thing any further, but from my standpoint I don't find that we have been provided very much basis for determining why the Army elected to pursue this particular course.

Now you can guess—and we do too much guessing, I think, when we get into this area.

Mr. VANCE. I could give you this much personal knowledge, because of my visits at CONARC in working on this problem. They had a staff, I believe, of one management analyst and a very junior man who was being trained. So the CONARC capability for making such a management study was quite limited.

The management analyst offices in the departments are larger, but——

Mr. HARDY. But you didn't participate in the decision.

Mr. VANCE. I did not participate in that part of the decision.

Mr. HARDY. As a matter of fact, we don't have anybody here that did, do we actually?

Mr. VANCE. Not that I know of.

Mr. HARDY. So what we are doing is running all around in the area of conjecture, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes; let's take the next contract.

Mr. COURTNEY. Was this a contract to find the papers on the subject?

Mr. VANCE. Yes, sir; it gives the parameters for the contractor to work with.

Mr. HÉBERT. The next contract.

Mr. SANDWEG. The next contract in order was with the Ark Engineering Co. of Philadelphia, contract DA36-039-sc-76469 awarded January 20, 1959, in the amount of $33,900.

(The detail on the above-mentioned contract is as follows:)

Type of effort: Research.
Contractor: Ark Engineering Co., 431 West Tabor Road, Philadelphia 20, Pa.
Contract No.: DA36-039-sc-76469.
Date of award: January 20, 1959.
Cost of contract: $33,900.
Completion date: December 14, 1959.
Subject matter: Report based on study and evaluation of interference present at or caused by the Department of Army Transmitter Station, Woodbridge, Va.
Recommendation or suggestion and to whom made: Reports and recommendation were furnished to the commanding officer, U.S. Army Signal Communications Agency, Arlington Hall Station, Arlington 12, Va. Attention: SIGLP-5.22.
Acceptance or rejection of recommendation or suggestion and why: The contractor recommended to CO, ASASEA, that there were two danger areas, one directly under the antennas, the other under the balen. Recommendations which were adopted were:

(*a*) Set up a roadblock.
(*b*) No employee work for a prolonged period under the antenna or balen.
(*c*) Build a protective fence.
(*d*) Post warning signs.

Mr. SANDWEG. A report was to be made based on study and evaluation of interference present at or caused by Department of the Army Transmitter Station at Woodbridge, Va. The contractor recommended to the commanding officer, USASEA, that there were two danger areas, one under the antenna and one under the balen. Recommendations were: (*a*) Set up a roadblock, (*b*) no employee work for a prolonged period under the antenna or balen, (*c*) build a protective fence, and (*d*) post warning signs.