

AN APPLICATION
FROM THE STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF
FOR $\begin{gathered}\text { ARIZONA } \\ \\ \end{gathered}$


8
the Establishment of a U.S. Routethe Relocation of U.S. Route ... 164the Extension of U.S. Routethe Establishment of an Alternate U.S. Routethe Establishment of a Temporary U.S. Route $\qquad$the Recognition of a Business Route on U.S. Routethe Recognition of a By-pass Route on U.S. Route

BETWEEN
Cortez, Colo. and Tuba City, Arizona Kayenta,..Ariz..... and .C.rescent...Jc.ta....Utah

> The Following
> State or States are
> Involved:
(In case more than one State is involved, an application must be submitted by each State for that portion within the respective State.)

ARIZONA $\qquad$


Date Submitted:
.6 June 1969

[^0] routing, if true, will suffice. If there are deficiencies, they should be so indicated in accordance with Page 4 instructions.

The State Highway Department agrees and pledges its good faith that it will not erect, remove, or change any U. S. Route Markers on any road without the authorization, consent, or approval of the Executive Committee of the American Association of State Highway Officials, not withstanding the fact that the changes proposed are entirely within this State.

US 164 E SR 464
The weighted average daily traffic volume along the proposed route, as shown on the map on page 3 , is
 routes in the State.

The "Purpose and Policy in the Establishment and Development of United States Numbered Highways, as Revised August 1, 1962" has been read and is accepted.

In our opinion, this petition complies with the above policy:


Chief Administrative Official,
ARIZONA STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT
$\qquad$ (Member Department)

This petition is authorized by official action of $\qquad$ Arizona State Hi.ghway...Commi.ss.ion under date of $\qquad$ as follows: (Copy excerpt from Minutes)

WHEREAS, it has been recommended by the Navajo Trail Association and concurred in'by Utah, New Mexico; and Colorado States that U.S. Route 164 from U.S. Route 89 near Tuba Citỳ, Arizona, northeasterly via Kayenta, Mexican Water and Teec Nos Pos to Cortez, Colorado, be designated as a part of U.S. Route 160, that present U.S. Route 160 from Cortez, Colorado, northwesterly to Monticello, Utah, be redesignated as U.S. Route 666 and that the highway from Kayenta, Arizona, northerly via Monticello, Utah, to Crescent Junction be designated as U.S. Route 164, and

WHEREAS, the redesignation and addition of these routes will result in the continuity of U.S. route designations and will assist the touring public, and

WHEREAS, the designation of State Route 464 as a part of U.S. Route 164 will provide a U.S. Designated Route in the northeastern part of Arizona that will be beneficial as a guide to the touring public, and

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved as follows:

1. That the necessary documents pertaining to the addition and redesignation of the aforementioned roads within Arizona be prepared andisubmitted to the American Association of State Highway Officials for approval.







 time accion pruseatly dantganzed - \#. \$. 260 .




The purpose of the U.S. Numbering and Marking is to facilitate movement along the general direction of desire lines of travel over the shortest and best available roads, and a route should form continuity of available facilities through two or more States that accommodate the most important and heaviest motor traffic flow in the area.

The system was established in 1926 and the U. S. Route System has reached the point of review, revision, consolidation, and perfecting, rather than continuous expansion. Therefore, any proposed alteration in the established system should be extremely meritorious and thoroughly, though concisely, explained in order that the Route Numbering Committee and the Executive Committee of the Association may give prompt and proper consideration to each and every request made by a Member Department.

Explanation and Reasons for the Request: (Keep Concise and Pertinent)

It is requested that U.S. Route 160 be designated from Cortez, Colorado southerly over the routing of U.S. Route 666 for approximately 20 miles to the junction with present U.S. Route 164 and thence southwesterly on the routing of present U.S. Route 164 to a junction with U.S. Route 89 near Tub̄a City, Arizona.

Present U.S. Route 164 is designated from U.S. Route 666 south of Cortez, Colorado, southwesterly to U.S. Route 89 near Tuba City, Arizona. The entire routing of present U.S. Route 164 will be designated as a portion of U.S. Route 160 and therefore, it is requested that the present location of U.S. Route 164 be deleted under this proposal.

It is further suggested that the routing from proposed U.S. Route 160 (present U.S. Route 164) at Kayenta, Arizona, northerly via Arizona State Highway No. 464 and Utah State Highway No. 47 through Mexican Hat, Bluff, and Blanding to Monticello, Utah, then northerly via present U.S. Route 160 to $C$ rescent Junction (U.S. Route $6 \& 50$ ), be designated as U.S. Route 164 and therefore it is requested that the present designation of U.S. Route 160 from Monticello, Utah, to Crescent Junction be deleted under this proposal.

This renumbering of U.S. Routes will provide a more desirable continuity of routings for the traveling public through the Four Corners Area of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico and Arizona.

The extension of U.S. Route 160 to a junction with U.S. Route 89 near Tuba City, Arizona, would designate one U.S. Route number along the historical Navajo Trail. This route in recent years has become extremely popular due to the development of recreation facilities in the area and due to improvements that have been made in the highway network.

The designation of U.S. Route 164 from Kayenta, Arizona, northerly via Mexican Hat, Bluff, and Monticello to Crescent Junction will provide a. U.S. Route in the southeast portion of Utah and will be beneficial to the touring public.

Does the petition propose a new routing over a portion of an existing U. S. Route $\qquad$ ? If so, where:



Map of State or Portion thereof, indicating proposed
addition or change in the U. S. Numbered System:
(A photographic reduction or section of Departmental Map attached to this sheet-may be folded to-sheet size, but do not use a map larger than four $81 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 11^{\prime \prime}$ sheets in size.)

## Paste Here

and
Fold to Size
(Indicate termini and control points on the map for the route, and number them in sequence. Use same numbers in Column 1 tabulation, Page 5, when listing mileage. Towns, Cities, Major Highway Intersections and State Lines to be used on Control Points. The top of Column 1, Page 5, will be one terminus, and Column 1 will give the $\log$ of the route as needed to describe the route in the Association publication "U. S. Numbered Highways," if the application is approved by the Executive Committee.)

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR RREPARATION OF PAGE NO. 5

Column 1: Control Points and Mileage. Top of column is one terminus of road. Indicate control points by identical number as shown on map on page 3. Show mileage between control points in miles and tenths.

## Column 2: Pavement Type. <br> Code

| High type, heavy duty | H |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intermediate type | I (Show in red) |
| Low type, dustless | L (Show in red) |
| Not paved | N (Show |

## Column 3: Pavement Condition.

Code

| Excellent | E |
| :--- | :--- |
| Good | G |
| Fair | F (Show in red) |
| Poor | P (Show in red). |

note: In columns 2 and 3, where pavement types and conditions change, the location of the change shall be indicated by a short horizontal line at the proper place opposite the mileage $\log$ and the proper code letter (shown above) shall be entered in the respective column between the locations so indicated.

Column 4: Traffic. Indicate average daily traffic volumes in this column. Points of changes in these data to be indicated by short horizontal lines opposite the appropriate mileage point on the mileage log. Any existing main line rail crossing that is not separated shall be indicated at the appropriate mileage point by $\mathbf{R} \mathbf{X}$ _-Black if signalized—Red if not protected by signals.

Columns Pavement Width and Shoulder Width. These columns to be completed by comparing standards of 5 \& 6: highway involved with applicable AASHO Primary Standards. Entries that fall to the right of the tolerance line (dashed) should be shaded in red.

Columns Major Structures. Show in these columns those structures that do not meet AASHO Primary Stand7 \& 8: ards. Show by horizontal line sufficiently long to indicate percentage of deficiency. Portion on right of tolerance line shall be shown in red. Indicate length of structure in feet immediately under the line. Any substandard highway underpass structure shall be shown opposite the appropriate mileage point by the designation $L P$ with the vertical clearance in feet following and shown in red.

Column 9: Vertical Sight Distance. Items to be shown in this column as a horizontal line, the length of which will indicate the deficiency as determined in accordance with comparisons with comparable AASHO Primary Standards. Portion of line past the tolerance line shall be shown in red.

Column 10: Horixontal Curvature. Curves in excess of AASHO applicable Primary Standards to be shown in this column by a short horizontal line with degree of curve shown immediately above the line. To be shown in red.

Column 11: Percent Grades. Show by horizontal lines opposite proper point on mileage log. Show percent of grade above the line and length of 'grade in feet immediately below. To be shown in red.

## AASHO ROUTE NUMBERING COMMITTEE

Analysis of an Application for Addition, Change, or Extension to the U.S. Route Number System

Credit Points

1. Completeness and clarity of application. . +5
2. Proposed route most direct and best available. +25
3. Traffic need is present. $\quad+25$
4. Proposed route is geometrically and structurally adequate. +25
5. Relation to other D.S. Routes in area or adjoining States;
(a) Complements and integrates with other $U_{0} S_{0}$ Routes: +10
(b) Creates over-concentration of U.S. Routes. - 10
6. Apparent origin of application:
(a) To serve a meritorious need; $\quad+10$
(b) Non-Highway Department promotion. $\quad 10$
7. Application has previously been denied. - 5
8. Proposed route presently has a continuous State Route Designation.

Net Score
(70 or above considered as justifying favorable action on application.)
$\qquad$

AASHO ROUTE NUMBERING COMMITTEE

Analysis of an Application for Addition, Change, or Extension to the U.S. Route Number System


Net Score
(70 or above considered as justifying favorable action on application.)


U.S. Route Numbering Committee American Association of State Highway Officials 917 National Press Building Washington, D. C. 20004<br>Attention: Mr. A. E. Johnson<br>Executive Secretary<br>Gent lemen:

Enclosed for your consideration are six copies of an application in conjunction with Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico pertaining to the redesignation of U.S. Routes in the northeast and the Four Corners areas in Arizona.

These changes are part of an overall proposal to improve U.S. route numbering in the area.

By this action these U.S. Routes will provide a more desirable continüity of routings for the traveling public through the Four Corners Area of Arizona, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico.

Favorable consideration of this request will be sincerely appreciated.

> Very truly yours,


FHH/sjn
encl.


William N. Price<br>State Highway Engineer<br>Arizona Highway Department<br>206 South 17th Avenue<br>Phoenix, Arizona 85007<br>Dear Mr. Price:

Thts will acknowledge receipt of your letizr of June 13, 1969, and the six copies of an application for U.S. route numbering change.

Unfortunately, your letter and enclosures were received too late to be included on the agenda for consideration at the Summer Metting, but it will be put on the agenda for the meeting in the fall.

Yours truly,
dkn

H. J. Rhodes

Assistant to the Director GOVERNOR BUS MEAD CHAIRMAN

## ARIZONA HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT



Phoenix, Arizona 85007

13 November 1969

Mr. A. E. Johnson
Executive Director
Ame rican Association of State Highway Officials 341 National Press Building
Washington, D. C. 20004
Dear Mr. Johnson:

In reply to your letter of November 4, 1969 concerning U.S. Highway 160 we have the following comments:

The description of U.S. Route 160 was extremely difficult to follow since it referred to overlapping routes not existing in Arizona, or routes located in a different part of the State. Arizona has no State Route 40 or 44. State Route 67 is located at the north rim of the Grand Canyon, some 50 miles west of the western terminus of U.S. 160. May it also be noted that the junction of U.S. 160 and U.S. 89 is 10.4 miles west of Tuba City, not in Tuba City as stated in your description.

Assuming proposed U.S. Route 160 follows the alignment previously assigned by AASHO to U.S. 164 in Arizona, we concur in your recommendations.

Would you please notify us whether our assumptions concerning U.S. 160 routing are correct, and the effective date of this action? An early response would be sincerely appreciated since our sign shop and mapping division are awaiting official authorization to begin the considerably complex task of renumbering a long route.

Very truly yours,


WM. N. PRICE
State Highw fysingeer
cc: Henry C. Helland, Director of Highways Utah Highway Department L. G. Boles, State Highway Engineer Nèw Mexico Highway Department Chas. E. Shumate, Chief Engineer Colorado State Department of Highways

Kr. W. H. Irice<br>Scate Highuay fingtineor<br>Arimona state Mighowy Bupartmant<br>206 south 17th Avepua<br>Phoenix, Axdsona 65007

Deas Hx. Prices
In suply so your latter of Mowenter the 1Hth, cencaraing the action of the U. B. Route Hombring Subcomittee, your assumption thet the dasignation of U. 8. 260 wonld follow that route presently danignated as U. 8. 164 \&rom Corten, Colorado, to junction wast of Tubat City, Arisona.

Thit dendgation has not yet been concurrad in the stace of tech since the pramencidealgnazion of 5 . S. 160 sould have to be changed froin Cortet. Colorado, to Crascent Junceion, Utah.

It hat been concutred in by both tien harleo and Colorado.
The ection oill not becom final until all states involved concur in the zenumberiag.

Toure tivis.<br>A. 8. Johnsce Executive Disectoz

H. J. Khedas

Amsiatent to the Diractor

## Kunifan

cat Colorado, Elem Kazico and Utah

```
To the Chief Administrative Officers of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah:
```


## Gentlemen:

At the meeting of the U. S. Route Numbering Subcommittee held October the 25th, in Philadelphia, the following action was taken on your requests for the renumbering of highways in the Four Corners area.

The following action was taken and approved by the Executive Comittee on October the 26 th, to designate as U. S. Highway 160 that route from Cortez, Coloraod, south overlapping U. S. 666 to the intersection of State Route 40, thence overlapping State Routes 40,67 and 44 to the intersection of U. S. 89 in Tuba City, Arizona.

To designate as U. S. 163 that route presently designated as U. S.' 666 from Gallop, New Mexico, to Cortez, Colorado, and from Cortez, Colorado, to Crescent Junction, Utah, that section presently designated as U. S. 160.

This action would then assign an odd numbered V. S. Route (163) to the major north-south route through this area and an even numbered D. S. Route (160) to the main east-west route through thls area.

The addition of a route between Monticello, Utah, and Rayenta, Arizona, was denied as not being developed to full geomatric design standards and not being necessary for the proper direction of through traffic.

It would be appreciated if you would advise if you concur in this recomandation so that the official records of the Association may be changed if you do.

Yours truly,
A. E. Johnson Executive Director

H. J. Ehodes Assistant to the Director


[^0]:    * A local vicinity map needed on Page 3. On Page 5 a short statement to the effect that there are no deficiencies on proposed

