

SHEET 10 LTPP TRAFFIC DATA TRAFFIC VOLUME AND LOAD ESTIMATE UPDATE-NO SITE COUNT	*STATE ASSIGNED ID	[] [] [] []
	*STATE CODE	[83]
	*SHRP SECTION ID	[1801]

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 TRUCKS AADT LTPP LANE	*ESTIMATED ESAL=S/YR LTPP LANE (1000'S)
<u>1993</u>	<u>3241</u>	<u>616</u>	<u>1543</u>	<u>293</u>	<u>150</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) Est. Growth 2% Avg

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

- ☐ Used system averages 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. (8)
☐ 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. (1)
☐ Averaged multiple counts taken this year at the LTPP site. (2)
☒ Other: (9) _____

4. METHOD FOR ESTIMATING 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 data count. (1)
☒ Other: (3) _____

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

- ☐ ESAL/Truck factor (1)
☐ ESAL/Vehicle class. (2) (No. of classes)
☐ ESAL/Axle(3) Sing. _____ Tand. _____ Tri. _____
☒ Other: (4) _____

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 STANTEC PREPARED
 DATE PREPARED MAY 27/08

PHONE# _____

rev. March 12, 2001

Manitoba

1801 - 1992

Given the low traffic volumes in eastbound lane 2, the 8+ hours of consecutive hours of zero volume may be realistic traffic measurements. (That is, it is currently recommended that these days be withheld from the LTPP databases, because the equipment may have failed during these time periods. That may not be the case. Manitoba staff should review these data to determine if such low volume conditions are reasonable occurrences at this site.)

The low volume of trucks weighed at this site makes it difficult to determine if the WIM scales being used were accurately calibrated for the site conditions. There are very few vehicles in the range of weights expected for unloaded vehicles. This could either be because there were no unloaded trucks operating during the data collection period, or because the scale is over estimating weights. The QA process expects the gross vehicle weight distribution to peak near the US legal limit for FHWA Class 9 vehicles (80,000 pounds). This does not occur at this location. There is a peak at 68,000 pounds, and there is also a secondary peak at 84,000 pounds. I suspect the scale is over calibrated, but the data are too scarce to warrant removal of these data points from the LTPP upload, unless Manitoba staff indicate that these weights are not valid.

The classifier appears to have problems classifying vehicles at the end of December. during this time period, a significant change in vehicle mix takes place, with Class 6 and 13 volumes dramatically increasing and Class 9 volume decreasing.

1801 - 1993

There are large quantities of missing data from this site.

Vehicle volumes by vehicle class are unstable. It is not clear whether these are actual changes in volume and vehicle mix, or whether these changes are the result of equipment/site problems. In general when Class 6 (3-axle single unit) volumes go up, Class 9 (5-axle, tractor, semi-trailer) volumes go down. This suggests that the classifier is dropping the trailing tandem axles of the combination vehicle. I suspect that this is the case. Unfortunately, the data present do not provide enough information to determine whether this is in fact the case. These data will be accepted for upload to the LTPP database, unless informed otherwise by Manitoba staff. Manitoba staff should review the volumes present in the QA graphics to help LTPP determine if these data are valid estimates of actual traffic volumes experienced at this site.