

SHEET 10 LTPP TRAFFIC DATA TRAFFIC VOLUME AND LOAD ESTIMATE UPDATE-NO SITE COUNT	*STATE ASSIGNED ID	[]
	*STATE CODE	[12]
	*SHRP SECTION ID	[0900]

1. ANNUAL TRAFFIC ESTIMATES

* YEAR	ESTIMATED TOTAL VEHICLES AADT (TWO-WAY)	ESTIMATED TOTAL TRUCK AADT (TWO-WAY)	ESTIMATED TOTAL VEHICLES AADT LTPP LANE	*ESTIMATED TOTAL TRUCK AADT LTPP LANE	*ESTIMATED ESAL'S/YR LTPP LANE (1000'S)
<u>2003</u>	_____	_____	_____	<u>2,297</u>	<u>513</u>

2. METHOD FOR ESTIMATING TOTAL VEHICLE AADT (TWO-WAY)

- _____ Growth factored last year's estimate. (6)
 _____ Estimated based on volume counts at nearby locations (3)
 _____ Used computerized network analyses.(4)
 _____ Factored a single count taken this year at the LTPP site. (1)
 _____ Average multiple counts taken this year at the LTPP site. (2)
 _____ Average and factored multiple count taken this year at the LTPP site. (5)
 _____ Used flow maps. (7)
 _____ Other: (8) _____

3. METHOD FOR ESTIMATING TOTAL TRUCK AADT (TWO-WAY)

- _____ Used system average from counts taken this year. (6)
 _____ Used count data from nearby sites. (3)
 _____ Used count data from previous years at the LTPP site. (7)
 _____ Used system averages from previous years. (9)
 _____ Used computerized network analyses. (4)
 _____ Used a single count taken this year at the LTPP site. (5)
 _____ Factored a single count taken this year at the LTPP site. (4)
 _____ Averaged multiple counts taken this year at the LTPP site. (2)
 _____ Other: (10) _____

4. METHOD FOR ESTIMATEING TOTAL VEHICLES LTPP LANE AADT

- _____ System distribution factors. (2)
 _____ Based on actual lane count data. (1)
 _____ Other: (3) _____

*5. METHOD FOR ESTIMATING TOTAL TRUCKS, LTPP LANE AADT

- _____ System distribution factors. (2)
 _____ Based on actual lane count data. (1)
 x _____ Other: (3) Projected from available data

*6. METHOD FOR ESTIMAING ESAL/YEAR IN LTPP LANE

- _____ ESAL/Truck factor (1)
 _____ ESAL/Vehicle class. (2) (No. of classes) _____
 _____ ESAL/Axle(3) Sing. _____ Tand. _____ Tri. _____
 x _____ Other: (4) Projected from available data

7. ESAL ESTIMATES - SOURCE OF DATA

- _____ Weight data collected at LTPP site prior years. (2)
 _____ Weight data from system averages this year. (3)
 _____ Weight data from system averages prior years. (4)
 _____ Weight data from historic W-4 Tables used. (5)
 _____ Other: (6) _____

8. WEIGHT SCALE TYPE

- _____ WIM scale. (1)
 _____ Static scale used for enforcement. (2)
 _____ Static scale not used for enforcement. (3)
 _____ Other: (4) _____

NAME OF PREPARER E Joe Kim
 DATE PREPARED 6/11/2009

PHONE # 512-977-1800
 REV. February 21, 2000

ENTERED JUN 17 2009 J P M

JUL-16-2003 10:12

FRUGRE BRE

SHEET 16

MONITORED TRAFFIC DATA
LTPF PROGRAM*STATE ASSIGNED ID
*STATE CODE
*SHRP SECTION ID[9936]
[12]
[0900]

SITE CALIBRATION INFORMATION

1. * DATE OF CALIBRATION (MONTH/DAY/YEAR) 10/20/2003
2. * TYPE OF EQUIPMENT CALIBRATED WIM CLASSIFIER BOTH
3. * REASON FOR CALIBRATION
 REGULARLY SCHEDULED SITE VISIT
☒ EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT
 DATA TRIGGERED SYSTEM REVIEW
☒ OTHER (SPECIFY) Replaced Detective Sensors
4. * SENSORS INSTALLED IN LTPF LANE AT THIS SITE (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):
 BARE ROUND PIEZO ☒ BARE FLAT PIEZO ☐ BENDING PLATES
 CHANNELIZED ROUND PIEZO ☐ LOAD CELLS ☐ QUARTZ PIEZO
 CHANNELIZED FLAT PIEZO ☒ INDUCTANCE LOOPS ☐ CAPACITANCE PADS
 OTHER (SPECIFY) _____
5. EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURER PAT America, Inc.

WIM SYSTEM CALIBRATION SPECIFICS**

- 6.** CALIBRATION TECHNIQUE USED:
 TRAFFIC STREAM - STATIC SCALE (Y/N) ☒ TEST TRUCKS
 NUMBER OF TRUCKS COMPARED 001 NUMBER OF TEST TRUCKS USED
0.15 PASSES PER TRUCK
 TRUCK TYPE SUSPENSION
 TYPE PER FHWA 13 BIN SYSTEM
 SUSPENSION: 1 - AIR; 2 - LEAF SPRING
 3 - OTHER (DESCRIBE)
- | TRUCK TYPE | SUSPENSION |
|------------|------------|
| 1 CLASS 9 | AIR |
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
7. SUMMARY CALIBRATION RESULTS (EXPRESSED AS A PERCENT)
 MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ---
 DYNAMIC VS. STATIC GVW -4.1 STANDARD DEVIATION 2.7
 DYNAMIC VS. STATIC SINGLE AXLES -15.2 STANDARD DEVIATION 5.7
 DYNAMIC VS. STATIC DOUBLE AXLES -2.1 STANDARD DEVIATION 4.0
8. 05 NUMBER OF SPEEDS AT WHICH CALIBRATION WAS PERFORMED
9. DEFINE THE SPEED RANGES USED (MPH) Three speed points at 55 mph, 65 mph, and 75 mph.
10. CALIBRATION FACTOR (AT EXPECTED FREE FLOW SPEED) 900.0
- 11.** IS AUTO-CALIBRATION USED AT THIS SITE? (Y/N) No
 IF YES, IDENTIFY AND DEFINE AUTO-CALIBRATION VALUE: _____

CLASSIFIER TEST SPECIFICS*** WIM also classifies

- 12.*** METHOD FOR COLLECTING INDEPENDENT VOLUME MEASUREMENT BY VEHICLE CLASS:
 VIDEO (1) MANUAL (2) PARALLEL CLASSIFIERS (3)
13. METHOD TO DETERMINE LENGTH OF COUNT TIME NUMBER OF TRUCKS
14. MEAN DIFFERENCE IN VOLUMES BY VEHICLES CLASSIFICATION:
 *** FHWA CLASS 9 FHWA CLASS
 *** FHWA CLASS 8 FHWA CLASS
 FHWA CLASS
 FHWA CLASS
- *** PERCENT "UNCLASSIFIED" VEHICLES:

PERSON LEADING CALIBRATION EFFORT: Kip Jones
 CONTACT INFORMATION: _____

rev. November 9, 1999

TOTAL P.03

ENTERED NOV 13 2003 RG

SHEET 16 LTPP MONITORED TRAFFIC DATA SITE CALIBRATION SUMMARY	*STATE ASSIGNED ID:	{ 9936 }
	*STATE CODE:	{ 12 }
	*SHRP SECTION ID:	{ 900 }

SITE CALIBRATION INFORMATION

1. *DATE OF CALIBRATION(MONTH/DAY/YEAR): { 02 / 24 / 2003 }
2. *TYPE OF EQUIPMENT CALIBRATED ☒ WIM ☐ CLASSIFIER ☐ BOTH
3. *REASON FOR CALIBRATION
- ☐ REGULARY SCHEDULED SITE VISIT ☐ RESEARCH
- ☐ EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT ☐ TRAINING
- ☐ DATA TRIGGERED SYSTEM REVISION ☒ NEW EQUIPMENT INSTALLATION
- ☐ OTHER(SPECIFY) _____
4. *SENSORS INSTALLED IN LTPP LANE AT THIS SITE (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):
- ☐ BARE ROUND PIEZO CERAMIC ☒ BARE FLAT PIEZO ☐ BENDING PLATES
- ☐ CHANNELIZED ROUND PIEZO ☐ LOAD CELLS ☐ QUARTZ PIEZO
- ☐ CHANNELIZED FLAT PIEZO ☒ INDUCTANCE LOOPS ☐ CAPACITANCE PADS
- ☐ OTHER(SPECIFY) _____
5. EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURER: _____ IRD / PAT _____

WIM SYSTEM CALIBRATION SPECIFICS**

6. **CALIBRATION TECHNIQUE USED:
- ☐ TRAFFIC STREAM ☐ STATIC SCALE(Y/N) ☒ TEST TRUCKS
- ☐ NUMBER OF TRUCKS COMPARED { 1 } NUMBER OF TEST TRUCKS USED
- ☐ { 17 } PASSES PER TRUCK
- TRUCK TYP SUSPENSION
- TYPE PER FHWA 13 BIN SYSTEM 1 Class 9 1 { Air Ride }
- SUSPENSION: 1-AIR; 2-LEAF SPRING 2 _____
- 3-OTHER(DESCRIBE): 3 _____
7. SUMMARY CALIBRATION RESULTS (EXPRESSED AS A PERCENT)
- MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN -
- DYNAMIC AND STATIC GVW: -4.1 STANDARD DEVIATION: 2.7
- DYNAMIC AND STATIC SINGLE AXLES: -15.2 STANDARD DEVIATION: 5.7
- DYNAMIC AND STATIC DOUBLE AXLES: -2.7 STANDARD DEVIATION: 2.7
8. NUMBER OF SPEEDS AT WHICH CALIBRATION WAS PERFORMED: 4
9. DEFINE THE SPEED RANGES USED (MPH): 54-59 60-64 65-69 70-74
10. CALIBRATION FACTOR (AT EXPECTED FREE FLOW SPEED): 750
11. ** IS AUTO-CALIBRATION USED AT THIS SITE? (Y/ N): N

CLASSIFIER TEST SPECIFICS***

12. *** METHOD FOR COLLECTING INDEPENDENT VOLUME MEASUREMENTS BY VEHICLE CLASS:
- ☐ VIDEO ☐ MANUAL ☐ PARALLEL CLASSIFIERS
13. METHOD TO DETERMINE LENGTH OF COUNT ☐ TIME ☐ NUMBER OF TRUCKS
14. MEAN DIFFERENCE IN VOLUMES BY VEHICLES CLASSIFICATION:
- *** FHWA CLASS 9 _____ FHWA CLASS _____
- *** FHWA CLASS 8 _____ FHWA CLASS _____
- _____ FHWA CLASS _____
- _____ FHWA CLASS _____
- ***PERCENT"UNCLASSIFIED"VEHICLES: _____

PERSON LEADING CALIBRATION EFFORT:	Michael R. Leggett
CONTACT INFORMATION:	(850) 414 - 4727

ENTERED
 SEP 30 2008 C G G