

places and he will catch the corner of the sign and damage it completely so it has to be replaced. So just from the point of maintenance, it would be better to get this thing out of here.

Mr. CONSTANDY. It is another cost factor that should be borne in mind.

Mr. RICKER. Mr. Prisk, that sign does not meet present clearance standards, lateral clearance, 2 feet beyond the shoulder?

Mr. PRISK. I think it does. There are 2 feet here and the edge of the shoulder is out here somewhere. These were checked, practically all of them. I think you will find it does meet the standards as far as minimum clearance is concerned. But it is ironic that the standards are actually set up to read that the sign must clear the edge of the shoulder by at least 2 feet, and you find all the signs at 2 feet. Suggestion of a minimum is taken as a standard and fixed dimension, unfortunately.

Mr. CONSTANDY. Just adherence to the minimum standards, without judgment, really is a problem.

Mr. PRISK. That is true.

Mr. CONSTANDY. On that picture, there is oil where the shoulder ends, here at the beginning of the fore slope. They spray it with tar or oil. It gives the impression the shoulder is over farther.

It might also give the same impression to a driver. As that relates to the closeness to the sign, and could, in turn, create an additional problem.

I might say this, we have many pictures of signs on these various projects and the problem is one of being able to pick a typical installation and not spend the entire day showing all of them. These signs are simply intended to be representative and they appear with great frequency on sections of the highway we looked at. The fact we show two or three slides for a given State should not suggest they were the only signs on the project.

Mr. PRISK. Moving on, here is another similar installation for another purpose, service sign, "Gas, Food" marking, with exposed footings.

