

appears that the back is pretty steep, is it not? The slope is a little bit too steep to negotiate safely.

Mr. PRISK. That is correct. Probably it is 2 to 1 anyway.

Mr. BLATNIK. Your drainage ditch is sharp and it serves similarly to the return groove on a bowling alley, which turns the bowling ball back.

Mr. PRISK. Yes.

Mr. BLATNIK. It is short. In that groove one could pretty well be frozen, fixed or locked in and run right into the culvert headwall; would he not?

Mr. PRISK. Yes. I think there is a pretty good chance. It would depend on the angle of entry. In any event, when you traverse a V type of ditch, you are far more apt to go out of control than you are with a flat, rounded bottom ditch.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Ricker, you had your hand up.

Mr. RICKER. This illustrates a question of whether the guard rail does not present more hazards than the culvert did originally. We think it would be worth review. You can't judge this just from this picture. Omit the guard rail entirely and the hazard may be so small it could be ignored or else perhaps extend the culvert slightly and you don't need any rail.

Mr. CONSTANDY. In other words, a change of design in the culvert might permit elimination of guardrail?

Mr. PRISK. Right.

Mr. CONSTANDY. Plus elimination of a possible hazard.

Mr. PRISK. This is a very good comment and this is also along the line of the investigation that was done in California under Mr. Wilson's direction, where the criteria for installation of guardrail was considered against the possible hazards involved by having the rail there. Its protective value against its hazard value, I think, must be compared.

Here is an instance of a very short section in front of a sign, again a very slight flare over a very short distance on this rail.

