many others are much worse off than the averages indicate. Over the long term, costs may increase more or less rapidly than projected, and enrollment growth may be faster or slower than projected.

Nevertheless, a few generalizations seem to be beyond question: (1) the quantity gap in academic facilities grew larger in the early years of the Higher Education Facilities Act because the Act came along three years later than needed to prepare for the enrollment bulge; (2) if the Higher Education Facilities Act is continued at the projected levels beginning in fiscal year 1970 (but without restoration of the FY 1968 and FY 1969 reductions) the quantity gap will be gradually reduced below its current level, although the gap remaining in 1973 would be larger than is considered desirable; but (3) if the reduced levels are sustained beyond 1969 the quantity gap will again begin to grow substantially.

The earlier Office of Education goals for the Fall of 1973 could be reached one year later, by the Fall of 1974, if the $200 million reduction for Fiscal Year 1969 (plus a 10 percent increment for increased costs) is added to the projected amount ($632 million) for Fiscal Year 1970, and the $275 million reduction from earlier projections for Fiscal Year 1969 (plus 10 percent) is added to the projected amount ($608 mililon) for Fiscal Year 1971.

Two other qualifications on the validity of these projections should be noted. First, they include a substantial, though slightly moderated, continuation of the current high levels of non-Federal effort. (In this connection, non-Federal effort has generally followed a cyclical pattern consistent with State biennial appropriations of funds for plant expansion.) How well this effort may continue to be sustained by the colleges and the State and local governments is perhaps subject to some question. Second, the statistics deal only with need in terms of quantity of space, and leave untouched the question of quality of existing space. The extent and nature of a possible quality gap should become clearer after updated inventories and comprehensive planning projects are completed in the next two or three years.

The academic facilities problem is not yet solved, but substantial progress is now being made and will continue to be made in the immediate future, even with the fiscal year 1968 and 1969 reductions in Federal funds for academic facilities. The presently planned Federal funds will not, of course, come close to meeting all the needs expressed. With carefully defined criteria for determining priorities however, they should be able to meet all the truly critical needs in the immediate future.

In the meantime, widespread activities for research and analysis now underway and planned for the near future, should provide a much more clearly defined estimate of the situation within the next two or three years.

TABLE I.—RELATIONSHIPS AMONG HEFA PROGRAM FUNDS COMMITTED, ESTIMATED COST OF BUILDINGS FOR WHICH COMMITTED, AND COST OF BUILDINGS COMPLETED WITH HEFA ASSISTANCE

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Total HEFA program funds committed	Total cost of buildings for which new HEFA funds commitments were made	Total cost of new buildings completed with HEFA assistance
1965	$392.1	$1,272.0	$106.1
1966	626.8	2,140.0	299.2
1967	710.7	1,701.0	723.0
1968 [1]	650.0	1,625.0	1,538.2
1968 [2]	450.0	1,125.0	1,528.2
1969 [1]	650.0	1,625.0	2,031.1
1969 [2]	375.0	937.5	1,952.3
1970 [1]	632.0	1,580.0	1,753.9
1970 [2]			1,389.5
1971 [1]	608.0	1,520.0	1,685.1
1971 [2]			1,157.0
1972 [1]	595.0	1,487.5	1,583.9
1972 [2]			1,377.6
1973 [1]	586.0	1,465.0	1,532.7
1973 [2]			1,527.7
1974	586.0	1,465.0	1,493.9

[1] Estimated on basis of original target levels, fall 1967.
[2] Reduced estimates, reflecting reductions in fiscal years 1968 and 1969 levels, assuming original target levels unchanged for fiscal years 1970 through 1973.