

Source, New York State Thruway Authority: 10th annual report and letter, dated Apr. 4, 1960:

Construction cost	\$799,663,799.00
Engineering cost	\$76,894,371.00
Engineering cost, percent of construction cost	9.62

Source, Richmond-Petersburg Turnpike Authority: 15th progress report:

Construction cost	\$49,130,282.56
Engineering cost	\$3,536,904.28
Engineering cost, percent of construction cost	7.20

Source, Florida State Turnpike Authority: Sunshine State Parkway, Miami to Fort Pierce section, final engineering report, dated July 1, 1958:

Construction cost	\$42,903,786.00
Engineering cost	\$3,368,636.00
Engineering cost, percent of construction cost	7.85

NOTE.—The above project is particularly noteworthy in that the entire project, 108 miles in length, was completed and opened to traffic in 19 months after proceeds from the bond issue were received. The short-time duration resulted in savings to the turnpike authority in excess of the total cost of engineering by virtue of savings in bond interest.

ANALYSIS OF REPLIES RECEIVED FROM MEMBERS OF THE CONSULTING ENGINEERS COUNCIL TO QUESTIONNAIRE WITH RESPECT TO FEES RECEIVED FROM AGENCIES OF THE ARMED SERVICES CONTRACTING FOR ARCHITECT-ENGINEER SERVICES

A. A. Heft, chairman, Fees and Contracts Committee, Consulting Engineers Council, October 20, 1958

A. SCOPE AND EXTENT OF QUESTIONNAIRE AND REPLIES

1. Under date of July 21, 1958, questionnaire was issued to the members of the Consulting Engineers Council with respect to architect-engineer services which they have performed for the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Yards and Docks, the Air Force Installations Office, or other similar agencies of the armed services. The questionnaire was directed to the fee, cost, and profit aspects of contracts which members had performed.

2. As of May 1958 the consulting engineering firms represented in the Consulting Engineers Council include 1,195 principals.

3. Replies were received from 144 members who indicated that they have had no recent experience with the armed services but are interested in performing such types of architect-engineer services, and replies were received from 157 furnishing fee and cost data about specific projects.

4. The number of replies analyzed herein does not coincide with the number of 157 given above. In some instances, replies concerning more than one project were received from one member. In other cases, replies were omitted from the analyses because certain data was omitted. Many valuable replies were received summarizing experience on a number of projects and making comments of a general nature. These also could not be included in the analyses, but are included in section B hereof.

5. It is believed that the replies are representative of the experience of architect-engineers in recent years on a wide variety of services performed for agencies of the Armed Forces. There is no indication that they represent unduly either favorable or unfavorable experience.

6. Firms replying are spread very widely throughout the country, the principal exception being the New England region. They include large, medium, and small firms, principally large and medium ones. Replies were received from a number of firms of outstanding national reputation, including several who are doing quite a large amount of work for the armed services.

7. Some of these firms have been performing architect-engineer services for the armed services since 1940; most replies are from firms which have been doing such services during the last 10 years.