Figure 6.3

## PM Peak Hour Travel Times
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Table 6.1
AM/PM Peak Hour Intersection Delay and Levels of Service

| Intersection | AM | AM | PM | PM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average Delay (seconds) | LOS | Average Delay (seconds) | LOS |
| Ken Caryl Avenue/West Ramps | 17.13 | B | 17.79 | B |
| Ken Caryl Avenue/East Ramps | 6.47 | A | 15.51 | B |
| Ken Caryl Avenue/Simms Street | 26.90 | C | 36.11 | D |
| Ken Caryl Avenue/Simms Street | 41.90 | D | 35.63 | D |
| Chatfield Avenue/Kipling Parkway | 37.56 | D | 46.81 | D |
| Kipling Parkway/North Ramps | 17.07 | B | 13.96 | B |
| Kipling Parkway/South Ramps | 32.74 | C | 36.48 | D |
| Ken Caryl Avenue/Wadsworth Boulevard | 30.79 | C | 45.04 | D |
| Chatfield Avenue/Wadsworth Boulevard | 37.39 | D | 50.89 | D |
| Wadsworth Boulevard/North Ramps | 16.35 | B | 20.49 | C |
| Wadsworth Boulevard/South Ramps | 39.53 | D | 47.15 | D |
| Ken Caryl Avenue/Pierce Street | 34.41 | C | 38.82 | D |
| Chatfield Avenue/Pierce Street | 9.53 | A | 12.87 | B |
| Ken Caryl Avenue/Platte Canyon Drive | 51.77 | D | 27.23 | C |
| Chatfield Avenue/Platte Canyon Drive | 49.37 | D | >100.00 | F |
| Santa Fe Drive/Mineral Avenue | 52.79 | D | 62.57 | E |
| Santa Fe Drive/County Line Road | 41.86 | D | 24.80 | C |
| Santa Fe Drive/North Ramps | 32.44 | c | 36.72 | D |
| Santa Fe Drive/South Ramps | 45.45 | D | 32.35 | C |
| Santa Fe Drive/Blakeland Drive | 27.11 | C | 32.97 | C |
| Santa Fe Drive/Town Center Drive | 22.74 | c | 12.77 | B |
| Santa Fe Drive/Highlands Ranch Parkway | 55.79 | E | 64.77 | E |
| Lucent Boulevard/County Line Road | 14.55 | B | 34.53 | C |
| Lucent Boulevard/North Ramps | 23.34 | C | 33.02 | C |
| Lucent Boulevard/South Ramps | 6.77 | A | 16.98 | B |
| Lucent Boulevard/Plaza Drive | 30.32 | C | 34.02 | C |
| Lucent Boulevard/Town Center Drive | 19.46 | B | 12.12 | B |
| Lucent Boulevard/Highlands Ranch Parkway | 34.78 | C | 35.77 | D |
| Broadway/Dry Creek Road | 25.99 | C | 27.38 | C |


|  | AM | AM | PM | PM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Average Delay (seconds) | LOS | Average Delay (seconds) | LOS |
| Broadway/Mineral Avenue | 47.38 | D | 75.73 | E |
| Broadway/County Line Road | 84.63 | F | 91.72 | F |
| Broadway/North Ramps | 33.19 | C | 30.34 | C |
| Broadway/South Ramps | 22.95 | C | 21.37 | C |
| Broadway/Dad Clark Drive | 52.49 | D | 51.21 | D |
| Broadway/Plaza Drive | 48.62 | D | 31.89 | C |
| Broadway/Highlands Ranch Parkway | >100.00 | F | 67.90 | E |
| Mineral Avenue/Dry Creek Road | 11.76 | B | 24.42 | C |
| University Boulevard/Dry Creek Road | 50.54 | D | 66.24 | E |
| University Boulevard/County Line Road | 85.69 | F | >100.00 | F |
| University Boulevard/North Ramps | 28.33 | C | 10.76 | B |
| University Boulevard/South Ramps | 19.59 | B | 10.94 | B |
| University Boulevard/Dad Clark Drive | 26.71 | C | 25.78 | C |
| University Boulevard/Highlands Ranch Parkway | 42.89 | D | 85.04 | F |
| Colorado Boulevard/T-Ramps | 50.08 | D | 20.10 | C |
| Colorado Boulevard/Dry Creek Road | 35.59 | D | 54.00 | D |
| Colorado Boulevard/County Line Road | 66.75 | E | 69.13 | E |
| Holly Street/Dry Creek Road | 70.66 | E | >100.00 | F |
| Holly Street/County Line Road | 25.91 | C | 30.28 | C |
| Quebec Street/Dry Creek Road | 77.58 | E | >100.00 | F |
| Quebec Street/County Line Road | 70.27 | E | >100.00 | F |
| Quebec Street/North Ramps | 18.01 | B | 20.42 | C |
| Quebec Street/South Ramps | 34.93 | C | 26.55 | C |
| Quebec Street/Park Meadows Drive | >100.00 | F | 71.89 | E |
| Quebec Street/University Boulevard | 54.55 | D | 57.89 | E |
| Yosemite Street/Dry Creek Road | 49.23 | D | >100.00 | F |
| Yosemite Street/County Line Road | 53.56 | D | >100.00 | F |
| Yosemite Street/South Ramps | 15.73 | B | 29.77 | C |
| Yosemite Street/North Ramps | 20.46 | C | 59.14 | E |
| Yosemite Street/Park Meadows Drive | 20.07 | C | 77.17 | E |
| Yosemite Street/Lincoln Avenue | 34.06 | C | 42.65 | D |

Table 6.2
AM Peak Hour Freeway Levels of Service/Density

| Express Lanes - Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | To | Density | LOS |
| Kipling | Wadsworth | 19.18 | C |
| Wadsworth | Lucent | 19.37 | C |
| Lucent | Broadway | 17.05 | B |
| Broadway | Colorado | 16.10 | B |
| Colorado | Quebec | 33.67 | D |
| Quebec | Yosemite | 26.55 | D |
| Yosemite | I-25 | 25.10 | C |
| General Purpose Lanes - Eastbound |  |  |  |
| From | To | Density | LOS |
| Ken Caryl Ramps |  | 23.00 | C |
| Ken Caryl | Kipling | 39.66 | E |
| Kipling Ramps |  | 32.79 | D |
| Kipling | Wadsworth | 39.51 | E |
| Wadsworth Ramps |  | 105.51 | F |
| Wadsworth | Santa Fe | 52.55 | F |
| Santa Fe Ramps |  | 23.03 | C |
| Santa Fe | Lucent | 94.55 | F |
| Lucent Ramps |  | 52.91 | F |
| Lucent | Broadway | 69.25 | F |
| Broadway Ramps |  | 84.37 | F |
| Broadway | University | 67.79 | F |
| University Ramps |  | 36.79 | E |
| University | Quebec | 41.58 | E |
| Quebec Ramps |  | 24.42 | C |
| Quebec | Yosemite | 33.83 | D |
| Yosemite | I-25 | 55.29 | F |


| Express Lanes - Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | To | Density | LOS |
| I-25 | Yosemite | 9.74 | A |
| Yosemite | Quebec | 11.03 | B |
| Quebec | Colorado | 23.15 | C |
| Colorado | Broadway | 12.93 | B |
| Broadway | Lucent | 8.58 | A |
| Lucent | Wadsworth | 4.76 | A |
| Wadsworth | Kipling | 4.50 | A |
| General Purpose Lanes - Westbound |  |  |  |
| From | To | Density | LOS |
| I-25 | Yosemite | 9.74 | A |
| Yosemite Ramps |  | 0.00 | - |
| Yosemite | Quebec | 23.46 | C |
| Quebec Ramps |  | 53.55 | F |
| Quebec | University | 44.79 | E |
| University Ramps |  | 62.24 | F |
| University | Broadway | 73.23 | F |
| Broadway Ramps |  | 99.14 | F |
| Broadway | Lucent | 61.64 | F |
| Lucent Ramps |  | 44.40 | E |
| Lucent | Santa Fe | 64.23 | F |
| Santa Fe Ramps |  | 18.09 | C |
| Santa Fe | Platte Canyon | 0.00 | A |
| Platte Canyon Ramps |  | 0.00 | - |
| Platte Canyon | Wadsworth | 26.02 | D |
| Wadsworth Ramps |  | 16.08 | B |
| Wadsworth | Kipling | 27.49 | D |
| Kipling Ramps |  | 13.54 | B |
| Kipling | Ken Caryl | 19.18 | C |
| Ken Caryl Ram |  | 12.94 | B |

Table 6.3
PM Peak Hour Freeway Levels of Service/Density

| Express Lanes - Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| From | To | Density | LOS |
| Kipling | Wadsworth | 17.31 | B |
| Wadsworth | Lucent | 8.62 | A |
| Lucent | Broadway | 9.72 | A |
| Broadway | Colorado | 7.26 | A |
| Colorado | Quebec | 13.84 | B |
| Quebec | Yosemite | 9.50 | A |
| Yosemite | I-25 | 11.15 | B |
| General Purpose Lanes - Eastbound |  |  |  |
| From | To | Density | LOS |
| Ken Caryl Ramps | Kipling | 26.13 | D |
| Ken Caryl | 48.60 | F |  |
| Kipling Ramps | Wadsworth | 90.58 | F |
| Kipling | 97.20 | F |  |
| Wadsworth Ramps | Santa Fe | 53.73 | F |
| Wadsworth | F | 19.89 | C |
| Santa Fe Ramps | Lucent | 31.51 | D |
| Santa Fe | 59.10 | F |  |
| Lucent Ramps | Broadway | 58.53 | F |
| Lucent | 50.18 | F |  |
| Broadway Ramps | Broadway | 70.63 | F |
| University Ramps | University | 20.35 | C |
| University | Quebec | 29.32 | E |
| Quebec Ramps | 20.66 | C |  |
| Quebec | 27.42 | D |  |
| Yosemite | 25.80 | C |  |


| Express Lanes - Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | To | density | LOS |
| I-25 | Yosemite | 20.01 | C |
| Yosemite | Quebec | 27.85 | D |
| Quebec | Colorado | 32.56 | D |
| Colorado | Broadway | 20.47 | C |
| Broadway | Lucent | 18.86 | C |
| Lucent | Wadsworth | 14.09 | B |
| Wadsworth | Kipling | 28.82 | D |
| General Purpose Lanes - Westbound |  |  |  |
| From | To | Density | LOS |
| I-25 | Yosemite | 20.01 | C |
| Yosemite Ramps |  | 0.00 | - |
| Yosemite | Quebec | 50.19 | F |
| Quebec Ramps |  | 52.79 | F |
| Quebec | University | 73.02 | F |
| University Ramps |  | 76.25 | F |
| University | Broadway | 73.26 | $F$ |
| Broadway Ramps |  | 112.46 | F |
| Broadway | Lucent | 67.07 | F |
| Lucent Ramps |  | 56.55 | F |
| Lucent | Santa Fe | 55.12 | F |
| Santa Fe Ramps |  | 21.12 | C |
| Santa Fe | Platte Canyon | 68.87 | F |
| Platte Canyon Ramps |  | 0.00 | - |
| Platte Canyon | Wadsworth | 29.41 | D |
| Wadsworth Ramps |  | 25.12 | C |
| Wadsworth | Kipling | 66.54 | F |
| Kipling Ramps |  | 85.23 | F |
| Kipling | Ken Caryl | 37.94 | E |
| Ken Caryl Ramps |  | 50.40 | F |

### 6.2 TRAFFIC MODELING

Two traffic modeling software programs were used in the analysis of the express toll lanes. The TP+ model, an extension of the DRCOG MINUTP, was used initially due to its ability to model toll lane demand within a macroscopic model. By using the TP+ model initially, the number of access points that needed to be modeled later in the AIMSUN model was reduced. The AIMSUN micro-simulation model was primarily used for the majority of the express lane analysis. It was used to estimate the traffic diversion into the express lanes, and to analyze the traffic operations in the express lanes.

### 6.2.1 Initial Toll Diversion Forecasts Using Travel Demand Model

The TP+ model is an extension of the macroscopic travel demand model that allows for the assignment of trips to toll roads based on a given toll rate in order to predict volume at potential express lane access locations. Before using the AIMSUN micro-simulation model, a cursory analysis of access locations was performed to reduce the number of alternatives and the amount of calibration that needed to be performed to the AIMSUN model. The TP+ model also allowed for the modeling of the potential extension of C-470 to the northwest corridor to determine the amount of demand that was created through the extension. Using the origin and destination matrices in the travel demand model, the connection between C-470 and the northwest corridor showed little demand for trips between the two corridors. The majority of trips along C-470 are contained within the southwest quadrant of the metro area, with little demand to travel outside the area except to connect to I-70 or I-25. It is anticipated as the entire beltway system reaches full build out, and development exists along its entire length, trips between beltway segments will increase.

### 6.2.2 Forecasts and Traffic Operations Using Micro-simulation Model

Origin and destination matrices from the regional travel demand model were used as volume input into the simulation model, which was calibrated to mirror traffic operations for existing conditions along C-470. Various parameters including queue lengths, delays, and existing turning movement counts were used to compare and calibrate the dynamic assignment model in AIMSUN to produce results similar to existing conditions. Express lanes were introduced in the simulation model after calibrating the model for existing conditions.

The proportion of travelers using each section of the express lanes was calculated using the dynamic traffic assignment model in the AIMSUN micro-simulation program. The program uses dynamic traffic assignment algorithms to estimate the probability of travelers using a given route from a set of available routes between each origin and destination. The calculated probability is a function of a "utility" that is calculated for each route. The AIMSUN route choice model used is a discrete path choice model, referred to as the C-logit model, and is a variation of the multinomial logit model. The
model calculates the choice probability for a given route using the value of the utility of that path as compared to utilities of all other alternative paths.

The utility or the "cost function" can be defined by the user to include a combination of path variables. In this study, the cost function is defined as a combination of travel time and monetary costs as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { utility }=\text { travel time }+a \text { *monetary cost } \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The coefficient " $a$ " in the above equation is used to convert the monetary cost in dollars to travel time in minutes. This value can be estimated based on how much commuters value their travel times; that is, how much they are willing to pay in dollars to save in their travel times.

The value of the coefficient " $a$ " was estimated based on a model developed from results from the stated preference survey completed as part of the ELFS. The model was developed to estimate the monetary cost that the commuters are willing to pay to use the express lanes under different travel time conditions on the C-470 corridor. The model has the following format:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { time saved per mile }=\text { coefficient }{ }^{*} \text { cost per mile } \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The statistical analysis performed in the survey indicated that the following model produced the best fit for the data:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { time saved per mile ( minutes) }=10.019 \text { *cost per mile (dollars) } \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, the utility equation to decide on the route choice probability (Equation 1) was coded in the simulation model as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { utility }=\text { travel time }+10.019 \text { * monetary cost } \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Also, in the simulation model, monetary costs were assigned to express lane sections as follows:
express lane section monetary cost = express lane section length * cost per mile (5)

For all other segments, the monetary costs were set to zero so that the utility values for these segments were equal to the travel time on the segments.

The dynamic traffic assignment model assigned the number of trips to the express lanes based on the congestion levels in the general purpose lanes and how much these
travelers were willing to pay to avoid these congestion levels, according to Equation 4. During the calibration process, the number of express lane users projected by the simulation model was compared to the number of users derived from the responses in the stated preference survey. If necessary, the model parameters were refined to have the model more accurately reflect the survey results.

To determine the revenue generated from a given express lane cost per mile charge, the following equation was used:

## revenue $($ dollars $)=$ toll charged per vehicle per mile * EL VMT (6)

EL VMT in the above equation is the express lane vehicle mile traveled. Separate simulation runs were performed with different toll rates on the express lanes to determine the toll that produced the best traffic operations combined with the most users.

### 6.2.3 Calibration of AIMSUN Model

Various parameters including queue lengths, delays, and existing turning movement counts were used to compare and calibrate the dynamic assignment model in AIMSUN to produce results similar to existing conditions. All intersections in the study area were initially analyzed for the existing AM and PM peak volumes and for the existing laneage using the HCM methodologies to identify oversaturated movements and intersections.

Queue data were later collected for these pre-identified, oversaturated movements to measure queues and discharge volumes in the AM and PM peak period. Queue and discharge data were collected every 20 seconds for a minimum of 20 minutes, or 10 signal cycles, to obtain the queue build-up pattern, discharge rate for a specific movement, and queue length. These data, in conjunction with signal timing and phasing patterns were then used not only to verify existing counts but also to calibrate the model. Travel time data and spot traffic volume counts on C-470 were collected to calibrate the micro-simulation model and validate the data collected.

The micro-simulation model was developed using existing laneage, volume, speed, and signal timing information. The micro-simulation model was then calibrated by adjusting vehicle performance, link saturation flow rates, decision distances, and maximum allowable speeds for various turning movements such that the queue buildup patterns, travel speeds, discharge rates, and queue lengths observed in the microsimulation model were similar to those observed in the field.

Express lanes were introduced into the micro-simulation model after the existing conditions model had been calibrated, validated, and verified against existing
operational (field) conditions. The express lanes were introduced with an initially assumed toll rate and the pre-determined value of time to assess validity of traffic diverting into the express lanes. The express lane traffic volumes were then examined for reasonableness by using the pre-determined value of time and the delay or travel time savings (along C-470) that was being predicted by the micro-simulation model.

The micro-simulation model was further refined until equilibrium was achieved between the declared value of time, toll price, and projected travel time savings. This calibrated model was used as a basis for coding and analyzing the proposed future configurations.
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