normal civilian practice, command a much higher fee. Actually it appears from this data that on an average basis, it neither commands an adequately higher fee nor results in a sufficient profit to compensate for the added work.

8. Civilian work for the Corps of Engineers also appears to suffer from an inadequate fee. While these projects are of their nature large and should carry low percentage fees, it would appear that the fee is now set too low to result

in what could be considered an adequate return.

9. Subcontract work for prime architect-engineers while, not the direct responsibility of the Department of Defense, reflects the fees awarded to the architect-engineer. Here again, this work can only be considered marginal from the profit standpoint.

10. Over 34 percent of the projects on which complete data was received

showed a net loss to the architect-engineer.

11. In most cases, the fees reported are below the minimum fees as set forth

in accepted fee schedules for comparable civilian work.

12. A study of the profits shown on these returns indicate why many medium and large architect-engineers do not regard projects for the Department of Defense very desirable.

Preliminary reports or advance planning

Job	Services per- formed				Fee	Construction cost		Percent of architect- engineer fee		Fee as per- cent of actual	Dollar profit or loss
	1	2	3	4		Estimated	Actual	Costs	Profit	cost	
	\dashv	\dashv							J. 1.		•
. Storm drainage report	x .				\$4,000			240	-140		-\$5,600
Corps of Engineers, study of electrical system	x			ادديدا	2,100			_ 69	31		600
Navy, widening and realinement	x				18, 300	\$285,000		_ 87	13	0.64	2, 400
Air Force, study on water supply and	x				12,000			38	62		7,500
sewerage Navy, study for missile facility	x	TT] 			27, 400	4, 600, 000		116	-16	. 60	-4, 400
erations building	x				8, 450	910, 000		83	17	.93	1,400
Corps of Engineers, dormitories—Ad- aptation from standard design—	X	1			4, 630	504, 700		40	60	. 92	2,80
Navy, aircraft hangar and lean-					22, 300	3, 386, 300		56	44	. 66	9, 80
tosaircraft	1]	3, 490			66	1033	. 85	1, 20
hangar Navy, dispensary building	X	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	_	4,860		[<u>.</u>	61	. 39	. 95	1,90
1. Navy, 3 aircraft hangars, includ- ing 1 set design											
drawings and 3 plot plans	\mathbf{x}		<u> </u>	-	10, 300	2, 063, 000		59	9 41	. 50	4, 20
hangar and lean-	\mathbf{x}				15,000	2,691,000	ļ	69	9 31		
3. Navy, aviation con- trol tower	\mathbf{x}		<u> </u>		_ 6, 400	0 135,000		7	3 27	4.75	1,80
4. Navy, aircraft maintenance hangar	. x				_ 9,790	0 2,002,000		5	6 4	1 .49	4, 30
5. Propositions only for procedure	\mathbf{x}	1			_ (1)			8	3 1	7	
studies	1	-	1	_	149, 02	0 17,	499, 000	7	8 2	2 .7	32, 5

^{1 \$125} per day.