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When planners, developers, or traffic engineers conduct traffic impact analyses for proposed developments, they typically use the trip-generation data and analysis methods published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) in its Trip Generation report and Trip Generation Handbook. However, standard traffic engineering practice does not account for project characteristics such as the mix and balance of land uses, compactness of design, neighborhood connectivity and walkability, infill versus remote location, and the variety of transportation choices offered. This can have significant implications when the project in question is a mixed use development.

The conventional methods used by traffic engineers throughout the U.S. to evaluate traffic impacts fail to account for the benefits of mixed use and other forms of lower-impact development. They exaggerate estimates of impacts and result in excessive development costs, skewed public perceptions, and decision maker resistance. These techniques overlook the full potential for internalizing trips through interaction among on-site activities and the extent to which development with a variety of nearby complementary destinations and high-quality transit access will produce less traffic. These effects can reduce the number of vehicle trips generated to a far greater degree than recognized in standard traffic engineering practice.

The ITE trip-generation data and analysis methods apply primarily to single-use and freestanding sites, which limits their applicability to compact, mixed-use, transit oriented developments (ITE 2004, 2012). The Handbook does include an approach based on limited data on mixed use developments, but only from six sites in Florida, not nearly enough to cover today's diverse mixed use developments across the United States.

It is important that planners and developers recognize the implications of using standard ITE trip-generation data and methodologies for mixed use developments and use methods that more accurately estimate traffic generated by these projects. Commonly used methods unjustifiably favor types of development that consume greater resources and generate greater impacts, shifting our attention away from development forms and locations that stimulate higher levels of social interaction and benefit to established communities.

Researchers have attempted to analyze how a mix of uses in a compact, walkable project design affects trip generation and on-the-ground traffic impacts. In 2011, two major studies introduced methodologies for predicting traffic generation from mixed use development. The researchers on those studies have now collaborated to combine the advantages of both and provide, in this PAS Memo, an even more complete and reliable approach to measuring the benefits of such forms of development. Using this new approach, planners conducting trip-generation analysis for mixed use development projects will produce more accurate forecasts of traffic generation, which will allow more appropriate on-site design features and off-site mitigation measures.

The Problem with Conventional Traffic Impact Analysis

Traffic analysis is intended to inform planners, community members, and public officials of the most suitable planning features and infrastructure elements needed to support new development. However, the conventional methods were developed during an era when most new development was single use, stand alone, highway oriented, and suburban. Standard practices ascribe similar levels of impact to mixed-use, integrated, transit-oriented, and infill development, and consequently overlook the benefits of — and impose unreasonable obstacles to — appropriate planning and approval of such “smart growth” forms.

The standard analytic process used for planning, design, and impact analysis does not account for the degree to which well-designed mixed use development places shops, restaurants, offices, and residences in close proximity to one another, shortening internal trips between them and making
more trips conducive to walking, biking, or riding transit. Such reductions in traffic and vehicle-miles traveled reduce fuel consumption, greenhouse-gas and other emissions, and exposure of residents to passing traffic and the related threats to comfort, health, and safety. Reduced vehicular travel can also lessen the need to construct new or wider streets and highways, allowing communities to economize on infrastructure. Mixed use developments (MXD) also create opportunities for shared parking, which can reduce the number of spaces needed in parking lot and garage construction.

Traffic-Reducing Attributes of Mixed Use Development

Many of the attributes of lower-impact development can reduce traffic generation compared with conventional single-use suburban development forms:

Diverse land uses and activities can fill basic needs nearby, thereby reducing automobile travel. They allow for linkage of trips in multipurpose trip chains, with a single auto trip to an activity center followed by several short trips on foot. Mixed use sites also create the opportunity for shared parking, which in turn encourages multipurpose trips and reduces the tendency to make separate automobile trips from one destination to the next.

Higher densities and intensities of development provide opportunities for residents, employees, and visitors to circulate among larger numbers of businesses and activities by walking, bicycling, or making short trips by automobile. Higher concentrations of land use also support higher-quality and higher-frequency transit service, offering tenants and visitors a viable alternative to driving. High land values and cost to provide parking also leads to higher parking prices, a disincentive to driving versus other available modes of travel.

Walkable urban design and interconnected streets generally reduce the perceived and real separation among destinations, encourage walking and cycling, and reduce the circuitousness and length of each trip.

Short distances to transit help make transit a viable alternative to the automobile and can create activity centers with sufficient street life, amenities, and walking connections where needs and entertainment can be accomplished without independent car trips.

Accessibility to complementary destinations outside the development reduces distances between jobs and housing, services and entertainment, and recreation, often making automobile travel unnecessary. Placed at infill locations, complementary new development that satisfies local needs can also reduce tripmaking by residents, employees, and shoppers in the surrounding community.

Socio-demographic compatibility can further reduce auto traffic to the extent that developments are designed to attract and accommodate residents with low auto ownership (through, for example, parking supply limits), low travel needs (based on, for example, family size, fewer employed residents, lower income, or age range), or close affiliation with other project elements or surrounding land uses (linked, or simply compatible, jobs and residents).

Scale of development affects feasibility for communities and employers to provide travel demand options and management services that can shift traveler modes from the auto to alternative modes of travel. Residents and businesses that self-select into such sites and settings are also often more amenable to travelling less or using alternatives to the automobile. Transportation demand management (TDM) programs are both more likely to be available and more likely to be successful in compact, central, transit-supported settings.
Mixed use sites can take many forms, but all offer a diversity of uses in walkable settings. Above, Oakland City Center BART; below, RiverPlace, Portland, Oregon. Photos courtesy Fehr & Peers.
The danger of using traditional traffic-generation data based on single-use facilities is that it misrepresents the true traffic generation impacts of mixed use development. The consequences of miscalculating the benefits of mixed-use development may include unreasonable development cost, exaggerated impacts and mitigation responsibilities, skewed public perceptions, and decision maker resistance. This penalizes mixed use development proposals, often tipping the balance in favor of projects that offer fewer benefits and ultimately generate higher impacts. Denying "smart" forms of development does not reduce the overall market demand for housing and business, so the building disallowed ends up in other locations within the region, often in less accessible locations, at lower densities, and in less-mixed use configurations. The end result can be more traffic and higher regional vehicle-miles traveled than had the smart-growth development been approved.

Understandably, communities and public reviewers want to minimize the risk of unmitigated impacts. However, doing so through the application of overly conservative project evaluation criteria undermines the pursuit of other community values, such as vibrant neighborhoods with integrated development and activities that minimize the need to travel and the impacts produced by excessive unnecessary use of the automobile.

Conservative traffic-generation estimates have supply-side impacts, affecting design and cost of streets and parking. Within constrained sites, overdesign of traffic elements can limit the space available for revenue-producing land uses and increase other development costs. Development fee programs also rely heavily on traffic-generation estimates from the ITE Trip Generation Manual; this can lead to setting excessively high fee rates on mixed use development. Unquestioning use of the ITE data can unreasonably jeopardize a MXD project's approval, financial feasibility, and design quality.

New Research Evidence for Mixed Use Development Trip Generation

Several hundred studies over the past 20 years have confirmed that the built environment affects travel generation (Ewing and Cervero 2010). Development features associated with reduced trip rates include a series of "D" variables: density, diversity of uses, design of urban environment, distance from transit, destination accessibility, development scale, demographics of inhabitants, and demand management. In the past three years, research has examined more directly the relative influence of each factor and their interactions and has sought to corroborate the research results through field verification. Organizations such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the National Academy of Sciences Transportation Research Board have sponsored several of the more reputable studies on the subject.

The Eight "D" Variables

The most advanced research has confirmed that trip rate reductions are quantifiably associated with the attributes of mixed use development, defined in terms of these characteristics of urban development patterns:

- **Density**: dwellings, jobs per acre. Higher densities shorten trip lengths, allow for more walking and biking, and support quality transit.
- **Diversity**: mix of housing, jobs, retail. A diverse neighborhood allows for easier trip linking and shortens distances between trips. It also promotes higher levels of walking and biking and allows for shared parking.
- **Design**: connectivity, walkability. Good design improves connectivity, encourages walking and biking, and reduces travel distance.
- **Destinations**: regional accessibility. Destination accessibility links travel purposes, shortens trips, and offers transportation options.
- **Distance to Transit**: rail proximity. Close proximity to transit encourages its use, along with trip-linking and walking, and often creates accessible walking environments.
- **Development Scale**: residents, jobs. Appropriate development scale provides critical mass, increases local opportunities, and supports transit investment.
- **Demographics**: household size, income. Mixed use development allows self-selection by households into settings with their preferred activities and travel modes, allows businesses to locate convenient to clients, and supports a socioeconomic "fit" among residents, businesses, and activities.
- **Demand Management**: pricing, incentives. Demand management ties incentives to the urban environment and allows alignment of auto disincentives with available alternate modes.

A growing body of evidence indicates that these factors, individually or together, quantifiably explain the number of vehicle trips and vehicle-miles traveled for a development project and for a
region as a whole. Each of the D factors influences traffic generation through a variety of mechanisms. There are also important interactions, both synergistic and mutually dampening, among the D factors that call for sophisticated techniques when quantifying the travel generation effects of different combinations proposed in any project or plan.

**The Evidence that Conventional Methods Overstate MXD Impacts**

Empirical evidence and research provides evidence that mixed-use, infill, and transit-oriented developments generate fewer external vehicle trips than equivalent stand-alone uses. A nationwide study sponsored by the U.S. EPA (Ewing et al. 2011) found statistical correlation between the D factors and increased trip internalization and increased walking and transit use. It further demonstrated, for 27 mixed-use development sites across the U.S., that:

- On average, the sites’ land uses would generate 49 percent more traffic if they were distributed among single-use sites in suburban settings, the situations to which the ITE *Trip Generation Manual* would apply.
- The ITE *Handbook*, the current state-of-practice resource for estimating mixed use trip generation, would overestimate peak hour traffic by an average of 35 percent.

The following examples from recent studies demonstrate the degree by which such developments reduce traffic generation relative to what would be presumed under conventional traffic analysis methods.

**Atlantic Station, Atlanta**

Atlantic Station is a major mixed-use infill development located on a 138-acre former brownfield site in midtown Atlanta, connected by nonstop shuttle service to a MARTA metro rail station about a half-mile away. At the time it was studied, the development included 798 mid- and high-rise residential units, 550,600 square feet of office space, 434,500 square feet of retail space, a 101-room hotel, a restaurant, and a cinema.

For Atlantic Station, the "internal capture rate" (proportion of generated trips that remain internal to the site) is 15 percent in the morning peak hour and about 40 percent of evening peak-hour. Of the trips entering and leaving the site, between 5 and 7 percent use transit and another 5 to 7 percent walk or bicycle.

According to standard ITE trip-generation rates, were the Atlantic Station development elements located at single-use suburban sites, they would generate 37 percent more weekday traffic and 69 percent more PM peak traffic than actually counted at the centrally located, mixed use site.

---

**RiverPlace, Portland**

RiverPlace is an award-winning mixed use waterfront development on a former brownfield within easy walking distance of downtown Portland, Oregon. Adjacent to the Tom McCall Waterfront Park, the site contains 700 residential units (condominiums and apartments), 40,000 square feet of office space, 26,500 square feet of small retail shops and restaurants, a 300-room hotel, and a marina, cinema, and athletic club. The waterfront walking environment conveniently links all of the activities within the development site and connects the site to the Portland central business district. Transit is also available at the site; the Portland Streetcar connects RiverPlace to downtown Portland and the greater Portland area.

Atlantic Station offers residential units alongside walkable office and commercial space. Photo left courtesy Fehr & Peers, right courtesy Brian Bochner.

---

*RiverPlace, Portland*

RiverPlace is an award-winning mixed use waterfront development on a former brownfield within easy walking distance of downtown Portland, Oregon. Adjacent to the Tom McCall Waterfront Park, the site contains 700 residential units (condominiums and apartments), 40,000 square feet of office space, 26,500 square feet of small retail shops and restaurants, a 300-room hotel, and a marina, cinema, and athletic club. The waterfront walking environment conveniently links all of the activities within the development site and connects the site to the Portland central business district. Transit is also available at the site; the Portland Streetcar connects RiverPlace to downtown Portland and the greater Portland area.
RiverPlace's internal capture rate is 36 percent. For internal and external trips combined, 40 percent are by walking and 5 percent by transit. These statistics are significantly higher than the regional averages of 15 percent of trips taken by walking and 2 percent by transit.

RiverPlace offers a mix of residential, office, and commercial uses on Portland's waterfront. Photo courtesy Fehr & Peers.

Bay Street, Emeryville
Bay Street is a vibrant, thriving recent redevelopment project in Emeryville, California, just outside San Francisco. The previously heavy-industrial area within and around Bay Street has undergone dramatic revitalization in the past two decades, and it now includes the headquarters of Pixar Studios and other businesses. Bay Street itself is a one-million-square-foot walkable urban village designed on a Main Street theme. It contains a major theater complex, hotel, and 382,000 square feet of fashionable retail shops (including an Apple Store) with 381 apartment units and offices above. The site is within walking distance of a Capitol Corridor commuter rail station and within a shuttle bus ride of BART metro rail.

Bay Street's daily traffic generation is about 41 percent less than the combined total that would be generated by similarly sized suburban shopping centers, theater complexes, residential uses, and office developments based on standard ITE trip rates for stand-alone land uses. It also generates 36 percent less daily traffic than would be estimated by traffic engineers applying the ITE Handbook and conventional analysis methods. In the PM peak hour, Bay Street traffic generation is 46 percent lower than would be generated by the same land uses scattered on individual suburban sites, and 41 percent lower than would be estimated by standard ITE traffic analysis.
New Models for Mixed Use Development Traffic Analysis

To address the shortcomings in conventional analysis methods, the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) and the U.S. EPA recently conducted significant research studies to improve quantification of the trip-reducing effects of mixed use development. Each study took a different approach: NCHRP undertook extensive visitor surveys and traffic counts at Atlantic Station and two mixed-use developments in Texas (Bochner et al. 2011), while EPA sponsored a nationwide study of more than 260 mixed use developments across the U.S. using regional travel survey data and verification traffic counts at a subset of the sites (Ewing et al. 2011). Using different analysis methods, each study developed a recommended approach to discounting traffic generation estimates to account for the mix of uses and other development characteristics. Each study represents a major advancement over conventional analysis methods.

NCHRP Report 684

National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 684, Enhancing Internal Trip Capture Estimation for Mixed-Use Developments, analyzed internal-capture relationships of MXD sites and examined the travel interactions among six individual types of land uses: office, retail, restaurant, residential, cinema, and hotel. The study looked at three master-planned developments: Mockingbird Station, a single-block TOD in Dallas; Legacy Town Center, a multiblock district in suburban Plano, Texas, containing fully integrated and adjacent complementary uses; and Atlantic Station (see above). It compared the survey results to those found in prior ITE studies at three Florida sites, Boca del Mar, Country Isles, and Village Commons, all containing a variety of land uses, though in single-use pods.

Based on traveler and vehicle counts and interviews, the study ascertained interactions among the six land-use types of interest and compared them with site characteristics. It then examined the percentage of visitors to each land-use type who also visited each of the other uses during the same trip. The study considered site context factors and described percentage reductions in sitewide traffic generation that might result from the availability of transit service and other factors.

Researchers then performed verification tests by comparing the analysis results to those available from ITE for three earlier studies at Florida mixed use sites. The validation confirmed that the
estimated values were a reasonable match for actual counted traffic. The product of the study is a series of tables and spreadsheets that balance and apply the discovered use-to-use visitation percentages to the land uses within the project site under study. The interaction percentages are then used to discount ITE trip-generation rates and to reduce what would otherwise represent the number of trips entering and leaving the entire site.

EPA MXD

The U.S. EPA–sponsored 2011 report, *Traffic Generated by Mixed-Use Developments — A Six-Region Study Using Consistent Built Environmental Measures*, investigated trip generation, mode choice, and trip length for trips produced and attracted by mixed use developments. Researchers selected six regions — Atlanta, Boston, Houston, Portland, Sacramento, and Seattle — to represent a wide range of urban scale, form, and climatic conditions. Regional travel survey data with geographic coordinates and parcel-level detail available for these areas allowed researchers to isolate trips to, from, and within MXDs and relate travel choices to fine-grained characteristics of these developments.

In each region, researchers worked with local planners and traffic engineers to identify a total of 239 MXDs that met the ITE definition of multi-use development. The MXDs ranged from compact infill sites near regional cores to low-rise freeway-oriented developments. They varied in size, population and employment densities, mixes of jobs and housing, presence or absence of transit, and locations within their regions. In total, the MXD sample for the six regions provided survey data on almost 36,000 trips.

The analysis found that one or more variables in each of seven D categories (see above) were statistically significant predictors of internal capture, external walking, external transit use, and external private vehicle trip length. Specifically, an MXD’s external traffic generation was related to population and employment within the site (density); the relative balance of jobs and housing within the site and the amount of employment within 1 mile of the site (diversity); the density of intersections within the site as a measure of street connectivity (design); the presence of bus stops within a quarter mile or the presence of a rail station (distance from transit); employment within a mile of site boundaries and percentage of regional employment within 20 minutes by car, 30 minutes by car, and 30 minutes by transit (destination accessibility); the gross acreage of the development (development scale); and the average number of household members as well as household vehicle ownership per capita (demographics). The accuracy of the EPA MXD method was verified through traffic generation comparisons at 27 mixed-use sites across the U.S.

The EPA MXD product is a series of equations and instructions captured in a spreadsheet workbook. The methodology calculates the percentage reductions in ITE trip generation resulting from the national statistical analysis of seven D effects on internal trip capture, walking, and transit use. The spreadsheets produce reduced estimates of traffic generation on a daily basis and for peak traffic hours.

Combining the Approaches

The NCHRP 684 method and EPA MXD method each derive from different research approaches and produce different methods of analyzing trip generation at mixed use developments. They focus on overlapping but not identical aspects of mixed-use development sites and their contexts and offer respective strengths and weaknesses in terms of factors considered and ease of application. Selecting which method to employ under different circumstances requires both a comparison of their capabilities as well as professional judgment of their respective strengths and weaknesses.

Report 684 includes a refined assessment of on-site land-use categories, specifically recognizing the roles of restaurants, theaters, and hotels within the site land-use mix, along with an adjustment to account for the spatial separations among individual land uses within the development site. It is directly useful for the evaluation of proposed development sites that are similar to the one or more of the three surveyed in Atlanta and Texas for the report. However, it is not responsive to factors such as regional location, transit availability, density of development, walkability factors, and the sociodemographic profile of site residents and businesses.

In contrast, the EPA MXD method accounts directly and quantitatively for these factors. However, while it accounts for the balances of retail, office, and residential development, it does not explicitly differentiate subcategories such as restaurants, theaters, and hotels. Furthermore, it requires the analyst to account for off-site development, including employment within a one-mile radius of the MXD and the number of jobs available within 30 minutes of the site.

To develop a method that captures the best of both sets of research findings, the authors of the two original studies decided to collaborate on an integrated method that recognizes the full array of on-site and context characteristics that contribute to traffic reduction and, through a focus on empirical verification, achieves greater accuracy than either method individually.

In developing the integrated approach, we compared the performances of the methods to actual
traffic counts at a diverse group of mixed use developments in a variety of settings. The 27 verification sites were successful mixed-use development, exhibiting moderate to high levels of activity in terms of business sales, occupied residential units, property value, and household income, with average or above-average person trips, at the time of the survey. They included those studied for NCHRP 684, the sites used as the basis for the ITE *Trip Generation Handbook*, and others surveyed by Fehr & Peers, transportation consultants. Six of the 27 sites were located in Florida, and three were located in Atlanta and Texas. Three of these nine were nationally known examples of smart growth or transit-oriented development: Atlantic Station, Mockingbird Station, and Celebration, Florida. Six sites were located in San Diego County and were designated by local planners and traffic engineers in 2009 as representing a wide range of examples of smart growth trip generators in that region. The 12 remaining sites were MXD developments located elsewhere in California and in Utah, ranging from TOD sites (commuter rail and ferry) to conventional suburban freeway-oriented mixed use sites.

**A New Approach: The MXD+ Method**

The new analytical approach, the MXD+ method, combines the strengths of NCHRP 684 and EPA MXD. The authors sought to (1) address the fact that each method has strengths relative to the other, (2) create a method that is more accurate than either of the individual methods alone, and (3) reduce confusion among practitioners on which is the most appropriate method.

The proposed MXD+ method incorporates the underlying data sources and logic that the two methods share. It offers the ability to assess the effects of spatial separation of uses and recognition of more specific land-use categories and to consider the dynamic influences of local development context, regional accessibility, transit availability, development density and walkability factors, and the sociodemographic characteristics of residents.

To develop the preferred method, the authors experimented with different methods of integrating the two methods and arrived at a direct calibration approach. The appropriate combination of the results of the two individual methods was determined through regression analysis to identify the proportions that provided the best correlation with the traffic counted at the 27 validation sites. Table 1 presents results from the regression analysis, listing the proportions of the two methods found most effective at matching the traffic generation at the diverse set of mixed use validation sites. Weighting the results of the two individual analyses by the percentages in Table 1 and combining the results produces more accurate estimates of traffic generation and captures the effects of all of the site description variables included in the NCHRP and EPA methods.

**Table 1. Optimal Blend of NCHRP 684 and EPA MXD Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM Peak Traffic</th>
<th>PM Peak Traffic</th>
<th>Average Daily Traffic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCHRP 684</td>
<td>10.1 percent</td>
<td>36.5 percent</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA MXD</td>
<td>89.9 percent</td>
<td>63.5 percent</td>
<td>100 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The step-by-step method is as follows:

1. Apply the full EPA MXD methodology to predict external traffic generation as influenced by site development scale, density, accessibility, walkability and transit availability, resident demographics, and general mix of uses.
2. Apply the full NCHRP 684 method to capture the effects of detailed land-use categories, including hotel, theater, and restaurant, and the spatial separation of uses within small and medium sites.
3. Combine the results of the two methods in terms of percentages of trips remaining internal to the development site, using proportioning factors presented in the table above.
4. Apply adjustments to account for off-site walking and transit travel using the EPA MXD method.
5. Discount standard ITE traffic-generation rates by the percentages of internalization produced in step 3 and the percentage of walk and transit travel in step 4 to obtain the estimate of site-generated traffic.

As Table 2 below indicates, the MXD+ method improves traffic generation estimates by considering the full array of 12 site development and context characteristics shown to influence internal capture and mode share, while the individual methods consider only 5 to 8 factors each. Effects considered in MXD+ that are not included in the NCHRP 684 method include household size and auto ownership, site proximity to bus and rail stops, and accessibility to local and regional jobs. Effects considered in the NCHRP 684 method that do not appear in the EPA MXD method include specific land uses and proximity of interacting land uses to each other.
Table 2. Comparison of Three Principal Methods in Terms of Project Characteristics Considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Characteristics Considered</th>
<th>EPA MXD Method</th>
<th>NCHRP 684 Method</th>
<th>MXD+ Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density of Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of Uses: Jobs/Housing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of Uses: Housing/Retail</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of Uses: Jobs/Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of Uses: Entertainment, Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design: Connectivity, Walkability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design: Separation Among Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Accessibility by Transit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Accessibility by Walk/Bike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from Transit Stop</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Needs (beyond Project Site Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Residents per Dwelling Unit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Autos Owned per Dwelling Unit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby (1/4 mi) Bus Stops and Rail Stations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs Within 1 Mile of Site</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs Within 30-Minute Transit Trip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located in CBD or TOD?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Development by Classification</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Occupancy Estimate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode Split Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 below presents the statistical performance of the MXD+ integrated method with the individual performance of the individual NCHRP 684 and EPA MXD methods. We compared the ability of each of the available methods to replicate the amount of traffic generated at the 27 validation sites in terms of statistical measures including percent root mean squared error, a metric used in the transportation field to evaluate model accuracy, and the coefficient of determination (or "R-squared"), which measures the ability of the analysis method to account for the variations in traffic generation among the 27 survey sites. For daily traffic generation, MXD+ is equivalent to the EPA MXD method, as the NCHRP 684 method does not address daily analysis. For peak hour traffic generation, MXD+ performs notably better than either of the individual methods.

Table 3. Comparison of Three Principal Methods in Terms of Performance at Validation Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Traffic Generation</th>
<th>EPA MXD Method</th>
<th>NCHRP 684 Method</th>
<th>MXD+ Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>96 %</td>
<td>89 %*</td>
<td>96 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Error</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>16 %*</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AM Peak Traffic Generation

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error</td>
<td>17 %</td>
<td>27 %*</td>
<td>17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>97 %</td>
<td>93 %</td>
<td>97 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Error</td>
<td>12 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td>12 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>21 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PM Peak Traffic Generation

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error</td>
<td>18 %</td>
<td>36 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>95 %</td>
<td>81 %</td>
<td>97 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Error</td>
<td>8 %</td>
<td>18 %</td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ITE Handbook internalization statistics (NCHRP 684 method does not address daily trip generation)

The following graphs compare the performance of the MXD+ method to the ITE Handbook method at replicating traffic generation at the diverse group of mixed-use validation sites. Compared with the ITE Handbook, MXD+ method more accurately matches the amount of daily traffic actually counted at 20 of the 27 survey sites. In the AM peak hour, it is more accurate than the ITE Handbook at 21 of the 24 sites for which counts were available, and in the PM peak hour, MXD+ is more accurate than the ITE Handbook method at 23 of 25 sites.
The MXD+ method explains 97 percent of the variation in trip generation among mixed-use developments, compared with 65 percent for the ITE Handbook method. On average, the Handbook overestimates AM peak traffic generation by 49 percent, compared with 12 percent for MXD+. For the PM peak hour, the ITE Handbook overestimates actual traffic by 35 percent. The MXD+ method reduces this to 4 percent, remaining slightly conservative and unlikely to understate impacts.

By combining and refining the two most advanced methodologies for estimating traffic generation for mixed-use development, the MXD+ method provides transportation planners and engineers a more accurate single approach that accounts for the most important factors that distinguish lower impact development from other forms. Doing so advances development planning and impact assessment beyond the practices that have, to date, unreasonably discouraged mixed-use development.
Recommendations for Planners

We recommend that planners adopt the latest methods for evaluating traffic generation of mixed use and other forms of smart growth, including infill and transit-oriented development. The MXD methods developed under the U.S. EPA multiregional study and the NCHRP 684 study on enhancing trip-capture estimation each represent substantial advances to the conventional practices previously available through ITE. Combining the two new methods, as described above, improves upon both individual methods. Tools for all three approaches are available for use through the references and resources listed below.

Traffic engineers are beginning to take notice of the new methods, but we expect that natural sluggishness in adopting new practices will continue to impose unfair penalties on mixed use and other forms of lower-impact development. We recommend activism on the part of all planners, development reviewers, and impact analysts on behalf of the more accurate MXD methods.

Immediate adoption of the improved methods will allow planners to account for a project's regional location, transit availability, density of development, walkability factors, and the sociodemographic characteristics of residents and businesses and on-site adjacencies of land uses including residential, office, retail, restaurants, theaters, and hotels. Accounting for these factors through the MXD+ method will achieve the highest levels of accuracy possible in estimating traffic impacts of mixed use development.

We recommend applying and promoting the MXD+ method for day-to-day project planning and performance-based site-plan refinement, impact analysis, and discretionary review. Doing so will eliminate what is presently a systematic bias in traffic analysis that favors single-use, isolated, suburban-style development.

Conclusion

Standard traffic engineering practices are blind to the primary benefits of smart growth. A plan's development density, scale, design, accessibility, transit proximity, demographics, and mix of uses all affect traffic generation in ways unseen to prescribed methods. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual and Handbook overestimate peak traffic generation for mixed-use development by an average of 35 percent. For conventional suburban stand-alone development, ITE rates portray the average for such sites; so hedging mixed-use analysis toward more conservative assumptions creates a systematic bias in favor of single-use suburban development.

ITE overestimation of traffic impacts reduces the likelihood of approval of mixed use and related forms of smart growth such as infill, compact, and transit-oriented development. Such overestimation escalates development costs, skews public perception, heightens community resistance, and favors isolated single-use development.

The methods of evaluating mixed use development described in this report represent a substantial improvement over conventional traffic-estimation methods. They improve accuracy and virtually eliminate overestimation bias, and they are supported by the substantial evidence of surveys and traffic counts at 266 mixed use sites across the U.S. The MXD+ analysis method explains 97 percent of the variation in trip generation among mixed use sites and all but eliminates the ITE systematic overestimation of traffic. We hope planners and other professionals will take advantage of the available spreadsheet tools listed below to help even the playing field between conventional development patterns and more sustainable, walkable, livable places.
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**Additional Resources**

Description, documentation, and spreadsheet tools for the NCHRP 684 method, Enhancing Internal Trip Capture Estimation for Mixed-Use Developments may be found at www.trb.org/Main/Blurbs/165014.aspx.

Description, documentation, and spreadsheet tools for the EPA MXD Trip Generation Tool for Mixed-Use Developments may be found at www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/mxd_tripgeneration.html.

Quick-response analysis tools for applying the EPA MXD method, the combined EPA /NCHRP method MXD+, and MXD in conjunction with analysis of vehicle-miles traveled, GHG emissions, and shared parking, Plan+, may be found at http://asap.fehrandpeers.com/tools/.
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