The Effect of Tax Credit Policy on Electric Vehicle Sales: A Synthetic Control Approach Using Bayesian Structural Time Series

Atia Ferdousee
Middle Tennessee State University

The government is intervening in automobile markets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in many countries. Several tax incentive programs, at both federal and state level, are being effective for the adoption of environment-friendly vehicles over the past few years. Previous studies in this field focused on discrete choice models analyzing such policies. In this study, however, I employed a Bayesian structural forecasting model to construct a synthetic control to test the effects of state-level tax credit policy in Maryland using a unique time-series data set of vehicle sales records. I observed a significant positive policy effect on electric vehicle sales.

Keywords: tax credit policy, Bayesian structural time series model, electric vehicle, synthetic control

INTRODUCTION

An electric vehicle is becoming an important transportation choice day by day, mostly because of its energy efficiency. Recently, many countries have set goals to ban the sales of gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles in the future to reduce greenhouse gas emission; notably, Norway by 2025, China by 2030, India by 2030, Germany by 2030, France by 2040, and Britain by 2040 or 2050 (Fingas, 2016; Petroff, 2017; Riley, 2017). Similarly, many cities around the world have begun transitioning public transportation towards environment-friendly electric vehicles (Forrest, 2017).

An electric vehicle (EV) or electric car is an automobile that is propelled by one or more electric motors, using energy stored in rechargeable batteries.

Until December 2018, there were about 5.3 million light-duty all-electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles in use across various countries in the world. Most recently, in July 2019, US-based Motor Trend Automotive Magazine awarded an electric car as "ultimate car of the year" (Guarnieri, 2012). Compared with internal combustion engine cars, electric vehicles are quieter, have no tailpipe emissions, and have lower emissions in general.

Several national and local governments have established government incentives, like tax credits, subsidies, etc., for plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles. The aim is to promote the introduction and adoption in the mass market of new electric vehicles, generally depending on battery size, their electric range, and purchase price. The current maximum tax credit allowed by the US Government is US $7,500 per car (Alternative Fuel Data Center [AFDC], 2019). Prior studies have tested these policy effects with various discrete choice models. As a better alternative to estimate the tax incentive effects on consumer purchases, this study employs the Bayesian structural forecasting model.

The rest of this study is organized as follows. First, I give a brief literature review in section 2. In section 3, I present an overview of data and Maryland tax credit policy. Section 4 discusses the theoretical background and model specification. I present the result of my analysis in section 5. Finally, I include robustness checking and sensitivity analysis in section 6 before concluding in section 7, with discussions about the limitation and scope of this study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Østli, et al., (2017) found that purchase tax for vehicles of higher CO_2 emission with exemptions granted for battery electric vehicles has a major impact on the average type approval rate of CO_2 emissions from new passenger cars registered in Norway. The fuel tax in Norway also encourages car customers to buy low emission vehicles. In contrast, Liu and Cirillo (2017) proposed a dynamic discrete choice model for Maryland car consumers and forecasted a decrease in both hybrid and electric car adoption. This paper formalizes a general dynamic discrete choice framework in which forward-looking agents optimize their utility over time; two options are available to consumers at each time: keeping the current vehicle or buying a new vehicle among the options available in the market. Concerning the behavior derived from the analysis, authors suggested a conclusion that consumers are more interested in purchasing gasoline and hybrid cars, for which the predicted market shares a peak of around 20% over the nine-year study period. Electric cars represent 4-7% of the future market, and there is a slightly increasing trend over time. The market share of electric cars highly depends on electricity price, purchasing price of the electric car, MPG equivalent electricity, and recharging range. The data used for this analysis were collected from a self-interview, and web-based stated preference survey, which was designed to analyze households' future preferences on new vehicle adoption in a dynamic market. Moreover, a new method to solve multivariate discrete-continuous problems is introduced by Fang (2008). He develops and applies the model to measure how much residential density influences households' vehicle choices. He proposes a more flexible method of modeling vehicle holdings in terms of the number of vehicles in each category, using a Bayesian multivariate ordinal response system. Using the 2001 National Household Travel Survey data, he finds that increasing residential density reduces households' truck holdings and utilization in a statistically significant but economically insignificant way. Nevertheless, Bolduc, et al., (2008) used a hybrid choice model to analyze the car choice pattern of Canadian consumers with new technology. They used perception and attitude as the latent variable of this hybrid model. With a multinomial logit model, they described the choice. The contribution of a given observation of the likelihood function of the full system is an integral of dimension equal to the number of latent variables in the model. All these above studies focused on several discrete choice models.

However, BSTS was first proposed by Scott and Varian (2013) and then extended to the synthetic control setting by Brodersen, et al. (2015). The article titled "Inferring causal Impact using Bayesian structural time series model," discusses the strengths and limitations of the state-space model. This paper proposes to infer causal impact based on a diffusion-regression state-space model that predicts the counterfactual market response in a synthetic control that would have occurred had no intervention taken place. This forecasting method has the advantage that it does not require a set of control units and instead can use any related time series to predict the counterfactual. This synthetic control approach using the Bayesian structural model is used by Kurtz et al. (2019) to estimate the effect of Bariatric surgery on health care costs in the absence of a randomized control trial.

OVERVIEWS OF POLICY & DATA

Maryland Tax Credit Program

In addition to federal incentives, Maryland is also offering a one-time excise tax credit up to $3000 for qualified vehicles, which is effective from July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2020.

According to the House bill, qualified Plug-in Electric Vehicle (PEV) and fuel cell EV purchasers may apply for a tax credit against the imposed excise tax up to $3,000. The tax credit is first-come, first-served, and is limited to one vehicle per individual and ten vehicles per business entity. Vehicles must be registered

in Maryland unless the vehicle manufacturer conforms to applicable state or federal laws or regulations governing PEVs or fuel cell EVs during the year in which the vehicle was purchased, or the vehicle was originally registered in another state (AFDC, 2019). A qualified vehicle must meet the following criteria:

a) Have a total purchase price not exceeding $63,000; (was $60,000 in 2017)
b) Be propelled to a significant extent by an electric motor that draws electricity from a battery with a capacity of at least five kilowatt-hours;
c) Have not been modified from original manufacturer specifications;
d) Be purchased and titled for the first time between July 1, 2017, and July 1, 2020;
e) The vehicle must have been acquired for use or lease by the taxpayer and not for resale.
f) There is no fee for applying for the tax credit.

The credit is returned to the taxpayer in the form of a check from the state. The state registration requires proof of residency, and an out-of-state permit does not require registration, and reselling the credit is not possible. Moreover, examining other applicable state's policies, it is clear that Maryland tax credit is not higher than other applicable States (AFDC, 2019). So, we can ignore the possibility that people from other states might be buying cars in Maryland or consumers from other applicable states might be applying for the tax credit in Maryland, which would cause the effect of the policy to be larger.

Another important thing is differentiating the pre and post period of the policy, or in other words, the cut Another important thing is differentiating the pre and post period of the policy, or in other words, the cut point of this model. This policy was effective from July 2017, but the bill of the excise tax credit for EV passed the Maryland House of Delegates on March 20, 2017, and then moved to the Senate for consideration, and this is the time the people of Maryland first came to know about the policy (Reference House Bill 1246, 2019). Also, as from the Maryland Department of Transportation Motor Vehicle Administration website, I came to know that titling and registering one's vehicle needs some additional time after purchasing. Maryland dealers are required by law to submit EV customers' title application documents and related fees no later than thirty days after the vehicle is delivered to the customer. Also, for registration, vehicles must be inspected by a licensed Maryland inspection station. A certificate of inspection is issued within ninety days of the vehicle to be titled (Maryland Department of Transportation Website, 2019). So, if any consumer purchases EVs in March, they could still apply for the tax credit for the 2017 -2018 fiscal year.

In my data set, I have the information about the delivery-date of each of the vehicles from the dealer. So, it seems more logical to me to use 20th March as my cut point rather than July 1.

Data

The analysis is based on a daily dealer sales record of vehicles in Maryland State. The sales record is separated by fuel type along with model, price, and vehicle type (truck/van/car, etc.) for the calendar year 2014 to February 2019. This data set contains 2.8 million vehicle transactions. It is a unique dataset, which is collected from the Maryland Department of Transportation Motor Vehicle Administration (MDT MVA).

As I mentioned above, our cut point is 20th March 2017 when the policy is first announced publicly. This indicates, in our dataset, we have 168 weeks of pre-period data and 102 weeks of post-period data. However, I aggregated the daily data into a weekly level. I then took the mean weekly price for necessary vehicle types over this 5-year period.

In this analysis, I omit all the hybrid vehicles. The reason being, in Maryland's tax program, along with electric cars, some "qualified plug-in hybrid" vehicles are also included. But from the given information of my data, I could not figure out which hybrid cars are conventional hybrid and thus not included in the policy, and which are "qualified plug-in hybrids" that are included. So, I drop all the hybrid models to avoid any potential bias.

Table 1 shows the summary statistics of the variables in my model for both the pre-policy and the post-policy period.

TABLE 1
SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR PRE AND POST-POLICY PERIOD

Weekly measure	Mean	Median	Min	Max	Total
Pre period (January 1, 2014- March 20, 2017)					
Electric car sale	9.65	8	1	49	1622 (.097%)
Gasoline car sale	8830.2	8716	4337	13323	1483473 (88.9%)
Diesel car sale	210.04	204.5	107	358	35287 (2.11%)
Flex-fuel car sale	886.02	888.5	425	1270	148852 (8.92%)
Electric car price ($)	28768.64	28676.26	10567.67	64044.38	--
Gasoline car price ($)	24551.84	24491.89	21497.26	27788.34	--
Diesel car price ($)	48606.33	47109.68	37028.17	65637.82	--
Median HH income ($)	78869	77573	76,668	82747	--
Post period (March 21, 2017- February 28, 2019)					
Electric car sale	67.88	49.5	14	335	6924 (.67%)
Gasoline car sale	9062.09	8898	6677	11898	924333 (89.63)
Diesel car sale	194.35	191	132	332	19824 (1.92%)
Flex-fuel car sale	785.13	771	541	1097	80083 (7.77%)
Electric car price ($)	58091.98	57051.58	37127.42	84078.92	--
Gasoline car price ($)	25857.05	25706.72	24170.27	28854.81	--
Diesel car price ($)	52723.4	52629.9	44342.67	62155.52	--
Median HH income ($)	82995	82995	82747	83242	--
Total sale= 2700398	**Total sale (pre)=1669234**		**Total sale (post)= 1031164**		

FIGURE 1
ELECTRIC VEHICLE SALES BEFORE AND AFTER THE TAX CREDIT POLICY


Figure 1 shows a graphical depiction of Electric car sales before and after the tax credit program. This plot may give a general idea about the sales pattern of electric vehicles. Here, red and blue lines are smoother for the dotted plots.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND & MODEL SPECIFICATIONS

Synthetic Control

The traditional synthetic control (SCM) by Abadie and Gardeazabal (2003) and Abadie et al. (2010) is an approach to determine the treatment effect without randomized controls that goes farther along with general pre-post comparisons of means. With this method, a number of untreated time series are optimally weighted according to their fit to the model outcome in the pre-intervention period. After that, they are combined into a composite time series to which the treatment group is compared. This difference is used to estimate the counterfactual scenario, and it allows variation of observed and unobserved predictors over time.

In this study, however, I use the Bayesian structural time series (BSTS) approach to construct the synthetic control that uses Gibbs sampling to estimate the model on the pre-treatment period and then iterates each sampling trajectory forward using the estimated parameters to construct the post-intervention counterfactual. This approach differs from the traditional synthetic control approach that explicitly models the outcome of the treated unit. It also includes information from the post-intervention period for the control units. In this way, the BSTS approach produces a dynamic forecast. Besides, it can more flexibly include time-series effects such as trends and seasonality.

Bayesian Structural Time-Series Models

Structural time-series models are state-space models for time-series data. This model starts by defining two equations:

$$y_t = Z^T_t \alpha_t + \varepsilon_t \tag{1}$$

$$\alpha_{t+1} = T_t \alpha_t + R_t \eta_t \tag{2}$$

where, $\varepsilon_t \sim N(0, \sigma_t^2)$ and $\eta_t \sim N(0, Q_t)$ are independent of all other unknowns. Equation (1) is the observation equation; it links the observed data y_t to a latent d-dimensional state vector α_t. Equation (2) is the state equation; it governs the evolution of the state vector α_t through time. In the present paper, y_t is a scalar observation, Z_t is a d-dimensional output vector, T_t is a d × d transition matrix, R_t is a d × q control matrix, ε_t is a scalar observation error with noise variance σ_t, and η_t is a q-dimensional system error with a q × q state-diffusion matrix Q_t, where q ≤ d.

The above specification is advantageous as it allows us to incorporate a linear trend in the state variable (α_t) as well as the seasonality and the additional state variable.

The local trends model from above can be directly interpreted by its components. If we decompose the model as a sum of trend component μ_t and regression component λ_t, we can rewrite it as follows:

$$y_{0t} = \mu_t + \lambda_t + u_t, \quad u_t \sim N(0, \sigma^2_u) \tag{3}$$

In the present case, the response variable is EV sales at weekly level, and regression components are a set of untreated control units, such as average EV price, gasoline vehicle sale, diesel vehicle sale, flex-fuel vehicle sale, average diesel vehicle price, average gasoline vehicle price, average flex-fuel vehicle price and median household income of Maryland.

The Bayesian model is asymptotically unbiased because this is the exact data-generating model; the posterior distribution would generally converge to a point mass on its actual value as the number of post-intervention time points goes to infinity (Brodersen, et al. 2015). Some other advantages of this BSTS approach are, we can report statistics such as the average absolute, relative, and cumulative effect caused by the intervention, including their confidence intervals (CIs). The CI can be considered as the region of firmest subjective belief, within which an unobserved parameter falls (Jaynes & Kempthorne, 1976).

Components of State
Local Level Model
The first component of our model is a local level model which is a popular trend model choice defined by the equation

$$\mu_{t+1} = \mu_t + \eta_{\mu,t} \tag{4}$$

where, $\eta_{\mu,t} \sim N(0,\sigma_\delta^2)$. The μ_t component is the value of the trend at time t.

Seasonality
We have some commonly used state-component models to account for seasonality. The most frequently used model is

$$\gamma_t = -\sum_{s=0}^{S-1}(\gamma_{t-s}) + \eta_t \tag{5}$$

where S represents the number of seasons, and γ_{t-s} denotes their joint contribution to the observed response y_t. The state in this model consists of the S −1 most recent seasonal effects. The mean value of γ_t is such that the total seasonal effect would be zero when we sum over S seasons. For example, if we set S = 4 to capture four seasons per year, the mean of the spring coefficient will be, −1 × (winter+ summer+ fall)

The preceding seasonal model can be generalized to allow for multiple seasonal components with different periods. When modeling weakly data, for example, I set S = 52 annual cycles. In the data set, I have a total of 270 weeks starting from January 2014 to February 2019.

Contemporaneous Covariates With Static Coefficients
In this model, covariates are a set of untreated control units, as mentioned before. Control time series that received no treatment is vital to this method for obtaining accurate counterfactual predictions since they account for variance components that are shared by the series. A natural way of including a control series in the model is through linear regression. Here, our coefficients are static.

FIGURE 2
INCLUSION PROBABILITY OF ALL THE COVARIATES FOR THE BSTS MODEL

In Figure 2, a white bar indicates that the predictor has a positive relationship with consumer sentiment, and a black bar indicates a negative relationship. The size of the bar measures the proportion of the estimated models in which that predictor was present. In the state-space form, we can write a static regression by setting $Z_t = \beta^T x_t$ and $\alpha_t = 1$.

One crucial advantage of working in a fully Bayesian treatment is that we do not need a fixed set of covariates. The "spike-and-slab prior" allows the model to integrate out the posterior uncertainty about which covariates to include and how they would influence model predictions, which avoids overfitting. All covariates are assumed to be contemporaneous.

Prior Distributions and Prior Elicitation

The unknown parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ in this system are the variance terms and the regression coefficients:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}: \{\sigma_u^2, \sigma_\delta^2, \boldsymbol{\beta}\} \tag{6}$$

and let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m)$ denote the full state sequence. This study adopts a Bayesian approach to inference by specifying a prior distribution $p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ on the model parameters as well as a distribution $p(\boldsymbol{\theta},\alpha|y)$ on the initial state values. We may then sample from $p(\boldsymbol{\theta},\alpha|y)$ using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) through a Gibbs sampler. We can then draw predictions of the counterfactual from $p(\boldsymbol{\theta},\alpha|y)$. I define an inverse gamma prior to the state error variance parameter and a "spike-and-slab" prior for the regression coefficients.

A spike-and-slab prior combines point mass at zero (the "spike"), for an unknown subset of zero coefficients, with a weakly informative distribution on the complementary set of nonzero coefficients (the "slab"). The spike part is a Bernoulli distribution, and the slab part is a weakly informative normal-inverse-gamma distribution.

Inference

Posterior inference in this model can be broken down into three pieces. First, I simulate draws of the model parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and the state vector α given the observed data $y_{1:n}$ in the training period. Second, I use the posterior simulations to simulate from the posterior predictive distribution $p(\tilde{y}_{n+1:m}|y_{1:n})$ over the counterfactual time series $\tilde{y}_{n+1:m}$ given the observed pre-intervention activity $y_{1:n}$.

Third, I use the posterior predictive samples to compute the posterior distribution of the pointwise impact $yt - \tilde{y}t$ for each $t = 1, \ldots, m$. I use the same samples to obtain the posterior distribution of cumulative impact.

Posterior Predictive Simulation

We are primarily interested in the posterior over model parameters and states $p(\boldsymbol{\theta},\alpha|y1:n)$, and at the same time, the causal impact analyses are concerned with the posterior incremental effect,

$$p(\tilde{y}_{n+1:m}|y_{1:n}, x_{1:m}) \tag{7}$$

The density in the above equation is defined precisely for that portion of the time series which is unobserved: the counterfactual market response $\tilde{y}_{n+1}, \ldots, \tilde{y}_m$ that would have been observed in the treated market, after the intervention, in the absence of treatment.

The posterior predictive density in this equation is defined as a joint distribution over all counterfactual data points, rather than as an assemble of pointwise univariate distributions. This ensures that we correctly transmit the serial structure determined on pre-intervention data to the trajectory of counterfactuals.

Causal Impact

To find the best fit for my model, I run several different possible specifications with various state components. The lowest AIC (Akaike Information Criterion) value of these models indicates the best fit (Akaike, 1974). After selecting the best fit BSTS model, I use the estimated states and parameters of the

treated unit for the post-intervention time points. Then this procedure is repeated many times. Samples from the posterior predictive distribution over counterfactual activity can be used to obtain samples from the posterior causal effect, that is, the sales of EV. For each draw τ and for each time point $t = n+1, \ldots, m$, we set,

$$\varphi_t^{(\tau)} = y_t - \tilde{y}_t^{(\tau)} \tag{8}$$

yielding samples from the approximate posterior predictive density of the effect attributed to the intervention.

In addition to its pointwise impact, we can see the cumulative effect of an intervention over time-

$$\Sigma_{t'=n+1}^{t} \varphi_t^{(\tau)} \tag{9}$$

$\forall t = n+1, \ldots, m$.

I implement BSTS in the R (R Core Team, 2017) programming language with the CausalImpact (Brodersen et al., 2015) package. Unlike more common "micro-econometric" techniques like difference-in-differences, synthetic control, or regression discontinuity, CausalImpact is designed to work with a univariate time series.

However, it is worth mentioning that, our time series is long enough to plausibly estimate the parameters we are interested in.

RESULTS

Table 2 presents the results of the BSTS analysis, and Figure 3 shows the observed and predicted time-series data.

The result shows that, during the post-intervention period, EV sales had an average value of approximately 68. By contrast, in the absence of an intervention, we would have expected an average response of 33. The 95% interval of this counterfactual prediction is [+19, +48]. To find the absolute effect, we may subtract this prediction from the observed response, which yields an estimate of the causal effect the intervention had on the response variable. This effect is 35 with a 95% confidence interval of [+19, +49].

TABLE 2
## THE CAUSAL EFFECT OF THE TAX CREDIT ON ELECTRIC VEHICLE SALES

		Actual Effect	Predicted	Predicted Lower-Upper	SD
Actual	Average	68	33	[19- 48]	7.5
	Cumulative	6924	3338	[1898- 4944]	760.8
		Absolute Effect	Absolute Lower	Absolute Upper	SD
Absolute	Average	35	19	49	7.5
	Cumulative	3586	1980	5026	760.8
		Relative Effect	Relative Lower	Relative Upper	SD
Relative		107%	59%	151%	23%

Posterior tail area probability, P=0.0034
Posterior probability of a causal effect= 99.96577%

Results also show a cumulative effect by summing up the individual data points during the post-intervention period. The EV sales had an overall value of 6.92K. By contrast, had the intervention not taken place, we would have expected a sum of 3.34K. The 95% interval of this prediction is [+1.90K, +4.94K]. In relative terms, the response variable showed an increase of 107%. The 95% interval of this percentage is [+59%, +151%]. This means that the positive effect observed during the intervention period is statistically significant and unlikely to be due to random fluctuations

The probability of obtaining this effect by chance is very small (Bayesian one-sided tail-area probability $p = 0$). This means the causal effect is statistically highly significant. Also, our confidence interval band is in the lower range, which indicates that our estimate is strong, and there is less uncertainty.

FIGURE 3
**ELECTRIC VEHICLE SALES BEFORE AND AFTER THE TAX CREDIT PROGRAM**

In this figure, the upper plots ("original") show the observed sales (solid black line) and the counterfactual synthetic controls (dashed blue line), including the 95% credible interval, according to the Bayesian structural time series model. The middle plots ("pointwise") show the average difference between the observed and estimated values. Another way of visualizing posterior inferences is by employing a cumulative impact plot, which is our lower plot. It shows, for each day, the summed effect up to that day.

ROBUSTNESS CHECK

Causal Impact on Other Fuel Type Vehicles
BSTS analysis for other fuel type vehicles sales reveals that there is no policy effect on these vehicles sales in the post intervention period.

FIGURE 4
**SALES FOR OTHER TYPES OF VEHICLES COMBINED BEFORE AND AFTER
TAX CREDIT PROGRAM**

In Figure 4, there is no increase in sales after the policy is implemented. The plot shows the observed sales (solid black line) and the counterfactual synthetic controls (dashed blue line), including the 95% credible interval (blue area), according to the Bayesian structural time series model.

Table 3 shows the results of the BSTS analysis for different fuel type vehicles other than EV. The first column of this table shows the result of the policy effect on gasoline, diesel, and flex-fuel vehicles combined. The next three columns present the result of Bayesian analysis for these three types of vehicles separately.

TABLE 3
**AVERAGE EFFECT OF TAX CREDIT PROGRAM ON OTHER FUEL-TYPE VEHICLES**

	Other Fuel Combined	Diesel	Gasoline	Flex-fuel
Actual effect	10,040	194	9062	785
Predicted	10,040	204	8185	896
95% CI	[9,990,10,090]	[144,266]	[6751,9741]	[734,1069]
Absolute effect	4.5	-9.9	877	-111
95% CI	[-45,52]	[-71,50]	[-679,2311]	[-284,51]
Relative effect	0.045%	-4.8%	11%	-12%
95% CI	[-0.45%,0.52%]	[-35%,25%]	[-8.3%,28%]	[-32%,5.7%]
Posterior tail area P	0.41441	0.36657	0.12553	0.07734
Prob. of a causal effect	59%	63%	87%	92%

I run the same analysis for diesel, gasoline, and flex-fuel vehicles separately and found no policy effect either. I remove those tables and graphs for the sake of brevity.

Sales Pattern

Figure 5 depicts the sales pattern of EVs in comparison with other fuel type vehicles like gasoline, diesel, and flex-fuel. Although EV market share is still small, after the intervention, EV shows an apparent increase in sales. Figure 5 shows the relationship of EV with other fuel type vehicle sales over time.

FIGURE 5
SALES PATTERNS OF EV AND OTHER FUEL TYPES OF VEHICLES

EV Price Change

To see if there is any drop in the price level near our cut-off point, I plot the average weekly EV price. If there is any price drop, our result of the tax credit effect may not be valid, but Figure 6 instead shows a price jump just before the cut point. It seems like people started to buy expensive EVs when the tax credit was announced, or we may say people stopped buying cheaper EVs after the tax credit was announced. Moreover, the tax credit only allocates $3000 for each EV, but the price range increased so much higher than that. Also, the tax credit does not apply to a vehicle with a price that exceeds $63000. However, we can see that those expensive vehicle purchases increased after the implementation of the tax credit.

FIGURE 6
AVERAGE EV PRICE OVER TIME

In this figure, the black vertical line represents the cut point. Nevertheless, all the above results/plots suggest that the tax credit policy itself had a positive effect on the EV market.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

This study has several limitations. As I mentioned before, I omit all the hybrid vehicles because I cannot differentiate between a conventional hybrid and a plug-in hybrid from the dataset I used.

In addition, there are some other incentives in Maryland State for EV, for example, qualified vehicles can use the HOV lane, and there are more charging stations available now for people's convenience. I could not measure these incentives in this model. However, Maryland is one of the wealthiest states in the USA. According to the ACS 2019 survey of median household income, Maryland is actually the number one richest state now. Moreover, electric vehicles are still considered an expensive consumer choice. So, there is a chance that this type of policy effect may not be as effective in other states also.

Nevertheless, all of my above analysis finds that the tax credit policy had a definite positive effect on the Maryland EV market. The actual average EV sales more than doubled than our counterfactual prediction. Our estimate is highly significant; moreover, our confidence interval band is smaller, which indicates less uncertainty.

However, Maryland State announced ambitious goals when implementing this policy, which is to achieve 300,000 EVs and PHEVs on the road by 2025. According to our result, we see during our over 23 months of post-intervention period, around seven thousand EVs were adopted. So, assuming this rate will continue, we can roughly calculate that only around Thirty thousand EVs will be adopted by 2025. Although we excluded Plug-in Hybrid (PHEV) from our estimate, this amount seems very lower than the stated goal, which is 300,000.

Moreover, according to Maryland State's website, this state already burned through the funds of 6 million dollars. So, the availability of tax credit for the 2019-2020 fiscal year becomes uncertain. Unless the state can come up with more funding, it is likely to see a decrease in sales of EV and PHEV.

In the future, I want to think about capturing the trade-offs and substitution patterns that the tax incentive created. For example, whether someone that would not have been willing/ able is now willing/ able to buy a vehicle or whether they are switching the purchase choice. If so, from what vehicle are they

switching? Are consumers switching from hybrid vehicles or gasoline vehicles? If they are only switching from Hybrid vehicles, then the effect would not be so high in terms of environmental perspective because hybrid vehicles are more energy-efficient than diesel/gasoline cars.

REFERENCES

Abadie, A., & Gardeazabal, J. (2003). The economic costs of conflict: A case study of the Basque country. *American Economic Review*, *93*(1), 113–132.

Abadie, A., Diamond, A., & Hainmueller, J. (2010). Synthetic control methods for comparative case studies: Estimating the effect of California's tobacco control program. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *105*(490), 493–505.

Akaike, H. (1974). *A New Look at the Statistical Model Identification*. Selected Papers of Hirotugu Akaike. Springer, New York, NY.

American Community Survey. (2019). *2019 Median Household Income* [Data set]. United States Census Bureau.

Bolduc, D., Boucher, N., & Alvarez-Daziano, R. (2008). Hybrid Choice Modeling of New Technologies for Car Choice in Canada. *Transportation Research Record*, *2082*(1), 63–71. https://doi.org/10.3141/2082-08

Brodersen, K.H., Gallusser, F., Koehler, J., Remy, N., & Scott, S.L. (2015). Inferring causal impact using Bayesian structural time-series models. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, *9*(1), 247–274.

Evans, S. (2019, July 10). *2013 Tesla Model S Beats Chevy, Toyota, and Cadillac for Ultimate Car of the Year Honors*. MotorTrend. Retrieved from https://www.motortrend.com/news/2013-tesla-model-s-beats-chevy-toyota-cadillac-ultimate-car-of-the-year/

Fang, H.A. (2008). A Discrete-Continuous Model of Households' Vehicle Choice and Usage, with an Application to the Effects of Residential Density. *Transportation Research*, *42*(9), 736-758.

Federal and State Laws and Incentives: Recent State Updates. (n.d). *Alternative Fuel Data Center*. U.S Department of Energy. Retrieved from https://afdc.energy.gov/laws/recent

Fingas, J. (2016, October 8). Germany calls for a ban on combustion engine cars by 2030. *Engadget*. Retrieved from https://www.engadget.com/2016-10-08-germany-wants-combustion-engine-ban.html

Forrest, A. (2017, April 13). *The death of diesel: Has the one-time wonder fuel become the new asbestos?* The Guardian. UK. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2017/apr/13/death-of-diesel-wonder-fuel-new-asbestos

Greentechmedia. (2019, January 7). *US Electric Vehicle Sales Increased by 81% in 2018*. Retrieved from https://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/us-electric-vehicle-sales-increase-by-81-in-2018

Guarnieri, M. (2012). Looking back to electric cars. *3rd Region-8 IEEE HISTory of Electro –Technology Conference*, pp. 1–6. Retrieved from https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6487583

Jaynes, E.T., & Kempthorne, O. (1976). Confidence intervals vs. Bayesian intervals. In W.L. Harper & C.A. Hooker (Eds.), *Foundations of probability theory, statistical inference, and statistical theories of science* (pp. 175–257). Springer.

Kurz, C.F., Rehm, M., Holle, R., Teuner, C., Laxy, M., & Schwarzkopf, L. (2019). The effect of bariatric surgery on health care costs: A synthetic control approach using Bayesian structural time series. *Health Economics*, *28*, 1293–1307. https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.3941

Liu, Y., & Cirillo, C. (2017). A Generalized Dynamic Discrete Choice Model for Green Vehicle Adoption. *ScienceDirect*, *23*, 868-886.

Maryland Department of Transportation Website. (n.d). *Maryland Vehicle Title and Registration Information*. Retrieved August 20, 2019, from http://www.mva.maryland.gov/vehicles/registration/title-registration-info.htm#certinspection.

Maryland Department of Transportation Website. (n.d). Retrieved August 20, 2019, from http://www.mva.maryland.gov/about-mva/info/27100/27100-14T.htm

Østli, V., Fridstrøm, L., & Johansen, K.W. (n.d.). A generic discrete choice model of automobile purchase. *European Transportation Research Review*, *9*(16). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12544-017-0232-1

Petroff, A. (2017, July 26). These countries want to ditch gas and diesel cars. *CNNMoney*. Retrieved from https://money.cnn.com/2017/07/26/autos/countries-that-are-banning-gas-cars-for-electric/index.html

RCore Team. (2017). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing, R foundation for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria. Retrieved from https://www.R-project.org https://afdc.energy.gov/laws

Reference House Bill 1246, 2019, and Maryland Statutes, Transportation Code 13-815. (2019).

Riley, C. (2017, July 26). Britain bans gasoline and diesel cars starting in 2040. *CNNMoney*. Retrieved from https://money.cnn.com/2017/07/26/news/uk-bans-gasoline-diesel-engines-2040/index.html

Scott, S.L., & Varian, H.R. (2013). *Bayesian variable selection for nowcasting economic time series*. National Bureau of Economic Research, NBER Working Papers 19567. Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/chapters/c12995.pdf

Statistica. (2019). *Light vehicle retail sales in the United States from 1978 to 2018 (in 1,000 units)*. Retrieved from https://www.statista.com/statistics/199983/us-vehicle-sales-since-1951/