

Also it is fairly obvious that many signs perhaps can be eliminated, or at least the supports, which are what we are concerned with, can be eliminated by mounting the signs on bridges, combining signs.

I noticed one in which we had two signposts adjacent to each other, one carrying one sign and one the other. This is not uncommon, and certainly needs to be looked at.

Mr. CONSTANDY. Overall, were you satisfied or not, Mr. Skeels?

Mr. SKEELS. I am satisfied that there is progress showing up. I particularly like the breakaway sign on the smaller Oklahoma sign we saw. There is progress in view. If this progress can be carried across the country, I am certain it would be still better.

I do know Michigan has gone to the breakaway sign, as well as Texas, and obviously many other States are moving in this direction rapidly. What we have done in the past, and we saw examples of, I am not satisfied with.

Mr. CONSTANDY. Mr. Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. I think this is one of the most fruitful areas that we can improve for the motorist, and not only in the structural problems we have been looking at here, but in sign messages as well, although I will not talk about sign messages now.

My office in Sacramento reviews message or sign guiding, and in that review we look at them very carefully to try to eliminate signs where possible, but where we find out the most good can be gained is the placement itself, particularly the lateral placement.

Due to heavy traffic volume and the fact that we put a lot of signs in the median, we found mounting signs back to back—in other words, putting a sign message in the median area, and having a sign face in both directions—eliminates one fixed object entirely. We think this is good.

I might recall on one modest-sized freeway project, after making our headquarters review of the guide signs, we found out we could eliminate about 45 supports that had been proposed by the district.

These are individual signposts. We did this by going to a back-to-back mounting, to structure mounting.

I would like to have Mr. Wilkes make a comment on what he thinks of mounting signs on structures. All in all we think this a pretty good area to improve safety for the motorist.

We have recently changed our wind loading specifications to the point where we are now getting 90 square feet of sign on wood posts. In years past we used wood on all signs having less than 60 square feet of area. That is a pretty good sized sign.

We have done extensive testing on structural timber, 4 by 6, 6 by 6, 6 by 8. We feel we can use a 6 by 8 post without causing too much damage to a vehicle striking it.

The exit signs that you saw in the gore area here we mount on a single 4-by-6 post.

One of the things that bothers traffic engineers is the number of signs we feel are not needed. You saw some of those here, particularly some of the rules of the road. I think there are enough freeways now constructed around the country that motorists should be aware of some of these regulations without having to be reminded of them every 3 or 4 miles.

The other area of needless signs is signs that are demanded by local groups. It is a difficult situation to try to tell someone that he should