



Here it is looked at from the other end, looking back. It is probably no more than 8 or 10 feet clearance at this end, at the most; perhaps as little as five or six at the other end.

Mr. CONSTANDY. Mr. Wilkes, this would seem to be the ideal type of situation for closing that space and removing the hazards that exist as a result of the parapet on each bridge, and having that area traversable, would it not?

Mr. WILKES. I would agree with you, Mr. Constandy, that probably it would have been very similar in cost to build the bridge without this opening.

Mr. CONSTANDY. Being as close as they are, it might have cost even less to have done it the safer way?

Mr. WILKES. Possibly. That would, of course, have taken out this rail and parapet entirely and made a paved section across the open area.

Mr. CONSTANDY. Incidentally, that particular spot has the usual skid marks of vehicles in advance of the structure, but the area beyond is equally covered by skid marks from people who are yet undecided, after they pass the bridge, in which direction they want to go.

Beyond the structure it still is traversable for an appreciable area, and it is used as a crossover in that situation.

Safety would be considerably enhanced by the removal of those inside parapets and paving the space in between.

Mr. Wilson, did you want to say something?

Mr. WILSON. What you just mentioned could be a deficiency somewhere else. It could be a deficiency in signing or in signing messages.

However, I would agree with you, every effort should be made to make the gore area as flat and as traversable as possible.

Mr. CONSTANDY. Yes. We are deliberately omitting messages on signs in this hearing. At some later time we will be discussing signing and the messages that appear on the signs.

Mr. Prisk?