

Mr. Linko, your point here was you could reduce these three to one and that would cut your chances of impact to one-third giving you two-thirds times better chance of missing an off-the-road collision. What you say is, move the concrete transformer behind the bridge, then you would have only one hazard, and place the sign on the overhead bridge?

Mr. LINKO. That is right. I feel there should be one hazard here. This happens to be an Interstate highway and a large truck running into that light switch box can cause thousands of dollars of damage. It would have to be replaced and the same goes for that sign. If it had been mounted on the existing bridge it might have saved thousands of dollars in the initial installation. And actually you need a guardrail at the bridge abutment, and there is none, as you can see. That should be the only hazard here, and instead there are three separate points for impact.

In other words, nobody is really thinking of reducing the hazards; they are just continuing building them.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Cramer.

Mr. CRAMER. When I was a kid we used to play the game called "What is wrong with the picture?" It looks like that is what we are into here.

Mr. Prisk, if I were suggesting what was wrong with this picture, I would say, No. 1, the transformer is on the right-of-way, constituting a hazard; No. 2, the sign has been placed on a separate standard, rather than the bridge, which provides a separate hazard; No. 3, the white and black striped post is a separate hazard; No. 4, the guardrail itself at the red spot is a hazard in that it is not in any way grounded or installed in any way to prevent serious accident; and in addition, No. 5, the stanchions supporting the bridge, or the pillars themselves, have no protection and are pretty close to the traveled lanes. Now, that provides five separate specific hazards.

Now, how can anyone possibly suggest that this design was made with safety in mind?

Mr. PRISK. This is a very good question, and you have made a good identification of the hazards that are there. I believe that the improvements that you suggested are not unreasonable ones, in most part.

That black and white board is simply a marker board up against the side pier. I doubt that this could be considered to be any kind of hazard. In fact, it probably contributes to safety at night, because those boards are reflectorized and show the motorist where the side pier is.

Mr. CRAMER. Substitute the light pole I did not mention—it is also in the picture—for the painted striped pillar.

Mr. PRISK. I wondered if you had overlooked that light pole. [Laughter.] I do not think of a good answer to your question.

Mr. CRAMER. How can we today, with the engineering capabilities that we have and with the Bureau's experience over many years, and with the State highway department's experience likewise, end up with five separate hazards in one location like this? That is what I want to know.

Mr. PRISK. There is no good answer for it that I can think of. These separate hazards looked at separately would be recognizable as hazards