Memorandum

U.S. Department
of Transportation

Federal Highway
Administration

6300 Georgetown Pike
McLean, Virginia 22101-2296

Subject: DRAFT LTPP TRAFFIC DIRECTIVE NO TDP-01

Date: December 21, 1995

From: Kris Gupta

Reply to
Attn. of: HNR-30

To: Mr. Ivan Pecnik, LTPP Regional Engineer (NA)
Mr. Morris Reinhardt, LTPP Regional Engineer (S)
Mr. Richard Ingberg, LTPP Regional Engineer (NC)
Mr. Cal Berge, LTPP Regional Engineer (W)

The attached Draft LTPP Program Directive Number TDP 01 documents the "Basic Steps (that need to be followed) for processing Monitored Traffic Data". The document listing the processing steps was requested at the last RCOC Traffic Representatives meeting in Seattle. My apologies for getting it out a bit late, however when finalized it should help in transitioning the upcoming contracts. It may be noted that the RCOC personnel have been following the steps noted and their comments/ suggestions will be really helpful in finalizing this directive. I will appreciate receiving your and RCOC staff's comments by January 16, 1996.

Please, contact me at 703/285-2376 if you have any question(s).

Attachments

cc:
Shahed Rowshan
Barbara Ostrom
Joe Wilkinson/Cindy Cornell
Mark Hallenbeck

LONG TERM PAVEMENT PERFORMANCE PROGRAM DIRECTIVE

For The Technical Direction Of The LTPP Program

DRAFT DRAFT

Program Area: Traffic Directive Number: TDP-01

Date: December 21, 1995

Subject: Basic Steps for processing Monitored Traffic Data–DRAFT

A directive that lists the steps for processing the traffic monitoring data was requested at the last RCOC Traffic Representative's meeting in Seattle. This memorandum provides that information. These procedures don't account for the adjustment of WIM data submitted by the SHAs ("post-calibrate"). The topic is still under investigation and instructions on the issue will be submitted separately.

Data Processing Steps

1) The RCOC will accept all traffic monitoring data submitted by the SHAs and process those data into Level 4 of the regional traffic database. The RCOC should enter submitted data into Level 4 of the regional traffic database and run them though the QC software as soon as practical. (A better response from the SHAs will be obtained with timely identification of data problems. Waiting to run the QC software until later in the year will dampen SHA personnel's interest in the QC results and will result in delays in identifying equipment that is not operating correctly.)

2) After creating the Level 4 archive files, the RCOC will run the SAS-based QC software developed by Chaparral Systems. (The software and *User's Manual* for this step have been distributed to the Regions.)

3) At a minimum, the following QC software analyses will be performed: **QC, GVW, 7 vs. 4, and Class Distr**. The GVW analysis should be run for the calendar dates for which Level 4 files have just been created. (The option for selecting these specific time periods is under the "Parms" button on the initial Standard Analysis input screen.) The remaining analyses should be run under the "quarterly" option under the "Parms" button. For the 7 vs. 4 analysis, as a minimum, vehicle classes 6, 8, 9, and either 11 or 13 should be selected. (The choice of Class 11 or 13 should depend on the vehicles that are most commonly found in that state or province.) These analyses will print out a series of graphics and summary remarks that indicate potential quality control problems (if any).

4) The RCOC is responsible for reviewing the output of the QC process and for creating a "packet" for each site and each SHA. This step includes the creation of initial "flag lists" using the Microsoft Word templates provided by Chaparral. Each "packet" should include a copy of the proposed "flag list" and a brief explanation of the reasons that data recommended for SHA review have been identified as "unusual." In addition, where appropriate, the RCOC should summarize the questions raised by the QC program in a separate text message for each site. The "flag lists" will indicate actions that will be taken (data that will be flagged and not used) if the RCOC does not receive additional input from the SHA. Directions for RCOC staff on identifying "unusual" traffic data are included in the SAS QC software *User's Manual*. Questions on the QC results should be referred to Mark Hallenbeck at (206) 543-6261.

5) The "packets" will then be transmitted to the SHAs for SHA response. The RCOC may need to follow up with contacts to ensure SHA response to these transmittals.

6) After SHA responses have been received, flag lists will be revised on the basis of the SHA response. (Note that the RCOC will have to create flag lists based exclusively on the QA results if SHA response to the QA "packets" cannot be obtained in a timely manner.)

7) After the RCOC has completed the revised "flag list" for a site, Level 3 may be created using the Level 3 processing software.

8) After all data for a site for a calendar year have been submitted, have passed the QC check, and have been used to create Level 3 data files, the Level 2 and Level 1 data processing can be performed for that site. The RCOC is responsible for creating the Level 2 and Level 1 files by using the regional traffic software. (FHWA-LTPP may establish specific time schedules for these procedures on the basis of the NIMS releases.)

7) Once Level 2 and Level 1 processing has been completed, the data for that site can be transferred to Barbara Ostrom.

Prepared by: Chaparral Systems Corporation--LTPP Technical Assistance Contractor.

Technical Contact: Cindy Cornell
Telephone: 505/983-5594 Ext.230

Program Manager: H.K (Kris) Gupta
Traffic Engineer LTPP Division
Telephone: 703/285-2376

Approving Official: _____
Monte Symons, Team Leader
LTPP Operations

FHWA:HNR-30: Kris Gupta 703/285-2376
File: c:\directiv\tdp01
cc:
Shahed Rowshan
Barbara Ostrom
Joe Wilkinson/Cindy Cornell
Mark Hallenbeck
Directive File
Chron
Official File: Kgupta