The next step is a simple request letter for funds. Brief annual reports are submitted to NSF up to the time of completion of the project. The completion report is submitted, and then postcompletion inspection and audit is conducted. The suggestion has been made that as this program moves on some aspects of the National Science Foundation procedure can be approximated rather than the much more intricate procedures that HUD still uses based perhaps on its earlier administration of very intricate housing projects.

Mr. Gibbons. You feel that HUD is carrying over to public institutions or essentially public institutions some of the things that they have learned or had to do when they were dealing with private contractors, building apartment houses and individual homes and things

of that sort?

Dr. McCann. This seems to be a possible reason why the procedures are so intricate, so involved and why the applicant now working in an academic facility is really so badly hampered.

Mr. Gibbons. Could you give us any suggestions other than to say that the HUD procedure was 50 percent more costly or time consuming than the National Science one? Can you make any rough estimates as to what is involved?

Dr. McCann. I have several estimates ranging between \$32,000 and \$50,000 extra cost in administering the construction supervision in

this way. That is to the individual institution.

Mr. Gibbons. On what size building? A million dollar building? Dr. McCann. These two ranges range from one and a half to three. That is not a very substantial percentage of the total construction cost but it is something that certainly has to be considered.

Mr. Gibbons. Mr. Quie, do you have any questions?

Mr. Quie. No.

Mr. McCormack. I would like to invite the attention of Dr. DeHart to this. I read with interest on page 4 of your statement the observation on your part and I quote:

One important point to observe in the process is that an extension of field services does not impose an extra layer of administration to block free communication between the field and the central headquarters in Washington.

To me that would presuppose that in your mind there has been or there is now such a blockage to justify an inference on your part to that extent. Will you clarify that?

Dr. DeHart. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will try to do that.

When the field service was first extended there was then fear in the minds of many educators that establishing an extended field service might impose an extra layer of administration through which the public, the education community and the general public will have

There was fear in the minds of many educators that extension of administration, the regional service might impose an extra layer of administration, a barrier as it were, through which people in the field would have to go in order to reach Washington's central headquarters. It was never the intention, and it seems not to have worked out that way, because we have kept open channels of free communication between the field, commissioners of education, superintendents of schools, colleges and universities, and the public in general directly to Wash-