

this gets down to a very exact science of weighing the amount that it costs against the good that it does.

Mr. O'HARA. It costs a lot not to do some of them, too.

Mr. NAUMANN. That is exactly right, and I don't think that there is any question of the fact that conceivably in our approach to the matter of seasonality that we perhaps in our examinations heretofore have not taken into account, perhaps, all of the areas of savings that could be made in coming up with a net additional cost.

Let me say this, that the overall study will probably produce practical applications. For example, there is no contractor that would be frightened of the actual enclosing of a building or a structure or something of this nature and carrying his work into the winter if it was a matter of the specifications and contract documents so requiring this and something that he can put a price on.

Mr. O'HARA. In his bid?

Mr. NAUMANN. That is right, put it in his bid.

Now, amazingly enough, there has been a great deal of freedom of choice as to whether or not a contractor works or whether he doesn't work. Conceivably, this will be an area that as it becomes more habitual to include by reason of an actual examination of the final result that it is beneficial not only to the work force but to the owner.

For example, I was much impressed by one of the statements that Mr. Fancher made or a question that you asked with regard to the carrying charges of \$45,000 a month on a particular project while it was shut down. Certainly, this would only be one factor, and the denial of income for the same number of months to the owners and constructors is just as big a factor.

Mr. O'HARA. That is right.

Mr. NAUMANN. Conceivably, the overall broader look at the problem will of necessity produce some good results and, conceivably, some very shocking ones.

Mr. O'HARA. You mention in your statement, on page 4, that:

* * * the government's engineering requirements are sometimes more strict in ruling out cold-weather construction than necessary.

I am not going to ask you to detail that here, but I am going to ask you if you would submit to us a memorandum with respect to specific examples of that which you might be able to cite, because that is something that we could go into immediately, I think, in discussion with the Federal agencies.

Mr. NAUMANN. Very well.

(The information follows:)

THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1968.

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA,
Select Subcommittee on Labor, House Education and Labor Committee, Rayburn
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: This is in response to your inquiry regarding some specific examples of engineering requirements that may be more rigid than necessary and which rule out cold-weather construction.

Limitations governing the placement of asphalt pavement vary significantly throughout the country. To the best of our knowledge, all states except one have a minimum temperature limitation for asphalt placement. Of these, 38 states specify a minimum temperature of 40° F. for either the ground or the air. Twenty states also have calendar date restrictions.