**In Louisiana**

Education is getting a big boost from the Louisiana Education Quality Trust Fund which was established in September 1986. This fund was initially endowed with $535 million received in the settlement of the state’s offshore drilling dispute with the Federal Government. Interest received from the Fund is to be distributed as follows: twenty-five percent will be added to the principal of the trust fund until the fund reaches $2 billion and seventy-five percent is to be distributed equally between higher education and secondary and elementary education.

Funds to higher education are administered through the Louisiana Board of Regents for Higher Education and have been earmarked: (1) to fund carefully defined research efforts of public or private universities in the state; (2) to endow chairs for eminent scholars; (3) to enhance the quality of academic, research, or agricultural departments or units within the university; and (4) to recruit superior graduate students. Distribution of funds in each of these categories is administered through a competitive process and participated in by the units of higher education within the state. Extensive use is made of nationally prominent scholars from outside the state in reviewing proposals. In awarding these funds specific consideration is given to (1) the potential for the award to enhance the overall quality of higher education in Louisiana and (2) the potential for the award to enhance the economic development of the state.

Long term and short term research and development projects focused on Louisiana’s competitiveness with respect to economic development were funded in 1987. The Board of Regents are currently in the second round of solicitations for the next fiscal year. Funded projects have increased the interaction between industry and the research sector of the state’s universities. One such effort has resulted in the establishment of a task force of business, industry, financial institution, farmer, and government agency representatives along with researchers from three universities. This task force has initiated a project known as AgroFlex. Its specific objective is to examine the potential for diversification and economic development of the agricultural sector of a twelve parish (county) region of the state.

*Contributed by Leo J. Guedry, Louisiana State University.*

**In Tennessee**

The Manage Program in Tennessee is an excellent example of state government and the University cooperatively responding to critical situations that affect farmers, farm families and their rural communities. In April 1986, key state legislative leaders worked with state agricultural leaders and the University of Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service to establish the Manage Program. The bill creating the program received overwhelming support from the general assembly. Additional state funds were provided to employ twelve area farm management specialists and three state specialists in farm management, stress management and family economics. Resources were also provided for additional support personnel.

Over the years, the Extension service has placed a high priority on management programs. The expanded program is providing additional resources to do a better job and reach more people.

Manage concentrates on how to manage the farm business, farm credit, family finances and stress. Area specialists have participated in over 350 group meetings and reached over 5,000 producers with financial information. As of October 31, 1987, over 1,200 farm families have been provided intensive farm and financial planning assistance.

Through September 1987, over 5,000 programs related to Manage were conducted. Over 151,000 people were reached (with all methods) through these programs. Over 93,000 persons gained some knowledge about stress, and 143 individuals sought mental health counseling.

Fitpack has been used as an educational tool in planning with the farm families. It is a computerized farm financial planning and analysis package developed at the University of Minnesota. Many families have made major changes as a result of their participation in Manage. All families interested in assessing their management strategies and alternatives in this period of economic uncertainty and financial stress can benefit from participating in the Manage Program.

*Contributed by D. Ray Humberd and Clark Garland, University of Tennessee.*

**In Arkansas**

The average half life of heptachlor contamination of dairy cows was 51 days for the 54 dairy herds that were quarantined in 1986 and 1987 in northwest Arkansas, northeast Oklahoma, and southwest Missouri. The rate of decontamination was highly variable, however, among the individual herds.

Quarantines were imposed on all farms where heptachlor contamination exceeded 0.1 points per million (ppm). The initial levels of contamination of the herds quarantined ranged from 0.12 to 16.07 ppm. Nearly one half of the herds exceeded 3.0 ppm. A half life of 51 days means that it took, on average, 51 days to reduce a contamination level by one half and additional 51 day periods of elapsed time to reduce the contamination level successively by one half.

Based on this rate, a herd contaminated at 3.0 ppm would require approximately 6 months to achieve the maximum balance for release from quarantine. Despite the fact that dairymen were indemnified by the Federal Government for lost milk sales, the quarantine imposed after the heptachlor tainted feed was consumed by dairy cows was economically devastating to the producers involved.

The initial uncertainties of whether financial relief would be provided for lost milk sales and the unknown prospects for cleaning the dairy herds of contamination was a source of great concern to both dairymen and their creditors. Also, fears among milk consumers were aroused by this perceived breach of public safety.

Finally, the total government cost of decontamination of a herd with an initial 3.0 ppm level of contamination was approximately equal to the market value of non-contaminated cows. These magnitudes of cost suggest that in the future it will be just as economical and less disruptive of public confidence for the Federal Government to purchase the animals at non-contaminated prices and destroy them.

*Contributed by Calvin R. Berry, University of Arkansas.*