

I wonder if you would supply the committee with the backup data used in reaching the conclusions contained in the last paragraph on page 7 of your statement:

These figures are not drawn out of the air, they are based upon careful and extensive study on what is needed to do the job and upon the rate at which capabilities can be developed.

I think the detailed information would be helpful although I would not want to leave you with a feeling that the possibility of reaching that level of authorization is too strong in view of the situation confronting the Congress at this time, as I would not want to encourage you to believe that 5-year funding authorization is possible.

The Commerce Committee has adhered rigidly to the 3 years in order that we have the opportunity to review the programs, to evaluate them, before extending them.

Thank you.

(The information requested was subsequently submitted in the following letter:)

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
Columbia, Mo., June 24, 1968.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOSS: Dr. W. L. Turner who presented testimony for the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges on behalf of the State Technical Services Act informs me that you wanted the basis of our recommendation on the funding level needed for the State Technical Services Act. I am happy to do this. Incidentally, I serve as Chairman of the Association's Committee on Industrial Extension; but a special session of our State Legislature made it impossible for me to be present for this hearing.

Considerable study was made to arrive at a proposed future funding level of 42 million dollars of federal funds. Two approaches were used.

The first was simply an extrapolation from Missouri. We have been concerned with and had underway some work with transfer of technology to business and industry before the passage of the State Technical Services Act. We have, with the help of industry, studied over a period of years resources needed to do the job on a minimum adequate basis. We figure as a maximum we will need 24 professional staff members serving as a field staff. These people serve as the primary and direct contact with business and industry. A central reference service is also essential and this will require a professional staff of at least six persons. Much of the actual teaching and responding to requests from the central reference center and field staff must be handled by highly trained faculty members or their counterparts in not-for-profit corporations. We estimate that it will require the equivalent of 34 persons to handle this phase. There will be many more individuals involved because most will be used on a part-time basis for this program; but the full time equivalent will be 34. These high level faculty members along with support personnel and the necessary educational hardware will require an annual budget of 1.6 million dollars at present cost levels for the state of Missouri.

Missouri is about an average state by every measure. We have about 2 percent of the population, space, business and industry, income, etc. Multiplying the 1.6 million by 50; and allowing for a modest amount for administration at the federal level, and assuming the Federal share will be half, we arrived at the 42 million figure. The graduation from 18 million in fiscal '69 to 30 million in fiscal '70 to 42 million in '71 represents our estimate of the speed at which the program can grow.

Dean Easton of Colorado, a member of my committee, worked with several members of our committee and used a completely different approach. A sample of states were contacted and asked to provide long range staffing and program needs to carry out the objectives of the State Technical Services Act. This study revealed the need for 500 field staff and 1000 faculty types. Those with associated