text{lower}} \]

\( j \in C_n^{\text{lower}} \) = route sequence incl. time structure

\[ S^{\text{lower}}(z_n, i) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \max_{j \in C_n^{\text{lower}}} U_{nj} \right\} \]
Layered structure

- **upper level:**
  - activities: “work”, “other”
  - uses an **independent** three-level nested logit per activity
    1. travel or not
    2. which mode
    3. which location
  - only **anonymous** cost (travel time, distance, monetary) feedback from lower level
  - **static**

- **lower level:**
  - dynamic person-centric DTA microsimulation
  - heuristic choice of trip sequence incl. timing
  - uses a utility function but cannot compute exp. max. utilities
“Utility” functions, right now

- upper level:

\[ U_{ni} = \left[ V^{\text{upper}}(z_n, x_i) + \varepsilon_{ni}^{\text{upper}} \right] + S^{\text{lower}}(z_n, i) \]

\( i \in C_n^{\text{upper}} = \) (to travel or not, where, what mode) per act. type

- lower level:

\[ U_{nj} = V^{\text{lower}}(z_n, x_j | i) + \varepsilon_{nj}^{\text{lower}} \]

\( j \in C_n^{\text{lower}} = \) \{route/activity sequence incl. time structure\}

\[ S^{\text{lower}}(z_n, i) = f(\text{static tour cost matrices}) \]
Tour cost matrices

- Aggregation of tour costs per OD pair and activity type:

\[
T_{\text{tour}}(\text{OD, act}) = \sum_k \Pr(\text{dpt. for act at time } k) \cdot t_{\text{trip}}(\text{travel at } k) \\
+ \sum_k \Pr(\text{dpt. for act at time } k) \cdot \sum_{\Delta k} \Pr(\text{act lasts } \Delta k) \cdot t_{\text{trip}}(\text{travel back at } k + \Delta k)
\]

- Approximates the expected tour cost of a randomly selected person per purpose.
Any way around cost matrices?

- The problem are the non-chosen alternatives (no lower-level simulation of their performance).
- (The upper-level model system would change a lot without matrices.)
- The feasible number of matrices is limited, but perhaps something like this:

\[
T_{\text{tour1,tour2}}(\text{OD1, OD2, } i, n) = T_{\text{tour1}}(\text{OD1}) + T_{\text{tour2}}(\text{OD2 | tour1}) + \beta^T \begin{pmatrix}
  z_n \\
  x_i
\end{pmatrix}
\]

where the last term can be estimated through regression based on lower-level observations.
• **Non-chosen upper-level alternatives**: approximate lower-level performance.
  ▶ Computationally probably a necessity.
  ▶ May even add realism if properly constructed.

• **Chosen upper-level alternative**: detailed lower-level performance is available.
  2. *Inconsistent consistency*: Use detailed information at least for chosen alternative.
Possible upper-level modification

- For the chosen (upper,lower)-level alternatives \((i,j)\):

\[
U_{ni} = V^{\text{upper}}(z_n, x_i) + U^{\text{lower}}(z_n, x_j) + \varepsilon_{ni}^{\text{upper}^2}
\]

- For the non-chosen upper-level alternative \(i\):

\[
U_{ni} = V^{\text{upper}}(z_n, x_i) + S^{\text{lower}}(i) + \beta^T \begin{pmatrix} z_n \\ x_i \end{pmatrix} + \varepsilon_{ni}^{\text{upper}}
\]

- One would expect \(\text{VAR}\{\varepsilon_{ni}^{\text{upper}^2}\} < \text{VAR}\{\varepsilon_{ni}^{\text{upper}}\}\).

- Likely to require model (system!?) re-estimation. Interesting.
Alternative: Dynamic discrete choice models

- Is actually already integrated as an upper-level model.
- Requires much more parameters to be estimated.
- More difficult to communicate. No longer an incremental change.