



Special Committee on U. S. Route Numbering
 Franklin, Tennessee- Franklin Marriott Cool Springs
 Monday May 21, 2018 – 5:30 PM (Central Daylight Time)
 Conference Call- Tel 1-888-585-9008, Conf. Room No. 191-374-518
Agenda

1. Call to Order Mark Van Port Fleet, MI
2. Roll Call and Introductions Mark Van Port Fleet, MI
 - Region 1 – William Cass, New Hampshire DOT
 - Region 2 – Emanuel Banks, Arkansas DOT
 - Region 3 – Mark Van Port Fleet, Michigan DOT (Chair)
 - Region 4 – Joshua Laipply, Colorado DOT
3. Order of the Day: Ballot Number: USRN-18-01 (action)
 - a. *Attachment 1*
 - b. Applications approved prior to Spring meeting: *Attachment 2*
 - c. Item not placed on the ballot: *Attachment 3*
4. National Bike Route Corridor DelineationMatt Hardy, AASHTO Committee on Planning
5. Discussion Items:
 - a. Route Numbering and Bike Route Application issues
 - b. Update on USRN digitization and database project
6. New Business
7. Next Meeting
8. Adjourn

AASHTO SPRING MEETING 2018 ROUTE NUMBERING APPLICATIONS

BALLOT RESULTS

Item Number and Description	Decision	Comments 1	Comments 2
<p>Item No. 1 – State: Alabama Route: U.S. 84 Action: Relocation of a U.S. Route: Between MP 167.593 and MP 163.413. Description: The relocation of US 84 will provide a less congested route over a better roadway.</p>	Affirmative	Route description is not in single space, paragraph format. The type of facility is not described	
<p>Item No. 2 - State: Arkansas Route: U.S. 82 Action: Relocation of a U.S. Route: Between U.S. Highway 82 Business west of the City of Montrose and U.S. Highway 82 Business east of the City of Montrose. Description: The Arkansas Department of Transportation has constructed a new location facility that bypasses the City of Montrose, Arkansas. This roadway segment is designated as U.S. Highway 82. This request is to relocate U.S. Highway 82 to this new location. A separate application is being submitted to re-designate the bypassed portion of U.S. Highway 82 as U.S. Highway 82 Business.</p>	Affirmative		
<p>Item No. 3 - State: Arkansas Route: US 82 Business Action: Relocation of a U.S. Route: Between U.S. Highway 82 Business east of the City of Montrose and U.S. Highway 82 Business west of the City of Montrose. Description: The Arkansas Department of Transportation has constructed a new location facility that bypasses the City of Montrose, Arkansas. This roadway segment is designated as U.S. Highway 82. A separate request has been submitted to relocate U.S. Highway 82 to this new location. It is requested that U.S. Highway 82, through the City of Montrose, Arkansas, be redesignated as U.S Highway 82 Business.</p>	Affirmative		
<p>Item No. 4 - State: Arkansas Route: U.S. 165 US 165 Action: Relocation of a U.S. Route: Between U.S. Highway 165 Business in the City of Gillett and U.S. Highway 165 Business in the City of Gillett. Description: The Arkansas Department of Transportation has constructed a new location facility that bypasses the City of Gillett, Arkansas. This roadway segment is designated as U.S. Highway 165. This request is to relocate U.S. Highway 165 to this new location. A separate application is being submitted to redesignate the bypassed portion of U.S. Highway 165 as U.S. Highway 165 Business.</p>	Affirmative	Confusing information on application. Says new route is constructed but the pavement is identified as fair. Seems inconsistent with "new". Also date facility available to traffic is 1982. Again not consistent with "new". Other than that it looks ok.	
<p>Item No. 5 - State: Arkansas Route U.S.165 Business</p>	Affirmative		

<p>Action: Recognition of a Business Route between U.S. Highway 165 in the City of Gillett and U.S. Highway 165 in the City of Gillett.</p> <p>Description: The Arkansas Department of Transportation has constructed a new location facility that bypasses the City of Gillett, Arkansas. This roadway segment is designated as U.S. Highway 165. A separate request has been submitted to relocate U.S. Highway 165 to this new location. It is requested that U.S. Highway 165, through the City of Gillett, Arkansas, be redesignated as U.S Highway 165 Business.</p>			
<p>Item No. 6 - State: Arkansas Route: U.S.167</p> <p>Action: Relocation of a U.S. Route: Between U.S. Highway 167 Business south of the City of Thornton and U.S. Highway 79 east of the City of Thornton.</p> <p>Description: The Arkansas Department of Transportation has constructed a new location facility that bypasses the City of Thornton, Arkansas. This roadway segment is designated as U.S. Highway 167. This request is to relocate U.S. Highway 167 to this new location. A separate application is being submitted to redesignate the bypassed portion of U.S. Highway 167 as U.S. Highway 167 Business.</p>		<p>Should business 79 be double posted as 79/167 to NE</p>	<p>New Route with Poor Pavement condition. Seems conflicting. Also date available to traffic is 1968? Otherwise ok.</p>
<p>Item No. 7 - State: Arkansas Route: U.S.167 Business</p> <p>Action: Recognition of a Business Route: Between U.S. Highway 167 south of the City of Thornton and U.S. Highway 79 Business in the City of Thornton.</p> <p>Description: The Arkansas Department of Transportation has constructed a new location facility that bypasses the City of Thornton, Arkansas. This roadway segment is designated as U.S. Highway 167. A separate request has been submitted to relocate U.S. Highway 167 to this new location. It is requested that U.S. Highway 167, through the City of Thornton, Arkansas, be redesignated as U.S Highway 167 Business.</p>		<p>Should business 79 be double posted as 79/167 to NE</p>	<p>It would be helpful to see before and after. I am assuming US 167 had formerly terminated at US 79 Bus</p>
<p>Item No. 8 State: Georgia Route: USBR No. 15</p> <p>Action: Establishment of a new U.S. Bicycle Route or segment: Route Connects Fitzgerald, GA and Georgia-Florida Border.</p>	<p>Affirmative</p>		
<p>Item No. 9 - State: Georgia Route: USBR No. 221</p> <p>Action: Establishment of a new U.S. Bicycle Route or segment*</p> <p>*NOTE: USBR 221 was originally designated as 321 in the 2015 USBR 21 application. This is a simple name change.</p> <p>Description: Route Connects Chickamauga & Chattanooga National Military Park and Chickamauga.</p>	<p>Affirmative</p>		
<p>Item No. 10 - State: Georgia Route: USBR No. 421</p> <p>Action: Establishment of a new U.S. Bicycle Route or segment*</p> <p>*NOTE: USBR 421 was originally designated as 521 in the 2015 USBR 21 application. This is a simple name change.</p>	<p>Affirmative</p>		

Description: Route Connects Mountain Cove Farm and LaFayette.			
<p>Item No. 11 - State: Georgia Route: U.S. 29 Action 1: Elimination of a U.S. Route between Northeast Lawrenceville and Southwest Lawrenceville Action 2: Relocation of a U.S. Route between Northeast Lawrenceville and Southwest Lawrenceville. Description: The relocation of U.S. Route 29 will provide the traveling public with a higher capacity route by avoiding traffic generators and constraints through the downtown area of Lawrenceville. The relocation will move from a 4 lane highway and one-way pair operation to a 4 lane divided facility with limited access. The local governments have been consulted and concur in the relocation of this route to State Route 316 and the Lawrenceville Suwanee Road. U.S. Route 29 signs will be removed from the present-day location when the AASHTO application is approved by the Committee.</p>		<p>The elimination of US-29 does not make sense from the travelling public since US-29 continues in both directions outside of Lawrenceville. For continuity a dual designation of US-29 with SR 316, SR 120, and Lawrenceville Suwanee Rd. seems more logical. The application is for both elimination and relocating US-29. Directional signing will be needed for US-29 traveling public.</p>	
<p>Item No. 12 State: Georgia Route: U.S. 341 Action: Relocation of a U.S. Route between Northwest Perry and Southeast Perry. Description: The relocation of U.S. Route 341 to the Perry Parkway will provide the traveling public a less congested and higher capacity route by avoiding the constraints through the downtown area in the city of Perry's central business district moving from a 2 lane facility to an open 4 lanes divided facility. The local government has been consulted and concur in the relocation of this route to the Perry Parkway. Present US Signage's of U.S. 341 will be removed from the current alignment in the city of Perry when the AASHTO application is approved by the Committee.</p>	Affirmative		
<p>Item No. 13 - State: Georgia Route: U.S. 341 BY Action: Elimination of a U.S. Route between Northwest Perry and Southeast Perry Description: The elimination of U.S. Route 341 Bypass from the Perry Parkway will eliminate public confusion when traveling on the deviating routing of U.S. Route 341 in the city of Perry. This change will also alleviate some of the congestion within the Central Business District of Perry.</p>	Affirmative		
<p>Item No. 14 - State: Indiana Route: I-69 Action: Extension of a U.S. Interstate Route between I-69 Interchange with SR37 in Monroe County AND South of SR 39/SR37 Interchange in Morgan County. Description: INDOT is upgrading 21.0 miles of median divided, partially</p>		Page 1 - Nothing was written in the blank indicating the State submitting the application Page 4 -	Application is ok and is signed by Council on Highways and Streets Member Trevor Mills. Do we need folks

<p>limited access 4-lane state highway, S.R. 37, into fully access controlled I-69 Section 5 over rolling terrain. The project starts at the Interchange of S.R. 37 and I-69 south of Bloomington in Monroe County and ends south of the interchange of S.R. 39 and S.R. 37 in Martinsville. The project is being built to interstate standards and includes 10 miles of 6-lane median barrier/median protected urban roadway and 11 miles of 4-lane median divided rural highway. The project adds four new interchanges, Fullerton Pike, Sample Road and Liberty Church Road and four new overpasses. A new 94 mile segment of Interstate 69 (Sections 1-4) between Evansville and south of Bloomington opened in 2012 and 2015. Eventually I-69 will link Evansville and Indianapolis, with the completion of Section 6, the final section, estimated in 2027.</p>		<p>CEO did not sign form and there was no letter attached Page 8 - Route description should be in a single space paragraph format Point to Point was not included in submittal</p>	<p>other than the CEO to sign for the CEO and not themselves.</p>
<p>Item No. 15 - State: Indiana Route: U.S. 421 Action: Relocation of a U.S. Route between 2nd Street in Madison, IN and Main Street in Madison, IN. Description: INDOT is currently building a realignment of US 421 on a new alignment to improve traffic conditions in Madison, IN. The project is two lane and connects Harrison Street directly to Main Street, greatly improving vehicle traffic flow. Indiana State Road 56 will be realigned also to limit impacts to adjacent historical districts.</p>		<p>Page 4 - Traffic ADT for US 421 is included, but traffic for all other US Routes is not included Page 7 - Route description should be in single space paragraph format Point to Point was not included in submittal</p>	<p>Poor explanation and a little unclear but I think I follow it</p>
<p>Item No. 16 - State: Kansas Route: USBR No. 66 Action: Establishment of a new U.S. Bicycle Route or segment. Description: Route Connects Missouri and Oklahoma</p>	<p>Affirmative</p>		
<p>Item No. 17 - State: Kansas Route: USBR No. 76 Action: Realignment of an existing U.S. Bicycle Route Description: Route Connects State Borders of Colorado and Missouri.</p>	<p>Affirmative</p>		
<p>Item No. 18 - State: Michigan Route: US U131 Business Action: Elimination of a U.S. Route: Between US 131 and 1-296/LJS 131. Description: Business US 131 in Grand Rapids, Michigan is being eliminated. The entire route was within Michigan. These roads were turned back to local jurisdiction in December 2017.</p>		<p>Page 2 - Reason for route change is illegible</p>	
<p>Item No. 19 - State: Michigan Route: USBR No. 35 Action: Establishment of a new U.S. Bicycle Segment Description: Route Connects (Existing USBR 35) Canada via Sault Ste. Marie Michigan and (Existing USBR 35) Indiana.</p>	<p>Affirmative</p>		
<p>Item No. 20 - State: Missouri Route: USBR No. 66 Action: Establishment of a new U.S. Bicycle Route or segment. Description: Route Connects Illinois State Border and Kansas State Border.</p>	<p>Affirmative</p>	<p>Would be nice to have larger scaled maps for locations in urban areas.</p>	

<p>Item No. 21 - State: Montana Route: US 93 Alternate Action: Establishment of a U.S. Alternate Route Between US 93 South of Kalispell and US 93 North of Kalispell. Description: The Montana Department of Transportation requests the designation of US 93 Alternate Route west of US 93, from the junction with US 93 south of Kalispell to the junction with US 93 north of Kalispell. US 93 facilitates travel from the Canadian Border to 1-90 in Montana and continues south to Idaho and Nevada. The route travels through the central business district (CBD) of Kalispell, MT. The 7.6 mile Kalispell alternate route, constructed in 2016, serves US 93 traffic traveling through Kalispell and is intended to relieve traffic congestion and reduce truck traffic in the CBD of Kalispell.</p>	Affirmative	Page 7 - The route description does not include the focal point city Point to Point log was not included	
<p>Item No. 22 - State: Nevada Route: USBR No. 50 Action: Establishment of a new U.S. Bicycle Route or segment. Description: Route Connects Nevada with Utah and California via USBR 50</p>	Affirmative	Would be nice to have larger scaled maps for urban areas.	
<p>Item No. 23 - State: North Carolina Route: I-140 Action: Relocation of an Interstate Route: Between US 17 in Brunswick County and US 421 in New Hanover County. Description: This section of roadway has been built to interstate standards and is currently open to traffic. The FHWA approved the adjacent section to the east between US 421 and I-40 as I-140 on December 15, 2008. As a result, the establishment of this remaining section as an interstate route will connect US 17 in Brunswick County, southwest of Wilmington, to I-40 in New Hanover County, north of Wilmington. This proposed interstate route will provide a logical connection to serve the growing transportation needs in the area.</p>		Page 7 - Route description is not in single space, paragraph format	Assuming the new route will be signed as I-140 it is approved. Application is not clear on the route designation
<p>Item No. 24 - State: North Carolina Route: I-285 Action: Establishment of an Interstate Route Between I-85 in Lexington (Davidson County) and I-40 in Winston-Salem (Forsyth County) Description: This route is a controlled access, divided, four-lane facility with connection to interstate routes at both ends, I-85 and I-40. This proposed addition of I-285 is a logical extension to the Interstate System. In addition, the Department has acquired resolutions from the Davidson County Commissioners, the City of Lexington, the High Point Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and the Winston-Salem MPO in support of designating I-285. The FHWA approved the addition of this segment to the interstate system on February 1, 2018.</p>		-Page 7 - Route description should be in single space paragraph format Point to Point was not included - 285 designation ok, no CEO signature	-Will US-52, be abandoned or dual signage with I-285? -Assume the US routes remain?
<p>Item No. 25 - State: North Carolina Route: US 311 Action: Elimination of a U.S. Route Between I-73 in Randleman (Randolph County) and US 311 in Winston-Salem (Forsyth County)</p>		Page 7 - The route description should be in single space paragraph format	FHWA Approval?

<p>Description: This application is to eliminate a 37.03-mile section of US 311 in Randolph, Guilford, and Forsyth Counties. Currently, US 311 is routed concurrently with I-74, I-40, and US 52 on the majority of this 37.03-mile section. The remaining 7.27- mile portion in Randolph County not concurrent with I-74 will be reclassified as a state secondary route.</p>			
<p>Item No. 26 - State: Ohio Route: USBR No. 50 Action: Realignment of an existing U.S. Bicycle Route. Route Connects Indiana and West Virginia. The following state or states are involved: West Virginia, Ohio, and Indiana.</p>		<p>Page 1 - Application is for realignment of an existing bike route. However, there is no description of where realignment occurs. Additionally, there is no corresponding application for deleting an existing bike route or segment</p>	<p>Not enough data, is this Route 50? Is the whole route being realigned? Cannot tell from application. Front page says realignment but appears to establish route across the state</p>
<p>Item No. 27 - State: Oklahoma Route: U.S. 270 Action: Elimination of a U.S Route: Between SH-09 and SH-270A. Description: To reroute highway around Seminole. The route begins at SH-09 junction and travels south then east through Seminole for 3.41 miles to SH-270A/Harvey Rd.</p>		<p>Page 2 - Need explanation of why this highway is being rerouted Page 7 - Route description is missing type of facility Point to Point log is not included</p>	<p>Connected with item 28? Need to elaborate. Assuming all 270 connected to removal on item 28. - Application not labeled correctly. It is for relocation not elimination of US-270. Not really sure what is being requested. See Item 28</p>
<p>Item No. 28 - State: Oklahoma Route: U.S. 270 Action: Relocation of a U.S Route: Between SH-09 and SH-270A. Description: The route begins at the SH-09/SH-3E junction in Seminole and travels east on SH-09 to SH-270A/Harvey Rd., then south on SH-270A/Harvey Rd. for a total of 4.18 miles to join back with US-270.</p>		<p>Page 2 - Need explanation of why this highway is being rerouted Page 7 - Route description is missing type of facility Point to Point log is not included</p>	<p>Need to elaborate. Assuming all 270 connected to removal on item 28. - This is the companion to Item 27. I am guessing that SH-09 and SH-270A were at one time US-270 but I am not sure.</p>
<p>Item No. 29 - State: Pennsylvania Route: USBR No. 30 Action: Establishment of a new U.S. Bicycle Route or segment. Description: Route Connects Ohio and New York.</p>		<p>Proposed route 30 is through NY. This is inconsistent.</p>	
<p>Item No. 30 - State: Pennsylvania Route: USBR No. 36 Action: Establishment of a new U.S. Bicycle Route or segment. Description: Route Connects Ohio and New York</p>		<p>Is this route north of bike route 40?</p>	

<p>Item No. 31 - State: Texas Route: U.S.59 and U.S.59 Business</p> <p>Action1: Relocation of a U.S. Route Between 1.0 mile south of the intersection of State Highway 7 southward to Spradley Street (US 59); and between the intersection of State Loop 224 and Spradley Street (BU 59).</p> <p>Action 2: Recognition of a Business Route on U.S. Route Between 1.0 mile south of the intersection of State Highway 7 southward to Spradley Street (US 59); and between the intersection of State Loop 224 and Spradley Street (BU 59).</p> <p>Description: In the city of Nacogdoches, Texas (Nacogdoches County), the Texas Transportation Commission approved the designation of US 59 on a new location from approximately 1.0 mile south of the intersection of State Highway 7 southward to Spradley Street, a distance of approximately 1.8 miles; and (2) the redesignation of the old alignment of US 59 as Business US Highway 59-F (BU 59-F) from the intersection of State Loop 224 to Spradley Street, a distance of approximately 1.0 mile.</p>		<p>-Page 1 - State not indicated Page 7 - Route description is not in single space, paragraph format. Type of facility is not indicated. The old alignment description is not necessary.</p> <p>-Should probably be 2 separate applications/actions</p>	<p>This application is to both designate a relocated US-59 and to designate the old US-59 as BU-59. Both are approved, however, should we require this as two separate application processes. We have in the past.</p>
<p>Item No. 32 - State: Washington Route: USBR No. 97</p> <p>Action: Realignment of an existing U.S. Bicycle Route</p> <p>Description: Route Connects Peace Arch Crossing, US-Canada Border, Blaine, WA and Port Townsend- Coupeville Ferry.</p>	Affirmative	NB & SB 97 on separate alignments. How is that signed?	
<p>Item No. 33 - State: Washington Route: USBR No. 10</p> <p>Action: Realignment of an existing U.S. Bicycle Route</p> <p>Description: Route Connects State Border Crossing with Idaho on Le Clerc Rd, Pend Oreille County and Anacortes/San Juan Islands / Sidney B.C.</p>	Affirmative		
<p>Item No. 34 - State: Washington Route: USBR No. 310</p> <p>Action: Establishment of a new U.S. Bicycle Route or segment. Description: Route Connects US 2 Junction with USBRs 10 and 210 at the Idaho State Border and US 2 Junction with USBRs 10 and 210 at the Idaho State Border.</p>	Affirmative	Should this be 110? Spur?	
<p>Item No. 35 - State: Washington Route: USBR No. 610</p> <p>Action: Establishment of a new U.S. Bicycle Route or segment. Description: Route Connects Junction with USBR 10 at E State Street and Township St, Sedro Woolley, WA and Junction with USBR 10 at WA-20 and W State St, Sedro Woolley, WA.</p>		610? Should it be 310? Loops back to itself.	
<p>Item No. 36 - State: Wyoming Route: U.S. 14/87</p> <p>Action 1: Relocation of a U.S. Route between milepost 19.951 and milepost 21.649</p> <p>Action 2: Extension of a U.S. Route between milepost 19.951 and milepost 21.649</p> <p>Description: The North Sheridan Interchange, at milepost 20.92 on Interstate 90, was relocated to milepost 20.06 on Interstate 90.</p>		-Page 1 - Dual signed US 14 and US 87 - submit one application for each route Page 3 - Map is illegible	<p>Does SH 338 need to be re-designated to Bus 90? Or does it go away?</p> <p>Poor description and couldn't read map</p>

		-Approved, but do we need separate applications for each action?	
--	--	--	--