

## U. S. Route Numbering Committee

Chicago, Illinois

November 22, 1957

<u>STATE</u>	<u>ROUTE NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
MASSACHUSETTS NEW HAMPSHIRE	U. S. 1 Alternate (2nd Presentation)	Proposed marking would be over Massachusetts State Route 17 north from U. S. Route 1 in Danvers to a connection with present U. S. 1 at New Hampshire-Massachusetts line.
<u>DENIED</u> ---for the reason that no new supporting data was submitted to justify the proposal.		
WEST VIRGINIA	U. S. 19 Relocation	Proposed marking would follow improved sections of State Routes 92 and 7, beginning 0.88 miles southerly from the West Va.-Pennsylvania State line at junction of present U. S. 19 and State Route 92, then southerly over Route 92 to State Route 7 about 1/4 mile east of Jere P. O. then easterly along Rtes. 7 and 92 thru Star City and Morgantown to U. S. 119, then west over State Route 7 A to junction with present Rte. 19 in Westover
<u>APPROVED</u>		
IOWA	U. S. 20 Relocation	Proposed marking will provide a better route for traffic between Waterloo and Jessup, over a newly constructed section of urban design in Waterloo and high standards in rural section between towns. Eliminates bad alignment and narrow pavement sections on old route. Bypasses Evansdale to north-east and Jessup to the south.
<u>APPROVED</u> (On the assumption that the old location would be marked with a state number.)		
IOWA	U. S. 20 Relocation	Proposed marking will provide a more modern highway for through traffic between Moville and U. S. 59 near Holestein. Will bypass Cushing to north and passes through a less congested section of Correctionville on the north.
<u>APPROVED</u> (On the assumption that the old location would be marked with a state number.)		
IOWA	U. S. 30 Relocation	Proposed marking will provide a high design type highway bypassing several towns between a point on original U. S. Route 30 north of Scranton and Grand Junction.
<u>APPROVED</u> (On the assumption that the old location would be marked with a state number.)		
IOWA	U. S. 61 Relocation	Proposed marking will be over new high type highway between Muscatine and Bluegrass and over present 18' pavement on State Route 22 (which is scheduled for widening and re-surfacing) thereby avoiding congested area along river route.
<u>APPROVED</u> (On the assumption that the old location would be marked with a state number.)		

<u>STATE</u>	<u>ROUTE NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
IOWA (Con't)	U. S. 218 Relocation	Proposed marking would be over new highway (State Route 153) then double marking with U. S. 6 into Western edge of Iowa City. Provides a bypass of business district.
<u>APPROVED</u>		(On the assumption that the old location would be marked with a state number.)
FLORIDA	U. S. 27 Alternate	Proposed routing would follow existing State Route 17 from Haines City to the junction with present U. S. 27 south of Frostproof.
<u>DENIED</u>		---for the reason that it violates the policy for marking the best available route to handle through traffic.
"	U. S. 98 Relocation	Proposed routing would be over new highway constructed to bypass coastal route between Fort St. Joe and Apalachicola via Tilton.
<u>APPROVED</u>		
"	U. S. 98 Alternate	Proposed routing would be over old U. S. Route 98 between Fort St. Joe and Apalachicola via Tilton to provide marked route along the policy for marking the best available coastal route for travelers desiring to use that facility.
<u>DENIED</u>		---for the reason that it violates the policy for marking the best available coastal route to handle through traffic.
CALIFORNIA	U. S. 40 B.R. Recognition of a Business Route in West Sacramento between Yolo Causeway and Tower Bridge	Beginning on the West Sacramento Freeway at the interchange near the Yolo Causeway then east through West Sacramento bearing north of the Freeway in a general parallel direction to the interchange at the west end of the Tower Bridge over the Sacramento River.
<u>APPROVED</u>		
"	U. S. 60-70-99 B.R. Recognition of a Business Route in Banning	Proposed routing would be over former routing of U. S. Routes 60, 70 and 99 in the City of Banning. A new Freeway bypassing the business district of the City of Banning has recently been completed and the original marking of these routes has been placed on the Freeway.
<u>APPROVED</u>		
"	U. S. 99 B. R. Recognition of a Business Rte. in Atwater between Buhach Rd. and Crane Road.	Proposed routing would be over former U. S. 9 which has been relocated on a new freeway through the area.
<u>APPROVED</u>		
"	U. S. 101 B. R. Recognition of a Business Route in Buena Park	Proposed routing would be over old U. S. 101 which has been relocated and built as a freeway bypassing the main business section.
<u>APPROVED</u>		
"	U. S. 101 B. R. Recognition of a Business Route in Paso Robles	Proposed routing would be over former U. S. 101 on Spring Street. A new freeway bypassing the business district will carry U. S. 101.
<u>APPROVED</u>		

November 22, 1957  
 Executive Committee  
 Chicago, Illinois

154

OPIAD

<u>STATE</u>	<u>ROUTE NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
MISSOURI <u>APPROVED</u>	U. S. 54 Relocation	Proposed marking will be over newly constructed section of U. S. 54 between Grand Glaiz Bridge and Linn Creek. Consists of several minor relocations and one major relocation shortening route approximately 0.4 mile.
" <u>APPROVED</u>	U. S. 60 Relocation	Proposed marking will be over new high-type highway, which will replace an obsolete section built many years ago. Distance between Willow Springs (Junction U.S. 63 South) and State Route 17, east of Mountain View will be shortened 1.7 miles.
" <u>APPROVED</u>	U. S. 60 Relocation	Proposed routing would be over a new bypass constructed south of the present route at Monatt. Beginning at the junction with State Route 37 at south edge of the city extend eastward on new location to a point east of the Frisco Railroad overpass on the present route about 4 miles west of Monatt.
" <u>APPROVED</u>	U. S. 60 Recognition of a Business Route	Proposed routing and marking would be over the route formerly used by U. S. Route 60 from the south junction with State Route 37 through the city and eastward to junction with new location for U. S. 60 about 4 mile from the east city limits.
" <u>APPROVED</u>	U. S. 66 Relocation	Proposed marking would be over a new Interstate type dual highway between Conway and a point east of Lebanon, bypassing Lebanon to the south.
" <u>APPROVED</u>	U. S. 66 Recognition of Business Route	Proposed Business Route would be marked over old U. S. Route 66 from a point east of Lebanon to a point west, where the new location intersects the old route. Interchanges are located at each terminal point.
" <u>APPROVED</u>	U. S. 166 Recognition of a Business Route	Proposed marking would be part way over a new dual urban project on State Route 43, leading directly into the heart of Joplin, from the south, thence east along a recently constructed 4-lane urban project to a connection with present U.S. Route 166.
ARKANSAS <u>APPROVED</u>	U. S. 70 Relocation	Proposed marking will be over modern designed (future 4-lane) controlled access highway on a shorter route from a point south of Benton to Hot Springs.

<u>STATE</u>	<u>ROUTE NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
NEBRASKA <u>APPROVED</u>	U. S. 73 Extension and Elimination of U. S. 73 E and U. S. 73 W.	Proposed marking will extend U. S. 73 northward from Tekamah over present U. S. 73 E (to be eliminated) to Decatur, thence northwest on U. S. 73 E (to be eliminated) to Winnebago. U. S. 73 W from Tekamah west and north via Oakland to Winnebago will be eliminated.
MONTANA	U. S. 287	Proposed marking is an extension from West Yellowstone near the Wyoming border over present U. S. 191 8 miles north to junction with Montana State Route 1, thence westerly and northerly over Route 1 through Ennis and Harrison to junction with U. S. 10 S, thence northeasterly to junction with U. S. 10 N, west of Three Forks, thence northerly on Route 10 N through Townsend to U.S. 91 in Helena, thence northerly on U. S. 91 to junction with State Route 33 at Wolf Creek thence over Route 33 through Augusta to U. S. 89 in Choteau, thence northerly on U. S. 89 through Browning to the Canadian border at Fort of Piegan.
GEORGIA NORTH CAROLINA	Request for the establishment of a new route between Savannah, Ga., and Marble, No. Carolina	<p data-bbox="1144 978 1356 1010">(Georgia Portion)</p> <p data-bbox="966 1010 1502 1393">Proposed new U. S. Route would begin at the junction of U. S. Routes 17 and 80 in Savannah, Ga., thence west over U. S. 80 to junction with State Route 17, thence northwesterly on Route 17 through Guyton, Oliver, Millen and Midville, Ga., to U.S. 1 in Louisville, thence north on U. S. 1 and State Route 17 to Wrens, Ga., thence continuing northerly on Route 17 to junction with U. S. 78 in Thomson, thence continuing northerly on State Route 17 and U.S. 78 to Washington, thence continuing northerly on State Route 17 through Elberton, Bowman, Canon, Lavonia, Toccoa, Clarksville, Hiwassee to the No. Carolina State Line south of Hayesville, North Carolina.</p>
	<u>DENIED</u> ---(same as Georgia Portion shown above.)	<p data-bbox="1120 1415 1412 1447">(North Carolina Portion)</p> <p data-bbox="966 1447 1502 1617">Proposed route would connect with Georgia routing at No. Carolina-Ga. State Line south of Hayesville, thence north on No. Carolina State Route 69 to U.S. Route 64 in Hayesville then west on U.S. 64 to a junction with a road 5 miles east of Murphy, then north about 9 miles to U.S. Rtes. 19 and 129 in Marble.</p>

<u>STATE</u>	<u>ROUTE NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
TENNESSEE	Request for the establishment of a new U. S. Route	Proposed route would begin at junction of U. S. 70 and State Route 20 approximately 6 miles north of Jackson, then over Route 20 through Lexington to State Route 100 in Linden, then easterly on Route 100 through Centerville and Wrigley to junction with U. S. 70 approximately 7 miles west of Nashville.
<u>ACTION DELAYED</u> ---in order to determine the effect of the location of Interstate Route through that general area. Also, there appears to be an over concentration of U. S. Routes.		
ARIZONA NEW MEXICO TEXAS	U. S. 90 Extension (For Reconsideration)	Proposed extension of U. S. 90 from VanHorn Texas via U. S. 80 through El Paso, Texas; via U. S. 80 and 85 to Las Cruces, New Mexico via U. S. 70 and 80 through Deming to Lordsburg, via U. S. 80 to Road Forks; thence via New Mexico Route 14 to the Arizona Line; thence via Arizona Route 86 to a junction northwest of Bowie; thence via U. S. 666 to Benson; thence via U. S. 80 to Tucson; thence via Arizona Route 84 through Casa Grande to a junction with U. S. 80 at Gila Bend.
<u>DENIED</u> ---for the reason that present construction is not up to required standards. (Respective states are invited to resubmit applications when standards of construction for this proposed route extension meet primary requirements.)		
ARKANSAS OKLAHOMA TEXAS	Request for establishment of U. S. 366 (For Reconsideration)	Proposed route U. S. 366 to begin at Little Rock, Arkansas, thence via Arkansas Route 10 westerly to Fort Smith; thence via Oklahoma Route 9 through Stigler, Eufaula, Wetumka, Tecumseh, Norman, Chickasha, Anadarko, Hobart, Granite, to the Texas Line west of Madge; thence via Texas Route 203 through Wellington to Hadley; (If routing is changed to go into Clovis, New Mexico as suggested by Oklahoma a revised application will have to be submitted from Texas for the portion between Hadley and Texico on U. S. 60 at the Texas-New Mexico State Line and an application from New Mexico for the 9 mile section between Texico and Clovis in New Mexico.)
<u>DENIED</u> ---for the reason that present construction is not up to required standards. (Respective states are invited to resubmit their applications when standards of construction for the establishment of this proposed routing meet primary requirements.)		