

|   |                    |          |
|---|--------------------|----------|
| <b>SHEET 10</b><br><b>LTPP TRAFFIC DATA</b><br><br><b>TRAFFIC VOLUME AND LOAD</b><br><b>ESTIMATE UPDATE-NO SITE COUNT</b> | *STATE ASSIGNED ID | [ ]      |
|   | *STATE CODE        | [ 40 ]   |
|   | *SHRP SECTION ID   | [ 4160 ] |

# 1. ANNUAL TRAFFIC ESTIMATES

| * YEAR | ESTIMATED<br>TOTAL VEHICLES<br>AADT<br>(TWO-WAY) | ESTIMATED<br>TOTAL TRUCK<br>AADT<br>(TWO-WAY) | ESTIMATED<br>TOTAL VEHICLES<br>AADT<br>LTPP LANE | *ESTIMATED<br>TOTAL TRUCK<br>AADT<br>LTPP LANE | *ESTIMATED<br>ESAL'S/YR LTPP<br>LANE (1000'S) |
|--------|--|---|--|--|---|
| 2003   |  |   |  | 395  | 136   |

## 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)  
☒ 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.  
☒ Other: (3) 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 systemaverages 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 | Dan YE    | PHONE # | 512-977-1845           |
| DATE PREPARED    | 2/26/2009 |         | REV. February 21, 2000 |

ENTERED FEB 27 2009 J P M  
ENTERED APR 02 2009 J P M

11919 ON YR/XLI 49:51 ENL 00/ST/20

RECEIVED SEP 04 2003

TOTAL P. 02

**SHEET 16  
MONITORED TRAFFIC DATA  
LTPP PROGRAM**

\*STATE ASSIGNED ID  
\*STATE CODE  
\*SHRP SECTION ID

\_\_\_\_\_  
40  
4160

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 ☐ RESEARCH  
☐ EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT ☐ TRAINING  
☐ DATA TRIGGERED SYSTEM REVIEW ☐ NEW EQUIPMENT INSTALLATION  
☐ OTHER (SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_
4. \* SENSORS INSTALLED IN LTPP 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 MSE / PRD

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  

| TYPE PER FHWA 13 BIN SYSTEM          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 10    | PASSES PER TRUCK |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|-------|------------------|
| SUSPENSION: 1 - AIR; 2 - LEAF SPRING | 1 | 2 | 3 | TRUCK | TYPE             |
| 3 - OTHER (DESCRIBE)                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9     | 1                |
|                                      |   |   |   |       |                  |
|                                      |   |   |   |       |                  |
7. SUMMARY CALIBRATION RESULTS (EXPRESSED AS A PERCENT)  
 MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN —  
 DYNAMIC VS. STATIC GVW -3.2 STANDARD DEVIATION 4.3  
 DYNAMIC VS. STATIC SINGLE AXLES 4.2 STANDARD DEVIATION 3.9  
 DYNAMIC VS. STATIC DOUBLE AXLES -4.8 STANDARD DEVIATION 7.6
8. 1 NUMBER OF SPEEDS AT WHICH CALIBRATION WAS PERFORMED
9. DEFINE THE SPEED RANGES USED (MPH) 60 mph ± 5 mph
10. CALIBRATION FACTOR (AT EXPECTED FREE FLOW SPEED) 0.62
- 11.\*\* IS AUTO-CALIBRATION USED AT THIS SITE? (Y/N) Y  
 IF YES, IDENTIFY AND DEFINE AUTO-CALIBRATION VALUE: 24W Class 9 2%

CLASSIFIER TEST SPECIFICS\*\*\*

- 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 0 FHWA CLASS \_\_\_\_\_  
 \*\*\* FHWA CLASS 8 \_\_\_\_\_ FHWA CLASS \_\_\_\_\_  
 FHWA CLASS \_\_\_\_\_  
 FHWA CLASS \_\_\_\_\_
- \*\*\* PERCENT "UNCLASSIFIED" VEHICLES: 0

PERSON LEADING CALIBRATION EFFORT: Blaine Meyers PRD 405 816 1427

ENTERED SEP 17 2003 RG