

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Linko, would you stop right here? You show a transformer in each of these two slides. Are these anywhere near the same stretch? Would this be under the same highway department or are they two different States?

Mr. LINKO. This is in New York State and on the same highway.

Mr. BLATNIK. New York State.

Mr. LINKO. There is another one here—here you see another one. This whole highway is saturated with this type of installation.

Here you have it on the right. In fact, you have three separate hazards here.



Mr. BLATNIK. May I ask, Mr. Prisk, here we have the same highway department, the same installation of the electrical transformer near a bridge. Each of these three are located at a different spot. One is right in line with the light pole along the edge of the highway; the other one directly behind the protecting guardrail near the bridge; and the third is off, not quite along, the shoulder; yet not as far back into the slope as it should be to be safe. Why the disparity in location?

Mr. PRISK. I think that the only honest answer I can give to that question, Mr. Chairman, is that there is failure to recognize that transformer box structure as a potential hazard. And not recognizing it as a potential hazard, these transformer boxes, or installations, were probably made on the determinations of electrical engineers and lighting engineers on the basis of the circuitry. They run so many hundreds of feet, so many thousands of feet, and put in a transformer, or so many pole installations and drop a transformer in. And they come more or less by chance on the highway on the basis of that type of reasoning.

Mr. BLATNIK. Here we have three possible points of impact, the concrete block housing the transformer to the right, the sign post for the sign, and the guard rail. Then beyond it we have the bridge support, vertical support.