

Memorandum Report No. 164

THE PLACE OF A
RECREATIONAL PROGRAM
IN THE
ORGANIZATION OF A MUNICIPALITY

A Study of 13 Larger American
Cities, with Special Reference
to Detroit

By the
Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, Inc.
5135 Cass Avenue

February, 1940

The Place of a
Recreational Program
in the
Organization of a Municipality

In June, 1938, the Bureau was requested by the then Mayor of Detroit to make a study of the proper organization of a recreational program for the City. The Bureau inquired into the practices of several of the larger cities, but the study was not circulated as it was understood that the matter had been dropped for the time being. More recently, the problem has again arisen, and the present report is a summary of the original investigation.

I. HISTORICAL

A park has been traditionally regarded as a place for passive enjoyment and quiet. The great parks in this country were developed after 1850 – Central Park in New York in 1853, Fairmount Park in Philadelphia in 1867, Belle Isle in Detroit in 1879, Franklin Park in Boston in 1883.

These were the "landscape" type of parks. But increasingly urbanization and industrialization not only made city parks more necessary but led to a new concept of parks as places for active enjoyment, sport, and recreation.*

Because of the failure of governments to provide recreational facilities for the people, commercial recreation was developed. A belated realization of the importance of wholesome recreation led to the development shortly after 1900, of organized community recreation.* This program of recreation was essentially one of social group work to encourage people to gather together to enjoy themselves during the added leisure which the industrialization of the 1920's and 1930's gave them.

* The Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, articles on "Parks" and "Recreation"

The difficulty of developing a proper organization for recreation within park areas has been due largely to the traditional view of the utility of parks in a city pattern. Robert M. Goodrich, Executive Director of the Providence Government Research Bureau, says, "I believe that the traditional park function has lost its vitality, if it ever had one, and that today the purpose of a park is essentially recreation. Today our parks serve as a suitable demonstration ground for certain year-round activities . . . The park also serves as a neighborhood playground . . . These functions in my judgment are of greater importance than that rendered by the park as a botanical or zoological garden through which people may drive on a Sunday afternoon".* This viewpoint appears to be practically universal among the directors of bureaus of governmental research whose opinion was asked on the subject.

In Detroit the park system was organized in 1871 and recreation in 1904. This corresponds to the approximate development of other large cities.

An aspect of the traditional attitude on park organization is the use of parks as the location for museums of various types, such as arboreta, botanical and zoological gardens and aquariums, natural history and art museums, outdoor theatres and music shells, together with innumerable statues and memorials which often give them the appearance of a prosperous cemetery. These all produce an aspect of "passive" recreation.

But coupled to these passive activities, recent trends are to add picnic grounds, swimming beaches, lagoons and pools for model sail and motor boats, athletic fields, playgrounds, tennis courts, golf courses, and other "active" functions which belong within the field of recreation.

* -- From a letter to the Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research on the Recreational Program in Providence, June 27, 1938.

There is some inclination to designate these recreational functions of parks as "non-supervised" recreation, that is, facilities which can be used by anyone, to distinguish them from directed play which is so much the function of modern recreation programs. But the distinction is difficult, because the "non-supervised" recreation should, to a great part, be "supervised" in order that the participants get the greatest benefit.

II. THE PROBLEM

It is fairly well accepted that supervised recreation is essential in the modern city, especially in the concentrated areas of the large metropolitan centers. The problem is develop the most effective organization to insure a comprehensive program utilizing all of the recreational facilities of the city, and one which will be within the capacity of the city to support. There are three possible solutions to this problem:

1. SEPARATE DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION

This is the organization in Detroit. A separate department is set up actively to supervise recreational activities, either with the full cooperation of the other agencies of government, as in Detroit, or as a separate entity controlling a plant which is separate from all other city departments.

The ADVANTAGES of this type of organization are said to be:

1. It permits unified action in developing recreation as a major function of the city government. Recreation has a different approach from that of any other city activity, and hence requires specialized direction.
2. Recreation is involving more and more social group work requiring specialized direction and tending to correct certain difficulties inherent in relationships when people are crowded together in large urban areas.
3. With the growth of leisure time, due to the shortened work week, recreational activities must be constantly expanded and this is only possible when there is an intensive

development under a single department. A separate department can secure better support for budget appropriations than can a division of another department.

4. It is the method of organization recommended by the National Recreation Association as being most desirable for a proper development of recreation.

The DISADVANTAGES are said to be:

1. It tends toward duplication of activities, inasmuch as there is no clear cut demarcation of the functions of the school system, park department, and department of recreation.
2. It is impossible in many cities to get full cooperation of the park department and school department with the facilities of each because of laws, inter-departmental jealousies, budget appropriations, and other factors, hence is more expensive.
3. It does not recognize the changing aspects of park service, that they are no longer solely places for rest and quiet, but are important facilities for recreation. Parks in the traditional sense are something of an extravagance in the modern city.

2. AS A PART OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

Active supervision of recreation is placed under the school system on the theory that it is chiefly concerned with children and youths and hence belongs to the educational process.

As the schools have expanded their functions to include adult education, so the theory is enlarged to include recreation as a highly important part of adult education. In the usual situation, the schools set up a separate department of recreation, under a full-time director and full or part-time recreational leaders.

The ADVANTAGES of this type of organization are said to be:

1. As mentioned above, recreation is but a part of the educational process both for children, youths, and adults. School authorities understand these educational problems and can best be organized to meet them through a recreational program.
2. No recreational program can be effective unless full use is made of existing school, such as swimming pools, gymnasiums, shops, laboratories, etc. To duplicate such facilities would be useless waste of public money.
3. All modern school systems provide many playgrounds as part of the school curriculum and these should be made available for after school use, as well as during the school day.

4. The school program has only to be expanded slightly to include all recreation, as much that is now considered recreation is already a part of a modern school curriculum.
5. A report on "Standards of Play and Recreation Administration" of the National Municipal League (1931) recommends that the schools have charge of the recreational program of children and youths up to 18 years of age, with a separate city department for older persons.

The DISADVANTAGES are said to be:

1. The principal objective of the school system is education, not recreation. Therefore the recreational system suffers at the expense of the day school instructional program.
 2. There is no reason, in most cities, why the facilities of the school system cannot be made available to other agencies, such as a recreational department, to operate after hours, on some type of permit basis.
 3. The high cost of education prevents a well rounded recreational program because when "cuts" are necessary the school-minded superintendent or board of education will naturally favor education.
 4. There are important problems of education still awaiting solution without increasing the confusion by adding the still infant function of recreation.
 5. At present most school people do not understand recreational needs or programs.
3. AS A PART OF THE PARKS SYSTEM

Under this system parks are considered as changing their characteristics from a "landscape" to a tool for the recreation of the people of the city. Thus, a park department evolves into a recreational department, although the process has been slow and not recognized by either the Detroit Charter or city administrations.

The ADVANTAGES of this type of organization are said to be:

1. The parks and parkways are the natural locale for much of what is considered recreation, although because of a traditional public attitude toward parks, the departments in charge of them have not made full recreational use possible.
2. As a park, the mechanics of repair and maintenance are purely routine functions requiring little or no discretion. The chief accent should be on a more complete use of the facilities afforded, which is the objective of the recreation program.

3. Because of the additions to the park program in many cities, anomalous situations have developed where similar functions of government have been assigned willy-nilly to one department or another – parks may control a bathing beach, but the recreation department control the bath house, etc.

The DISADVANTAGES are said to be:

1. Recreational activities, with their social group work characteristics, make use of many facilities not now included in any park program.
2. There is still a division of functions between the park s as a municipal activity, and recreation as such. The difficulties which have arisen have been due to a poor allocation of activities by charter or ordinance, and can be corrected by a redistribution of functions.
3. There is danger that if the combined functions are placed under a park superintendent, recreation will be neglected; if under a recreation director, park activities will be inadequately carried on.
4. There is a possibility that parks departments will over-emphasize the outdoor and purely athletic features of the recreational program and omit or give little attention to the neighborhood programs carried on in community houses, school buildings, etc.
5. WHAT IS THE BEST SOLUTION?

There is little doubt that recreation is one of the modern functions of government which will become larger in the public consciousness, or should, if urban life is to be facilitated. The recreation problem is becoming even wider than any one city area, and already there has been a development of state and county parks not only to relieve the pressure on the city parks but to extend recreation facilities of a more versatile nature.

In an effort to secure opinion as to the best type of organization for these facilities, this Bureau communicated with bureaus of governmental research in various large cities. The following is the summary of the questionnaires as to existing municipal organization for recreation and parks. Brief descriptions of the organizations in the various cities listed is given in the Appendix.

<u>Separate Recreation Departments</u>	<u>Separate but Duplicating Departments</u>	<u>Combined Parks and Recreation Departments</u>	<u>Park Consolidations</u>	<u>Parks and Recreation Consolidations</u>
Detroit Los Angeles	Chicago Philadelphia Milwaukee	Cleveland St. Louis Boston Buffalo Indianapolis St. Paul Providence	Chicago (1934) Milwaukee (1937)	Indianapolis (1934) Providence (1939)
2	3	7		

Baltimore has no municipal recreation department.

Note: For details of the organization of the so departments, and how they function, see Appendix. The heading "Separate but Duplicating Departments" indicates ties in which two or more departments furnish recreational activities, independently of each other. "Combined Parks and Recreation Department" indicates consolidated departments operating the park and recreational program under one administrator.

Judging from the above there is little doubt there is a definite trend toward the parks and recreation activities into single departments. Of the 13 cities queried, 7 have the combined system. Three, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Milwaukee, have separate but duplicating departments.

There have been two recent large park consolidations – Chicago and Milwaukee – seeking to provide more extensive park facilities at a reduced cost. In Chicago this consolidation was to eliminate numerous ad hoc authorities each controlling an independent park, some very small. It is notable that in Indianapolis and Providence, there has been a recent consolidation of the parks and recreation departments. And still more notable the proposed new charter for Philadelphia provided for consolidation of the parks and recreation departments into a single unit, and the Bureau of Budget and Efficiency of Los Angeles (a bureau of research financed by

municipal funds) has strongly recommended the combination of the two departments. If these recommendations had been followed, the tabulations would show:

Separate Recreation Depts.	1 (Detroit)
Separate but Duplicating Depts.	2
Combined Parks and Recreation Depts.	9
No official recreation department	<u>1</u>
Total	13

Of the 13 cities queried, DETROIT stood alone as a modern recreation department where duplicate facilities have been held to the minimum by full cooperative use of the facilities of other departments of the city government. Of these cities (Detroit and Los Angeles) have a similar organization for municipal recreation. The organization plans for Philadelphia, Chicago, and Milwaukee appear indefensible, although legal difficulties have prevented, in some cities, free interchange of facilities between departments.

In some of the cities studied, where the parks and boulevards department had been combined, was there any adverse criticism that the combination had prevented an effective recreational program. In general, it was thought that it had produced an excellent program at a minimum cost.

Engineering Functions: It is notable that where the parks department has charge of boulevards, there is a strong opinion that the engineering functions of repairs and maintenance of streets should be transferred to the Department of Public Works or similar city department.

Rational Recreation Association

A tabulation by the National Recreation Association in December, 1937 showed a slightly different picture. This is shown below:

<u>City Group</u>	<u>Separate Recreation</u>	<u>Park Department</u>	<u>School Authority</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total Cities U.S. Census</u>
Over 1,000,000	3	2	2	7	5
500,000 to 1 million	3	3	2	8	8
250,000 to 500,000	8	7	3	18	24
Total	14	12	7	33	37

These statistics are difficult to interpret because the figures represent "administrative authorities", not cities, hence if there are two or more "administrative authorities" (as in Chicago which has three or four, according to the interpretation) this would be shown in more than one column. It is noted that 33 "administrative authorities" are tabulated for the 37 cities in the population group.

This table shows that the separate recreation authorities predominate, with a slight advantage over combination with the parks department. However, by using "administrative authorities" the table is more favorable to the cause for separate recreation departments, which is the goal of the National Recreation Association. It is difficult to compare the results of this table with the former which was on a city basis, not "administrative authorities".

The most significant comparison is that while this table shows a slight advantage for the separate recreation department, the other table showed a notable trend toward consolidation of the recreation and parks department.

CONCLUSIONS

Notwithstanding the recommendation of the National Recreation Association the conclusion seems inevitable that there is a tendency toward combining the parks and recreation departments to organize for more efficient and economical administration of recreation.

Probably "combining" is not the proper term -- fusing the two departments into one new department would be more descriptive of the actual organization.

A parks department as the organization to provide a quiet, restful landscape in the midst of a large city still influences thinking on municipal organization, but has become archaic so far as the actual functions of a modern parks department are concerned. It seems that the parks department in the old concept is gone, and in its place is a new idea of a municipal department operating on the principles of group activities for large numbers of people to provide a recreational program, utilizing not only the park facilities, but likewise the facilities of present recreation departments with such other buildings and equipment as the city affords, especially those under the jurisdiction of the schools.

The recreated department to replace the parks department would consider park facilities as a tool to be used in furnishing recreation to the people as well as to supply "landscaping". It is activated by a desire to supply recreation to the largest number of people at a cost within the capacity of the city to afford. In substance, is the absorption of the parks department into the recreational program.

Further, so far as Detroit is concerned, there appears no good reason why the Zoological Park (Woodward and Ten Mile Road) should not be consolidated within a merged Parks and Recreation Department, especially so that the Bells Isle Zoo could be combined with the larger zoo, leaving on Belle Isle perhaps only a small animal zoo, placing the others in the better setting at the Zoological Park.

ORGANIZATION FOR DETROIT

The organization of a recreation program follows rather standardized lines, such as outlined in the plan set up for Los Angeles in the report already mentioned. In charge of a new combined Department of Parks and Recreation would be a commissioner, appointed by the mayor for an indefinite term as in other major departments. Under him the work would be divided into four major divisions, each headed by a director either appointed by the commissioner, or under the civil service provisions of the charter. A suggested organization would be as follows:

1. Recreation: A director would have charge of the active direction of the recreational activities, undertaking all of the functions of the present Department of Recreation, but utilizing fully the plant and equipment of the combined departments.
2. Plant and Equipment: This director would be in charge of plant and equipment, providing the facilities for recreation. Chiefly, it would take over the present functions of the Parks and Boulevards Department with such additional plant as would be added through the merger.
3. Zoo: The proper growth and development of a zoological park apparently requires specialized direction and attention to modern trends. A director should be placed in charge of this work. It would assume the work of the present Zoological Park, combining it with the Belle Isle Zoo.

Advisory Board: The present Zoological Park Commission has indicated the desirability for a citizen committee who by their interest and attention to the development of the zoo have made it outstanding in this country. To perpetuate this interest it is believed

that an advisory commission should be developed of 5 to 7 members, appointed by the mayor.

The Commissioner of Parks and Recreation would necessarily be an ex-officio member.

The Board would act as an advisor to the Director of Zoological Parks in much the same manner as at present, except it would not be in responsible charge of a single activity.

4. Business Office: A central business Office, under an office manager, to undertake the clerical work for all other divisions.

A TRANSFER of the maintenance and repairs of the boulevards could well be made to Department of Public Works, as these streets are but a common problem in the general engineering necessary to maintain the street system of the City. This would leave the Department of Parks and Recreation with only functions which do not duplicate other city activities.

A CHARTER AMENDMENT would be necessary to accomplish this change.

J. M. Leonard
Jan. 25, 1940

Note: The following are summaries of replies to a questionnaire sent to the directors of bureaus of governmental research located in the various cities, concerning the organization of the recreational activities. These persons are considered to have an informed opinion free from the bias resulting from a professional interest furthering any one particular type of organization.

The cities quoted were not specially selected but represent all the replies to the questionnaire.

They include:

- | | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| 1. Chicago | 8. Boston |
| 2. Philadelphia | 9. Milwaukee |
| 3. Detroit | 10. Buffalo |
| 4. Los Angeles | 11. Indianapolis |
| 5. Cleveland | 12. St. Paul |
| 6. St. Louis | 13. Providence |
| 7. Baltimore | |

1. CHICAGO

Separate Authorities: The rec recreational program is divided among three authorities:

1. Bureau of Parks, Recreation and Aviation. which is part of the Department of Public Works. It operates 2 community centers, 20 bath houses, bathing beaches, and some 37 playgrounds. The organization provides for two divisions in the Bureau charged with recreation; one for beaches and pools and one for playgrounds.
2. Board of Education. The Bureau of Recreation supervises some 60 school playgrounds with a total of 82 acres. It is a complete program of recreation separate from the other two authorities.

3. Chicago Park District. An ad hoc body responsible for the operation of the park system, and recreational facilities. There are some 92 community centers called field houses. It has the most extensive program of all authorities, operating some 137 parks and playgrounds. The organization provides a recreation division under a chief executive officer, which is divided into five general divisions (1) golf and beaches, (2) physical activities, (3) general activities, and (4) a clerical section. The fifth division is subdivided into six districts, each district being responsible for the recreational activities within an area.

Editorial Note: The result of the three authorities -- there are really four, except that the Cook County Forest Preserve District does not operate within the City limits -- is a sad confusion and overlapping of recreational activities. Playgrounds distant only a few blocks from each other will be supervised by a different authority. In 'one community area*' -- number 28 -- in the central part eight supervised playgrounds, two by the Board of Education, two by the Bureau of Parks and four by the Chicago Park District.

Consolidation of Parks: A move toward centralization in recreational facilities was the consolidation of 22 separate parks in 1934 into the Chicago Park District. Ad hoc park districts have always been a passion of Chicago, and this consolidation gave a bit of sanity to a strange organization.

Results: The Chicago organization for recreation is an excellent example of poor municipal organization for recreational activities.

* -- See Chicago Recreational Survey, Vol. 1, Public Recreation, page 104-A. This study, conducted in 1937, consisting of 4 volumes, was a joint project under the Works Progress Administration, National Youth Administration and the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission, sponsored by the Chicago Recreation Commission and the Northwestern University.

2. PHILADELPHIA

Separate System Parks: There are two authorities

1. Commissioners of Fairmount Park, composed of 5. ex-officio members and 10 members appointed by the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas. Has charge of Fairmount Park (3,845 acres) and 29 smaller parks with 3,623 acres. Also has charge of several parkways and boulevards, and shade trees on city streets. While necessary funds are made available by the City Council, has separate engineering and maintenance forces, and a separate police force, called park guards.

Recreation is offered by the Commissioners of Fairmount Park by providing swimming pools, bathing beaches, tennis courts, and playgrounds.

2. Bureau of City Property Department of Public Works maintain some 68 smaller parks, and 40 unnamed parks and plots. Other small plots at street intersections are maintained by the bureau of Highways and Street Cleaning of the Department of Public Works.

The Bureau of Recreation of the Department of Public Welfare, maintain the recreation program, operating some 45 recreation centers, 38 swimming pools, bathing beaches, ect.

Board of Education makes available summer playgrounds at some of the schools.

Zoo A private corporation, utilizing a portion of Fairmount Park with management in a board of 23 directors, of which one is elected by the City Council. The City Council appropriates about 50,000 a year for zoo maintenance.

A study of operational changes in Philadelphia's government was made in connection with a proposed charter revision. The new charter proposed to merge all municipal park and recreation activities as enumerated above (except schools) into one department of

Recreation and Parks, consisting of seven members, with overlapping terms of seven years each, and serving without salary.

The maintenance and repair of highways within parks was transferred to the Department of Public Works; the park guards, assigned to the Department of Public Safety. The Bureau of Recreation in the Department of Public Welfare was abolished and the work undertaken by the new department. Quoting from the "Official Report of the Philadelphia Charter Commission", "... the merging of all municipal park and recreation activities in one department remedies a major defect of the old form of organization, viz., the scattering of a function throughout a number of city departments so that no single office is directly responsible or accountable for it."

The Charter also recommended the city manager form of government. The legislature would not permit it to be submitted to the people.

3. DETROIT

Detroit has four separate departments concerned with recreation:

1. Board of Education Most of the 350 schools have play fields, some reaching the dignity of athletic fields, but in general are level fields of packed earth, utilized mostly for the school health education program, but some are given over to the Recreation Commission for afternoon and summer programs. The Board of Education also cooperates by opening the gymnasium, pools, shops and other facilities to the Recreation Commission for after school, summer and evening programs. The Board of Education has no separate recreational

programs as such, but cooperates fully with the Recreation Department in giving full use of its facilities to the recreation employee who conduct supervised activities.

2. Parks and Boulevards under the supervision of a single commissioner appointed for an indefinite term by the mayor, supervises some 46 parks, with 3,193 acres, and 13 boulevards with 276 acres. The largest park, Belle Isle, with 985 acres, lies in the Detroit River, is intensively developed, with golf courses, zoo, beaches, bath houses, athletic fields, lagoons for model boats, etc., etc. The Department also has control of shade trees, municipal cemeteries, etc.

Criticism: The present organization of the Parks and Boulevard Department has been criticized in these respects:

- a. Zoo: Maintains a zoo, duplicating that at Woodward Avenue and Ten Mile Road.
 - b. Streets: Under the Charter, Parks and Boulevards Department has charge of all pavements, maintenance, etc. Of the boulevards, which duplicates the work for the Department of Public Works recently.
 - c. Recreation: There is a lack of definition as to what constitutes recreation. All the golf courses are operated by the Parks Department, although it would seem these would be a part of a recreational program. There is a swimming pool at River Rouge Park., and a Bath House of Belle Isle, but the Recreation Department operates the old-time Elmwood Pool.
3. Recreation Department: Under the supervision of a single commissioner appointed for an indefinite term by the mayor, operates 35 playgrounds of 228 acres, a summer camp of 314 acres and 4 community centers. It also supervises activities on rented or loaned facilities,

such as tennis courts, playgrounds, swimming pools, gardens, skating rinks, summertime and afterschool use of school buildings, etc. It also licenses commercial recreation.

In general, the Recreation Department has furnished the supervision for recreation, utilizing the plant and facilities of other departments, rather than developing an entirely separate plant of its own. There can be little criticism of the Detroit system on the ground of duplicate construction and facilities -- thorough cooperation has been given all departments to the Department of Recreation.

Criticism of the Recreation Department has been said to be:

- a. Group Work: Not sufficiently active or alert to the changing concepts of group work. More attention should be given to the social needs of the neighborhood groups, chiefly by furnishing these groups with leadership, which in turn, helps them to achieve their purposes.
- b. Maintenance: It has been felt that there is not sufficient interchange of the maintenance crews of the parks and recreation departments. Some of this duplication has been eliminated in the past year.
- c. What is Recreation? Perhaps most difficulty has arisen from a lack of a clear-out concept as to the functions of modern recreation. The peculiar organization in Detroit of one department operating the plant and equipment of two other departments, and interchanging facilities, makes for confusion in the minds of the critics.
- d. Personnel Policies: The modern concepts of recreation have not been reflected in the civil service examination for recreational workers. These workers need to understand community organization, so they have a definite objective other than entertainment of the people. There has been very little attention been paid to improving the present personnel through "in...service" training courses which are now being offered in this area.

Prior to 1920, the Recreation Commissioner was directed by a board of four members. In that year, it was changed to a single commissioner administration.

Recreational Facilities are supervised by the Playground Department, controlled as the Park Department, by a board of five members, appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the council. Its program appeals chiefly to the youth and young adults, through intensive leadership in recreational activities.

Both Departments are semi-independent for the city government and are not subject to budgetary control as other city departments. The charter provisions are not subject to budgetary control as other city departments. The charter provisions are remarkably similar – substituting the words “parks” for “playgrounds”, they read almost alike.

Proposed Organization

A detailed study was made of the park and recreational facilities of Los Angeles by the Bureau of Budget and Efficiency of Los Angeles, “Administration of Activities is the Department of Parks and the Department of Playgrounds and Recreation”, January 2, 1934. This report recommended a consolidation of the Parks and Playground Department, under the supervision of a general manager, with three department heads reporting to him -- (1) a superintendent of activities to take active charge of the recreational activities, (2) a superintendent of properties to construct and maintain the properties, and (3) a business office. It was thought that such an organization would give better coordination of the various facilities and a more comprehensive recreational program. The report listed as advantages of the organization.

1. A single park and recreational unit would be more effective and economical. It would be a convenience to the public to deal with a single department.
2. It would result in a better balanced system of facilities. (One of the criticisms of the existing organization in Los Angeles was the purchase of land by each of the present departments without regard for the facilities of the other).
3. A concentration of recreational policies would result in much benefit to both public and private agencies, especially in the relations with the school authorities.

4. A closer distinction should be drawn between the policy determining the administrative functions.
5. The proposed plan would permit a closer scrutiny of the finances for recreation with the present city department.
6. Elimination of the two semi-independent bodies would permit closer cooperation with the present city departments.
7. Adoption of better controls over acquisition of land would insure safeguards of public funds.

While the program was suggested in 1934, no action has been taken to date, but the conditions are basically the same so the recommendations are still valid.

5. CLEVELAND

Combined System: The first home rule charter of 1912 established recreation as one of the activities in the Department of Parks and this has been maintained during the years. There is a small zoo operated by the Park Department. There has been some agitation by groups interested in recreation for a separate department, but it has never developed into a real campaign. In general, it is thought that the present system provides for the most economical and complete development of recreational facilities.

6. ST. LOUIS

Combined System:

Parks and recreation are combined in the Division of Parks and Recreation which is one of several divisions of the Department of Public Welfare, headed by a director of Public Welfare. The zoo is under the administration of a board of nine members, four appointed by the mayor and five ex-officio officers. It is located on the grounds of Forest Park.

The program offered under the combined departments appears to be adequate and there is no evidence that the Parks Division operates the parks to the detriment of the active recreational program. There has been little criticism, and if the charter was to be revised, in the opinion of competent observers, it is believed that the combined system would be retained. However, there is a question as to whether the Parks Division should be a part of the Welfare Department.

7. BALTIMORE

No Municipal Recreation: There is no recreation department. Parks are under the jurisdiction of the Board of Park Commissioners (five) appointed by the mayor. The park system is financed partially from general property taxes and partially from a special franchise tax on the street railway company. The park system provides over 3,000 acres of park land, bathing beaches, swimming pools, tennis courts, baseball diamonds, golf courses, etc. It does not provide recreational supervision as such.

Supervised recreation is carried on by the Playground Athletic League, a private organization, but which receives about half of its financial support from the general tax levy. It utilizes playgrounds in parks and school yards, and in several centers.

A small zoo is located in one of the parks.

Criticism: There appears no general objections to the present organization even though there is no public recreation department as such. In 1937, a study was made by the National Recreation Association which recommended creating a new Department of Public Recreation to have charge of all recreational activities. The Commission on Governmental Efficiency and Economy

(a bureau of governmental research) did not agree with these conclusions and believed that recreational activities could be administered satisfactorily if (1) the engineering functions of the Parks Department were transferred to the Department of Public Works and (2) the Parks Department be authorized to add recreational supervision to the present activities.

8. BOSTON

Combined System: The recreational activities are included in the Park Department, administered by a board of three, appointed by the mayor, the chairman receiving a salary and acting as full-time head of the department. The Department has jurisdiction over parks (about 3,500 acres including 75 playgrounds), gardens, beaches, zoo logical garden, aquarium, airport, and cemeteries, etc.

The organization is rather loose, but functions effectively because of the long time service of an able Park Commissioner. There are 20 full-time recreation leaders.

School Committee: A recreational program is conducted by the schools using 100 school yards, play corners and health units. The program, chiefly for younger children, is under a full-time supervisor and a large number of assistants.

Criticism of the organization for the recreation was made by the National Recreation Association in 1937 which claimed that the recreational activities were subordinated to the purely engineering functions of park maintenance and improvement. However, the report found the City well provided with recreational facilities and annual expenditures ranked high. The report recommended, as in Baltimore, the recreation establishment of a separate (new) Recreation Department.

Recommendation: The Boston Municipal Research Bureau believes that the engineering functions of the Parks Department could be consolidated with other public works services of the city, and leave the Parks Department with the existing parks and recreational activities.

9. MILWAUKEE

County Consolidation: in 1937, all parks owned by towns, cities and villages in Milwaukee County were transferred to the County making a county unit administration for all parks. Certain functions formerly undertaken by the Milwaukee Parks Department were transferred to other city departments; park guards were transferred to the City Police Department, and forestry was made a division of the Department of Public Works. In general, it is thought that the transfer has been beneficial.

A zoo was transferred by the City to the county as a part of the Park system.

Schools maintain a recreational program of supervise playgrounds and social centers, with a budget appropriation of about 500,000 a year. This is the main recreational program.

10. BUFFALO

Combined System: All recreational activities are included in the park system as a separate division on in the Department of Parks. The Director of Recreation is in the competitive class under civil service. In general, the system appears to work satisfactorily and there has been no criticism.

11. INDIANAPOLIS

Combined System:

In 1934, there was a CONSOLIDATION of the recreational division to place it under the existing Board of Park Commissioners, composed of 4 members, appointed by the mayor for four-year terms. This is a semi-independent agency with a special tax and power to issue bonds, but in 1936, the mayor was given power to appoint and remove all employees.

Schools do not cooperate in the recreation program and the playgrounds and auditoriums are not available in the summer time.

Recreational Facilities are provided by 2,000 acres of parks and playgrounds, 8 community houses, 5 swimming pools, a beach, and football fields, open air theatre, wading pools, golf courses, etc. Recreation is organized in a separate division with a director in charge, having charge of the playgrounds, swimming pools, and the community houses. Golf courses are in a separate division. There is no zoo.

Criticism has been made of the inadequate program by the National Recreation Association, which claims it to be the weakest of any large city similarly situated. However, Indianapolis is noted for the low cost of government, and perhaps this is a factor in that reputation.

Recommendation for a continuance of the combined system is made by the Inter organization Council of Indiana which believes that all of the deficiencies in the recreational program could be cured by more liberal appropriations for recreation.

12. ST. PAUL

Combined System:

Parks and parkways, playgrounds and the zoo are consolidated under an elected Commissioner of Parks, Playgrounds and Public Buildings, who is one of six city councilmen. The superintendent of parks is appointed by the commissioner, but the playgrounds department is under a director selected under civil service procedure. Recently it was suggested that school playgrounds should be placed under the direction of the city playgrounds.

The program apparently is operation with effectiveness.

13. PROVIDENCE

Combined System:

Prior to 1939 recreation was divided between the Park Commission, a three-man commission selected by concurrent vote of both houses of the city council and the Board of Recreation consisting of the mayor as chairman, the three members of the Park Commission (ex-officio) and four citizens appointed by the mayor. The Parks Department had charge of all city parks, boulevards, corner triangles, golf course and the zoo. The chief administrative officer of the Board of Recreation was secretary who directed the recreation program of the city.

New Charter: The new charter adopted in 1939, however, eliminate the Board of Recreation, consolidated it into the Park Commission which consists, as it did formerly, of three member, nominated by the mayor and approved by the council, to hold office for a three year term. The

charter provided that the Park Commission have and exercise all powers and duties now vested in the Board of Recreation. Which said board is hereby abolished.”

Schools do not cooperate in any recreational activities.

The consolidation of the recreation and park activities in one department apparently reflects the best judgment of the political leader of the city.