

Mr. CRAMER. I want to make sure that I understood what you said about the amount of money spent on the engineering for guardrail, which you say is about \$15,000 a mile as compared to a million dollar per mile total construction cost, therefore that the amount of engineering going into guardrails is possibly less than what it should be.

Do I understand, then, that your comment relates to section 121(d) that limits payments for construction engineering to 10 percent of the cost of construction? Is that what you are referring to?

Mr. PRISK. I can talk to you about the design efforts in general that are put into the development of guardrail plans and their place.

Mr. CRAMER. It is true that there is a limit, is that correct?

Mr. PRISK. There is a limit, yes.

Mr. CRAMER. So in this guardrail section costing, say, \$15,000 per mile, assuming it were all guardrail, which apparently it is not, it would be sections of guardrails, then the amount of maximum engineering that could be put into it costwise would be \$1,500, is that right?

Mr. PRISK. If you take that literally, I guess you are correct. Actually, \$15,000 a mile is a single run of rail a mile long. It would come out about that. If you put rail on all sides of all roadways, then you get up to \$60,000 a mile.

Mr. CRAMER. I understand that.

Mr. PRISK. \$6,000 for engineering. I am not sure this \$15,000 worth of attention that has been given, even accepting your low figure—

Mr. CRAMER. But you do not require a breakdown of the 10 percent relating to each phase of the construction, do you?

Mr. PRISK. No, sir.

Mr. CRAMER. So they could put more than 10 percent into the planning and safety features if the State wanted to, were inclined to, is that not correct?

Mr. PRISK. This is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. So the obvious conclusion is that the States just have not been inclined to spend money for safety engineering planning as compared to construction? They want to get maximum construction, is that not the general attitude?

Mr. PRISK. I believe that the accent has been on mileage production.

Mr. CRAMER. That is right, and that has been the attitude of the Bureau, has it not?

Mr. PRISK. This is not the attitude of the Bureau currently. It has been.

Mr. CRAMER. In other words, currently since these hearings started, since we passed the Safety Act last year, we are looking into things that happened prior to that time, and it appears, according to these slides, that even currently there is not much interest in safety, based upon the evidence we have.

Mr. PRISK. Well, I do not know whether I can say any more than the fact that the Bureau's first contact with the State highway departments in a formal sense was devoted totally to considerations of safety. The Director of Public Roads a few weeks ago wrote to the head of each State highway department asking that such items as we are looking at this morning occupy a major place in the program.

Mr. CONSTANDY. Mr. Ricker, do you want to comment?

Mr. RICKER. It might be worth while noting the standards for guardrail placement are related to the cross section of the road and it is rather difficult to anticipate in advance just how much guardrail