



AASHTO 2019 SPRING MEETING

May 20th to 23rd, Canyons Village at Park City

Special Committee on U. S. Route Numbering

Park City, Utah- Kokopelli Grand Ballroom - Parlor III

Monday May 20, 2019 – 5:30 PM (MDT)

Conference Call- Tel 1-888-585-9008, Conf. Room No. 191-374-518

Agenda

-
1. Call to Order Emanuel Banks, AR
 2. Roll Call and Introductions Emanuel Banks, AR
 - Region 1 – William Cass, New Hampshire DOT
 - Region 2 – Emanuel Banks, Arkansas DOT (Chair)
 - Region 3 – Burt Morey, Kansas DOT
 - Region 4 – Joshua Laipply, Colorado DOT
 3. Order of the Day: Ballot Number: USRN-19-01 (action)
 - a) Ballot Results: *Attachment 1*
 - b) Applications approved prior to Spring Meeting: *Attachment 2* (information)
 - Kentucky USBR21-Establishment
 - Kentucky USBR 23-Establishment
 - Kentucky USBR76-Realignment
 4. Discussion Items:
 - a) Bike Route Applications and Conformity with National Corridor Plan (National Corridor Plan Map: *Attachment 5*) Caroline Kielyka, AASHTO
 - b) New Route Numbering Application and Review Software (Open Water Intro)
 - c) Route Numbering and Bike Route Application Form Changes
 - d) Update on USRN historical files digitization
 5. New Business
 6. Next Meeting
 7. Adjourn

AASHTO SPRING MEETING 2019 ROUTE NUMBERING APPLICATIONS

Item Number and Description	Preliminary Decision	Comment 1	Comment 2
<p>Item No. 1 - State: Arkansas Route: US 63 Jonesboro <i>Action:</i> Elimination of a U.S. Route Between U.S. Highway 49 in the City of Brinkley and U.S. Highway 49 in the City of Jonesboro <i>Description:</i> A shorter route exists between Brinkley, Arkansas and Jonesboro, Arkansas along existing U.S. Highway 49. Therefore, the Arkansas Department of Transportation requests the elimination of U.S. Highway 63 from the junction of U.S. Highway 49 in the City of Brinkley, Arkansas running concurrently with Interstate 40, Interstate 55, and Interstate 555 to the junction of U.S. Highway 49 in the City of Jonesboro, Arkansas. A separate request has been submitted to relocate U.S. Highway 63 to run concurrently with U.S. Highway 49 from the junction of Interstate 40 in the City of Brinkley, Arkansas to Interstate 555 in the City of Jonesboro, Arkansas.</p>	Affirmative		
<p>Item No. 2 - State: Arkansas Route: US 63 Jonesboro <i>Action:</i> Relocation of a U.S. Route Between Interstate 40 in the City of Brinkley and Interstate 555 in the City of Jonesboro <i>Description:</i> A shorter route exists between Brinkley, Arkansas and Jonesboro, Arkansas along existing U.S. Highway 49. Therefore, the Arkansas Department of Transportation requests the relocation of U.S. Highway 63 to run concurrently with U.S. Highway 49 from Interstate 40 in the City of Brinkley, Arkansas to Interstate 555 in the City of Jonesboro, Arkansas. A separate request has been submitted to eliminate U.S. Highway 63 from the junction of U.S. Highway 49 in the City of Brinkley, Arkansas running concurrently with Interstate 40, Interstate 55, and Interstate 555 to the junction of U.S. Highway 49 in the City of Jonesboro, Arkansas.</p>	Affirmative		

<p>Item No. 3 - State: Arkansas Route: US 63 BUS Jonesboro <i>Action:</i> Elimination of a U.S. Route between Interstate 555 and State Highway 463 in the City of Jonesboro and U.S. Highway 49 and State Highway 18 in the City of Jonesboro <i>Description:</i> Since a shorter route exists between Jonesboro, Arkansas and Brinkley, Arkansas along existing U.S. Highway 49, the Arkansas Department of Transportation has submitted a separate request to relocate U.S. Highway 63 to U.S. Highway 49. Therefore, The Arkansas Department of Transportation requests the elimination of U.S. Highway 63 Business in the City of Jonesboro, Arkansas.</p>	Affirmative		
<p>Item No. 4 - State: Arkansas Route: US 63 BUS Marked Tree <i>Action:</i> Elimination of a U.S. Route between Interstate 555 in the western portion of the City of Marked Tree and Interstate 555 in the eastern portion of the City of Marked Tree. <i>Description:</i> Since a shorter route exists between Jonesboro, Arkansas and Brinkley, Arkansas along existing U.S. Highway 49, the Arkansas Department of Transportation has submitted a separate request to relocate U.S. Highway 63 to U.S. Highway 49. Therefore, the Arkansas Department of Transportation requests the elimination of U.S. Highway 63 Business in the City of Marked Tree, Arkansas.</p>	Affirmative		
<p>Item No. 5 - State: Arkansas Route: US 82 BUS Magnolia <i>Action:</i> Elimination of a U.S. Route between U.S. Highway 371 in the City of Magnolia and U.S. Highway 82 in the City of Magnolia <i>Description:</i> U.S. Highway 82 Business has been removed from the Arkansas State Highway System. Therefore, the Arkansas Department of Transportation requests the elimination of U.S. Highway 82 Business in the City of Magnolia, Arkansas.</p>	Affirmative with Condition	Is there a northern leg of 82 BYP, along US 371, that completes loop?	
<p>Item No. 6 - State: Arkansas Route: US 82 BUS Monticello <i>Action:</i> Recognition of a By-Pass Route on U.S. Route 278 between U.S. Highway 425 south of the City of Monticello and U.S. Highway 278 east of the City of Monticello. <i>Description:</i> The Arkansas Department of Transportation has constructed a new location facility that bypasses the City of Monticello, Arkansas. This roadway segment</p>	Affirmative with Condition	Shouldn't Bypass be connected to US 278 at each end? Seems odd	

<p>is designated as U.S. Highway 278 Bypass. This request is to designate U.S. Highway 278 Bypass to this new location.</p>			
<p>Item No. 7 - State: Georgia Route: USBR 1 <i>Action:</i> Establishment of a new U.S. Bicycle Route <i>Description:</i> Route Connects Effingham County, Georgia at the intersection of Tuckasee-King Landing Road and GA 119 and Georgia / Florida Border (Charlton, GA).</p>	<p>Affirmative</p>		
<p>Item No. 8 - State: Illinois Route: US 55 BUS <i>Action:</i> Relocation of a U.S. Route Between Intersection of 5th St. & Spruce St. / 6th St. & Myrtle St. (Springfield) and Intersection of 9th St. & Cook St. / 9th St. & Lawrence Ave. (Springfield) <i>Description:</i> The proposed relocation is necessitated by the City of Springfield's Rail Improvement Project which includes the construction of a railroad underpass near the current Business Route 55 designation (9th St. and Laurel St.). This proposed underpass will require ending the 9th St. pavement that currently carries the Business Route 55 designation. This proposed relocation also places more of the business route within the downtown Springfield business district. Please note the relocated route marking will be placed on streets under the jurisdiction of the City of Springfield.</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Page 2: Provide calendar date for Date facility open to traffic. Page 7: Route description should be in a single space paragraph format. Page 7: First sentence has the word couple and it should be couplet. Point to point was not included with the application.</p>	<p>Application to eliminate existing route?</p>
<p>Item No. 9 - State: Indiana Route: I-265 <i>Action:</i> Extension of an Interstate Route Between I-65 and I-71 <i>Description:</i> To connect routing of two lengths of freeway in Indiana and Kentucky that are currently routed as I-265. The segment in question is currently routed as Indiana State Road 265 in Indiana and Kentucky State Road 841 in Kentucky. The roadway serves as a beltway around the north, east, and south sides of Louisville.</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Point to point was not included</p>	<p>see #12</p>
<p>Item No. 10 - State: Iowa Route: US 30 <i>Action:</i> Relocation of a U.S. Route Between Jct of U.S. 30 and Wilcox Rd. and Jct of U.S. 30 and Charles Ave. <i>Description:</i> This request pertains to the relocation of U.S. 30, in Linn and Cedar Counties. The relocation of this route and the construction of a new 4 lane facility that bypasses the towns of Mt. Vernon and Lisbon in Linn County. This bypass will help expedite</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Page 7: Entire page is missing from the application. Provide a separate application for the elimination of the existing route.</p>	

<p>the flow of freight traffic along the corridor. Portions of the existing U.S. 30 route will be transferred over to local entities once the bypass is open to traffic. The proposed reroute will carry traffic on a 4-lane facility for 7.5 miles.</p>			
<p>Item No. 11 - State: Iowa Route: US 52 <i>Action:</i> Relocation of a U.S. Route Between South Junction of U.S. 52 and U.S. 61/U.S. 151 near Dubuque and Junction of U.S. 52 and IA 3 in Luxemburg. <i>Description:</i> This request pertains to the relocation of U.S. 52, in Dubuque County. The relocation of this route will improve safety and continuity, and will no longer require U.S. 52 traffic to be routed through downtown Dubuque.</p>	Affirmative with Condition	Page 7: Route description should be in a single space paragraph format. A second application should be submitted to remove the existing U.S. 52.	Dual Sign US 52/20
<p>Item No. 12 - State: Kentucky Route: I-265 <i>Action:</i> Extension of an Interstate Route Between I-65 and I-71 <i>Description:</i> To connect routing of two freeways in Kentucky and Indiana that are currently routed as 1-265. The extension in question is currently routed as Indiana State Road 265 and Kentucky State Highway 841 (Gene Snyder Freeway). The roadway serves as a Bypass around the north, east, and south sides of Louisville, Kentucky.</p>	Affirmative	see #9	
<p>Item No. 13 - State: Louisiana Route: I-49 <i>Action:</i> Extension of an Interstate Route Between 1-20 Interchange and LA 1 Interchange <i>Action:</i> Relocation of an Interstate Route Between 1-20 Interchange and LA 1 Interchange <i>Description:</i> To officially request the 1-49 designation for the newly constructed extension and to route 1-49 onto 1-20 and 1-220 to provide continuity routing of the 1-49 corridor.</p>	Affirmative with Condition	Page 2: Provide calendar date for Date facility open to traffic. Page 7: Direction of travel was not provided in the route description. Page 7: Contact information was not provided. There should be another application to extend or relocate I-49.	not clear where I-49 was routed before, or if it was discontinuous, but this connectivity makes sense
			Dual sign I-49/I-220 from Control Point 3 to Control Point 2. Dual sign I-49/I-20 from Control Point 2 to Control Point 1.
<p>Item No. 14 - State: Louisiana Route: U.S 61 BUS <i>Action:</i> Relocation of a U.S. Route Between 1-110 at Florida St. and 1-110 at Chippewa St. <i>Description:</i> Request to reroute a part of U.S. 61 Business onto 1-110 for approximately 2.5 miles. A portion of U.S. 61 BUS has recently been transferred to the City of Baton Rouge with other bypassed segment(s) to soon be transferred as part of the State's Right Sizing Program.</p>	Affirmative with Condition	Page 2: Provide calendar date for Date facility open to traffic. Another application should be submitted to eliminate the portion of U.S. 61 Business that was transferred to the city.	Would we really have a business route on Interstate? Or would we just delete the business route at the control points coincident to the Interstate?

<p>Item No. 15 - State: Massachusetts Route: USBR 7 <i>Action:</i> Relocation/Realignment of an existing U.S. Bicycle Route <i>Description:</i> Route Connects Hoosac Street and GA 119 and Lime Street. With the recent extension of Ashuwillticook Trail in Adams, there is an opportunity to shift an additional 1.2 mile section of US Bile Route 7 onto the trail.</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Point to point is not included with the application. Current alignment should be provided on map.</p>	
<p>Item No. 16 - State: Michigan Route: US 131 BUS <i>Action:</i> Elimination of a U.S. Route Between US 131 (south junction) and Dunkley Street <i>Description:</i> Business US 131 in Kalamazoo, MI, is being shortened (not entirely eliminated, but shortening of a route is not an available choice on the application). The current business route between US 131 (south junction) and Dunkley Street is being eliminated (the signs are being removed) because a portion of the business route was turned back to local jurisdiction in January 2019. This business route will remain signed between Dunkley Street and US-131 (north junction).</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Page 2: Provide calendar date for Date facility open to traffic. Page 4: Traffic ADT is not provided. Page 7: Route description should be in a single space paragraph format. Shortening of route will leave U.S. 131 as a spur route.</p>	
<p>Item No. 17 - State: Michigan Route: I-94 Kalamazoo <i>Action:</i> Elimination of an Interstate Route Between I-94 (west junction) and Kings Highway (M-96) <i>Description:</i> I-94 Business Loop in Kalamazoo, MI, is being shortened (not entirely eliminated, but shortening of a route is not an available choice on the application), and the route will now be I-94 Business Spur. The current business route between I-94 (west junction) and Kings Highway (M-96) is being eliminated (the signs are being removed) because a portion of the business route was turned back to local jurisdiction in January 2019. The business route will be resigned as I-94 Business Spur (vs. Loop) between Kings Highway (M-96) and I-94 (east junction).</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Page 2: Provide calendar date for Date facility open to traffic. Page 4: Traffic ADT is not provided. Page 7: Route description should be in a single space paragraph format. Shortening of route will leave I-94 as a spur route. Point to point is not provided with the application.</p>	

<p>Item No. 18 - State: Missouri Route: US 65 BUS Carroll County <i>Action:</i> Elimination of a U.S. Route US 24/US 65 Interchange and US 65/MO-10 Interchange <i>Description:</i> The proposed section of U.S. BUS 65 is to be conveyed to the city of Carrollton. The intent of this change is to relinquish and eliminate U.S. BUS 65 numbering and remove U.S. BUS 65 from state system in Carroll County.</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Page 2: Provide a calendar date or future date for facility available for traffic. Page 8: Type of facility and total miles is not included in the paragraph</p>	
<p>Item No. 19 - State: Missouri Route: US 65 BUS Grundy <i>Action:</i> Elimination of a U.S. Route Between US 65 north intersection in Trenton and US 65 south interchange in Trenton <i>Description:</i> The portion of U.S. BUS 65 from Log Mile 0.29 to Log Mile 1.52 isto be conveyed to the city of Trenton. Therefore, MoDOT will relinquish and eliminate the U.S. BUS 65 numbering and remove U.S. BUS 65 from state system in Grundy County.</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Page 1: Date submitted is not provided. Page 7: Number of miles is not included in the paragraph description. Point to point is not included with the application.</p>	
<p>Item No. 20 - State: Missouri Route: US 61 BUS Scott <i>Action:</i> Establishment of a U.S. Route Between US 61 at Kelso and 1-55 At Scott City <i>Description:</i> The establishment of the route begins at US 61 at Kelso. It travels north along current US 61 for 2.497 miles to Scott City where it terminates at 1-55.</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Page 7: Type of facility is not included in the paragraph description. Point to point is not included with the application.</p>	<p>See item #22, related</p>
<p>Item No. 21 - State: Missouri Route: US 67 BUS Madison <i>Action:</i> Relocation of a U.S. Business Route Between US 67 and US 67 <i>Description:</i> The current U.S. BUS 67 Route Loop will be relocated to a loop consisting of MO Route A, U.S. BUS 67, and MO Route C. This will make a small loop through the city of Cherokee Pass.</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Point to point is not included with this application. Provide a separate application for the elimination of the existing route.</p>	<p>Presume existing sections of bus 67 outside of proposed are eliminated.</p>
<p>Item No. 22 - State: Missouri Route: US 61 Scott <i>Action:</i> Relocation of a U.S. Route Between US 61 at Kelso and US 61 at Scott City <i>Description:</i> The current U.S. Route 67 will be relocated west along a newly constructed section of proposed U.S. Route 61 to a new interchange onto Interstate 55. A portion of the route will be dual signed as Interstate 55 and U.S. Route 61.</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Page 2: Provide calendar date for Date facility open to traffic. Point to point is not included with the application.</p>	<p>see item #20, related</p>

<p>Item No. 23 - State: North Carolina Route: I-274 (Future) <i>Action:</i> Establishment of an Interstate Route Between us 158 in Forsyth County and US 52/Future 1-74/Proposed Future 1-285 in Forsyth County <i>Description:</i> The proposed route is a controlled access, divided, multi-lane freeway on new location and is 16.83 miles in length. This facility will satisfy a great need to alleviate congestion in Winston-Salem, an urbanized area of approximately 244,000 people. A control of access type of facility is currently unavailable to provide movement of traffic around the western portion of the Winston-Salem urbanized area. This application is in conjunction with the application for proposed Future 1-285 located at the eastern terminus of proposed Future 1-274.</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Page 2: Provide an estimated calendar date for Date facility available to traffic. Point to point is not included with the application.</p>	<p>Would we approve this with condition of resubmitting when funded? Will I-74 be built prior to I-274, if not designation will be confusing?</p>
<p>Item No. 24 - State: North Carolina Route: I-285 (Future) <i>Action:</i> Establishment of an Interstate Route Between 1-40/1-285 in Forsyth County and Future I-74/Proposed Future 1-274 (Winston-Salem Northern Beltway) in Forsyth County <i>Description:</i> Proposed Future 1-285 will be concurrent with a section of US 52 between 1-40/1-285 and Future I-74/Proposed Future 1-274 (Winston-Salem Northern Beltway) in Forsyth County. While the existing section is a controlled access, divided, multi-lane highway, a proposed project will upgrade US 52 to interstate standards and add additional capacity between 1-40/1-285 and Future I-74/Proposed Future 1-274 (Winston-Salem Northern Beltway). Winston-Salem is a major transfer point for motor freight services. Numerous freight operators are in the Winston-Salem area, with substantial truck volumes utilizing US 52 to access other major highways in and around Winston-Salem. US 52 also provides access to the Innovation Quarter of Winston-Salem. This area houses research, business and several college education facilities for a total of approximately 2 million square feet of office space in 330 acres. This application is in conjunction with the application for proposed Future 1-274 located at the northern terminus of proposed Future 1-285.</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Page 2: Provide an estimated calendar date for Date facility available to traffic. Point to point is not included with the application.</p>	

<p>Item No. 25 - State: Texas Route: US 79 BUS <i>Action:</i> Elimination of a U.S. Business Route between: State Highway 95 and US 79; and Business US 79-B and US 79. <i>Description:</i> In the City of Taylor, Williamson County, Texas, the Texas Transportation Commission approved (1) the removal of Business US 79 from the state highway system from State Highway 95 eastward to US 79; and that jurisdiction, control and maintenance be transferred to the City; (2) the removal of the concurrent designation of Business US 79 from BU 79 southward to US 79, leaving the designation of SH 95.</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Page 2: Provide calendar date when route was originally open to traffic in the field Date facility open to traffic. Page 7: Route description should be in a single space paragraph format. Point to point is not included with the application. Updated online application should be used.</p>	
<p>Item No. 26 - State: Texas Route: I-169 <i>Action:</i> Extension of an Interstate Route between: Old Alice Road and the new limits of access control approximately 0.4 mile east of FM 1847 <i>Description:</i> Section 1105(c) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), as amended, has identified Farm-to-Market Road (FM) 511 from U.S. 77/Interstate 69 East (IH 69E) to the Port of Brownsville, Texas, as part of the High Priority Corridor 18 system on the National Highway System (NHS). According to Section 1105(e)(5) of ISTEA, as amended, segments of FM 511 from U.S. 77 to the Port of Brownsville may be designated as part of the 1-69 system at such time it is determined that a segment meets the Interstate design standards approved under Section 109(b) of Title 23, United States Code and connects or is planned to connect to an existing Interstate system segment by July 1, 2037.</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Page 2: Explanation and reasoning should be concise and pertinent. Page 2: Provide calendar date for Date facility open to traffic. Page 7: Route description should be in a single space paragraph format. Point to point is not included with the application. Updated online application should be used.</p>	<p>Ok, seems like an odd spur</p> <hr/> <p>Dual Sign I-169 & SH 550</p>
<p>Item No. 27 - State: Texas Route: US 62/US 85 <i>Action:</i> Elimination of a U.S. Route between: Paisano Street (US 62/US 85) and 6th Avenue <i>Description:</i> Prior to this application. US 62/US 85 existed on two separate roads in El Paso near the Mexico border: El Paso Street (one-way) and Stanton Street (two-way): the Texas Transportation Commission approved the removal of US 62/US 85 from the state highway system along El Paso Street from Paisano Street south to 6th Avenue: and that jurisdiction. control and maintenance be transferred to the City of El Paso. The path of US62/US 85 still remains along Stanton Street. which is a two-way roadway.</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Page 2: Provide calendar date for Date facility open to traffic. Page 8: Route description should be in a single space paragraph format. Point to point is not included with the application. There should be another application to eliminate either U.S. 62 or U.S. 85. Should not be on the same application. Updated online application should be used.</p>	

<p>Item No. 28 - State: Texas Route: US 175 <i>Action:</i> Relocation of a U.S. Route between: 0.5 mile west of Farm To Market (FM) 315 to approximately 0.5 mile east of FM 315 (US 175). <i>Description:</i> In the City of Poynor, Henderson County, Texas, the Texas Transportation Commission approved the designation of US 175 along a new location from approximately 0.5 mile west of FM 315 to approximately 0.5 mile east of FM 315, a distance of approximately 1.0 mile.</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Page 7: Route description should be in a single space paragraph format. Point to point is not included with the application. Updated online application should be used.</p>	<p>Since it is newly opened, I am assuming it meets standards? Why is design standard sheet N/A? along with item 29</p>
<p>Item No. 29 - State: Texas Route: US 175 BUS <i>Action:</i> Recognition of a Business Route between: 0.5 mile west of FM 315 to approximately 0.5 mile east of FM 315. <i>Description:</i> In the City of Poynor, Henderson County, Texas, the Texas Transportation Commission approved the redesignation of US 175 as BU 175-H from approximately 0.5 mile west of FM 315 to approximately 0.5 mile east of FM 315, a distance of approximately 1.0 mile.</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Page 2: Provide calendar date for Date facility open to traffic. Page 7: Route description should be in a single space paragraph format. Point to point is not included with the application. Updated online application should be used.</p>	<p>along with item 28</p>
<p>Item No. 30 - State: Virginia Route: USBR 76 <i>Action:</i> Realignment of an existing U.S. Bicycle Route <i>Description:</i> Route Connects Atlee Rd (VA-638) and Atlee Station Rd (VA-637)</p>	<p>Affirmative with Condition</p>	<p>Point to point is not included with the application. There should possibly be a second application to remove old alignment.</p>	