

architect, to apply their skills—esthetic considerations to ornament the bridge.

Mr. CRAMER. So we have here another instance of esthetics or beautification, if you want to call it that, being the primary consideration, apparently largely to the exclusion of safety consideration. This could be compared to planting trees in the right-of-way, is that correct?

Should there not be some mode of welding together in the form of planning whatever engineering esthetics are advisable and the safety hazards that might result?

Mr. PRISK. I would agree.

Mr. CRAMER. These clearly indicate there is just no coordination between the esthetic aspects and the safety aspects?

Mr. PRISK. I doubt that the author of that design would agree, but I agree with you.

Mr. CRAMER. We can only judge it by the results. People are getting killed here.

Mr. PRISK. Right.

Mr. W. MAY. Mr. Congressman, you would be interested to know the staff has talked to bridge engineers and asked them what is the purpose of the end post. The answer is there is no purpose. It serves no function.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, it looks pretty and costs money.

Mr. W. MAY. There are times we could put the date on it. But you notice it is like a tombstone.

Mr. CRAMER. It looks pretty, costs money, and kills people.

Mr. LINKO. Here you see a guardrail installed improperly also. Instead of letting you slide by here, you can hit the abutment head on.

Mr. W. MAY. Again, here is a case of a failure to carry the structure—the bridge narrows down and this is how they handled that particular offset.

