

can get down to \$4,900 without having an impact on the quality of the program. And again that was a center where we changed contractors. The previous contractor did not do a very good job there. During the period again July 1 to May 1, 1967, they were running at the rate of \$7,737 per man-year, but as I recall the contract that was renegotiated calls for operating costs around \$5,900 during 1968, so I think the \$5,900 figure is an accurate reflection of what they are planning and what we have agreed to do.

Chairman PERKINS. We have very few residential centers in this country. What is your knowledge of the residential center and what would it cost to get a residential center into operation?

Mr. KELLY. To get one into operation?

Chairman PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. KELLY. It is difficult for me to say, Mr. Chairman. When you start out from scratch of course, depending upon the size of the center, depending upon what you are going to teach in the center, depending upon its location, you either have to create it or you have to rehabilitate something else you are going to turn into that center. Depending upon the size, of course, will dictate and to a large extent what your facility creation costs and what your rehabilitation costs are.

I suppose we spend anywhere in terms of looking at conservation centers from \$250,000 in a 100-man conservation facility for the creation facility to \$3.5 million to \$4 million for creation of facilities and rehabilitation at a 3,000-man urban Job Corps center. We could give you some analysis of that, Mr. Chairman, but right off the top of my head I am afraid I am not being very helpful.

Mr. GOODELL. Would you either now or subsequently give us the figure of the total amount of costs that have gone into the capital investment in your Job Corps centers? This is total from the beginning to right now?

Mr. KELLY. Let me give it to you for the record. I think it is \$140 million for total capital costs. It is \$140,912,310 and that is broken down as follows: Men's urban construction and obligation \$27,863,000; accountable equipment ran to \$13,347,000, for a total of \$41,210,000.

Women's urban construction and rehabilitation, we spent \$8,791,000. On accountable equipment \$4,623,000, for a total of \$13,314,000.

On State conservation centers, the State-related centers, we have spent on construction and rehabilitation \$1,628,968. On accountable equipment, \$547,465, for a total of \$2,176,333.

On the Federal conservation centers, \$66,071,803 for construction and rehabilitation, \$18,041,174 for accountable equipment for a total of \$84,111,977.

So that the total on construction and rehabilitation is \$104,354,771, equipment \$36,557,539, for a grand total of \$140,912,310.

That was through April 1, 1967.

Mr. SHRIVER. Could I make an additional comment on that? You will notice that the amount of money spent for the conservation is much larger than for the men's centers or the women's centers and that the accountable equipment for them is much larger. That is because actually they use a lot of equipment in the work of doing conservation. That point has been brought out here occasionally. But against this \$84 million—in other words, \$84 million out of \$140 million was