

Attachment C

Existing Traffic Conditions and Needs Technical Report

February 2024







4.3.	Delay at Intersections					
4.4.	Queues					
5.	2050	No Action Conditions	48			
5.1.	Cha	anges Included in the 2050 No Action Scenario	48			
5.2.	Fut	ure Travel Demand	50			
5.3.	205	50 Microsimulation Traffic Volume Inputs	50			
5.4.	205	50 No Action Microsimulation Model Updates	54			
5.4.1.	Traffi	c Signal Timing Optimizations	55			
5.4.2.	Drive	r Behavior Parameter Refinements	55			
5.4.3.	4.3. Coding of Managed Lanes					
5.5.	205	50 No Action Microsimulation Model Results	56			
5.5.1. Serviced Volumes on Peña Boulevard						
5.5.2. Speeds Along Peña Boulevard 5						
5.5.3.	Delay	at Intersections	60			
5.5.4.	Queu	es	67			
5.5.4.1	L.	Queues at the 56th Avenue and Peña Boulevard Ramp Terminals	68			
5.5.4.2	2.	Queues Along Chambers Road between I-70 and 40th Avenue	69			
5.5.4.3	3.	Queues at the Tower Road and I-70 Ramp Terminals	70			
Refere	ences		71			
Appen	dix A.	Unbalanced Existing Conditions Turning Movement Counts (TMCs)	73			
Appen	idix B.	Balanced Existing Conditions TMCs	80			
Appen	dix C.	Microsimulation Model Calibration Results	87			
Appen	dix D.	Balanced 2050 No Build TMCs	88			

DEN

10

15

17

18

18

23

29

29

29

30

32

32

33

34

48

Table 2-1 – Daily Traffic Count Data Collection Locations and Dates Table 2-2 – Peak Hours and Peak Periods for the Traffic Analysis Table 2-3 – Peak Period Truck Percentages Table 2-4 – Vehicle Occupancy on Peña Boulevard Table 2-5 – Peak Period Travel Time Results Table 3-1 – Intersection Control Overview Table 3-2 – Vehicle Occupancy Distribution for Passenger Vehicles Table 3-3 – Generalized Truck Percentages Table 3-4 – Corridor Specific Truck Percentages Table 3-5 – Microsimulation Calibration Targets Table 3-6 – Customized Cooperative Lane Changing Parameters Table 3-7 – Calibration Results: Traffic Volume Table 3-8 – Calibration Results: Travel Time on Peña Boulevard Table 3-9 – Calibration Results: Travel Time on Major Corridors Other than Peña Boulevard

Figures

Tables

Figure 1-1 – Study Areas for the Peña Boulevard and Gateway Area	8
Figure 2-1 – Turning Movement Count Data Collection Locations	11
Figure 2-2 – Daily Traffic along Peña Boulevard	12
Figure 2-3 – Daily Freeway Ramp Traffic	13
Figure 2-4 – Daily Traffic on Local Roadways	13
Figure 2-5 – Hourly Weekday Volumes and Peak Periods on Peña Boulevard	14
Figure 2-6 – Hourly Weekday Volumes and Peak Periods on Local Roadways	15
Figure 2-7 – Daily Truck Volumes on Peña Boulevard	16
Figure 3-1 – Microsimulation Model Extents	22



Figure 3-2 – Corridor Traffic Volumes – AM Peak Hour	26	
Figure 3-3 – Corridor Traffic Volumes – Mid-day Peak Hour	27	
Figure 3-4 – Corridor Traffic Volumes – PM Peak Hour	28	
Figure 4-1 – Peña Boulevard Existing Conditions AM Peak Period Serviced Volumes	36	
Figure 4-2 – Peña Boulevard Existing Conditions PM Peak Period Serviced Volumes	37	
Figure 4-3 – Existing Conditions Speeds Along Peña Boulevard Inbound (Toward DEN)	38	
Figure 4-4 – Existing Conditions Speeds Along Peña Boulevard Outbound (Away from DEN)	39	
Figure 4-5 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: AM Peak (Intersections 1–35)	40	
Figure 4-6 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: AM Peak (Intersections 36–67)	41	
Figure 4-7 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: Mid-day Peak (Intersections 1–35)	42	
Figure 4-8 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: Mid-day Peak (Intersections 36–67)	43	
Figure 4-9 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: PM Peak (Intersections 1–35)	44	
Figure 4-10 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: PM Peak (Intersections 36–67)	45	
Figure 4-11 – Existing Conditions: AM Peak Period	46	
Figure 4-12 – Existing Conditions: Mid-day/PM Peak Period	47	
Figure 5-1 – 2050 No Action: Changes in the Network	50	
Figure 5-2 – 2050 No Action: Corridor Volumes: AM Peak Hour	52	
Figure 5-3 – 2050 No Action: Corridor Volumes: Mid-day Peak Hour	53	
Figure 5-4 – 2050 No Action: Corridor Volumes: PM Peak Hour	54	
Figure 5-5 – Peña Boulevard AM Peak Period Serviced Volumes	57	
Figure 5-6 – Peña Boulevard Mid-Day/PM Peak Period Serviced Volumes	57	
Figure 5-7 – 2050 No Action Speed Heat Map for Peña Boulevard Inbound (Toward DEN)	58	
Figure 5-8 – 2050 No Action Speed Heatmap for Peña Boulevard Outbound (Away from DEN	1)60	
Figure 5-9 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: 2050 No Action AM Peak (Intersection	ons 1–35) (61
Figure 5-10 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: 2050 No Action AM Peak (Intersect	ions 36–73)(62
Figure 5-11 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: 2050 No Action Mid-day Peak (Inte	rsections 1–3 63	5)



Figure 5-12 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: 2050 No Action Mid-day Peak (Intersections 36					
	64				
Figure 5-13 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: 2050 No Action PM Peak (Intersecti	ons 1–35)	65			
Figure 5-14 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: 2050 No Action PM Peak (Intersecti	ons 36–73)	66			
Figure 5-15 – Queue Analysis: 2050 No Action: AM Peak Model	67				
Figure 5-16 – Queue Analysis: 2050 No Action: Mid-day/PM Peak Model	68				

Acronyms

ADT	Average Daily Traffic
CCD	City and County of Denver
CDOT	Colorado Department of Transportation
DEN	Denver International Airport
DOTI	Department of Transportation and Infrastructure
DRCOG	Denver Regional Council of Governments
EB	Eastbound
Gateway Study	Denver Moves Gateway Area Travel Study
GP	General-Purpose
GVR	Green Valley Ranch
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
НОТ	High-Occupancy Toll
LOS	Level of Service
MOE	Measure of Effectiveness
NB	Northbound
NCHRP	National Cooperative Highway Research Program
Peña Boulevard Study	Peña Boulevard Transportation and Mobility Master Plan Study
PPV	Person Per Vehicle
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
SB	Southbound
ТМС	Turning Movement Count
TDM	Travel Demand Model
TRB	Transportation Research Bureau
VPD	Vehicle Per Day
WB	Westbound





1. Introduction

Denver International Airport (DEN) scoped the Peña Boulevard Transportation and Mobility Master Plan Study (Peña Boulevard Study) to investigate potential improvements in mobility and safety along Peña Boulevard for passengers, employees, freight, and visitors and to future-proof Peña Boulevard to accommodate DEN growth and development. The City and County of Denver's (CCD) Department of Transportation and Infrastructure (DOTI) simultaneously scoped the Denver Moves Gateway Area Travel Study (Gateway Study) to better understand the travel demands and needs in the Gateway Area, with more recent changes in land usage, current/planned transit services, current/planned bike network, and growing traffic volumes. DEN and DOTI recognized that there was significant overlap between the two studies and agreed to combine them into one study, co-managed by these two agencies.

The study areas for both the Peña Boulevard Study and the Gateway Study are in Figure 1-1. Given the desire to understand linkages between Peña Boulevard and local transportation facilities within the Gateway Study area, all traffic analyses were completed using a single, expanded traffic analysis area that encompassed the limits of both studies. The boundary of this traffic analysis area is also in Figure 1-1.



Figure 1-1 – Study Areas for the Peña Boulevard and Gateway Area



The combined study area spans the jurisdictions of CCD and the City of Aurora. The proposed solutions for Peña Boulevard and the Gateway Area will be developed holistically to ensure they complement each other and provide regional benefits by considering other plans for the area, such as the *Advancing Adams Comprehensive Plan* (Adams, 2022), *Aurora Places: Planning Tomorrow's City* (Aurora, 2018a), the draft *Commerce City 2045 Comprehensive Plan*, CCD's *Far Northeast Area Plan* (CCD, 2019), and City of Aurora's *Northeast Area Transportation Study* (Aurora, 2018b).

This report documents the existing traffic conditions within the study area based on collected traffic count data and subsequent microsimulation traffic modeling and documents future forecasted operations of the roadway network. The information presented within this report builds upon information presented in previous study documents. A list of these documents is below. Relevant information from these documents is repeated within this report, as needed, and references to these documents are made throughout this report.

- Peña Boulevard Transportation and Mobility Master Plan Study Data Collection Plan Memorandum (May 2022)
- Peña Boulevard Study and Gateway Study Traffic Modeling Methodology and Land Use Assessment Memorandum (September 2022)
- Peña Boulevard Master Plan Study Vehicle Occupancy Data Results Memorandum (May 2023)

Information presented within this report will be used to develop and evaluate potential build alternatives and to address the identified needs. The results of this alternative analysis process will be documented in future reports.

2. Summary of Data Collection and Analysis

To support the traffic analysis, in-field data was collected and reviewed. This data included information on vehicle volumes and classifications, turning movements at intersections, vehicle occupancy, and corridor travel times. The findings of the data collection effort, as they relate to the traffic analysis, are presented within this chapter. Additional evaluation of the data, including an analysis of historical traffic volumes and travel patterns, are provided in the *Peña Boulevard Transportation and Mobility Master Plan and Denver Moves Gateway Area Travel Study Data Collection Summary and Existing Conditions Report* (September 2022).

2.1. Volumes

Average daily traffic (ADT) counts with vehicle classifications for all major roadways and tuning movement counts at all signalized intersections within the traffic analysis area were collected. The details about locations and dates of daily traffic count collection are in Table 2-1. All TMCs were collected during both AM (7:00 AM and 9:00 AM) and mid-day/PM (2:30 PM to 6:30 PM) peak periods on either Thursday, May 19, 2022, or Thursday, May 26, 2022. The location of all TMC data collection points is in Figure 2-1.



ID	Location	Source	Date of Data Collection
1	Chambers Road south of Green Valley Ranch (GVR) Boulevard	In-Field Counts	Wednesday, May 18, 2022 – Friday, May 20, 2022
2	Tower Road north of 56th Avenue	In-Field Counts	Wednesday, May 25, 2022 – Friday, May 27, 2022
3	64th Avenue east of Gaylord Rockies Boulevard	In-Field Counts	Wednesday, May 25, 2022 – Friday, May 27, 2022
4	Eastbound I-70 off-ramp to northbound Airport Boulevard	In-Field Counts	Wednesday, June 8, 2022 – Friday, June 10, 2022
5	Westbound I-70 off-ramp to southbound Airport Boulevard	In-Field Counts	Wednesday, June 8, 2022 – Friday, June 10, 2022
6	Southbound E-470 off-ramp to eastbound Peña Boulevard	In-Field Counts	Wednesday, June 1, 2022 – Friday, June 3, 2022
7	Northbound E-470 off-ramp to westbound Peña Boulevard	In-Field Counts	Wednesday, June 8, 2022 – Friday, June 10, 2022
8	Northbound E-470 to eastbound Peña Boulevard	In-Field Counts	Wednesday, June 1, 2022 – Friday, June 3, 2022
9	Westbound Peña Boulevard off-ramp to southbound E-470	In-Field Counts	Wednesday, June 8, 2022 – Friday, June 10, 2022
10	Eastbound Peña Boulevard to northbound E-470	In-Field Counts	Wednesday, June 1, 2022 – Friday, June 3, 2022
11	Peña Boulevard between I-70 and 40th Avenue	Permanent Count Station	June 2022
12	Peña Boulevard between 40th Avenue and GVR Boulevard	Permanent Count Station	June 2022
13	Peña Boulevard between GVR Boulevard and 56th Avenue	Permanent Count Station	June 2022
14	Peña Boulevard between 56th Avenue and Tower Road	Permanent Count Station	June 2022
15	Peña Boulevard between Tower Road and E-470	Permanent Count Station	June 2022

Table 2-1 – Daily Traffic Count Data Collection Locations and Dates



Figure 2-1 – Turning Movement Count Data Collection Locations





2.1.1. Link Volumes

The average daily traffic on Peña Boulevard ranges between approximately 101,900 vehicles per day (vpd) and 136,750 vpd, with the highest volumes observed between E-470 and Jackson Gap, and the lowest volumes observed between Tower Road and E-470. Figure 2-2 shows the variation in ADT along Peña Boulevard.





Note: The DEN counter on southbound Peña Boulevard between GVR Boulevard and 56th Avenue was out of commission during June 2022.

Of the observed ramps, freeway ramp volumes show that the ramp from eastbound I-70 to Peña Boulevard carries the most traffic (approximately 42,600 vpd). At the E-470 and Peña Boulevard interchange, ramps carry between approximately 500 vpd and 9,900 vpd. Data shows that more traffic enters Peña Boulevard from southbound E-470 than from northbound E-470. Observed ramp volumes are in Figure 2-3.

Pena Blvd



Daily traffic on local roadways ranges between approximately 3,600 vpd on 64th Avenue and 26,500 vpd on 56th Avenue. Figure 2-4 shows daily traffic on these facilities.

EB I-70 Ramp to SB E-470 Ramp SB E-470 Ramp NB E-470 Ramp NB E-470 Ramp EB Pena Blvd to to WB Pena Blvd to EB Pena Blvd to EB Pena Blvd to WB Pena Blvd





Note: Percentages shown indicate the directional split in traffic.

NB E-470



2.1.2. Peak Hours

Hourly weekday traffic data along Peña Boulevard shows two distinct patterns (Figure 2-5). Along the southern/western end of the corridor (between approximately I-70 and 56th Avenue), traffic follows a typical commuting pattern with morning and evening peak periods. This pattern is observed in both northbound/eastbound (inbound) and southbound/westbound (outbound) directions. The second pattern is observed along the northern/eastern portion of the corridor closer to the airport. In this location, inbound traffic peaks earlier in the morning as compared to the rest of the corridor (around 5:00 AM), and outbound traffic peaks in the middle of the day (around approximately 1:00 PM). This location experiences a different travel pattern as compared to the southern/western portion of the corridor due to its proximity to DEN. Given that almost all traffic on Peña Boulevard east of E-470 is headed to DEN, traffic patterns in this location are highly influenced by work shifts and flight schedules at DEN.





Note: The DEN counter on southbound Peña Boulevard between GVR Boulevard and 56th Avenue was out of commission during June 2022.





Figure 2-6 – Hourly Weekday Volumes and Peak Periods on Local Roadways

It should be noted that peak periods for Peña Boulevard do not perfectly match peak periods for local roadways. For the purposes of the traffic analysis, peak periods used in the analysis were chosen to best capture peaks on both facilities, to the maximum extent possible. These peak periods are in Table 2-2. Given that the mid-day peak period does not fully recover before the start of the PM peak period, these two peaks have been combined into a mid-day/PM peak period for the purpose of traffic analysis.

Time of Day	Peak Hour	Peak Period
AM	7:00 AM – 8:00 AM	7:00 AM – 9:00 AM
Mid-day	2:30 PM – 3:30 PM	2:30 PM – 6:30 PM
PM	5:00 PM – 6:00 PM	2:30 PM – 6:30 PM

Table 2-2 – Peak Hours and Peak Periods for the Traffic Analysis

2.1.3. Truck Percentages

Vehicle classifications were reviewed to obtain truck percentages along major corridors within the study area. Along local roadways, vehicle classification data was collected at the same time as vehicle volume data. However, on Peña Boulevard, automated traffic counters were not fully functional during the June 2022 data collection period and therefore, only collected volume data and not vehicle classification data. To complete the truck percentage analysis for Peña Boulevard, additional data was reviewed from count stations along Peña Boulevard



for Friday, November 4, 2022. During this time, the counters had been corrected and vehicle classification data was available.

Daily truck volumes on Peña Boulevard range between approximately 6,700 trucks per day and 12,400 trucks per day, which represents between 6 percent and 10 percent of daily traffic on Peña Boulevard depending on location and direction. Figure 2-7 shows truck volumes along Peña Boulevard.





Note: Truck data for inbound Peña Boulevard between I-70 and 40th Avenue was not available because of the in-field automated counter being nonfunctional during the data collection period.

Table 2-3 summarizes truck percentages for different facilities within the traffic analysis area. Note, for Peña Boulevard where data was available for multiple locations, truck data was averaged across various locations to provide a corridor wide average.



Location	Period	Single-unit Trucks	Multi-unit Trucks	Total
Chambers Road south of Green Valley Ranch (GVR) Boulevard	AM	5%	4%	9%
Chambers Road south of Green Valley Ranch (GVR) Boulevard	PM	4%	4%	8%
Tower Road north of 56th Avenue	AM	7%	7%	14%
Tower Road north of 56th Avenue	PM	4%	6%	11%
64th Avenue east of Gaylord Rockies Boulevard	AM	8%	11%	19%
64th Avenue east of Gaylord Rockies Boulevard	PM	4%	13%	17%
Inbound Peña Boulevard *	AM	9%	1%	10%
Inbound Peña Boulevard *	PM	9%	1%	10%
Outbound Peña Boulevard *	AM	6%	1%	7%
Outbound Peña Boulevard *	PM	6%	1%	7%

Table 2-3 – Peak Period Truck Percentages

* Averaged over 5 locations on Peña: (1) between I-70 and 40th Avenue, (2) between 40th Avenue and GVR Boulevard, (3) between GVR Boulevard and 56th Avenue, (4) between 56th Avenue and Tower Road, and (5) between Tower Road and E-470.

2.1.4. Turning Movement Counts

TMC data was collected at all major intersections within the study area on either Thursday, May 19, 2022, or Thursday, May 26, 2022, during both AM and PM peak periods. This data is summarized in Appendix D of this report.

2.2. Vehicle Occupancy on Peña Boulevard

Vehicle occupancy data was collected on Peña Boulevard on November 10, 2022, between 6:00 AM and 5:00 PM at two locations:

Peña Boulevard between 40th Avenue and GVR Boulevard

Peña Boulevard between E-470 and Gun Club Road

The results of this data collection effort are in Table 2-4. This data indicates that vehicle occupancy is slightly higher on Peña Boulevard between E-470 and Gun Club Road than it is on Peña Boulevard between 40th Avenue and GVR Boulevard. This pattern indicates that airport bound vehicle traffic has an overall higher occupancy than of non-airport bound traffic within the study area. Additional details about this occupancy data collection effort



can be found in the *Peña Boulevard Transportation Master Plan Vehicle Occupancy Data Results Memorandum* (May 2023).

Location	Direction	1 Occupant	2 Occupants	3+ Occupants
Peña Boulevard Between 40th Ave. and Green Valley Ranch	Inbound	57.3%	38%	4.7%
Peña Boulevard Between 40th Ave. and Green Valley Ranch	Outbound	58.2%	36.1%	5.7%
Peña Boulevard Between E-470 and Gun Club Rd	Inbound	57.4%	36.6%	6%
Peña Boulevard Between E-470 and Gun Club Rd	Outbound	54.8%	37.9%	7.3%
Average	Both	57%	37%	6%

Table 2-4 – Vehicle Occupancy on Peña Boulevard

2.3. Corridor Travel Times

Multiple travel time runs were conducted within the study area on Wednesday, November 2, 2022, and Thursday, November 3, 2022, using the floating car methodology. Travel times were collected for each major roadway during the AM peak period and the mid-day/PM peak period. Along Peña Boulevard, three travel time runs were taken in each direction. On local roadways, between one run and three runs were taken in each direction depending on local conditions. For example, along 64th Avenue, no congestion was observed during travel time runs, and therefore, only a single run in each direction was collected.

Table 2-5 summarizes the results from this effort. Note: Reported travel times represent the average of all runs collected.

Roadway	Direction	From	То	Distance	Period	Average Travel Time (minutes)
Peña Boulevard	Inbound (NB/EB)	40th Avenue on-ramp	Gun Club Road off- ramp	6.7 miles	AM	6.4
Peña Boulevard	Inbound (NB/EB)	40th Avenue on-ramp	Gun Club Road off- ramp	6.7 miles	PM	6.1

Table 2-5 – Peak Period Travel Time Results



Roadway	Direction	From	То	Distance	Period	Average Travel Time (minutes)
Peña Boulevard	Outbound (WB/SB)	Gun Club Road on- ramp	40th Avenue off-ramp	6.6 miles	AM	9.8
Peña Boulevard	Outbound (WB/SB)	Gun Club Road on- ramp	40th Avenue off-ramp	6.6 miles	PM	11.7
64th Avenue	EB	Tower Road	Himalaya Street	1.0 mile	AM	1.6
64th Avenue	EB	Tower Road	Himalaya Street	1.0 mile	PM	1.8
64th Avenue	WB	Himalaya Street	Tower Road	1.0 mile	AM	1.6
64th Avenue	WB	Himalaya Street	Tower Road	1.0 mile	PM	1.8
56th Avenue	EB	Chambers Road	Dunkirk Street	2.4 miles	AM	4.0
56th Avenue	EB	Chambers Road	Dunkirk Street	2.4 miles	PM	5.7
56th Avenue	WB	Dunkirk Street	Chambers Road	2.4 miles	AM	5.3
56th Avenue	WB	Dunkirk Street	Chambers Road	2.4 miles	PM	5.2
Green Valley Ranch Boulevard	EB	Chambers Road	Himalaya Street	3.9 miles	AM	5.8
Green Valley Ranch Boulevard	EB	Chambers Road	Himalaya Street	3.9 miles	PM	8.9
Green Valley Ranch Boulevard	WB	Himalaya Street	Chambers Road	3.9 miles	AM	6.6
Green Valley Ranch Boulevard	WB	Himalaya Street	Chambers Road	3.9 miles	PM	8.4



Roadway	Direction	From	То	Distance	Period	Average Travel Time (minutes)
40th Avenue	EB	Chambers Road	Tower Road	2.0 miles	AM	4.5
40th Avenue	EB	Chambers Road	Tower Road	2.0 miles	PM	4.4
40th Avenue	WB	Tower Road	Chambers Road	2.0 miles	AM	5.6
40th Avenue	WB	Tower Road	Chambers Road	2.0 miles	PM	5.3
Chambers Road	NB	40th Avenue	56th Avenue	1.7 miles	AM	4.2
Chambers Road	NB	40th Avenue	56th Avenue	1.7 miles	PM	3.2
Chambers Road	SB	56th Avenue	40th Avenue	1.7 miles	AM	5.5
Chambers Road	SB	56th Avenue	40th Avenue	1.7 miles	PM	3.2
Tower Road	NB	32nd Avenue	Peña Boulevard	5.1 miles	AM	9.3
Tower Road	NB	32nd Avenue	Peña Boulevard	5.1 miles	PM	12.5
Tower Road	SB	Peña Boulevard	32nd Avenue	5.1 miles	AM	12.2
Tower Road	SB	Peña Boulevard	32nd Avenue	5.1 miles	PM	18.0



3. Existing Conditions Traffic Analysis

Existing traffic operations were evaluated by using PTV's VISSIM[®] 2022 microsimulation traffic analysis software. This chapter documents the details of the following: (1) the building/coding process of the microsimulation model, (2) the microsimulation model calibration and validation process and results, and (3) microsimulation model results.

3.1. Development of the Base Year Model

To evaluate the existing roadway operations, a base year 2022 model was developed. Based on collected traffic data, three time periods of the day were chosen to be modeled, reflecting various volume peaks: AM (6:30 AM - 9:00 AM), mid-day (2:30 PM - 3:30 PM) and PM (3:30 PM - 6:00 PM). Given that congestion in the mid-day peak period continues to build and influence congestion occurring in the following PM peak period, it was decided to model both periods within a single model to capture spillover effects of congestion starting in the mid-day period and continuing to build into the PM peak period. Therefore, two time periods were evaluated for existing 2022 conditions, including an AM peak period model (6:30 AM - 9:00 AM) and a combined mid-day/PM peak period model (2:00 PM - 7:00 PM).

3.2. Traffic Analysis Extents

Major links were included in the model with intersections along those major links. A list of the links included in the microsimulation analysis is below and in Figure 3-1. Peña Boulevard from I-70 to east of Gun Club Road and all interchanges along its length.

- I-70 between Chambers Road and Tower Road
- Chambers Road between I-70 and 56th Avenue
- Tower Road between I-70 and Peña Boulevard
- 64th Avenue between E-470 and Tower Road
- 56th Avenue between Chambers Road and Dunkirk Street
- GVR Boulevard between Chambers Road and Himalaya Road
- 40th Avenue between Chambers Road and Tower Road





Figure 3-1 – Microsimulation Model Extents

3.2.1. Geometry of the Model

Roadways in the microsimulation network, including turn-bays and intersection configurations, were coded based on existing satellite imagery. The primary purpose of the traffic model was to understand vehicular operations, and therefore, pedestrian walkways, bike paths, and bus stops were not explicitly modeled.

3.2.2. Intersection Control

Table 3-1 summarizes the intersections and how they are configured in the microsimulation model. Traffic signals were coded into the model based on DOTI's existing signal timing plans.



Intersection Name	Control Type	Intersection Name	Control Type
I-70 & Chambers Rd. (EB Ramp)	Signalized	54th Ave. & SB Tower Rd.	One-Way Stop Controlled
I-70 & Chambers Rd. (WB Ramp)	Signalized	54th Ave. & NB Tower Rd.	One-Way Stop Controlled
40th Ave. & Chambers Rd.	Signalized	57th Ave. & Tower Rd.	One-Way Stop Controlled
Andrews Dr. & Chambers Rd.	Signalized	59th Ave. & Tower Rd.	One-Way Stop Controlled
46th Ave. & Chambers Rd.	Signalized	60th Ave. & Tower Rd.	Signalized
Bolling Dr. & Chambers	Two-Way Stop Controlled	61st Ave. & Tower Rd.	Signalized
GVR Blvd. & Chambers Rd.	Signalized	64th Ave & Tower Rd.	Signalized
53rd Ave. & Chambers Rd.	Signalized	65th Ave. & Tower Rd.	Two-Way Stop Controlled
Maxwell Pl. & Chambers Rd.	Signalized	66th Ave. & Tower Rd.	Two-Way Stop Controlled
56th Ave. & Chambers Rd.	Signalized	High Point Blvd. & Tower Rd.	Signalized
56th Ave. & Laredo St.	One-Way Stop Controlled	68th Ave. & Tower Rd.	One-Way Stop Controlled
56th Ave. & Memphis St.	One-Way Stop Controlled	69th Ave. & Tower Rd.	Two-Way Stop Controlled
56th Ave. & Peña Blvd. (SB Ramp)	Signalized	71st Ave. & Tower Rd.	Signalized
56th Ave. & Peña Blvd. (NB Ramp)	Signalized	Peña Blvd. (EB Ramp) & Tower Rd.	Signalized
56th Ave. & Telluride St.	One-Way Stop Controlled	Peña Blvd. (WB Ramp) & Tower Rd.	Signalized
56th Ave. & Tower Rd.	Signalized	64th Ave. & Argonne St.	Two-Way Stop Controlled
56th Ave. & Argonne St.	Signalized	64th Ave. & Dunkirk St.	Two-Way Stop Controlled
56th Ave. & Cathay St.	One-Way Stop Controlled	64th Ave. & Fundy St.	Two-Way Stop Controlled

Table 3-1 – Intersection Control Overview



Intersection Name	Control Type		Intersection Name	Control Type
56th Ave. & Dunkirk St.	Signalized		64th Ave. & Himalaya Rd.	Two-Way Stop Controlled
40th Ave. & Andrews Dr.	Two-Way Stop Controlled		64th Ave. & Gaylord Rockies Blvd.	Signalized
40th Ave. & Kittredge St.	Signalized		64th Ave. & Lisbon St.	Two-Way Stop Controlled
40th Ave. & Lewiston St.	Two-Way Stop Controlled 64th Ave. & Picadilly Rd.		One-Way Stop Controlled	
40th Ave. & Airport Way	Signalized 64th Ave. & E-470 (SB Ramps)		One-Way Stop Controlled	
40th Ave. & Peña Blvd. (SB Ramp)	Signalized	Signalized 64th Ave. & E-470 (NB Ramp)		One-Way Stop Controlled
40th Ave. & Peña Blvd. (NB Ramp)	Signalized		GVR Blvd. & Kittredge St.	Two-Way Stop Controlled
40th Ave. & Salida St.	Signalized GVR Blvd. & Memphis St.		Signalized	
40th Ave. & Walden St.	One-Way Stop Controlled		GVR Blvd. & Airport Blvd.	One-Way Stop Controlled
40th Ave./38th Ave. & Tower Rd.	Signalized		GVR Blvd. & Peña Blvd. (NB Ramp)	Signalized
Salida St. & Tower Rd.	Signalized G		GVR Blvd. & Telluride St.	Signalized
32nd Ave. & Tower Rd.	Signalized	alized GVR Blvd. & Walden St.		HAWK
I-70 (WB Ramp) & Tower Rd.	Signalized	alized GVR Blvd. & Yampa St.		Signalized
I-70 (EB Ramp) & Tower Rd.	Signalized		GVR Blvd. & Andes Ct.	Two-Way Stop Controlled
43rd Ave. & Tower Rd.	Signalized		GVR Blvd. & Argonne St.	Signalized
45th Ave. & Tower Rd.	Signalized		GVR Blvd. and Ceylon St.	One-Way Stop Controlled
46th Ave. & Tower Rd.	One-Way Stop Controlled		GVR Blvd. & Flanders Way	Signalized
47th Ave. & Tower Rd.	Signalized		GVR Blvd. & Genoa St.	One-Way Stop Controlled
GVR Blvd. & Tower Rd.	Signalized		GVR Blvd. & 48th Dr.	One-Way Stop Controlled
49th Ave. & Tower Rd.	Signalized		GVR Blvd. & Himalaya Rd.	Signalized



Intersection Name	Control Type		Intersection Name	Control Type
51st Ave. & Tower Rd.	Two-Way Stop Controlled		I-70 (WB Ramp) & SB Airport Blvd.	Signalized
Elmendorf Dr. & Tower Rd.	Two-Way Stop Controlled		I-70 (EB Ramp) & Airport Blvd.	Uncontrolled

3.2.3. Loading the Microsimulation Model

Microsimulation models were loaded by using balanced TMC volumes at each intersection. These balanced TMC inputs were created by taking the in-field TMC data (discussed in Chapter 0 of this report) and adjusting the values between adjacent intersections to balance the network. In general, left-turning and right-turning movements remained constant at all intersections, and, where needed, through volumes were adjusted to achieve a balanced network. The resulting balanced corridor volumes for Peña Boulevard for each peak hour are in Figure 3-2 through Figure 3-4. Balanced TMC diagrams for local roadways are in Appendix B. Balanced Existing Conditions TMCs of this report.



Figure 3-2 – Corridor Traffic Volumes – AM Peak Hour







Figure 3-3 – Corridor Traffic Volumes – Mid-day Peak Hour





3.2.3.1. Vehicle Occupancy within the Microsimulation Model

The regional travel demand model was used to determine an overall vehicle occupancy distribution for the peak period within the microsimulation model. These occupancy values used are in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2 – Vehicle Occupancy Distribution for Passenger Vehicles

Peak Period	SOV	HOV2	HOV3+	Average Occupancy*
AM	75%	16%	9%	1.4 ppv
PM	80%	15%	5%	1.3 ppv

*ppv = persons per vehicle

3.2.3.2. Truck Volumes within the Microsimulation Model

Microsimulation model extents included multiple, connected corridors, and so it was not possible to set specific truck percentages to each corridor. Instead, truck volumes were loaded by using a two-step approach to best reflect in-field conditions. First, a global truck percentage was established for different facility types. These values shown in Table 3-3 were synthesized based on in-field data collection and agreed to by both DEN and DOTI.

Table 3-3 – Generalized Truck Percentages

Location	Period	Single-unit Trucks	Multi-unit Trucks	Total
Arterials and Driveways	AM	5%	4%	9%
Arterials and Driveways	PM	4%	4%	8%

Specific truck percentages were also assigned to entry nodes of major corridors to get corridor truck percentages as close to in-field observations (shown in Table 3-4).

Table 3-4 – Corridor Specific Truck Percentages

Location	Period	Single-unit Trucks	Multi-unit Trucks	Total
Chambers Road south of Green Valley Ranch (GVR) Boulevard	AM	5%	4%	9%
Chambers Road south of Green Valley Ranch (GVR) Boulevard	PM	4%	4%	8%
Tower Road north of 56th Avenue	AM	7%	7%	14%
Tower Road north of 56th Avenue	PM	4%	6%	11%
64th Avenue east of Gaylord Rockies Boulevard	AM	8%	11%	19%



Location	Period	Single-unit Trucks	Multi-unit Trucks	Total
64th Avenue east of Gaylord Rockies Boulevard	PM	4%	13%	17%
Inbound Peña Boulevard *	AM	9%	1%	10%
Inbound Peña Boulevard *	PM	9%	1%	10%
Outbound Peña Boulevard *	AM	6%	1%	7%
Outbound Peña Boulevard *	PM	6%	1%	7%

3.3. Microsimulation Model Calibration

This section documents the microsimulation model calibration process, including the list of adjustments made, the specific location of these adjustments, the rationale behind these adjustments, and calibration results.

3.3.1. Calibration Measures and Targets

The *Peña Boulevard Transportation and Mobility Master Plan* and *Denver Moves Gateway Area Travel Study Traffic Modeling Methodology and Land Use Assessment Memorandum* framework were used to perform the calibration process. The 2018 CDOT Traffic Analysis and Forecasting Guidelines methodology was followed to ensure adequate calibration. This approach uses both traffic volumes and travel times for calibration. The respective calibration targets are in Table 3-5.

	-			
Microsimulation Model Calibration Targets				
Simulated Traffic Volume Served 85% of network links, or additional critical links or	 For < 100 vph, within ± 20% of observed traffic volumes 			
movements as determined, must meet the calibration target.	• For 100 to 1,000 vph, within ± 15% of observed traffic volumes			
	 For 1,000 to 5,000 vph, within ± 10% of observed traffic volumes 			
	 For > 5,000 vph, within 5% of observed traffic volumes 			
Simulated Travel Times (Segments/Links)	• For >7mins, within ± 15%,			
85% of network links or additional critical links or movements as, must meet the calibration target.	 Else, within 60 seconds 			

Table 3-5 – Microsimulation Calibration Targets

Source: 2018 CDOT Traffic Analysis and Forecasting Guidelines

3.3.2. Parameters Modified for Calibration

To calibrate the microsimulation model, certain parameters needed adjustments. These included adjustments to lane-changing distance and general driver behavior. Each of these is discussed in the following sections.



3.3.2.1. Lane-Change Distance

The "lane-change distance" feature allows VISSIM[®] to decide how far ahead a vehicle needs to get into a particular lane to make a required downstream-turning movement.

The default value within VISSIM for this parameter is 656 feet. This value was adjusted in certain locations. First, because of queues observed within the existing conditions model, the default value sometimes led to vehicles waiting too long to drive into the appropriate lane. If queues extended beyond approximately 600 feet, then vehicles would not try to change lanes until after the queue formed. This resulted in vehicles stopping in adjacent lanes and causing grid-lock conditions. It was observed that when long queues begin to form in the field, drivers tend to pre-position themselves well in advance in anticipation of the queue. Therefore, where such extended queues were observed, the default lane-changing distance was increased. This increase varied by location and observed queue length, but no location exceeded a lane-changing distance of 2,650 feet (or approximately 0.5 miles).

The second rationale for adjusting the lane-changing parameter was for locations with closely spaced intersections. In these instances, the default lane-changing distance was observed to exceed the length of the link. To avoid this, the lane changing distance was reduced. This reduction varied based on site-specific conditions, but no location had a lane-changing distance less than 400 feet.

3.3.2.2. General Driver Behavior

The car-following mode parameters dictate the driving behavior of vehicles in the model. By default, the Urban (motorized) setting using the *Wiedemann 74* approach was applied to all local roadways. For freeway facilities (i.e., Peña Boulevard and I-70), the default *Wiedemann 99* was applied.

Using these default values, it was observed that atypical queueing was occurring at on-ramp merge points within mainline freeways. At these locations, vehicles coming from on-ramps could not find sufficient gaps in traffic flow to enter the mainline freeway and were therefore coming to a stop onto the on-ramp.

To account for this behavior, a customized, cooperative lane-changing driver behavior was created. This modified behavior increased the allowable deceleration and speed differentials to better reflect in-field observations (Table 3-6). All modifications were made within limits set by the *2023 Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) Traffic Analysis and Forecasting Guidelines*. This modified set of parameters was applied to all freeway merge locations within the microsimulation model. This resulted in smoother merging behavior and eliminating vehicles coming to a stop onto on-ramps at merge locations.



Table 3-6 – Customized Cooperative Lane Changing Parameters	Fable 3-6 – Customized	Cooperative Lane	Changing Parameters
---	------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

	Parameter	Default Value on Freeways	Modified Value on Freeways
Maximum Deceleration (ft/s²)	Leading Vehicle (called "own" vehicle in VISSIM)	13.12	15.00
Maximum Deceleration (ft/s ²)	Trailing Vehicle	9.84	12.00
Maximum Deceleration (ft/s²)	Cooperative Braking	9.84	12.00
Maximum speed difference for lane change (mph)		6.71	10.00

3.3.3. Microsimulation Calibration Results

Table 3-7 shows calibration targets for all model time periods, including both freeway and non-freeway links. Additional details for each individual link are in Microsimulation Model Calibration Results of this report.

Table 3-7 – Calibration Results. Harrie Volume	Table 3	3-7 –	Calibration	Results:	Traffic	Volume
--	---------	-------	-------------	-----------------	---------	--------

Simulated traffic volume criteria	Model Time Period	Percentage of network meeting the criteria (target: 85% or higher)
 For < 100 vph, within ± 20% of observed traffic volumes For 100 to 1,000 vph, within ± 15% of observed traffic volumes 	AM	95%
 For 1,000 to 5,000 vph, within ± 10% of observed traffic volumes For > 5,000 vph, within 5% of observed traffic volumes 	Mid-day and PM	98%

Note: Cells highlighted in green indicate that the relevant calibration target was met.

Travel times calibration targets required 85 percent of all links to be either within 15 percent of observed travel times (for travel times greater than seven minutes) or within 60 seconds (for travel times less than seven minutes). Table 3-8 and Table 3-9 show the model achieved this criterion for both Peña Boulevard (100 percent of links meeting target) and local roadways (86 percent of links meeting targets).



Model Time Period	Travel Time Segment	Field Travel Time (minutes)	Model Travel Time (minutes)	Criteria Satisfying Range (minutes)	Criteria Met?
AM Peak	Inbound Peña	6.4	6.7	5.4–7.4	Yes
AM Peak	Outbound Peña	9.8	8.8	8.33–11.27	Yes
Mid-day/PM Peak	Inbound Peña	6.1	6.9	5.1–7.1	Yes
Mid-day/PM Peak	Outbound Peña	11.7	11.4	9.95–13.45	Yes

Table 3-8 – Calibration Results: Travel Time on Peña Boulevard

				AM Peak Period				Mid-Day & PM Peak Period				
Street Name	Start	End	Direction	Field Time (s)	VISSIM Time (s)	Calibration Range (s)	Criteria Met?	Field Time (s)	VISSIM Time (s)	Calibration Range (s)	Criteria Met?	
56th Ave.	Chambers Rd.	Peña SB Ramps	EB	99.0	120.6	39–159	Yes	132.5	117.6	72.5–192.5	Yes	
56th Ave.	Peña SB Ramps	Tower Rd.	EB	98.0	126.4	38–158	Yes	148.5	133.3	88.5–208.5	Yes	
56th Ave.	Tower Rd.	Dunkirk Rd.	EB	44.0	58.2	0–104	Yes	59.5	50.2	0–119.5	Yes	
56th Ave.	Dunkirk Rd.	Tower Rd.	WB	89.0	174.5	29–149	No	96.7	106.4	36.7–156.7	Yes	
56th Ave.	Tower Rd.	Peña SB Ramps	WB	94.0	153.3	34–154	Yes	92.3	119.7	32.3–152.3	Yes	
56th Ave.	Peña SB Ramps	Chambers Rd.	WB	133.0	118.8	73–193	Yes	121.0	116.5	61–181	Yes	
GVR	Chambers Rd.	Peña SB Ramps	EB	130.0	123.9	70–190	Yes	115.0	114.0	55–175	Yes	
GVR	Peña SB Ramps	Tower Rd.	EB	125.0	194.6	65–185	No	286.5	206.3	226.5-346.5	No	
GVR	Tower Rd.	Himalaya Rd.	EB	93.0	113.6	33–153	Yes	134.0	109.7	74–194	Yes	
GVR	Himalaya Rd.	Tower Rd.	WB	142.0	151.6	82–202	Yes	123.0	152.1	63–183	Yes	
GVR	Tower Rd.	Peña SB Ramps	WB	115.0	144.9	55–175	Yes	238.0	139.8	178–298	No	
GVR	Peña SB Ramps	Chambers Rd.	WB	139.0	139.6	79–199	Yes	143.5	143.2	83.5–203.5	Yes	
40th Ave.	Chambers Rd.	Peña SB Ramps	EB	128.0	155.2	68–188	Yes	126.0	149.7	66–186	Yes	
40th Ave.	Peña SB Ramps	Tower Rd.	EB	140.0	160.3	80–200	Yes	136.0	168.7	76–196	Yes	
40th Ave.	Tower Rd.	Peña SB Ramps	WB	186.0	135.1	126–246	Yes	133.0	139.5	73–193	Yes	
40th Ave.	Peña SB Ramps	Chambers Rd.	WB	151.0	184.3	91–211	Yes	182.0	167.4	122–242	Yes	
64th Ave.	Tower Rd.	Dunkirk Rd.	EB	51.0	55.3	0–111	Yes	53.0	55.2	0–113	Yes	
64th Ave.	Dunkirk Rd.	Himalaya Rd.	EB	47.0	44.6	0–107	Yes	56.0	44.4	0–116	Yes	
64th Ave.	Himalaya Rd.	Dunkirk Rd.	WB	46.0	45.9	0–106	Yes	58.0	45.1	0–118	Yes	
64th Ave.	Himalaya Rd.	Tower Rd.	WB	47.0	100.3	0–107	Yes	48.0	98.3	0–108	Yes	
Chambers Rd.	40th Ave.	GVR Blvd.	NB	73.0	79.6	13–133	Yes	69.0	79.6	9–129	Yes	
Chambers Rd.	GVR Blvd.	56th Ave.	NB	181.0	157.4	121–241	Yes	120.0	160.7	60–180	Yes	
Chambers Rd.	56th Ave.	GVR Blvd.	SB	173.0	103.3	113–233	No	110.5	80.6	50.5–170.5	Yes	
Chambers Rd.	GVR Blvd.	40th Ave.	SB	155.0	137.3	95–215	Yes	80.5	85.0	20.5–140.5	Yes	
Tower Rd.	32nd Ave.	38th Ave.	NB	62.5	75.2	2.5–122.5	Yes	201.0	93.8	141–261	No	
Tower Rd.	38th Ave.	GVR Blvd.	NB	105.5	151.8	45.5–165.5	Yes	123.5	139.8	63.5–183.5	Yes	
Tower Rd.	GVR Blvd.	56th Ave.	NB	122.0	101.9	62–182	Yes	143.0	124.1	83–203	Yes	
Tower Rd.	56th Ave.	64th Ave.	NB	95.5	112.1	35.5–155.5	Yes	108.5	94.7	48.5–168.5	Yes	

Table 3-9 – Calibration Results: Travel Time on Major Corridors Other than Peña Boulevard

February 2024 Existing Conditions Traffic Analysis & Future Needs Report



~

AND MOBILITY MASTER PLAN												
				AM Peak Period				Mid-Day & PM Peak Period				
Street Name	Start	End	Direction	Field Time (s)	VISSIM Time (s)	Calibration Range (s)	Criteria Met?	Field Time (s)	VISSIM Time (s)	Calibration Range (s)	Criteria Met?	
Tower Rd.	64th Ave.	EB Peña Blvd.	NB	122.5	130.0	62.5–182.5	Yes	131.5	130.8	71.5–191.5	Yes	
Tower Rd.	EB Peña Blvd.	WB Peña Blvd.	NB	52.0	28.4	0–112	Yes	43.5	34.7	0–103.5	Yes	
Tower Rd.	WB Peña Blvd.	EB Peña Blvd.	SB	31.5	26.2	0–91.5	Yes	33.5	32.1	0–93.5	Yes	
Tower Rd.	EB Peña Blvd.	64th Ave.	SB	118.5	136.7	58.5–178.5	Yes	156.5	137.6	96.5–216.5	Yes	
Tower Rd.	64th Ave.	56th Ave.	SB	232.0	113.5	172–292	No	401.5	126.9	341.5–461.5	No	
Tower Rd.	56th Ave.	GVR Blvd.	SB	151.5	135.4	91.5–211.5	Yes	171.5	109.3	111.5–231.5	No	
Tower Rd.	GVR Blvd.	38th Ave.	SB	128.5	121.3	68.5–188.5	Yes	139.0	130.0	79–199	Yes	
Tower Rd.	38th Ave.	32nd Ave.	SB	68.0	58.1	8–128	Yes	179.0	75.3	119–239	No	



4. Existing Conditions Microsimulation Results

This section summarizes the findings of the microsimulation modeling effort. The results examined three measures of effectiveness (MOEs), including serviced volumes on Peña Boulevard, speeds along Peña Boulevard, delays at local roadway intersections, and queues within the network. Each of these MOEs are discussed in the following sections.

4.1. Serviced Volumes on Peña Boulevard

Serviced volumes on Peña Boulevard in existing conditions reflect demand patterns, with the highest serviced volumes observed on the southern portion of the corridor, near 40th Avenue and the lowest volumes near the northern end of the corridor around E-470. Figure 4-1 and Figure 4-2 show serviced volumes on Peña Boulevard for AM and Mid-Day/PM peak periods, respectively.










4.2. Speeds Along Peña Boulevard

Speeds along Peña Boulevard were reviewed to understand where existing bottlenecks are occurring. In the inbound direction (heading from I-70 toward DEN), congestion is observed only near the southern portion of Peña Boulevard near 40th Avenue. This congestion is a result of on-ramp traffic from 40th Avenue (and Airport Boulevard) merging in with Peña Boulevard traffic. This merging causes traffic on Peña Boulevard to slow. In the morning peak period, this slowing is generally localized to the 40th Avenue interchange. However, during mid-day and evening peak periods, this congestion spills back to the I-70 mainline. Figure 4-3 shows average speeds along Peña Boulevard for the inbound direction.





Figure 4-3 – Existing Conditions Speeds Along Peña Boulevard Inbound (Toward DEN)

Speeds on Peña Boulevard are slower/more congested in the outbound direction than the inbound direction (see Figure 4-4). This is because traffic in the inbound direction is metered by the existing two-lane ramp from eastbound I-70 to Peña Boulevard. Once reaching Peña Boulevard, more traffic exits Peña Boulevard than enters it. This results in lessening congestion along Peña Boulevard moving away from I-70. However, in the outbound direction, the reverse pattern is observed with more traffic entering at Tower Road, 56th Avenue, and GVR Boulevard than exiting. The existing two lanes on Peña Boulevard, including the two-lane ramp from Peña Boulevard to westbound I-70, meters traffic trying to reach I-70.







4.3. Delay at Intersections

The Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) Level of Service (LOS) methodology was used to evaluate intersection delays. An LOS is a measurement of the average delay per vehicle at an intersection. Based on this delay, a score of A through F is assigned, with A representing the best conditions (or smallest delay), and F reflecting the worst conditions (or greatest delay).

Figure 4-7 to Figure 4-10 show the LOS and average delays at each intersection included in the microsimulation model. The results show that all intersections within the network operate at an LOS D or better in both AM and mid-day/PM peak periods.



Figure 4-5 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: AM Peak (Intersections 1–35)

CHAMBERS RD AND GATEWAY/ GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD







MEMPHIS AND

Α









CHAMBERS RD AND I-70 (EB)









в



← 14

Ω



















TELLURIDE ST AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD







SALIDA ST AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD





WALDEN ST AND 40TH AVE



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (WB)



Tower RD and Peña BLVD (EB)



ARGONNE ST AND 64TH AVE

D

FLANDERS WAY AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD D

HIMALAYA RD AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD

Figure 4-6 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: AM Peak (Intersections 36–67)

A

TOWER RD AND 61ST AVE

A

TOWER RD AND WALDEN ST

В

TOWER RD AND 38TH AVE





E470 (SB) AND 64TH AVE



E470 (NB) AND 64TH AVE





Figure 4-7 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: Mid-day Peak (Intersections 1–35)

CHAMBERS RD AND GATEWAY/ GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD













AIRPORT BLVD (NB) AND 40TH AVE







CHAMBERS RD AND I-70 (WB)



MEMPHIS AND 56TH









PEÑA BLVD (NB) AND 56TH

AIRPORT BLVD AND I-70 (WB)















PEÑA BLVD (SB) AND 56TH AVE





16 **→**

























TELLURIDE ST AND 56TH AVE



1.5



WALDEN ST AND 40TH AVE



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (WB)



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (EB)



11

ARGONNE ST AND 64TH AVE

Figure 4-8 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: Mid-day Peak (Intersections 36–67)

22

3

A

TOWER RD AND 61ST AVE

47 -

8

A

TOWER RD AND WALDEN ST

43 ~

25

С

TOWER RD AND 38TH AVE





E470 (SB) AND 64TH AVE



E470 (NB) AND 64TH AVE



5

40

D

HIMALAYA RD AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD

48

FLANDERS WAY AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD



Figure 4-9 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: PM Peak (Intersections 1–35)

CHAMBERS RD AND GATEWAY/ GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD

Ν





F

CHAMBERS RD AND I-70 (EB)



MEMPHIS AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD

A 47

D

AIRPORT BLVD AND I-70 (WB)









PEÑA BLVD (NB) AND 56TH







TELLURIDE ST AND 56TH AVE











TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (WB)



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (EB)



Figure 4-10 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: PM Peak (Intersections 36–67)





E470 (SB) AND 64TH AVE



E470 (NB) AND 64TH AVE

= Unsignalized Intersection
= Signalized Intersection
= Traffic Approach

Levels of Service A-C
Level of Service D
Levels of Service E-F





4.4. Queues

Figure 4-11 and Figure 4-12 show maximum observed queue lengths for AM and mid-day/PM peak periods, respectively. Note that for legibility only queues of significant length are depicted in these diagrams. All other queues were determined to be minor in nature and did not affect overall roadway operations.

In the AM peak period, the longest queues were observed at the Chambers Road and 56th Avenue intersection, at 56th Avenue and Peña Boulevard ramp terminals, and Tower Road and I-70 ramp terminals. In the PM peak period, the longest queues were observed on the Peña Boulevard to westbound I-70 ramp, the inbound Peña Boulevard off-ramp to Tower Road, and at the Tower Road and 38th Avenue intersection. In all cases, queues were observed to be localized to these singular locations and did not impede operations of other links within the roadway network.









Figure 4-12 – Existing Conditions: Mid-day/PM Peak Period



5. 2050 No Action Conditions

This chapter discusses the expected future traffic conditions within the traffic analysis area in 2050 should no action—beyond what is already planned to occur—be taken. It is important to note that this condition, hereafter referred to as the 2050 No Action scenario, is not the same as doing nothing. This is because even without implementing any improvements due to this study, certain changes to the transportation network are already planned to occur, as defined in Denver Regional Council of Governments' (DRCOG) *2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan* (2050 RTP), adopted in April 2021. These changes, the methodology for their evaluation, and the predicted impacts of them on the transportation network are in the following sections.

5.1. Changes Included in the 2050 No Action Scenario

Table 5-1 summarizes the changes to the roadway network included in the 2050 No Action scenario. These changes come from the DRCOG 2050 RTP or, if not included in the RTP, were included in the DRCOG 2050 regional Travel Demand Model (TDM). Note, the regional TDM includes some additional minor changes to the transportation network, such as the extension of local roadways, which are important to the traffic analysis area but are not considered regionally significant and therefore, are not included in the RTP.

It should be noted that the DRCOG 2050 RTP includes plans to add one high-occupancy toll (HOT) lane direct connect to/from I-70 and Peña Boulevard in each direction, add one HOT lane to Peña Boulevard from I-70 to E-470 in each direction, and add one additional general-purpose (GP) lane in each direction to Peña Boulevard from E-470 to DEN terminals. Because the purpose of this study is to evaluate potential improvements to Peña Boulevard, some of which may differ from what is currently included in the RTP, additional HOT lanes on Peña Boulevard from I-70 to E-470 and additional GP lanes east of E-470 are not included as part of the No Action scenario. However, the HOT direct connect between I-70 and Peña Boulevard is included in the No Action

Facility	Changes	Source
Peña Boulevard	Add a direct connect from the eastbound I-70 managed lanes to Peña Boulevard	DRCOG 2050 RTP
	Add a direct connect from Peña Boulevard to the westbound I-70 managed lanes	
Tower Road	Widen from four to six lanes from 45th Avenue to 106th Avenue	DRCOG 2050 RTP
40th Avenue	Widen from four to six lanes from Chambers Road to Tower Road	DRCOG 2050 RTP

Table 5-1 – Changes Included in the 2050 No Action Scenario



Facility	Changes	Source
56th Avenue	Widen from four to six lanes from Havana Street to Tower Road Widen to six consistent lanes from Genoa Street to Powhaton Road	DRCOG 2050 RTP
64th Avenue	Widen from two to four lanes from Tower Road to Dunkirk Road Widen from four to six lanes from Dunkirk Road to Harvest Mile Road	DRCOG 2050 RTP
Telluride Way	Extended to be continuous from 40th Avenue to 71st Avenue	DRCOG Regional TDM
Yampa Street	Extended to be continuous from 45th Avenue to 71st Avenue	DRCOG Regional TDM
Airport Way	Extended to be continuous from 40th Avenue to 56th Avenue	DRCOG Regional TDM

Modifications on the existing network along with changes in the roadways by 2050 are in Figure 5-1.



Figure 5-1 – 2050 No Action: Changes in the Network

5.2. Future Travel Demand

The project team used DRCOG's Focus 2.3.1 travel demand model (DRCOG model) to develop 2050 volumes for the study area. The latest copy of the calibrated and validated DRCOG model was obtained from DRCOG to estimate future volumes. This version of the DRCOG model is updated for the base year of 2020 and a future year of 2050. The 2050 model network was verified and updated to ensure it included all projects contained within the DRCOG 2050 RTP within the traffic analysis area (shown in Table 5-1) as well as other major projects and planned land use changes in the surrounding area, such as Jackson Gap improvements and the Aerotropolis project.

5.3. 2050 Microsimulation Traffic Volume Inputs

The No Action microsimulation model was loaded using forecasted TMC volumes derived from the 2050 DRCOG TDM outputs. These forecasted volumes were created through a multi-stepped process, which started by extracting the 2020 and 2050 link volumes from the DRCOG TDM. The 2020 and 2050 volume assignments from the DRCOG model were used to calculate the growth, in terms of the absolute growth in volume (difference in



volumes) and proportion of growth (ratio between volumes). Final 2050 volumes were calculated by using a hybrid of the difference method and the ratio method, as prescribed by the *NCHRP 765* guidance document published by the *Transportation Research Bureau* (TRB), to ensure that future volumes were not overestimated.

These 2050 link volumes were then converted into TMCs to input into the microsimulation model. This conversion was done by first, taking the approach link volumes to each intersection in the microsimulation model extents and then distributing them proportionally to the left-turning movements, through movements, and right-turning movements based on the existing TMC movement splits. At new intersections or intersections with new movements for which there are no existing TMC splits, engineering judgment was used to estimate the proportion of left-turning movements, through movements, and right-turning movements.

The resulting TMCs represented unbalanced volumes, as the volumes coming from a previous intersection did not equal volumes approaching the next intersection. Because VISSIM requires balanced TMC volumes, further manual processing of these tables was required. To do this, first, the total imbalance in volumes was calculated for each corridor in each direction. If overall imbalance was less than approximately 400 vehicles, then the net imbalance of vehicles was added or subtracted from through movements at the first intersection on either side of the corridor, and that change was propagated along the corridor, changing only through volumes. If the imbalance was greater than approximately 400 vehicles, then the difference was split, and half of the trips were added to one end of the corridor, and the other half were removed from the opposite end. This change was then propagated along the corridor root both ends until volumes balanced in the middle. Left-turning volumes and right-turning volumes were not adjusted. The resulting balanced corridor volumes for Peña Boulevard of each peak hour are in Figure 5-2 through Figure 5-4. The balanced, 2050 TMC tables used in the microsimulation analysis are in Appendix D. Balanced 2050 No Build TMCs of this report.







Figure 5-3 – 2050 No Action: Corridor Volumes: Mid-day Peak Hour





5.4. 2050 No Action Microsimulation Model Updates

Because of changed conditions included in the No Action scenario, several features within the microsimulation model were revised between the existing conditions model and the No Action model. The following section describes these changes.





5.4.1. Traffic Signal Timing Optimizations

In response to improvements included in the No Action scenario, new intersections were created, and existing intersections were modified. These new and modified intersections were created based on an engineering judgement using the following principles:

- Turn lanes, including number and storage lengths, were maintained if, based on a visual inspection of the specific location, there were no clear site constraints (such as an adjacent building or other obstruction) that would require removing or modifying turn lanes.
- In locations where roadways are to be widened, existing unsignalized intersections were reviewed to see if the intersection should be signalized. Signalization was based on an engineering judgment and the overall size of the intersection and anticipated volumes. No signal warrant analysis was completed. A similar approach was applied when creating new intersections.

After coding the geometrics of all new and modified intersections, new (and updated existing) signal timing plans were created for all signalized intersections within microsimulation model extents. Synchro version 11.1 was used to create and optimize signal timings and offsets. This data was then fed back into VISSIM models. The following principles were used to develop new signal timing plans:

- Permissive, protected-permissive, and protected left-turn signal phasing was maintained at all existing intersections. At new intersections, engineering judgement was used to determine if new left-turn movements were likely to be permissive, protected-permissive, or protected.
- All lead-lag sequencing was maintained.
- All signal cycle lengths were set to 120 seconds.
- Although pedestrian crossing volumes were not included in the models, for any roadway that was widened or for any new signalized intersections that were created, revised/new pedestrian clearance times were calculated and used to ensure no signals ran with pedestrian timing violations.
- All signal timings were optimized based on 2050 TMCs as discussed in section 5.2 of this report.

5.4.2. Driver Behavior Parameter Refinements

Upon loading 2050 volumes into the microsimulation model, it was noticed that the additional demand in 2050 resulted in extensive queueing and unreasonable behaviors along the local roadway network. In many locations, it was observed that long turning queues would form and spill back upstream along roadways. In turn, this impact would make it very difficult for drivers to change lanes, resulting in them either missing their turns or coming to a full stop along a roadway and blocking through traffic. During the PM peak period, this issue became so extensive it resulted in the model becoming gridlocked.

The primary cause for that unreasonable behavior was identified to be drivers being less aggressive than what would be expected in congested, urban conditions. To correct for this, the average standstill distance parameter,



which governs the distance between two stationary vehicles, was adjusted from its defaulted value of 6.56 feet to a revised value of 5 feet. This revised value is within the range of suggested values, given by CDOT's 2023 Traffic Analysis and Forecasting Guidelines and was found to better reflect more natural congested queueing behaviors, as determined by engineering judgement.

5.4.3. Coding of Managed Lanes

As part of the No Action scenario, new HOT direct connects are included, connecting the existing managed lanes on I-70 to the GP lanes on Peña Boulevard. Within the model, the toll price was used to manage the utilization of these direct connect lanes. The toll price during each modeling period was set to achieve a balanced, per-lane utilization between the available GP and managed lanes.

5.5. 2050 No Action Microsimulation Model Results

This section summarizes the findings of the Existing and 2050 No Action microsimulation modeling effort. The results examined three MOEs, including serviced volumes on Peña Boulevard, speeds along Peña Boulevard, delays at local roadway intersections, and queues within the network. Each of these MOEs are discussed in the following sections.

5.5.1. Serviced Volumes on Peña Boulevard

Although overall travel demand within the traffic analysis area is expected to increase in 2050, microsimulation results indicate that overall peak period serviced volumes on Peña Boulevard decrease in the 2050 No Action scenario as compared to the Existing Conditions. This reduction in serviced volumes is the result of extreme congestion within the microsimulation model, causing queues at intersections to spill back and block adjacent intersections resulting in gridlock conditions. Due to this gridlock, vehicles are not able to proceed, meaning they are not actually serviced by a facility and are therefore not counted in serviced volumes.

Figure 5-5 and Figure 5-6 show the serviced volumes on Peña Boulevard for the AM and mid-day/PM peak periods, respectively. An additional discussion about these queues and their impact on the roadway network is in Section 5.5.4 of this report.







Figure 5-6 – Peña Boulevard Mid-Day/PM Peak Period Serviced Volumes

5.5.2. Speeds Along Peña Boulevard

Figure 5-7 shows the speeds along Peña Boulevard in the inbound direction for both existing and 2050 No Action conditions. In 2050, two bottlenecks form along inbound Peña Boulevard. The first occurs between 40th Avenue and GVR Boulevard due to the end of the managed lane direct connect from I-70. The end of the direct connect reduces the capacity on Peña Boulevard (from two GP lanes and one managed lane down to two GP lanes) and



results in slower speeds and a queue to form. This behavior is observed in both AM and mid-day/PM peak periods.

The second bottleneck forms at 56th Avenue. A spillback queue causes this slowdown at the 56th Ave off-ramp, which due to congestion at the ramp terminal, spills back onto the mainline freeway and blocks traffic on the freeway. This bottleneck only forms during the midday/PM peak period. An additional discussion about spillback queues at the 56th Avenue ramp terminals is in Section 5.5.4 of this report.



Figure 5-7 – 2050 No Action Speed Heat Map for Peña Boulevard Inbound (Toward DEN)



Figure 5-8 shows the speeds along Peña Boulevard in the outbound direction in 2050. Congestion along Peña Boulevard is expected to be most impacted by increasing ramp volumes and adding the managed lane direct connect from Peña Boulevard to westbound I-70. From a ramp volume perspective, increasing on-ramp volumes at Tower Road are expected to result in congestion at the interchange. This congestion will create a localized bottleneck at the Tower Road interchange and will result in higher volumes (and lower speeds) between Tower Road and approximately GVR Boulevard in both AM and, in particular, mid-day/PM peak periods.

South of GVR Boulevard, congestion in 2050 is expected to decrease as compared to the existing conditions because of the addition of the manage lane direct connect to I-70. The direct connect increases the Peña Boulevard capacity through the interchange and improves the increases in traffic speeds south of GVR Boulevard compared to existing conditions.

Note that, near the end of the mid-day/PM peak period, the queue at the Tower Road off-ramp is expected to spill back onto Peña Boulevard and block freeway traffic. This queue is a result of a series of local roadway queues and grid lock. An additional discussion about this queue is in Section 5.5.4 of this report.



Figure 5-8 – 2050 No Action Speed Heatmap for Peña Boulevard Outbound (Away from DEN)



5.5.3. Delay at Intersections

LOS for the 2050 No Action intersections are in Figure 5-9 through Figure 5-14 for different peak periods of the day. Due to increasing demand, intersection operations are expected to worsen in the No Action conditions as compared to the Existing Conditions. Note that operations and delays at many minor intersections are the result of spill back queues from adjacent major intersections. A discussion about these queues and their impacts is in Section 5.5.4 of this report.



C

MEMPHIS AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD

19

F

216 -

F

PEÑA BLVD (NB) AND 56TH

148 F

Figure 5-9 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: 2050 No Action AM Peak (Intersections 1–35)

Ξ

49

CHAMBERS RD AND

BOLLING DR

С

CHAMBERS RD AND I-70 (EB)

21













С

30

С

AIRPORT BLVD AND I-70 (WB)

31 —

TELLURIDE ST AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD



WALDEN ST AND 40TH AVE



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (WB)



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (EB)

Figure 5-10 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: 2050 No Action AM Peak (Intersections 36–73)





HIMALAYA RD AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD

LISBON ST AND 64TH AVE



TOWER RD AND 71ST AVE



TOWER RD AND 69TH AVE



TOWER RD AND HIGH POINT BLVD



TOWER RD AND 64TH AVE



February 2024

Existing Conditions Traffic Analysis & Future Needs Report





TOWER RD AND 38TH AVE













FLANDERS WAY AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD



















18 -

27

C

MEMPHIS AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD

69 **—**

30

C

PEÑA BLVD (NB) AND 56TH

30 -

CHAMBERS RD AND BOLLING DR

52

D

CHAMBERS RD AND I-70 (EB)

Figure 5-11 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: 2050 No Action Mid-day Peak (Intersections 1–35)





70 —

42

108

1

F

AIRPORT BLVD AND I-70 (WB)

Figure 5-12 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: 2050 No Action Mid-day Peak (Intersections 36–73)



TOWER RD AND 71ST AVE



TOWER RD AND 69TH AVE



TOWER RD AND HIGH POINT BLVD



TOWER RD AND 64TH AVE



February 2024

Existing Conditions Traffic Analysis & Future Needs Report



F

TOWER RD AND 57TH AVE

F

65

D

42

D

47 -

← 26

← 95

41

F

C 44 27 F



D 53 - 148 E 129

F



E

55

С

TOWER RD AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD

F

Ξ

47

F

48

F

158

189 -

64 -

← 65

24

176

18

- 224

22

F

F

17

В

TOWER RD AND 47TH AVE

E

E

C

TOWER RD AND 45TH AVE

E

Ξ









F TOWER RD AND I-70 (WB)



TOWER RD AND I-70 (EB)



ANDES CT AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH + DRIVEWAY TO KING SOOPERS



ARGONNE ST AND 64TH AVE













E

 $5 \rightarrow$

A

← 55

31

Е

GENOA ST AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD + 48TH DR



E470 AND PEÑA BLVD INTERCHANGE





E

B

YAMPA ST AND 56TH AVE





AIRPORT WAY AND 56TH AVE



























Ξ

45

66

A

1

C

E470 (SB) AND 64TH AVE

В

A

F

47

31



























65















F

408 -

240

MEMPHIS AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD

39

F

CHAMBERS RD AND I-70 (EB)

F

212

D

45 →

F

317

=

CHAMBERS RD AND

BOLLING DR

27

Figure 5-13 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: 2050 No Action PM Peak (Intersections 1–35)

212

F

F

PEÑA BLVD (NB) AND 56TH

982

F

573 **—**













F

F

543

AIRPORT BLVD AND I-70 (WB)

525 -

TELLURIDE ST AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD



WALDEN ST AND 40TH AVE



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (WB)



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (EB)

Figure 5-14 – Microsimulation Analysis: Level of Service: 2050 No Action PM Peak (Intersections 36–73)























FLANDERS WAY AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD



LISBON ST AND 64TH AVE



ARGONNE ST AND 64TH AVE

























5.5.4. Queues

Due to congestion throughout the roadway network in 2050 No Action, overall roadway operations at any location will be highly influenced by the upstream and downstream queues and bottlenecks. Based on the microsimulation modeling, several key bottlenecks have been identified, including:

56th Avenue and Peña Boulevard ramp terminals

Chambers Road between I-70 and 40th Avenue

Tower Road and westbound I-70 ramp terminal

These bottlenecks do not represent all locations of congestion in 2050 No Action; however, they have been identified as having the largest impact on overall operations of the traffic analysis area. Figure 5-15 and Figure 5-16 show the extents of maximum queues observed at key locations throughout the microsimulation model during both AM and mid-day/PM peak periods. A discussion about the cause and effect of each of the key queue locations is in the following sections.









Figure 5-16 – Queue Analysis: 2050 No Action: Mid-day/PM Peak Model

5.5.4.1. Queues at the 56th Avenue and Peña Boulevard Ramp Terminals

Long queues at the 56th Avenue and Peña Boulevard ramp terminals, including both inbound and outbound Peña Boulevard ramp terminals, are observed in both AM and mid-day/PM peak periods in the 2050 No Action scenario. These queues are primarily caused by three turning movements, including the:

Westbound left-turn from 56th Avenue to the outbound Peña Boulevard on-ramp (during AM Peak)

Eastbound left-turn from 56th Avenue to the inbound Peña Boulevard on-ramp (during mid-day/PM Peak)

Southbound right-turn from the outbound Peña Boulevard off-ramp to westbound 56th Avenue (during AM Peak)

This queue starts with the westbound left-turn from 56th Avenue to the Peña Boulevard outbound on-ramp during AM Peak. This queue forms due to the high volume of left-turning traffic, which is unable to accommodate the existing single left-turn lane at the signal (the interchange was reconstructed in 2021 and plans for a dual left-



turn lane). This queue eventually blocks through traffic on 56th Avenue, resulting in a queue extending back past Tower Road to the edge of microsimulation model extents.

Along Tower Road, this queue prevents traffic on Tower Road from turning onto westbound 56th Avenue, causing the queue to extend to the north and south of the Tower Road and 56th Avenue intersection. In the northbound direction, lower traffic volumes on Tower Road minimize the impact of the 56th Avenue queue, resulting in mostly localized impacts to northbound Tower Road. However, higher southbound traffic volumes result in the southbound queue from at the 56th Avenue and Tower Road intersection extending back along Tower Road to the edge of microsimulation model extents, in both peak periods.

The spillback queues along Tower Road north of 56th Avenue block traffic at all side-streets along this segment of Tower Road. Within the microsimulation model, this included impacts to westbound 64th Avenue and the outbound Peña Boulevard off-ramp to Tower Road.

The second queue at the 56th Avenue and Peña Boulevard ramp terminals results from the eastbound 56th Avenue left-turn to the inbound Peña Boulevard on-ramp during the mid-day/PM peak. A combination of high traffic volumes with impacts of the westbound 56th Avenue queue causes the queue, which reduces overall operations at this intersection. During the AM peak period, this eastbound queue is generally localized and extends from the inbound Peña Boulevard ramp terminal to approximately Memphis Street. However, during the mid-day/PM peak period, this queue extends back past Chambers Road to the edge of microsimulation model extents. This queue impacts northbound operations along Chambers Road and causes a queue to form back along Chambers Road, eventually extending to I-70 and impacting freeway operations.

The third queue at the 56th Avenue and Peña Boulevard ramp terminals forms due to the southbound right-turn from outbound Peña Boulevard to westbound 56th Avenue during the AM peak. The high right-turning volumes not being accommodated in the single right-turn lane causes this queue. This queue extends back to the mainline of outbound Peña Boulevard and blocks through traffic. This impact results in a queue on Peña Boulevard extending back to E-470, in both peak periods.

5.5.4.2. Queues Along Chambers Road between I-70 and 40th Avenue

Due to high volumes of traffic—and in particular, left-turn movements—at the I-70 and Chambers Road interchange and at the Chambers Road and 40th Avenue intersection, spillback queues are expected to impact operations in the area. In the northbound direction, a queue starts at the Chambers Road and 40th Avenue intersection. This queue is a result of high northbound traffic volumes at this location and the limited green time available to service them due to the other high-volumes movements at the intersection, including westbound and southbound left-turns. This northbound queue extends back to eastbound I-70 ramp terminals and blocks traffic exiting eastbound I-70, causing the off-ramp queue to spill back onto the I-70 mainline.

In the southbound direction, a queue results from a combination of the southbound right-turn to enter westbound I-70 and high volumes of westbound left-turns at the Chambers Road and 40th Avenue intersection. Because a large volume of traffic from both southbound Chambers Road and westbound 40th Avenue wants to enter westbound I-70, the lane utilization on southbound Chambers Road between 40th Avenue and I-70 is



imbalanced, with most drivers wanting to use the outside lane to take the on-ramp to westbound I-70. Therefore, although southbound Chambers Road has three through lanes at the 40th Avenue intersection, these lanes are not being fully utilized. Furthermore, high left-turning volumes from westbound 40th Avenue to southbound Chambers Road exceed the capacity of two left-turn lanes.

5.5.4.3. Queues at the Tower Road and I-70 Ramp Terminals

Due to increasing traffic volumes, extensive queues are expected at both eastbound and westbound I-70 offramps to Tower Road in the 2050 No Action scenario. Along westbound I-70, the off-ramp queue spills back onto mainline I-70 and effectively meters traffic along I-70 entering the microsimulation modeling area. Along eastbound I-70, the off-ramp queue spills back onto mainline I-70 and eventually extends throughout the modeling area.



References

- Adams County. 2022. Advancing Adams: Planning for a Shared Future. Online. Available at: <u>https://adcogov.org/sites/default/files/2022-09/Advancing-Adams-Comp-Plan_2022.09.27_highres.pdf</u>
- City of Aurora. 2018a. *Aurora Places: Planning Tomorrow's City*. Online. Available at: <u>https://cdnsm5-</u> <u>hosted.civiclive.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_1881137/File/Business%20Services/Planning/Comprehensiv</u> <u>e%20Plan/Aurora%20Places%20Plan%20Adopted.pdf</u>
- City of Aurora. 2018b. Northeast Area Transportation Study Refresh Final Report. Online. Available at: <u>https://cdnsm5-</u> <u>hosted.civiclive.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_1881137/File/Business%20Services/Planning/NEATS%20Upd</u> <u>ate%202018%20Report%20FINAL%2011-16-2018%20DS%20wAppendices%208.5x11.pdf</u>
- City of Commerce City. 2023. *Draft Commerce City 2045 Comprehensive Plan*. Online. Available at: <u>https://www.c3gov.com/home/showpublisheddocument/20043/638228526182270000</u>
- City and County of Denver (CCD). 2019. Far Northeast Area Plan. Online. Available at: <u>https://www.denvergov.org/media/denvergov/cpd/Far_Northeast_Area_Plan.pdf</u>
- Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT). 2018. Traffic Analysis and Forecasting Guidelines.
- CDOT. 2023. *Traffic Analysis and Forecasting Guidelines Version II.* Online. Available at: <u>https://www.codot.gov/safety/traffic-</u> <u>safety/assets/traffic_analysis_forecasting_guidelines/traffic_analysis_forecasting_guidelines</u>
- Transportation Research Board (TRB). 2014. NCHRP Report 765: Analytical Travel Forecasting Approaches for Project-Level Planning and Design. Online. Available at: <u>https://www.trb.org/Publications/Blurbs/170900.aspx</u>



Appendices


Appendix A. Unbalanced Existing Conditions

Turning Movement Counts (TMCs)

Unbalanced Volume TMCs: AM Peak Period (Intersections 1–35)



MEMPHIS AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD





31



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (WB)



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (EB)

Unbalanced Volume TMCs: AM Peak Period (Intersections 36–67)







E470 (SB) AND 64TH AVE



E470 (NB) AND 64TH AVE

- e Unsignalized Intersection
- Signalized Intersection
- = Traffic Approach



- Traffic Approach

Ν

Unbalanced Volume TMCs: Mid-day Peak Period (Intersections 1–35)







31

TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (WB)



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (EB)

Unbalanced Volume TMCs: Mid-day Peak Period (Intersections 36–67)



TOWER RD AND 71ST AVE



TOWER RD AND 69TH AVE

810

1110

14 **-**14 **-**

16 🥆

40

29

11

TOWER RD AND 64TH AVE

٦1

57

TOWER RD AND 61ST AVE

L 146

← 19 ← 123

ntr

603 113





TOWER RD AND 56TH AVE

L 16

↓¹ **↓**⁶

5 75 895 25



TOWER RD AND ELMENDORF DR





TOWER RD AND WALDEN ST



▲ 58

ntr

5 66 913 65

✓ 90
← 81
← 123

ntr

172 922 137

~ 65

~ 101

n tr

1,222

TOWER RD AND 45TH AVE

TOWER RD AND 43RD AVE

1 L L L C 5 24 L C 5 25 C 1 26 C 5 26 C 5 28 C 5

3 J) 333 J) 287 J) 72 J

TOWER RD AND 47TH AVE

46

47

48

49

50

1²⁵ 1²⁵ 1²⁵ 1²⁵

16 → 46 → 103 ~

110 123

1150 11150 1413848

45 🕒

29 → 41 ~



237



712 285 14 556 🌙 11 295 -942 41





ANDES CT AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH + DRIVEWAY TO KING SOOPERS







TOWER RD AND 38TH AVE

ח î r

52 883 242









DUNKIRK ST AND 64TH AVE



DUNKIRK ST AND 56TH AVE





~ 7

11 ²⁷ ²⁰



61

33 34

1tr

30 → 83 → 10 ~

← 42 ← 791

✓ 43 ← 819

~ 20

111

81 43 17

G 2

L 115

2 **5** 134

735 ---

123 61 163

JTr

ARGONNE ST AND 56TH AVE

ب 37





HIMALAYA RD AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD

















E470 (SB) AND 64TH AVE



E470 (NB) AND 64TH AVE

Ν

Unbalanced Volume TMCs: PM Peak Period (Intersections 1–35)



CHAMBERS RD AND BOLLING DR

MEMPHIS AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD









WALDEN ST AND 40TH AVE



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (WB)



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (EB)

Unbalanced Volume TMCs: PM Peak Period (Intersections 36–67)







E470 (SB) AND 64TH AVE



E470 (NB) AND 64TH AVE

= Unsignalized Intersection
= Signalized Intersection
= Traffic Approach





Appendix B. Balanced Existing Conditions TMCs

Balanced Volume TMCs: AM Peak Period (Intersections 1–35)







WALDEN ST AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD



YAMPA ST AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD



WALDEN ST AND 40TH AVE



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (WB)



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (EB)

41 61 36 46 € 35 € 1,144 145 1 897 897 43 861 76 **-** 54 €9 € 5 - 12 10 10 ← 183 ← 12 ← 0 1110 γtr 1110 G1 **~** 13 **~** 19 143 611 75 75 75 7 75 7 45 → 138 → 21 ~ 62 **)** 5 **)** 25 **)** ntr 1 **D** 59 **J** ntr ntr ntr 2 19 14 5 0 796 6 150 964 150 41 432 753 --- TOWER RD AND 57TH AVE TOWER RD AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD TOWER RD AND 71ST AVE TOWER RD AND SALIDA ST ARGONNE ST AND 56TH AVE HIMALAYA ST AND 64TH AVE 42 47 62 1 ⁵⁰⁰ 11r0 835 44 44 44 290 2 58 J [C 30 ↓ 74 ↓ 970 246 27 ↓ 18 ↓ 52 38 331 38 843 759 115 38 58 **L** 19 **L** 10 42 ĩ ← 988 ← 15 ← 820 11 11r J 11r 1 **1** 252 591 **1** 174 **r** 50 ntr htr. ntr **٦**† 455 → 15 641 18 165 481 143 72 639 74 189 974 ARGONNE ST AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD TOWER RD AND 69TH AVE TOWER RD AND 56TH AVE TOWER RD AND 47TH AVE TOWER RD AND I-70 (WB) GENOA ST AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD + 48TH DR 43 48 53 63 ► 81 ← 155 1 € 649 688 38 815 38 ل 1 20 17 867 22 14 ↓ 32 ↓ 2 ↓ 11 18 853 43 593 224 → 325 → 1,677 ~ 238 28 83 **E**⁴ JIC 1110 JIL ĨL JIC **~** 203 5 **)** 0 **)** 20 **r** 20 **J** 43 **†** 86 **r** 208 → 2,700 → 112 → 57 **J** 1 75 **T** 511 htr ntr f f r 11r 250 30 11 11r 1 → 245 → 30 30 13 49 84 170 677 120 32 34 664 38 TOWER RD AND HIGH POINT BLVD E470 AND PEÑA BLVD INTERCHANGE TOWER RD AND ELMENDORF DR TOWER RD AND 45TH AVE TOWER RD AND I-70 (EB) DUNKIRK ST AND 64TH AVE 44 54 64 49 59 1 1 684 159 4 159 ↓ 153 ↓ 10 169 101 826 27 ▲ 44 ← 1,162 ← 5 - 75 3 27 **L** 20 110 -0 11r 110 **~** 163 2 **J J** 133 **J J** 445 **T** 198 **T** 2 → 6 ↑ 7 ↑ 21 → 7 → 54 ↑ 50 **)** 67 **)** 58 **r** 50 **-**า1 ntr htr 11 htr. ٢ 743 → 25 → 27 683 18 830 15 81 81 52 22 577 162 TOWER RD AND 64TH AVE TOWER RD AND 51ST AVE TOWER RD AND 43RD AVE ANDES CT AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH + DRIVEWAY TO KING SOOPERS DUNKIRK ST AND 56TH AVE 64TH AND GAYLORD ENTRANCE 50 40 45 55 65 60 1 € 44 0 0 0 155 155 52 52 J 5 0 30 27 62 52 11²⁰⁴ 1⁴⁸ 1⁴⁸ 82 100 22 **℃** 62 € 5 **~** 48 J1℃ 2°°° 2 43 2 ← 425 ← 412 ← 293 ← 5 G231 ← 609 ← 79 JIC 110 48 **-**63 **-**22 **-**122 -187 -61 -23 **)** 0 **)** 59 **)** 13 → 300 → 14 ~ 64 htr. ntr ntr <u>ו</u>ונ ntr 733 42 653 39 48 788 143 129 32 29 139 90 61

Balanced Volume TMCs: AM Peak Period (Intersections 36–67)



TOWER RD AND 61ST AVE





TOWER RD AND WALDEN ST TOWER RD AND 38TH AVE





ARGONNE ST AND 64TH AVE

















66

67

E470 (SB) AND 64TH AVE



E470 (NB) AND 64TH AVE

= Unsignalized Intersection Signalized Intersection - Traffic Approach



Balanced Volume TMCs: Mid-day Peak Period (Intersections 1–35)





Balanced Volume TMCs: Mid-day Peak Period (Intersections 36–67)







E470 (SB) AND 64TH AVE



E470 (NB) AND 64TH AVE

= Unsignalized Intersection
= Signalized Intersection
= Traffic Approach



Balanced Volume TMCs: PM Peak Period (Intersections 1–35)





Balanced Volume TMCs: PM Peak Period (Intersections 36–67)







E470 (SB) AND 64TH AVE



E470 (NB) AND 64TH AVE

= Unsignalized Intersection
= Signalized Intersection
= Traffic Approach





Appendix C. Microsimulation Model Calibration Results

				AM Peak Period					Mid-day Peak Period					PM Peak Period				
Street	Direction	Location	Field Value Micr	rosimulation Diff	ference %	Difference	Target Met?	Field Value Micro	osimulation Diffe	erence % Di	ifference Targ	et Met?	Field Value M	icrosimulation Di	ifference %	Difference 1	Target Met?	
		East of I-70 EB	3340	3270	-70	-2%	Ye	3164	3139	-25	-1%	Yes	3096	3027	-69	-2%	Yes	
		Between 40th on-ramp and GVR off-ramp	4256	4132	-124	-3%	Ve	4256	4195	-61	-1%	Ves	4377	4259	-118	-3%	Ves	
		Between GVP off-ramp and on-ramp	2502	2280	_124		Vo	2/27	2201	-56	-2%	Voc	2267	2077	-90	-3%	Vos	
	E	Detween GVR on ramp and 56th off romp	3505	3580	-125	-470	Te:	3437	2522	-50	-276	Vec	3307	3277	-90	-3%	Vec	
	B/	Between GVR on-ramp and 56th off-ramp	3665	3520	-145	-4%	Ye	5 3580	3523	-57	-2%	Yes	3493	3396	-97	-3%	Yes	
	z	Between 56th off-ramp and on-ramp	3046	2921	-125	-4%	Yes	s 3091	3034	-57	-2%	Yes	2788	2702	-86	-3%	Yes	
	pur	Between 56th on-ramp and Tower off-ramp	3183	3022	-161	-5%	Ye	s 3258	3192	-66	-2%	Yes	2994	2903	-91	-3%	Yes	
	JOL	Between Tower off-ramp and on-ramp	2465	2314	-151	-6%	Ye	s 2443	2388	-55	-2%	Yes	2011	1949	-62	-3%	Yes	
σ		Between Tower on-ramp and E-470 off-ramp	3020	2848	-172	-6%	Ye	3009	2960	-49	-2%	Yes	2537	2425	-112	-4%	Yes	
var		Between E-470 off-ramp and on-ramp	2700	2543	-157	-6%	Ye	2659	2612	-47	-2%	Yes	1975	1894	-81	-4%	Yes	
le		Between E-470 on-ramp and gun club road off-ramp	3908	3646	-262	-7%	Ye	3827	3717	-110	-3%	Yes	2971	2779	-192	-6%	Yes	
na Bo		Between F-470 off-ramp and gun club road on-ramp	2240	2245	5	0%	Ye	4255	4239	-16	0%	Yes	3672	3691	19	1%	Yes	
		Between E-170 clover on-ramp and off-ramp	19/15	1037	-8	0%	Vo	3604	3585	-19	-1%	Voc	30/7	3054		0%	Vos	
Per	8/ WB)	Detween E-470 clover on-ramp and on-ramp	1945	1937	-0	50/0	Te:	2461	3365	-19	-1/6	Vec	2021	3034	, 02	0%	Vec	
		Between Tower off-ramp and E-470 off-ramp	2350	2244	-112	-5%	re:	5401	3421	-40	-1%	res	2931	2848	-65	-3%	res	
		Between Tower off-ramp and on-ramp	1870	1768	-102	-5%	Ye	5 2496	2454	-42	-2%	Yes	2275	2228	-47	-2%	Yes	
	4 (s	Between 56th off-ramp and Tower on-ramp	2934	2853	-81	-3%	Ye	s 3140	3116	-24	-1%	Yes	3007	2987	-20	-1%	Yes	
	pounc	Between 56th off-ramp and on-ramp	2682	2600	-82	-3%	Ye	s 2890	2848	-42	-1%	Yes	2783	2846	63	2%	Yes	
		Between GVR off-ramp and 56th on-ramp	3510	3362	-148	-4%	Ye	s 3479	3427	-52	-2%	Yes	3400	3471	71	2%	Yes	
	Dut	Between GVR off-ramp and on-ramp	3346	3163	-183	-5%	Ye	3344	3284	-60	-2%	Yes	3254	3355	101	3%	Yes	
	0	Between 40th off-ramp and GVR on-ramp	4242	3978	-264	-6%	Ye	3954	3868	-86	-2%	Yes	3881	3950	69	2%	Yes	
		East of I-70 WB	3212	2918	-294	-9%	Ye	3113	2940	-173	-6%	Yes	2891	3024	133	5%	Yes	
Chambers Road		South of I-70	696	715	19	3%	Ve	1059	1166	107	10%	Yes	1085	1049	-36	-3%	Ves	
		South of 40th (Partial)	1000	898	-102	-10%	Ve	1346	1288	-58	-4%	Ves	1654	1/182	-172	-10%	Ves	
	NB	South of GVP	720	649	-90	-1.2%	Voi Voi	1064	068	-96	-0%	Voc	1174	008	-176	-15%	No	
		South of 56th	210	200	-50	-12/0	Ver	411	412	-50	-576	Voc	200	240	-170	00/	Voc	
		South of 56th	200	203	-1	0%	Te:	AD7	412	21	E 0/	Vec	300	J43 170	-51	-070	Vec	
		North of Green Valley Panch	302	501	-1	0%	Te:	711	440	25	570 E0/	Ver	430	4/3	10	-370	Yes	
	8	North of 40th	1640	1620	1	U%	Te:	1209	14/	30	J 70	Vec	1257	1205	-10	-370	res	
	S	North of L 70 (Dortion)	1040	1020	-20	-1%	re	1230	134/	49	470	res	100/	1285	-72	-5%	res	
		South of 1.70	2124	1/13	-411	-19%	NO	01010	865T	-120	-13%	Yes	122/	12/0	-28/	-18%	NO	
		South of 1.70	1330	1225	-102	-8%	Yes	1012	984	-28	-3%	Yes	985	8/6	-109	-11%	Yes	
Tower Road		South of I-70	684	684	0	0%	Ye	983	1043	60	6%	Yes	1078	1033	-45	-4%	Yes	
		South of 40th	979	954	-25	-3%	Ye	5 1214	1255	41	3%	Yes	1360	1333	-27	-2%	Yes	
	~	South of GVR	691	646	-45	-6%	Ye	s 1049	1043	-6	-1%	Yes	1069	1025	-44	-4%	Yes	
	Z	South of 56th	789	762	-27	-3%	Ye	s 989	1017	28	3%	Yes	938	919	-19	-2%	Yes	
		South of 64th	761	727	-34	-5%	Ye	s 872	890	18	2%	Yes	893	878	-15	-2%	Yes	
		South of Pena	739	720	-19	-3%	Ye	s 883	903	20	2%	Yes	857	850	-7	-1%	Yes	
		North of Pena	1189	1127	-62	-5%	Ye	s 1825	1817	-8	0%	Yes	1775	1735	-40	-2%	Yes	
		North of Pena	1832	1838	6	0%	Ye	s 1331	1336	5	0%	Yes	1463	1267	-196	-13%	Yes	
		South of Pena	967	973	6	1%	Ye	s 959	971	12	1%	Yes	926	846	-80	-9%	Yes	
		North of 64th	855	871	16	2%	Ye	s 1010	1048	38	4%	Yes	957	879	-78	-8%	Yes	
	m	North of 56th	915	766	-149	-16%	No	1074	997	-77	-7%	Yes	1017	821	-196	-19%	No	
	SI	North of GVR	893	727	-166	-19%	No	1064	963	-101	-9%	Yes	1026	867	-159	-16%	No	
		North of 40th	1251	1156	-95	-8%	Ye	1296	1284	-12	-1%	Yes	1236	1126	-110	-9%	Yes	
		North of I-70	1602	1520	-82	-5%	Ye	1879	1940	61	3%	Yes	1830	1715	-115	-6%	Yes	
		South of I-70	838	802	-36	-4%	Ye	1007	1020	13	1%	Yes	1132	1079	-53	-5%	Yes	
64th Avenue		West of Tower	15	15	0	2%	Ye	<u> </u>	47	3	6%	Yes	37	37	0	-1%	Yes	
	EB	West of Himalaya	204	190	-14	-7%	Ye	142	138	-4	-3%	Yes	164	157	-7	-4%	Yes	
		East of Himalaya	207	224	17	8%	Ye	180	217	37	20%	Yes	164	156	-8	-5%	Yes	
	N	East of Tower	332	351	19	6%	Ye	288	324	36	12%	Yes	297	285	-12	-4%	Yes	
		West of Chambers	675	692	17	3%	Ye	831	893	62	7%	Yes	1004	962	-42	-4%	Yes	
		West of Pena	701	660	-41	-6%	Ye	5 707	697	-10	-1%	Yes	828	787	-41	-5%	Yes	
e	EB	Fast of Pena	1044	977	-67	-6%	Ve	937	918	-19	-2%	Ves	1200	1167	-33	-3%	Ves	
d 56th Avenu		West of Tower	1019	95/	-64	-6%	Ver	00/	085	-9	-1%	Vos	1200	1107	-30	-2%	Ves	
		Fast of Tower	1290	1272	_18	_1%	Vo	883	037	5/	6%	Voc	964	030	_34	_2%	Ves	
		East of Pena	1/70	1452	-10	-170	Te:	1044	1001	J4 A7	070 10/	Ver	1000	1021	-54	-370	Vec	
	WB	Most of Popp	1472	1452	-20	-1%	re	T044	1031	47	470	res	1080	1031	-49	-5%	res	
	-	Fast of Chambers	1035	8101	-17	-2%	re	720	820	29	4%	res	δ14 0C5	8Ub	-ŏ	-1%	Yes	
		Last of Chambers	549	983	-10	-2%	Yes	/38	//U	52	4%	Yes	505	853	-12	-1%	Yes	
/alley Ranch Boulevard		West of Champers	518	519	1	0%	Ye	524	529	5	1%	Yes	525	460	-05	-12%	res	
	ß	Fact of Dana	1053	986	-0/	-b%	Yes	8/8	128	-27	-3%	Yes	808	//9	-89	-10%	Yes	
	Ξ		1409	1282	-127	-9%	Yes	1346	12/1	-/5	-6%	Yes	1452	1330	-122	-8%	Yes	
		vvest of Lower	832	787	-45	-5%	Ye	/90	/83	-7	-1%	Yes	1150	1069	-81	-7%	Yes	
		EB GVR West of Himalaya	455	507	52	11%	Ye	6/8	/0/	29	4%	Yes	855	835	-20	-2%	Yes	
		WB GVR east of Himalaya	/36	/54	18	2%	Ye	602	644	42	7%	Yes	498	476	-22	-4%	Yes	
	ß	WB GVR east of Tower	1182	1216	34	3%	Yes	1032	1110	78	8%	Yes	874	827	-47	-5%	Yes	
2	Ž	WB GVR east of Pena	1363	1366	3	0%	Ye	s 1143	1195	52	5%	Yes	1043	977	-66	-6%	Yes	
Greer		WB GVR west of Pena	866	860	-6	-1%	Ye	s 876	903	27	3%	Yes	862	832	-30	-4%	Yes	
		WB GVR east of Chambers (partial)	807	773	-34	-4%	Ye	5 713	718	5	1%	Yes	667	629	-38	-6%	Yes	
40th/38th Avenue		West of Chambers	160	170	10	6%	Ye	s 97	106	9	9%	Yes	88	82	-6	-7%	Yes	
	8	West of Pena	579	546	-33	-6%	Ye	s 588	589	1	0%	Yes	678	626	-52	-8%	Yes	
	ш	East of Pena	592	571	-21	-4%	Yes	803	804	1	0%	Yes	851	763	-88	-10%	Yes	
		West of Tower	370	354	-16	-4%	Ye	695	706	11	2%	Yes	672	616	-56	-8%	Yes	
		East of Tower	899	916	17	2%	Ye	639	689	50	8%	Yes	572	540	-32	-6%	Yes	
	8	East of Pena	771	737	-34	-4%	Ye	s 920	948	28	3%	Yes	750	694	-56	-7%	Yes	
	3	West of Pena	766	724	-42	-5%	Ye	5 780	794	14	2%	Yes	824	753	-71	-9%	Yes	
		East of Chambers	810	789	-21	-3%	Ye	5 747	773	26	3%	Yes	720	685	-35	-5%	Yes	
1-70		West of Chambers	6250	6187	-63	-1%	Ye	6239	6201	-38	-1%	Yes	7020	6801	-219	-3%	Yes	
	~	West of Pena	5195	5103	-92	-2%	Ye	5328	5286	-42	-1%	Yes	5941	5719	-222	-4%	Yes	
	E	West of Airport	2143	2094	-49	-2%	Ye	2414	2425	11	0%	Yes	3156	3036	-120	-4%	Yes	
		West of Tower	1757	1707	-50	-3%	Ye	2000	2007	7	0%	Yes	2662	2581	-81	-3%	Yes	
		East of Tower	2457	2436	-21	-1%	Ye	1904	1915	11	1%	Yes	1802	1812	10	1%	Yes	
	8	East of Airport	3141	3066	-75	-2%	Ye	2813	2851	38	1%	Yes	2520	2477	-43	-2%	Yes	
	Ň	East of Pena	3140	3047	-93	-3%	Ye	3065	3086	21	1%	Yes	2660	2712	52	2%	Yes	
		West of I-225	6352	5821	-531	-8%	No	6178	5873	-305	-5%	Yes	5551	5804	253	5%	Yes	



Appendix D. Balanced 2050 No Build TMCs

Balanced Volume TMCs: 2050 No Action: AM Peak Period (Intersections 1–35)









TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (EB)

Balanced Volume TMCs: 2050 No Action: AM Peak Period (Intersections 36–73)







PICADILLY ST AND 64TH AVE



TIBET ST AND 64TH AVE



TOWER RD AND 32ND AVE



Balanced Volume TMCs: 2050 No Action: Mid-day Peak Period (Intersections 1–35)









TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (WB)



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (EB)

Balanced Volume TMCs: 2050 No Action: Mid-day Peak Period (Intersections 36–73)







Balanced Volume TMCs: 2050 No Action: PM Peak Period (Intersections 1–35)



CHAMBERS RD AND BOLLING DR

CHAMBERS RD AND I-70 (EB)



MEMPHIS AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD



AIRPORT BLVD AND I-70 (WB)

TELLURIDE ST AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD







WALDEN ST AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD



YAMPA ST AND GREEN VALLEY RANCH BLVD



WALDEN ST AND 40TH AVE



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (WB)



TOWER RD AND PEÑA BLVD (EB)

Balanced Volume TMCs: 2050 No Action: PM Peak Period (Intersections 36–73)





