reaches the end of the parapet wall on the bridge structure. Any deflection of this rail, being struck on the approach to the bridge, would cause a car to stop at this point, and of course this is pretty much an immovable object, and collision here gets pretty violent.

Mr. CONSTANDY. Is that typical of the installation in Indiana, Mr. Prisk?

Mr. PRISK. Yes. This is typical of Indiana, and a good many of the other States that we will see.

Mr. CONSTANDY. You relate what would happen when the guardrail is struck by an automobile and the consequences of it; could we conclude that this is wrong?

Mr. PRISK. I think it would be necessary to conclude that. We have no post support in the picture for a very considerable distance, and there is a 12-foot-6 spacing on the post. An additional post in this area would help somewhat to reinforce that guardrail against lateral deflection.

As it stands, this could rather easily be moved back by the impact of a car, and the car would collide with the structures.

Mr. CONSTANDY. That is a very severe type of accident, is it not?

Mr. PRISK. It is. It is a violent collision.

Mr. WILKES. Could I point to another undesirable feature, and that is the end of that bridge rail, which is obviously an ornamental feature.

Mr. CONSTANDY. How could that be better done?

Mr. WILKES. Even with the parapet extended to protect the end of that, to keep the rail from hitting the driver or occupant in some cases, the rail could be turned down.

Mr. CONSTANDY. We saw that same point in Utah yesterday. In that instance it was turned down and that round part that we see at the end was curved down to where it meets the top of the parapet, making it a smooth curve.

Mr. SKEELS. I was simply going to add one comment. On this very short bridge it is doubtful in my mind that the rail is justified at all.

Mr. CONSTANDY. The entire structure on top of the parapet?

Mr. SKEELS. The metal rail installed on top of the concrete.