find bushes and so, on behind the rail, where they normally would not be hit and they do improve the appearance as well as to slow down vehicles that do get that far.

Mr. CONSTANDY. Mr. Huff?

Mr. HUFF. In my opinion, the obtuse angle of approach on the median rail makes it an unsafe area and as a matter of fact I think it is more unsafe than the one on the right.

Mr. CONSTANDY. What would your solution be—extend the length of it and lessen the angle? Then you would not have to worry about a car getting behind it.

Mr. HUFF. Well, I think you get virtually the same advantage if you move the one on the left back up near the shoulder, the same distance from the shoulder as it is down the road.

Mr. CONSTANDY. Anyone else care to comment?

Mr. PRISK. Here is another treatment where a different solution approaching what Mr. Huff just suggested has been followed: Just a very slight flare and this seems to be the end of it. I think that the one thing that bothered me, as an engineer, looking at these jobs, if I may be permitted a very general comment, is the variability even on specific jobs of the treatment of essentially the same kind of situation. Perhaps we learn from doing things differently and with incomplete knowledge; also, of course, perhaps we can gain as one is built this way and this one is built another way. Maybe later on we will know something about this.

Mr. CONSTANDY. Both of them are intended to protect the motorist from some hazard in the median?

Mr. PRISK. That is right.

Mr. CONSTANDY. In the former case it is the twin bridge, in the latter it is the slope?

Mr. PRISK. The embankment, yes. True.

Mr. SKEELS. On this one we have here, I don't know the whole situation, of course, but it appears that perhaps that slope could have been modified and not need the guardrail.