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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS

I. THE PROBLEM

For many years the people living in the less populated districts of California have felt a definite need for more public park and recreation areas. They have had an earnest desire to provide a planned, supervised, wholesome program of recreation for citizens of all age levels and to provide recreational areas and facilities in which to conduct recreation activities of many types. They have learned by investigation that in order for the parks and recreational program of a community or area to have a greater permanency, it should be legally formed and tax supported. The formation of recreation districts, is one of the legal processes for meeting this felt need. The five types of recreation districts are: (1) "Recreation, Park and Parkway Districts"; (2) "Regional Park Districts"; (3) "County Park Districts"; (4) "Park, Recreation and Parkway Districts"; and (5) "Regional Shoreline Park and Recreation Districts."

The State of California Recreation Commission reported that as of October 15th, 1951, twenty recreation districts, employing an executive and operating a year-round service, had been formed under the Public Resources Code, State of
California, Division 5, Chapter 3, entitled "Districts." Other
districts, although legally formed, did not administer a
year-round program with an executive employed on a full-time
basis.

Many other communities or groups of communities have
created voluntary community recreation organizations under
the familiar names of coordinating councils, community
recreation councils and many other titles. These voluntary
councils carried on community-planned recreation programs
similar in content to the leisure-time activities adminis-
tered by the legally formed governing boards of the recrea-
tion districts. Because these voluntary councils were not
organized on a legal basis they did not directly receive any
funds raised by taxation. This factor alone, regardless of
the many other factors, indicated that the voluntary com-
munity organization was founded on an intrinsically less
permanent basis. Some of these voluntary types of community
recreation organizations eventually evolved into legally
consstituted recreation districts or some other types of
public recreation authorities.

Many other California communities and groups of
communities were in various stages of organization and legal

1 Public Recreation Agencies of Cities, Counties,
Special Districts and School Districts (Compilation by the
formation during the time this study was in process. It was indicated that in the near future many more communities in California will be seriously considering the factors involved in the organizing of recreation districts.

The preponderance of recreation districts have been legally formed in rural and semi-rural areas. Recreation districts were recognized by the laws of California primarily to provide parks and recreational programs for the population of the rural areas. This study was conducted with foremost emphasis on the rural and semi-rural areas and with secondary emphasis on the urban areas.

**Statement of the problem.** The purpose of this study is to develop a guide for use in self-appraisal within a community of the factors involved in the establishment of recreation districts.

It is the primary objective of this study to provide a study-guide that can be advantageously used by laymen and lay voluntary community organizations as one source of information. The secondary objective is to produce a study-guide that professional workers in public recreation and other related fields can utilize as an additional source of information.

**Importance of the study.** One of our basic assumptions is that many more communities in California will be seriously
considering the factors involved in the organizing of recreation districts in the future.

Recreation is a community responsibility, therefore it is the primary aim of this study to develop a study-guide that interested lay members and organizations of a community can use as an aid when analyzing the factors involved in organizing recreation districts. In a large percentage of cases, the initial creating of interest stems from the efforts of individual lay citizens or lay community organizations.

This study-guide is written so that it can be used in all stages of the normal development of organizing recreation districts. Following its use by the individual lay citizens and lay community organizations, this study-guide can be beneficially referred to by community recreation organization committees, community coordinating councils, community recreation councils, public agencies, local public authorities, local legal authorities, the appointed organizing boards of directors and any other organizations seeking information.

Most community-wide or district-wide councils or committees include some professional workers in recreation or in related fields from their own or neighboring communities. Sometimes resource persons such as consultants in recreation
from some local or state agency advise the community recreation organization. By reading and discussing the factors of the normal evolution of a recreation district in this study-guide, the groups, referred to immediately above, should be considerably aided in their efforts to study and weigh the values and successive steps of organizing recreation districts.

This study-guide can be used concomitantly by the local community or district recreation organizations with consultant or advisory service from local or state public agencies of recreation or related fields. Some public agencies, although willing to be of service, are not in a position to provide complete consultant or advisory service to all the communities and districts requesting services. In some instances, the consultant service, to be of real value, requires that preliminary surveys be conducted by the consultants, and that recommended plans of development be presented from the findings of the surveys. Many public agencies do not have enough funds allocated for this purpose nor an adequate number of trained personnel. Therefore, this study-guide was prepared with the aim that it could supplement the services of local and state public agencies.

Another less important value of this study is that it can be beneficially used by communities and districts investigating the formation of other types of recreation authorities.
The emphasis on the importance of a factor will vary with each community or district because the existing recreational conditions are different in any given community or district. This stems from the fact that every community or district has varying recreational needs and interests.

The value of the factors described in this study-guide to communities and districts which are investigating the organization of other types of recreation districts and other types of recreation authorities will be in direct ratio to the common application of the factors.

Method of procedure and treatment of findings. The methodology was that of survey and critical synthesis of compiled data.

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

As public recreation is a relatively new function of government, it was decided that definitions of frequently used terms would be appropriate to establish a common understanding of these terms.

Recreation. "Recreation" is interpreted as meaning any activity, voluntarily participated in, which contributes to the physical, mental, social or moral development of the individual and the group in which he is participating.
Leisure-time activities. Throughout this report, the term "leisure-time activities" is interpreted to mean any activities in which individuals participate during their free time and are a natural expression of human interests seeking happiness and satisfaction. ²

Public recreation authority. The terms "public recreation authority," "public recreation agency" and "public recreation body" are used synonymously throughout this study. They are defined as the governmental agencies, that are given the responsibility, through legislation, for providing recreation services within a community.

Public recreation. "Public recreation" is then interpreted as any recreational programs administered by the public recreation authority.

Recreation district. A "recreation district" is any public recreation authority established under the Public Resources Code of the State of California, Division 5, Chapter 3, Articles 1-5.

Community recreation organization. The terms "community recreation organization," "community recreation council" and "community recreation committee" are also used

synonymously. These terms imply that the organized body for
planned community-wide recreation is not a governmental body
organized under some legislative act. This type of body is
usually an organization of volunteer representatives from
community organizations and public agencies.

**Community recreation.** It follows then that "community
recreation" is interpreted as meaning any recreational pro-
grams administered by the community recreation organization.

**III. ORGANIZATION OF REMAINDER OF PROJECT**

The importance and growth of recreation districts in
California is the dominant theme for Chapter II. The
Chapter begins by describing the social conditions in
California that produced the need for recreation districts.

The intent of this Chapter is to give a brief histor-
ical background of recreation districts in California. The
existing social conditions within communities that produced
the need and encouraged the growth of recreation districts
are explained. The reasons for organizing recreation dis-
tricts in California are also presented. The Chapter termi-
nates with a review of the growth of recreation districts in
California.

The purpose of Chapter III is to describe the role of
local and state resources in establishing recreation districts.
The various methods by which local individuals and organizations assist in organizing recreation districts is presented. This presentation is followed by a discussion of services rendered by local and state public agencies.

It is the intent of Chapter IV to present and discuss the six major factors that are studied and evaluated by the recreation district councils and the people of the community. They are known as the "Big Six" factors for organizing public recreation authorities. The "Big Six" factors that are discussed in this study are (1) program; (2) areas, facilities and equipment; (3) personnel; (4) finances; (5) type of recreation authority; (6) legal procedures.

The summary, conclusions and recommendations that resulted from the findings of this study are presented in Chapter V.

A selected, annotated bibliography terminates the written report of this study.
CHAPTER II

THE GROWTH OF RECREATION DISTRICTS IN CALIFORNIA

I. HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT

The history of the recreation district movement in California, being a socially significant movement, is difficult to present strictly as chronological steps of progression. The recreation district movement developed from the individual efforts of many communities to find a solution to their recreational problems.

At the inception of the movement, around the year of 1930, the efforts of the individual communities and districts were unrelated and unorganized. As the movement gained momentum, some communities and districts collaborated to determine what could be done to solve some of their social problems through the means of community recreation. They realized that this involved providing desirable recreation programs as well as to provide the necessary areas, facilities, materials and personnel.

The representatives of some of the communities and districts attended these recreation district movement meetings. They discussed some of the significant social conditions that brought about the need for recreation districts.

It was noted that many of the larger cities in
California had organized public recreation and/or park departments. The Los Angeles City Council appointed a Board of Playground Commissioners in September 1904. The following year a superintendent of recreation was employed and the first playground was opened. Slowly other large cities followed the example of Los Angeles. These were followed by some medium sized cities which organized departments of recreation.

The Civic Center Act was first passed by the State of California Legislature in 1919.

It stated that:

There is a civic center at each and every public school building and grounds within the State where the citizens, parent-teachers' association, Campfire Girls, Boy Scout troops, farmers' organizations, clubs, and associations formed for recreational, educational, political, economic, artistic, or moral activities of the public school districts may engage in supervised recreational activities, and where they meet and discuss, from time to time, as they may desire, any subjects and questions which in their judgment appertain to the educational, political, economic, artistic, and moral interests of the citizens of the communities in which they reside. Governing boards of the school districts may authorize the use, by such citizens and organizations of any other properties under their control, for supervised recreational activities.

In brief, this act established every public school


4 Education Code, State of California, Division 9, Chapter 9, Article 2, Section 19431. (Enacted 1943).
building and its grounds as a community center to be used for many community purposes, including recreation. The passing of this act made many recreational areas and facilities available to communities that were fortunate enough to have adequate recreational facilities on public school grounds.

The use of public school district facilities for community and public recreation was expressed by Conrad in the following paragraph:

Public school districts throughout California have given valuable service to the development of community recreation programs by making available the grounds, gymnasiums, and recreational equipment of schools under their jurisdiction. School plants have many advantages as community centers. They are generally located conveniently in population centers, and their locations are well known to children and adults. The public school is nonsectarian, nonpartisan, and is public property. Maximum recreational use of schools can give citizens a large return on their investment without interfering with its main purpose.

Although the existing public school facilities were available for use, many rural areas in particular soon found that the public school facilities did not provide even a minimum amount of facilities and areas suitable for community recreation. Even for the more fortunate communities with adequate school facilities such problems as administration, personnel, finances, and materials arose to be solved.

---

The passing of the Civic Center Act did not provide any local legal body responsible for the administration of public recreation and did not provide for the raising of funds to operate the areas, facilities and programs. These were the two fundamental weaknesses of the act. Recreation-minded groups in rural communities and small cities started to investigate how these weaknesses of the Civic Center Act had been overcome in other states.

Many community groups commenced to study the recreation enabling legislation of the several other states in which it had proven to be beneficial. In these states, the recreation enabling legislation provided the necessary legislation to organize public recreation bodies under existing public bodies or a combination of them. This state recreation enabling legislation, in many of the states, also legalized the expenditure of funds by these public bodies for public recreational purposes. This type of recreation enabling legislation, therefore, was recommended by the study groups because it provided a means of overcoming the major weaknesses of the Civic Center Act.

Several rural communities and small cities, after hearing the results of their study groups, believed that the passing of a recreation enabling act by the State Legislature would help to solve their recreational problems. With
encouragement from the above mentioned community groups plus other recreation interest groups the State Recreation Enabling Act was passed in 1939 by the California Legislature. It stated that:

The purposes of this chapter are:

(a) To promote and preserve the health and general welfare of the people of the State and to cultivate the development of good citizenship by provision for adequate programs of community recreation.

(b) To authorize cities, counties, cities and counties, and public school districts to organize, promote, and conduct such programs of community recreation as will contribute to the attainment of general educational and recreational objectives for children and adults of the State.

After the passing of the State Recreation Enabling Act, several communities organized public recreation authorities under its legislative power. The recreation enabling legislation proved by experience to be more beneficial for the incorporated cities than the unincorporated areas. The foremost reason for this greater benefit to the incorporated city was that a new public recreation agency with its primary purpose to administer public recreation, was formed by one, or a combination of, existing public bodies.

The funds for operating the budgets of these existing public bodies, which sponsored the public recreation authority, was raised by taxation from the citizenry who lived in an area with a definite boundary. Many times the district

---

6 Education Code, State of California, Division 12, Chapter 4, Section 24401. (Enacted 1943).
area of one public body did not coincide with the district area of another public body. For example, a high school district might not have an area coterminus with the elementary school district or the park district or the city limits. Therefore, objections were raised when funds obtained in one district were expended for people living in another district. Criticism was also forthcoming when funds raised originally for the primary purpose, for example "public education," were used for a secondary purpose, "public recreation."

In many instances, public bodies, which wanted to sponsor or co-sponsor community or district recreation agencies, did not have an adequate budget to provide the minimum standards for areas, facilities, personnel or materials for their own operation. Many of these public bodies already had reached their tax limits, and could not obtain any extra funds for public recreation.

Another unfortunate development occurred in some communities where the public recreation agency had been organized under the State Recreation Enabling Act. After operating for a period of time, the appropriations from the sponsoring public bodies were reduced or eliminated, therefore bringing about the deactivating of the public recreation agencies. In some cases, the public recreation programs were decreased to seasonal programs, usually during the summer
Because public recreation was a secondary rather than a primary function of the sponsoring public body or bodies, it was a natural development that adequate funds for recreation were also a secondary consideration. The cost of operation of primary functions in many cases, had increased faster than the increase in funds from taxation. The allocations to the public recreation agencies were therefore decreased or eliminated. It became quite apparent that, in order for public recreation agencies to become permanent, they would need to have their own primary source of income.

At the same time that several communities and small cities were investigating the advantages of state recreation enabling legislation, other communities and small cities with surrounding unincorporated areas were studying the public recreation situation from another approach. Many of the people who lived in the unincorporated areas were familiar with the laws relating to school districts. They began to inquire how districts for "public recreation," comparable to school districts for "public education," could be organized.

It was felt that the districts for public recreation should be so constituted as to provide the legislation found to be essential in forming a permanent public recreation body.
They should be as autonomous and free from politics as is practical. If possible, the administrative bodies should be elected by the people, the same as the school board trustees, or appointed by the local public bodies. The funds should be raised by direct taxation from the people and the rate set by the administering body within its limits set by law. The administering bodies should have power to purchase recreational areas, facilities and materials; to employ personnel; to administer programs; to issue bonds; and several other minor powers. These were the ideas that the study groups believed to be essential and which were recommended to be incorporated in the legislation.

This review of historical data on the development of the recreation district movement was presented at meetings throughout the state to the representatives of the communities adjacent to or within unincorporated areas. With this background of information and the resulting understanding of the need for a recreation district movement, the above recommendations were accepted as a basic pattern for legislation. The legislators were contacted by these representative groups and were convinced of the need for legislation to provide recreation districts.

The legislators prepared the necessary legislation and with the support of interested communities, the recreation
district legislation was first passed in 1939. Recreation district legislation is written in the Public Resources Code, State of California, Division V, Chapter 3, entitled "Districts." Article 1, entitled, "Recreation, Park and Parkway Districts"; Article 2, entitled, "County Park Districts"; Article 3, entitled, "Regional Park Districts," were all enacted in 1939. Article 5, entitled, "Regional Shoreline Park and Recreation Districts," was enacted ten years later in 1949.  

Thus, five different types of recreation districts have been authorized by the California Legislature. It is possible that there will be more types in the future.

II. REASONS FOR ORGANIZING

The more common reasons within communities or districts for establishing recreation districts are presented and analyzed in this section of the study.

It was found in this study that many reasons for forming recreation districts were common but that some communities and districts have also individual problems peculiar to the situation of each. Only the more common reasons will be discussed. It must be remembered that in
each community and district each reason weighs differently on the scale of importance.

This study of factors involved in organizing recreation districts showed that many communities and districts realizing the need for public recreation, first organized voluntary recreation councils of some type. These voluntary recreation councils exist as long as the enthusiasm of interested community organizations or individuals remain. Some last over a period of time and are quite successful. Many recreation councils slowly fade away as the enthusiasm of the volunteer recreation workers dwindle.

The reasons for the losing of interest by individuals to serve are: (1) the work load for a volunteer becomes too heavy and the volunteer service becomes real work instead of fun; (2) more guidance and supervision are needed; (3) or more knowledge and training are required for the volunteer recreation leader to carry on with satisfaction. Sometimes the operation of the community recreation programs grows so large that the volunteer recreation councils do not have enough funds or trained personnel to carry on the programs.

Therefore, communities which have experienced community recreation under volunteer recreation councils, which are no longer able to provide adequate community recreation programs, seek a solution to the problem. They want public recreation bodies with adequate funds, trained personnel and
permanency. Recreation districts are the public recreation bodies formed in some of these cases.

Another important determining factor in forming recreation districts found by this study, is the small size of some communities. Naturally, along with the limitations of size, there are in most instances, little or no recreational areas and facilities and a low assessed valuation for taxation to raise funds for the operation of recreation districts. Therefore, communities which are too small to financially support an adequate public recreation program seek to join with other communities and unincorporated areas to establish recreation districts.

The ability to form recreation districts without regard to existing legal boundaries is a very important advantage for organizing recreation districts. The established business, cultural, educational or social boundaries can be used to determine the boundaries for the greatest benefit to the communities. Butler⁸ during his discussion of California recreation district laws states that, "These (laws) authorize the creation of special recreation districts which may be determined without regard to existing municipal or county political boundaries." Therefore, recreation district boundaries are determined by the natural existing

---

⁸ Butler, op. cit., p. 429.
social conditions uniting the people of the areas.

One of the most important reasons for organizing recreation districts in California communities in addition to desired services, is that the citizenry living in unincorporated areas want to pay their share of the cost and want to have a voice in selecting the areas, facilities and programs.

In many communities, located in the unincorporated areas around incorporated cities, the citizenry participates in the recreation programs and utilizes the areas and facilities financed by the taxpayers of the incorporated cities. On the one hand, the people living in the unincorporated areas do not have any legal right to be represented in the public recreation planning. Therefore, in many instances, the programs are not adapted to the leisure-time needs and interests of the citizens living in the unincorporated areas. On the other hand, the taxpayers of the incorporated cities, paying the cost of operating the public recreation areas, facilities and programs, object to financing the recreation of the people living in the unincorporated or "fringe" areas.

In some counties, upon petition from the County Board of Supervisors, public recreation has been financed from the general funds of the counties. The taxpayers of the
incorporated cities also object to this means of financing public recreation for the unincorporated areas. The major cause for this objection, wrote Hjelte,9 is, "It (a special recreation district for local community recreation) overcomes what appears to be the principal difficulty in the way of counties providing for rural recreation out of general county funds, raised in a large part through taxes assessed against city property."

To summarize, a very important reason for organizing recreation districts is, the people living in unincorporated areas prefer to finance, organize, and administer their own public recreation authorities.

As was cited previously in this Chapter, many public recreation agencies were formed under the State Recreation Enabling Act. The possible financial problems of these types of organizations were presented. Several communities experience other difficulties under this type of public recreation agency that encourage the passing of recreation district legislation.

The development of policies and plans for expending the budgeted funds of the public recreation agencies formed under the State Enabling Act brings disagreement among the sponsoring public agencies of the public recreation bodies in

some communities. Because of the primary function of some sponsoring agencies, they are more inclined to have the funds expended for certain recreational programs or in specific areas. For instance, the school representatives might be more interested in providing programs for teen-age juvenile delinquents, while the representatives of the park departments might be more interested in furnishing leisure-time activities for the senior citizens sitting in the parks.

Another source of disagreement in many cases is whether to develop facilities first, or to operate programs first, or to work for both concomitantly.

A summation of the situation was expressed aptly by Butler\(^\text{10}\) when he wrote, "Although most recreation enabling acts empower two or more political units to establish and operate a recreation program jointly, the problems encountered in such a joint operation have deterred municipalities from making much use of this power."

The final common reason for organizing recreation districts is related to the need for the advance master planning of public recreation areas and facilities. The unincorporated areas around many incorporated cities are being developed very rapidly, in most cases more rapidly than the incorporated area. A survey in 1950 of the

\(^{10}\) Butler, op. cit., p. 429.
population growth of the city of San Diego and its surrounding fringe area and unincorporated area revealed these data: the population inside the city increased fifty-eight percent; the fringe areas increased in population eighty-five percent; and the unincorporated area increased 153 percent.\(^\text{11}\) This population trend is quite common in the larger California cities.

There are ample reasons for the people living in the unincorporated areas to establish recreation districts while adequate areas for parks, playfields, playgrounds and recreational facilities are still available. There are definite advantages in purchasing recreational areas at the same time that school sites are being purchased. Subdividers should be contacted and encouraged to have their plans coincide with the master park and recreation plans.

III. GROWTH OF DISTRICTS

The formation of recreation districts in California has shown a steady growth since the passing of the first recreation district legislation in 1939. The trend has been for a greater number of recreation districts to be formed as the values of recreation districts are empirically proven

\(^{11}\) Quarterly Program Report, Third Quarter, Auburn Recreation and Parkway District, 1950, p. 7.
during their years of operation. During the course of this study, many communities and districts have been in various stages of establishing recreation districts.

The first recreation district was the East Bay Regional Park District established in 1934.\textsuperscript{12} One recreation district was formed during the period of 1931-5; two during the period of 1936-40; one during the period of 1941-45; three during the period of 1946-50.\textsuperscript{13} Eight more recreation districts were established by October 15, 1951.\textsuperscript{14} It should be noted that only recreation districts operating year-round programs, employing an executive are used in the above data.

The sharp increase in the number of recreation districts formed since 1948 is primarily due to the establishment of the State of California Recreation Commission in October, 1947. Consultant service by recreation specialists is made available to the rural communities and unincorporated areas. The aid and advice of these trained recreation specialists is made available to the rural communities and unincorporated areas. The aid and advice of these


\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p. 55.

trained recreation specialists provide the organizing communities with the information necessary for completing the organizing of recreation districts and other public recreation authorities.

If the experience of the past is any indicator of the future, many more recreation districts should be organized in the next five year period.
CHAPTER III

THE ROLE OF LOCAL AND STATE RESOURCES IN
ESTABLISHING RECREATION DISTRICTS

It is the intent of this Chapter to describe the role
of local and state resources in establishing recreation
districts. The ways and means, by which local individuals
and local community organizations, aid in organizing recrea-
tion districts are presented. This is followed by a
discussion of the services rendered by local and state
public agencies.

Community relations and public agencies are two
very important factors involved in organizing recreation
districts. They are treated separately in this Chapter
because they are involved and exert a definite influence
throughout the entire process of establishing recreation
districts.

The descriptive adjective "normal" was chosen to
declare the pattern of development of recreation districts
because of its connotation. "Normal" does not imply being
identical or having the same characteristics. It does refer
to falling within a certain range determined by accepted
standards. Two normal individuals do not have identical
characteristics; therefore, with the same kind of reasoning,
two normal patterns of development in organizing recreation districts do not follow identical patterns.

This study revealed that the recreational conditions in each community are distinctly different. It follows, therefore, that the degree of importance of each factor varies with each community's organizational pattern. It is emphasized for a clearer understanding that the factors involved in organizing recreation districts do not develop as individual progressive steps. The factors evolve concomitantly in relation to other developing factors. Along the normal pattern of development it is found that certain factors of organizing recreation districts receive more emphasis during some phases of organizing than others.

I. COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Individuals and community organizations. This study revealed that in a normal pattern of organizing recreation districts the initial stimulus to establish recreation districts originated from one or more individuals or organizations in the community. These interested recreation-minded individuals or organizations in most communities started out with the intention of developing some type of public recreation authority. These interested groups in the majority of cases did not know what kind of public recreation
authority they wanted until they started to study that particular factor of organizing.

While discussing the subject of developing community recreation organizations, Meyer and Brightbill\(^1\) expressed the following:

There are several methods of procedure for initiating community recreation program. Local situations determine the methods to be used in particular cases:

1. Community recreation initiated by the efforts of a single institution or agency.

2. Community recreation initiated by the collective efforts of all agencies interested.

3. A combination of a well-coordinated program of public, private and commercial interests.

In almost all communities, these recreation-minded individuals and organizations had been actively engaged in sponsoring and directing one or more community recreation activities. These activities usually were some special annual event such as Christmas parties, Hallowe'en parades and carnivals, Easter egg hunts, marble tournaments, track meets, doll shows and numerous other special events. As these sporadic events demonstrated their value to the social life of the community, the citizens commenced to think that more community recreation events would be beneficial. They began to believe that some community-wide planning for recreation

Community recreation committees. The next step in the development of community recreation was to call a meeting of all individuals and organizations concerned with the development of community-wide plans. The usual evolutionary progression was to organize community-wide recreation committees with representation from interested community organizations. The membership consisted entirely of volunteer lay workers. These volunteer lay workers very often were professionals in the related fields of education, public parks, social work and law enforcement.

The natural development under these organized community recreation committees was the increase in the number of leisure-time activities. They were held more often on a regularly scheduled basis. The program emphasis changed from large special events to smaller events held more frequently. These were, for example, sports leagues and tournaments for all ages and both sexes, teen-age dances, children's playground programs, arts and crafts classes and folk dance clubs. The special events were not eliminated but were encouraged. They were co-sponsored with the community organizations which originally sponsored the special events or they were sponsored fully by the original community
organizations alone. In a small minority of the communities, these special events were completely turned over to the community recreation councils.

As the community recreation programs expanded under the supervision of the volunteer committees, the planning became more involved. The recreation committees found out that they needed more assistance in finances, facilities, and personnel. They decided that the best resources for these needs would be the local public agencies in related fields.

**Community recreation councils.** Representatives of the public agencies in related fields were invited to attend meetings with the community recreation committees. As a result new and larger community-wide recreation planning organizations were formed. They had greater representation and support from the public agencies than the community recreation committees. They bore the title of community recreation councils, community recreation coordinating councils, community recreation planning councils or any one of many other titles.

If any of the communities were fortunate enough to have had community coordinating councils previously organized and actively operating, the community recreation councils usually became outgrowths of the community coordinating
councils. The community recreation councils then became sub-committees of the community coordinating councils which were responsible for the coordination of the planning for the social needs of the communities.

The possible relationship of community coordinating councils to community and public recreation were outlined by Conrad\(^{16}\) in the following statements:

With the large number of combined activities presented by the aforementioned organizations, it is believed advisable to consider the formation of a community or coordinating council. Generally, an informal body of this type is representative of the various youth interests of the whole city and coordinates activities of private agencies and those public departments whose functions affect youth welfare. A Community Council is interested, not only in the city-wide picture, but more specifically in the neighborhood aspects. It should do much to broaden scope of work on behalf of youth, and should serve as a coordinating body for youth recreation services.

The community-wide recreation programs improved and expanded under these improved organizations. The recreational events in most communities became regularly scheduled with more frequency, because more professionals in related fields were assisting with the planning, supervision and directing.

The emphasis on the types of recreational programs

\(^{16}\) Carson Conrad, Community Self-Study of Recreation, South Pasadena California (Conducted by the California State Department of Education, 1949), p. 67.
changed very little between the community recreation council organizations and the community recreation committees. The outstanding improvement was that the recreational activities became more varied in nature and content.

In many communities, at this phase of the normal developmental pattern, new, serious problems arose. The community recreation programs enlarged to such expansive operations that the problems of finances, facilities and personnel became too large for the voluntary community recreation organizations, no matter how well organized.

At this point, the community recreation councils began to study how adequate finances, facilities and personnel might be obtained to keep the present programs in operation. It was at this time, in the normal pattern of development, that the community recreation councils called on the local and state public agencies to provide advisory service.

II. PUBLIC AGENCIES

It was noted under the section on community relations that the representatives of local public agencies were very active on the volunteer community recreation committees and councils. In some communities, state public agencies also had been contacted and had furnished consultant services
during the organizational stage of the committees and councils.

The public agencies returned to a place of importance at this stage of development, when the community recreation councils decided to investigate the factors involved in organizing public recreation authorities. The community recreation councils decided that they wanted to organize public recreation bodies that would eliminate the weaknesses of the community recreation councils. After some study and discussion, the community recreation councils invited local and state public agencies to meet with them in an advisory or consultant capacity.

Local public bodies. The local public bodies who sent representatives to these meetings were the boards of education, the city councils, the park commissions, the police commissions, the county boards of supervisors, and sometimes, the boards of directors of local group work and social work agencies. As many of these public agencies had organized under some legislative act, their representatives gave valuable information on the procedures to follow in organizing recreation districts or where to secure the information. At this point in the normal developmental pattern, the community recreation councils were advised by the representatives of the local public agencies to seek
professional legal advice from the local district attorneys and the state public agencies, which provide consultant services in community recreation.

**Local district attorneys.** The community recreation councils then contacted these two sources of information. First, the community recreation councils visited the local district attorney's offices, also public agencies, which advised the councils of the necessary legal steps to organize into public recreation bodies. The councils were informed that there are several types of public recreation bodies into which most communities can organize. The factors involved in selecting the best type of public recreation authority for a particular community will be discussed in Chapter IV. The type of authority selected will naturally determine the legal steps to be taken in order to organize into a public recreation body.

**Public recreation agencies.** Although the local district attorney's office supplied the necessary legal information, this was only one of the many factors involved in organizing public recreation authorities. The community recreation councils, before the establishment of state public agencies for providing advisory services, relied heavily on the public recreation bodies in the neighboring
communities to provide advisory service on the many other factors in addition to the legal factor. The public recreation bodies of neighboring communities and their employed personnel proved to be very helpful and effective.

State public agencies. Ever since the establishment of the State of California Recreation Commission in October, 1947\(^7\) and the position of Consultant in School Recreation in the Bureau of Health Education, Physical Education and the Recreation of the Division of Instruction by the State of California, Department of Education in 1945,\(^8\) these state agencies have carried the bulk of the load in advisory service to communities seeking the best solution to their recreational problems. These two state agencies did not replace the representatives of the local public agencies nor the representatives of the public recreation authorities of neighboring communities on the community recreation council. The Recreation Specialist of the State Recreation Commission and the Consultant in School Recreation of the State Department of Education were turned to as additional sources of information. They are professional people with specialized training in all the factors involved in organizing public

\(^{17}\text{Third Annual Report 1949-50, State of California Recreation Commission, Appendix C, p. 56.}\)

\(^{18}\text{Education Code, State of California, Division 5, Chapter 3, Section 24411.}\)
recreation bodies.

The functions of the Recreation Specialist and the Consultant in relation to aiding public recreation are similar. For example, the duties of the office of consultant in school recreation are stated in the Education Code of the State of California as follows:

The Department of Education may advise and assist public school authorities, and upon request any public authorities other than school districts, in establishing, developing and maintaining a system or systems of recreation in accordance to this chapter.

The primary function of the Recreation Specialist and the Consultant in School Recreation is to provide information to the community recreation councils on what to do and how to do it. In some communities, surveys of public opinion on organizing public recreation authorities, surveys of existing recreation facilities, surveys of existing recreational programs and surveys of the future growth of the community are made by the Recreation Specialist and/or the Consultant in School Recreation. Any combination of the above surveys are used in a particular community depending on the need to make a decision on any of the factors involved in organizing public recreation authorities. Any other factors relating to organizing public recreation authorities are also surveyed as the need arises for it. In discussing these types of

19 Ibid., Section 24411.
recreational surveys Fitzgerald believed that,

Many types of surveys are necessary in recreation. The type to be used will depend upon the degree of development of the recreation service and upon the areas of the service that present the most pressing problems. An explanatory study should be utilized where a recreation system is to be instituted in a community for the first time.

The Recreation Specialist and the Consultant in School Recreation supply information on what procedures are necessary for organizing public recreation authorities, how to go through these procedures and to make recreational surveys. In addition, the Recreation Specialist and the Consultant of School Recreation may accompany representatives of the recreation community councils when they talk to other public officials about technical matters. Although the Recreation Specialist and the Consultant in School Recreation assist in many ways, the local community councils are expected to carry the procedures as far as possible and to call upon the state public agencies when more information is needed.

Regarding the cooperation and coordination of the two primary state agencies providing advisory service in community recreation, it was found that in some communities both the Recreation Specialist and the Consultant in School Recreation were requested to serve in an advisory capacity. When this

20 Fitzgerald, op. cit., p. 251.
situation occurred the work was coordinated and each covered a certain area of responsibility. In many communities either one or the other state agency was requested to serve in an advisory capacity and carried on alone.

The terms, "public recreation body," "public recreation authority" or "public recreation agency" have been used until now, instead of recreation district. In the normal pattern of development of community recreation in a community, the community recreation councils have not, up to this point, had enough information to study in order to make decisions on the type of public recreation authorities they want.

The community recreation councils have been collecting over a period of time, the necessary information for studying the factors involved in organizing public recreation authorities. Some community recreation councils decide to establish public recreation authorities, and to investigate the possibility of organizing recreation districts. These factors involved in organizing recreation districts, that are studied by the recreation district councils and the communities, are discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV

FACTORS FOR COMMUNITY STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to present and discuss the six major factors involved in establishing recreation districts. These major factors are the factors analyzed by the recreation district councils and the people of the communities included in the area of the proposed recreation districts.

Although the two major factors of community relations and public agencies just discussed in Chapter III, exert a continuous influence on the organizing process, they usually are not factors that the recreation district councils and communities study and evaluate.

At this stage in the normal pattern of development the communities study the "Big Six," which are the basic factors in organizing for public recreation. The "Big Six" factors are: (1) program; (2) areas, facilities and equipment; (3) personnel; (4) finances; (5) type of recreation authority; (6) legal procedures. These factors are called the "Big Six," because they were found in this study to be the most common factors studied by the people of the communities and recreation district councils.

It is re-emphasized here because of its vital importance
that all the factors are inter-related in the normal pattern of development of organizing recreation districts. One factor can not be dissected from all the others and placed under the microscope for analysis. The reason, for each factor being emphasized at a particular time, is for the convenience of concentrating on the part played by that factor in the total organizing process.

Under the section on "the reasons for recreation districts," it was stated that one of the major advantages of recreation districts is that large areas including both unincorporated areas and incorporated cities can be organized into one recreation district. Therefore, at this stage in the evolution of recreation districts, all the separate communities in the contemplated recreation districts were invited to send representatives to the community recreation council meetings. When communities had operating community recreation organizations, they sent representatives from those organizations. In such cases, when the communities had not formed local community recreation councils, a representative was appointed by the local governing body.

The community recreation councils informed the appointed representatives what they had learned in their study of the factors involved in organizing public recreation authorities. After studying all the information from many
recognized sources, the councils stated that they believed that a particular type of recreation district organization would be the best public recreation authority for the area composed of the communities in the proposed recreation district. The representatives were requested to return to their individual communities and inform their people of the purpose of the meetings. The community recreation councils emphasized that sending representatives to the meetings did not signify approval of the plans. The councils wanted all communities in the contemplated recreation district areas to be represented and to be well informed on every factor in organizing recreation districts, that was to be discussed in detail at the following meetings.

With the addition of these new representatives of all the individual communities in the contemplated recreation districts, the "community recreation councils" in most cases, changed their names to the "recreation district councils or committees." The purposes of these recreation district councils were: (1) to study the factors involved in organizing recreation districts; (2) to disseminate this information to the people living in the contemplated districts; (3) to determine the consensus of opinion of the people living in the proposed districts in regards to forming recreation districts; (4) to carry through the necessary legal
procedures to establish recreation districts in the areas where consensus of opinion appeared to be in favor of establishing such districts.

The first responsibility of these newly formed recreation district councils was to study the factors involved in organizing recreation districts. The "Big Six" factors were discussed by most of the recreation district councils for several meetings over a long period of time.

I. PROGRAM

The first factor to be discussed by the recreation district councils was usually the recreation programs. The leisure-time activities were a common factor that everyone understood. They could visualize community recreation in action through recreation programs in their own particular communities.

Community recreation program surveys. The usual starting point was developing lists of the present leisure-time activities being conducted and compiling some information on their operations. This information was gathered in most communities by local survey committees or by means of surveys by the State Recreation Specialist and/or the State Consultant in School Recreation.

In an appraisal of the community recreation program
contained in a recreation survey of the Carmel Unified School District, Conrad,\textsuperscript{21} State Consultant in School Recreation, recommended that:

The community recreation program should provide for all residents of the Carmel Unified School District a variety of recreational opportunities and activities in a comprehensive and economical program throughout the entire year. Only through the co-operative and co-ordinated efforts of all agencies concerned with those services could that be accomplished. Those were the principles upon which the program was appraised.

The next major point was a determination of what new programs were required to meet the needs and interests of the people of the districts. It was pointed out that these would depend largely on the local facilities made available, the amount of funds in the budget and trained personnel available. Another item was the number of existing recreational activities that would be turned over to the recreation districts to operate when they were formed.

In planning the scope of their programs, the newly formed recreation district councils considered several major factors. First of all, districts covering large areas found it necessary to make provisions for bringing the leisure-time activities to the several individual communities in the unincorporated areas. Secondly, the kinds of recreational event that have family participation ranked very high on the

\textsuperscript{21} Carson Conrad, \textit{A Survey of Recreation in the Carmel Unified School District (Conducted by the California State Department of Education, 1951)}, p. 45.
list of recreation activities for the more rural communities.

This information regarding recreation programs, and other information concerning the recreational needs and interests of the citizenry of the proposed recreation districts was discussed at the meetings of the recreation district councils. This information was gathered in the following ways: (1) by surveys conducted by the State Recreation Specialists; (2) by survey conducted by the State Consultant in School Recreation; (3) by survey conducted by local volunteer committees and by questionnaires or any combination of the three types of recreational surveys.

Arnold and Bush,22 State Recreation Specialists, recommended in a recreation survey the use of a recreation interest finder questionnaire with this statement:

Conduct an activity interest inventory, whereby the needs and interests of various neighborhoods and age groups can be determined as a basis for the development of particular activities best suited to each segment of the population. This questionnaire could be distributed through the schools, or the playgrounds, and also through different organizations.

Another important area of discussion centered around the leisure-time activities being sponsored, at the present

time, by local public agencies and local community organizations. It was necessary for the recreation district councils to find out how many of these operating programs wanted (1) to be continued under their present sponsorship; (2) to be co-sponsored by their present sponsors and the recreation districts; (3) to be sponsored by the proposed recreation districts when established.

One of the primary purposes of public recreation authorities is to coordinate the public recreational events of their constituents. District recreation calendars of all public recreational events were usually recommended by the community recreation surveys. All recreational organizations, regardless of sponsorship, therefore would receive some service from the offices of the recreation districts. On this subject Bush,23 State Recreation Specialist, recommended:

That the District Manager participate with organizations, school administrators, and national youth agencies in establishing the District office as a clearing house for recreational activities. A schedule of these activities should be publicized on community bulletin boards.

The discussion of future needs in public recreation programs in recreation districts brought up the question of where to hold these activities. Therefore, the discussion of recreation areas, facilities and equipment was the next

factor emphasized at the meetings of the recreation district councils.

II. AREAS, FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

The initial subject for the discussion of areas, facilities and equipment was found to be centered around a survey of the present recreational areas and facilities adaptable to public recreation use. The different kinds of recreational areas were listed with an enumeration of their location, size, kinds of rooms, equipment and any other necessary specifications for public recreation use. This information on areas, facilities and equipment was collected by recreation surveys conducted by the same sources that compiled the information on the presently operating recreation programs in the proposed recreation districts.

**Community recreation physical facilities surveys.** The existing recreation areas, facilities and equipment were usually the next item to be presented and discussed. The first step was to find out which ones were available for public recreation use. The procedure involved: (1) a determination of ownership of these recreation areas, facilities and equipment; (2) present utilization thereof; (3) who used them and when they might be available to the proposed recreation districts, if any time at all.
Contracts for the use of physical facilities. When the areas or facilities were owned and operated by a local public agency or local community organizations, it was recommended in many of the recreation surveys that the recreation district councils find out which public agencies and which community organizations would draw up contracts for the use of their facilities. These contracts should be for not less than a year in most cases. Pauly,24 State Recreation Specialist, in one of his public recreation surveys believed certain basic fundamentals of operation should be covered in these contracts. The three fundamentals were illustrated in the following statement:

This agreement should include the following stipulations: (a) Financing the cost of operating and administering the public recreation services, (b) Mutual use of existing and future recreational areas, facilities and equipment, (c) Responsibilities of the contracting parties.

The reasons for finding out what existing facilities could be used and how often they could be used were the following. The foremost reason was to avoid the duplication of facilities in order to save the taxpayers from paying unnecessary taxes. Many rural areas did not have their present public facilities used to anywhere near capacity.

Improvement of physical facilities. In developing this factor further, the discussion led to what improvements recreation districts might make to existing facilities in order to make them useable for public recreation. Also, the discussion included what new recreation facilities might be added to existing public facilities so that such facilities would be of much more service to the community for many phases of community life. For example, in one of the surveys25 by the State of California Recreation Commission, the following suggestion was made:

... (7) Consideration should be given to the need for a heated swimming pool to be located on or immediately adjacent to high school property by agreement and joint financing for school year instructional swimming as well as summer use.

The above illustration indicated the possibility of joint financing in improving existing facilities or adding new facilities to already existing facilities.

In order to greatly expand the use of existing facilities, frequently the possibility of installing night lighting was discussed. Recreation facilities are in their greatest demand in the evening after work. In many communities in California, at certain times of the year, it is too hot to recreate until the sun goes down. The installing

of lights therefore greatly increases the use of certain facilities.

**Master plan.** The next progressive step in the discussion of areas, facilities, and equipment was the consideration of the new areas, facilities and equipment required to operate the enlarged public recreation programs as indicated by the recreation surveys. The recreation district councils, at this level of development of the normal pattern of organizing recreation districts, considered a master plan of public recreation facilities. The purpose of master plans of facilities needed in the next five or ten years and based upon population trends was to help the recreation district councils determine the type of recreation district they thought would be best. It would also be a tremendous aid in setting up the first year's budget.

In many proposed recreation districts, the city and county planning commissions were called upon to render their services to the recreation district councils. Pauly,26 State Recreation Specialist, expressed the basic philosophy and criteria for developing master plans of recreation facilities for recreation districts in the following statement:

---

26 Pauly, op. cit., p. 4-5.
It is suggested that the City Council, Recreation Park and Parkway District, and the Elsinore School Boards:

1. Prepare in cooperation with the City Planning Commission and the County Planning Commission of Riverside County, a master plan for the location, acquisition, and the development of Lake Elsinore recreation areas and facilities. In this development the planning authorities should be guided by the following criteria:

a. Willingness and desire of the local citizens to finance both the acquisition and development, and the operation and maintenance of the recreation areas and facilities.

b. Development of an over-all master plan financed through accumulated revenues.

c. Proposed developments should be placed on a priority list, with each desired development being classified under the categories of:

1. Immediate
2. Desirable
3. Long Range

d. Inform the public so they will recognize the value of a total community approach and develop a plan that will provide recreational opportunities to the greatest number of people.

e. Consider the existing circumstances of Lake Elsinore and the potential recreational development and the beneficial effects it would have on the community set up as it now is, chiefly a resort city.

Equipment and supplies. The subject of recreational equipment and supplies very often was discussed next. It was necessary for the recreation district councils to estimate the amount of equipment and supplies for the first year's operation, based upon information from operating recreation
districts, from local public agencies and from state public agencies. This was necessary for setting up the first year's budget.

The recreation surveys usually emphasized the fact that recreation supply kits were provided by operating recreation districts, especially for the people living in rural areas. Community organizations, public agencies and family groups picked up the equipment from the recreation district offices for their use at special events.

When the question about using the recreation equipment and supplies of other public agencies and community organizations was raised, it was seriously discouraged. Experience has proven that recreation districts can avoid many misunderstandings with other local public agencies and community organizations by providing their own recreational equipment and supplies. It also was a great convenience and time-saver not to have to make arrangements to borrow and return the equipment.

**Construction, maintenance and repair.** The construction, maintenance and repair of recreation districts' facilities were the next item usually discussed in order to help in setting up the budget. This study revealed that most capital outlay construction has been done by contract with building contractors. Some capital outlay development in
some recreation districts has been done by volunteer community organizations, labor unions and individuals. The maintenance and repair usually has been carried on by part- or full-time paid workers.

Use of community recreation facilities. The recreation surveys revealed that the use of areas and facilities of local public agencies and community organizations by operating recreation districts was donated, with limitations, by some agencies and organizations. Most of the community organizations and local public agencies charged a minimum fee, just to cover the cost of the use and cleaning of the area and facilities. In some cases, the recreation districts did their own cleaning and paid for the use of the areas and facilities. In the case of the co-sponsorship of an activity, the division of cost and responsibilities was worked out to the satisfaction of both parties.

III. PERSONNEL

After a thorough discussion of the factors of program, areas, facilities and equipment, a discussion of personnel was in order. Most of the recreation surveys indicated that some full-time and/or part-time paid personnel would be necessary in order to operate programs and to prepare, maintain and repair recreational areas, facilities and equipment.
In one of his recreation survey of a recreation district, Bush, State Recreation Specialist, referring to the employing of personnel expressed the theory that:

In studying the problem of providing qualified leadership, both professional and volunteer, to administer a year round recreation program it must be understood that the provision of areas and facilities must be accompanied by a corresponding provision of leadership. Leadership is necessary to develop program opportunities and instruct participants in the use of areas and facilities.

To summarize what has been presented about personnel, the theory of employing trained, experienced, paid personnel has several pertinent factors. Without such leadership, in the first place, the recreational programs will not achieve as well the purposes and aims of public recreation. In the second place, the participants in the recreation programs will lose interest and stop attending if they do not receive adequate supervision and direction. In the third place, the recreational areas, facilities and equipment, regardless of cost, will not be used unless they are attractive and clean, because of proper preparation, maintenance and repair. Some of the above responsibilities may be carried on by volunteer workers. Experience has proven that volunteer workers in order to render satisfactory services require good supervision.

---
It was decided to approach the factor of personnel from a broad point of view. The study of personnel will include not only the paid employed personnel but also the governing board and volunteer workers.

**Governing body.** As type of governing body is one of the factors in selecting the type of a recreation district, the recreation district councils referred to the Public Resources Code. The councils studied the types of governing boards and their powers and duties. They found that the powers and duties followed the general pattern of all public bodies. A most difficult decision, for many recreation district councils to make, was whether or not the recreation district councils preferred an elected or appointed governing board. Some recreation districts have a choice in the matter. The appointing bodies are the county boards of supervisors and/or the city councils. The choice very often is influenced by the opinions of these two public bodies regarding the appointment or the election of the governing bodies of the recreation districts.

With the decision of the preferred type of governing board determined, the attention of the recreation district councils turned to personnel. The number and types of personnel were discussed in relation to the previously
studied factors of program, areas, facilities and equipment. The number and types of personnel were recommended in the recreation surveys which were made by the same services as listed under the two previous "Big Six" factors of organizing, just presented in this study.

**Personnel.** The paid, employed personnel found to be the most important for newly organized recreation districts, in the order of priority were administrators, office workers, maintenance workers, supervisors and directors. Most recreation district councils estimated the number and salaries of paid personnel to be needed for the first year. The primary reason for estimating was for the purpose of setting up the first year's budget. The actual seeking and employing of personnel did not take place until the recreation districts were voted in and the governing boards elected.

In a recreation survey by Snyder,\(^{28}\) State Recreation Specialist, the recommendations were:

Employ a year round Director of Recreation, to promote and conduct programs of community recreation for children, youth and adults. He should be qualified by training and experience in recreation. His duties and responsibilities should be prescribed by the Recreation Commission in advance of his employment. He should be provided with adequate office space, telephone and secretarial service.

\(^{28}\) Gladys Snyder, Plans for Development of Public Recreation Services in the City of Walnut Creek, California and the Surrounding Unincorporated Area (Conducted by the State of California Recreation Commission, 1949), p. 2.
He should be assisted by citizen leaders working in a volunteer capacity and by such occasional part time employed recreation leaders as budgetary limitation will allow.

**Volunteer services.** Many recreation surveys also recommended that full utilization of volunteer organizations and individuals to supplement the employed paid personnel. The recreation district councils were encouraged to continue as advisory councils to the governing boards after the establishment of the recreation districts. The individual recreation councils or committees in each community were urged to continue in an advisory capacity to both the recreation district councils and the governing boards. The community organizations were asked to continue sponsoring leisure-time activities with aid from the recreation districts. Individuals with talent in any leisure-time activities were enlisted to serve either as volunteer or part-time leaders.

IV. **FINANCES**

After discussing and making tentative decisions concerning the first three of the "Big Six" factors—program; areas, facilities and equipment; and personnel—the fiscal budget became the center of discussion. Again the reports of recreation surveys formed the basis for discussion.

**Public recreation budget formulas.** The first subject
for study was the development of a formula setting up public
recreation budgets. There are many formulas but two
universally accepted are the budget formulas by George D.
Butler and that of the International City Managers' Associa-
tion. While discussing this subject, Butler29 stated the
following:

In 1940 it was the consensus of opinion of experienced
leaders in the recreation field that in order to provide
adequate recreation opportunities for its citizens, any
city should spend annually $1 per capita for its program
under leadership, not including the maintenance costs.
Of this amount approximately 75 cents would be for
recreation leadership; the balance for supplies, supple-
mentary personnel, and incidental expenses. An addi-
tional expenditure of 50 cents per capita was determined
as the cost of maintaining areas, buildings, and
facilities used in connection with the recreation pro-
gram. Therefore, a standard expenditure of $1.50 per
capita was developed for organized recreation activities
and leadership and for maintaining and operating facili-
ties such as golf courses, swimming pools, and tennis
courts, as well as playgrounds, playfields, and indoor
centers. Of this $1.50, one-half would be needed for
recreation leadership.

For maintaining general park areas not used for
active or organized recreation, for operating special
features such as a zoo, botanical gardens, and museums,
concerts and holiday celebrations, an additional $1.50
per capita was suggested. Three dollars per capita was
therefore arrived at as the desirable annual standard
of expenditure for all forms of municipal recreation
service in an American city. The various figures pre-
sented here relate to current expenditures only and do
not include amounts spent for the improvement or
extension of recreation areas and facilities.

The per capita expenditure necessary in any city in
any year bears the same relation to the standards recom-
mended in 1940 that the general price level for the year

29 Butler, op. cit., pp. 481-82.
bears to the 1940 price index. On this basis a city needed to spend about 50 per cent more in 1947 than in 1940, or approximately $2.25 per capita, for its community recreation program.

Providing that there are existing recreation and park facilities sufficient in number, distribution and kind to meet nationally accepted standards, the International City Managers' Association\textsuperscript{30} recommended that:

\ldots any American city would need to spend annually $1.50 per capita for its organized recreation program, for the operation and maintenance of areas and facilities used for active recreation, and for the furnishing of communitywide recreation leadership and services. Of this amount approximately 75 cents is required for recreation leadership; 50 cents for maintaining areas, building, and facilities used in connection with the recreation program, \ldots and the balance, or 25 cents, for supplies, supplementary personnel, and other expenses incidental to the activities program.

Rising costs have influenced expenditures and it is the experience of some departments and agencies that budget proportions are as follows: 75\% for personal services; 15\% for operating expenses; 10\% for capital outlay.

These two formulas will vary slightly depending on many factors including the section of the nation, the geographical factors of the districts, the wealth of the districts, the social and cultural standards of the districts, and the facilities already provided by the local, state and federal agencies. Population is a relatively unimportant factor in determining the amount per person except for small

communities, which require a larger amount per person to provide the same public recreation services.

**Developing a recreation district budget.** With these formulas in mind, the recreation district councils then reviewed the budgets of other recreation districts of the same size. An advisor from one of the two state agencies, the State Recreation Commission or the State Department of Education, was usually present because of the technical and professional knowledge required to develop a fiscal budget.

The major budget items for expenditures were personnel services; capital outlay; maintenance and repair; materials, supplies and services; transportation and contractual services. The major budget items for income were taxes, program income, gifts and donations.

Each major budget item for expenditure was analyzed and the specific minor items were added with an estimated amount of outlay for the first fiscal year. For example, the minor budget items under the major budget item, "personnel," might be a superintendent of recreation, an office secretary, some part-time leaders and a maintenance worker. The same procedure followed for each major budget item and its corresponding minor budget items. For example, program income might include such minor budget items as admissions to sports leagues, memberships to social clubs, admission
to dances and league entry fees. Each one of these minor budget items was studied in order to estimate the amount of income that might be raised during the next fiscal year.

The total amount of expenditure in any recreation district depended more upon capital outlay than any other item. The other major items usually followed the percentages recommended by the two recreation budget formulas. Capital outlay varied from very small to very large depending on the amount of construction and improvement anticipated. The construction of recreation buildings, or swimming pools, or the improving of large parks involved a considerable expenditure and increase in the size of the budget totals.

**Determining the tax rate.** The required tax rate was one of the most important factors for selecting the type of recreation district. The estimated tax rate was determined during the budget sessions. The total amount of income to be raised by the programs of the recreation districts was subtracted from the total expenditures. The difference between these two sums was the amount to be raised by taxation. The tax rate was then determined at a later date by the city and/or county auditor.

**V. TYPE OF PUBLIC RECREATION AUTHORITY**

After the proposed fiscal budgets and required tax
rates were determined, the next "Big Six" factor discussed was the selection of a type of public recreation authority. In this study, the factor is narrowed down to the selection of one of the five types of recreation districts which are legally established.

All the major and minor factors for organizing recreation districts that have been discussed have had an influence, directly or indirectly, in the selection of one of the five types of recreation districts.

In the final analysis, the type of recreation district is determined primarily by the five following factors: (1) the amount, kind and valuation of territory to be included in the district; (2) the amount of population in the district; (3) the desired tax rate; (4) the amount of capital outlay expenditure for the development and maintenance of recreation areas and facilities; (5) the type of governing board.

Amount, kind and valuation of the territory. During the study of the territory to be included in the recreation districts, the recreation district councils again referred to the Public Resources Code of California.31 The councils found that "Recreation, Park and Parkway Districts" may

---
31 Public Resources Code, State of California, Division 5, Chapter 3, Articles 1-5.
include any portion of the incorporated area of a city or
unincorporated territory of a county. "County Recreation
Districts" may include any of the unincorporated area of a
particular county. "Regional Park Districts" may include
any parcels of cities and counties in their territory. All
the area in the proposed district shall be contiguous and
shall be located within the boundaries of a municipal
utility district organized and existing under Chapter 218
of the Statutes of 1921. "Park, Recreation and Parkway
Districts" may include any portion of the unincorporated
area of any county not included in any other park district
and lying entirely outside of any national forest. The
area does not need to be contiguous. The "Regional Shore-
line Park and Recreation Districts" may include two
municipalities together with one or more other municipalities
and any other parcel or parcels of city or county territory
in the same or different counties. All the territory in the
proposed district shall be contiguous.

The kind of area is important because it helps deter-
mine the major purpose of the district. For example, communi-
ties which are desiring to develop their beaches and parks
along the ocean will most likely select a "Regional Shoreline
Park and Recreation District."

It becomes evident that the type of recreation district
depends very strongly on the kind of territory to be included. Notwithstanding, there are other choices to be made, even within a type of recreation district, as is explained in the following paragraphs.

**Population.** Also, the number of people who reside in the proposed territory is important. From the program point of view, enough people should be included to have enough participants in a wide variety of leisure-time activities. The number of people who live in the proposed territory of the recreation districts is very important from the financial standpoint.

Not only should the population be large enough but also the assessed valuation of the proposed districts should be high enough to collect sufficient taxes to operate the district on minimum standards on a year-round basis. The amount required is taken from the estimated fiscal budget, described under the section on finances in this study and is the basis for determining the tax rate. The more the assessed evaluation, the less the tax rate.

**Tax rate.** The amount of the tax limit and the means of acquiring funds to operate recreation districts are also very significant factors in selecting a particular type of recreation district. The "Recreation, Park and Parkway
Districts" have a tax ceiling not to exceed twenty-five cents per one hundred dollars of the valuation of the real and personal property. The budget funds are raised by direct taxation. The "County Recreation Districts" receive their budget funds from a special tax of the property lying in the district. The board of trustees of the district requests the funds from the county board of supervisors and presents the next fiscal year's budget for approval. The "Regional Park Districts" raise their budget funds by direct taxation. The tax ceiling shall not exceed ten cents on each hundred dollars of assessed value of all real and personal property within the district. The "Park, Recreation and Parkway Districts" have a tax ceiling not to exceed fifty cents on each hundred dollars of assessed value of all taxable property lying within the district. The board of trustees of the district furnish the county board of supervisors with an estimate in writing of the amount of money necessary to operate for the coming year. Upon approval the supervisors levy a special tax upon all taxable property. The "Regional Shoreline Park and Recreation Districts" have a tax ceiling not to exceed ten cents on each hundred dollars of assessed value of real property. The budget funds are raised by direct taxation on all real property.

The governing boards of the recreation districts
present, in writing, to their governing bodies, a copy of the proposed fiscal budget. The budget is approved by the governing bodies, and can not be changed or vetoed by the governing bodies except for the following two reasons: (1) the legal tax limit is exceeded, (2) one per cent of the voters in the last election file a petition to have a hearing.

When the first reason is violated, the amount of funds to be raised by taxation must be reduced. When the second reason occurs, the governing bodies call a public meeting to review the proposed budgets with the residents and boards of directors of the recreation districts. In the light of the facts presented at this meeting, the governing boards either approve the proposed budgets of the recreation districts or recommend that the boards of directors of the recreation districts revise their budget requests. The same procedure follows for the revised budgets as the original proposed budgets of the recreation districts, until budgets acceptable to the governing bodies are approved.

By analyzing the tax ceiling and procedures for raising tax funds, it is discovered that each type of recreation district has a different procedure for acquiring its funds for the fiscal budget and that the tax rate ceilings have a range from ten cents to fifty cents per hundred
Bonds for capital outlay expenditures. The legal right to issue bonds is another primary factor in selecting a type of recreation district. If recreation districts plan to go into a large improvement and building program of facilities and areas in the near future, then bonding may be a necessary feature. "County Recreation Districts," "Regional Park Districts" and "Regional Shoreline Park and Recreation Districts" can legally bond themselves. The "Park, Recreation and Parkway Districts" and the "Recreation, Park and Parkway Districts" can not bond themselves.

Governing board. The type of governing board is another factor in determining the selection of one of the types of recreation districts. Some recreation districts have elected governing boards and some have appointed governing boards; some recreation districts have a choice between elected or appointed governing boards. The "Recreation, Park and Parkway Districts" shall have five directors and have a choice between an elected or an appointed governing board. The "County Recreation Districts" shall be managed by seven trustees appointed by the county board of supervisors. The "Regional Park Districts" shall have five directors, one from each of the wards or subdistricts from which they are
nominated. They shall be elected at large. The "Park, Recreation and Parkway Districts" shall have three trustees that govern the district. They are elected at large. The "Regional Shoreline Park and Recreation Districts" shall have five directors and shall be elected at large.

After studying and discussing all the major and minor factors involved in organizing recreation districts, the recreation district councils make their decisions on the type of recreation districts they prefer.

The representatives of the individual communities were requested to return to their communities and inform their constituents of the decisions of the recreation district councils. They were also asked to try to find out what approximate percentage of the communities was in favor of establishing recreation districts.

In those districts in which the representatives returned to the next meetings with the answer that a majority of the people appeared to be in favor of establishing recreation districts, the next step was to start a publicity campaign.

The publicity campaigns were organized by the recreation district councils. Many different effective methods of informing the public were used. The most effective method was by having the recreation district council members and
other interested citizens speak at special public meetings and at all organization meetings held in the district. All other media of contacting the public were utilized, such as newspapers, radio, parades, shows, rallies, meetings with youth and many other means.

VI. LEGAL PROCEDURES

While the publicity campaigns were continuing, the recreation district councils contacted the local city and/or county district attorneys' offices.

The legal steps to be taken were explained in detail by the local district attorneys' offices. It was pointed out that the general procedure for organizing any of the recreation districts follows a similar pattern and only the specifics differ. The major steps in the normal pattern of development of the legal procedure are described in the succeeding paragraphs.

The following legal steps were abstracted from the Public Resources Code\(^\text{32}\) of the State of California and were supplemented by the findings of the survey. The division of and the number of steps were decided by the information found by this study.

\footnote{32 Public Resources Code, State of California, Division 5, Chapter 3, Articles 1-5.}
**First step.** The first step is the appearance of the representatives of recreation district councils before the governing bodies of the incorporated and unincorporated areas. The representatives explain their cases and request a joint resolution of all the governing bodies, to form consolidated recreation districts.

The governing bodies then call meetings to discuss the requested resolution to establish recreation districts. The major questions to be decided at these meetings were: (1) shall consolidated recreation districts be formed; (2) which governing boards are in favor of establishing recreation districts and which are not; (3) how shall the governing bodies of the recreation districts be selected.

When all the governing boards of the communities located in the proposed recreation districts are in favor of establishing consolidated recreation districts, joint resolutions creating consolidated districts are passed. The issue of the means of selection of the governing bodies of the recreation districts is usually next on the agenda for discussion. The governing boards of the recreation districts are either elected or appointed. For some of the recreation districts there is no choice. For other recreation districts, there is a choice of having either appointed or elected governing boards. In these cases, the decision is usually
up to the vote of residents of the recreation districts.

**Second step.** The second step is that the governing bodies of the cities and/or counties set a time and place for hearings, and publish notices to that effect. The notices to call hearings on the establishing of recreation districts are published for a minimum of two weeks in newspapers that cover the entire proposed recreation district.

At the hearings or any time to which they are continued, the governing bodies consider all written objections filed. The governing bodies analyze all the objections and evaluate them. It is permissible to exclude certain territories from the proposed recreation districts, providing justifiable reasons are presented.

**Third step.** If the governing bodies decide to continue with the establishment of the recreation districts, then resolutions are adopted by the governing bodies calling for elections. The elections shall be held no sooner than twenty days after the adoption of the resolution ordering the holding of the election. The resolutions are published for a period of two weeks in newspapers covering the entire proposed recreation districts. The notice may include that at the same election the residents will vote whether they want
elected or appointed governing boards for the recreation districts. This procedure eliminates the necessity of calling another election to determine if the voters of the districts want elected or an appointed governing boards, providing the proposal for establishing recreation districts receive the majority of votes cast in the election.

Fourth step. After the date of the election is announced, the recreation district councils redouble their efforts to stimulate interest in the elections. They not only attempt to inform everyone of the reasons for and values of recreation districts but also encourage everyone to vote so that a more reliable indication of the feeling of the population can be known.

The elections are held. If a majority of the votes favors the establishing of recreation districts, the governing bodies enter a finding to that effect in their minutes. The recreation districts become legally established and organized.

If a majority of the votes are also in favor of elected boards, resolutions calling for an election of the members of the governing boards of the recreation districts are drawn up by the governing bodies of the recreation district areas. Either special elections are called or the regular election time is designated by the governing boards
of the recreation district areas. The elections for the members of the governing boards are called in the same previously described manner as the elections for the establishment of the recreation districts.

On the other hand, when a majority of the votes signifies a preference for the members of the governing boards of the recreation district to be appointed by the designated governing bodies of the consolidated recreation districts, the governing bodies select and appoint the number of governing board members specified by law. With the appointment or election of the members of the recreation district governing boards, the recreation districts are completely established and are ready to commence to operate.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

Historical background. This study found that the recreation district movement developed from an accumulation of the individual efforts of a number of California communities to find a solution to their recreation problems.

The Civic Center Act was passed in 1935, which was the first attempt by the State Legislature to solve the public recreation problems of people living in California. As this act did not solve the public recreation problems of some communities, the State Legislature enacted the State Recreation Enabling Act in 1939. This act provided for establishing local public recreation authorities whose primary function would be the administration of public recreation.

Again some California communities found that the State Recreation Enabling Act was not applicable for use in their communities. The people in small cities and unincorporated areas soon discovered that another legislative act was needed in order to enable them to organize in a workable plan. The legislation adapted to the needs of the small cities and unincorporated areas was made part of the Public Resources
Code of the State of California, entitled, "Recreation Districts."

The recreation district laws enable many small communities and their surrounding unincorporated areas to jointly sponsor recreation districts. The boundaries of recreation districts may be established without regard for existing legal boundaries. The citizens living in the unincorporated areas desire to pay their share of the cost of the public recreation program and want to have a voice in selecting the areas, facilities and programs. Recreation districts should be organized before the unincorporated areas become so developed that no areas are left that are suitable for public recreation purposes. A master plan of recreational areas and facilities should be developed and areas purchased while desirable land is available at a reasonable price.

The establishing of recreation districts in California has shown a steady increase in growth, since the passing of the first recreation district legislation in 1939. There has been a sharp increase in the number of recreation districts formed since 1948. The primary reason for this sharp increase was the establishment of the State of California Recreation Commission in October, 1947. Consultant service in community recreation was made available to the rural
communities and unincorporated areas.

This study found that the most common factors involved in organizing recreation districts are: (1) community relations; (2) public agencies; (3) program; (4) areas, facilities and equipment; (5) personnel; (6) finances; (7) selection of the type of public recreation authority; (8) legal procedures.

**Community relations.** The findings of this study revealed that, in almost every community, the original stimulus to establish recreation districts was initiated by local interested individuals or organizations. They were usually actively engaged in sponsoring and directing one or more community recreation activities. These interested recreation-minded individuals or organizations started out with the intention of creating some type of public recreation authority. In most communities they did not decide on the type of public recreation authority until they had studied all of the factors involved.

Previous to initiating the movement to establish recreation districts, the communities usually had gone through a normal pattern of evolution. The normal pattern in many communities started with voluntary recreation committees which developed into voluntary recreation councils. In some cases, recreation commissions followed the committees and
councils. All of these types of community-wide recreation organizations failed to fully satisfy the recreational needs of the communities in many small cities and unincorporated areas.

Public agencies. The public agencies, both local and state, played large and important parts in the establishing of recreation districts. In the first place, representatives of local public agencies were very active on, and were very beneficial to, the volunteer recreation committees and councils, which administered the local community recreation programs. The representatives of the local public agencies became an excellent source of information during the stage of studying the factors involved in organizing recreation districts. They also were good representatives of the recreation district councils during the period of the publicity campaigns and the period of going through the prescribed legal steps.

Representatives of public agencies of neighboring towns also donated their services to the recreation district councils as resource persons. The personnel and members of the neighboring public recreation authorities were also especially helpful.

Since the establishment of the State Recreation Commission and the office of Consultant in School Recreation,
a large percentage of resource service has been supplied by them. They conduct surveys and appraisals to determine the factors involved in organizing public recreation agencies. This information in turn makes it possible for the local organizing committees and councils to make more accurate decisions.

Program. The first factor, that was usually discussed by recreation district councils was the recreation program, because this factor was the most understandable. Everyone had seen recreation in action. The normal pattern of development in most communities began with surveys of the leisure-time activities being conducted at that time. This was followed by surveys to find what new programs were required to meet the needs and interests of the citizens. These surveys were made by local committees, sometimes with the help of the state recreation agencies.

In examining the scope of the program for proposed recreation districts, two major factors became evident. First, the programs were usually brought to the individual communities by the recreation directors and were not centralized in the large community. Second, family type leisure-time activities ranked very high on the list of planned public recreation programs for recreation districts.
Areas, facilities and equipment. The normal pattern of development of the factor of areas, facilities and equipment followed a sequence very similar to the normal pattern of development for the factor of program. The first step was to make surveys of the existing areas and facilities useable for public recreation. The second step involved conducting surveys to find out which facilities were available for public recreation use and how often they could be used.

The purposes of the surveys of recreation facilities were: (1) to avoid unnecessary duplication of facilities in order to save the taxpayers from expending funds without definite need; (2) to find out what improvements can be made to existing facilities to make them useable for public recreation; (3) to learn what new facilities can be added to existing facilities so that the improved facility can give more service to many phases of community life; and (4) to determine what new areas, facilities and equipment would be required to operate the enlarged public recreation program.

It was considered important to develop long-range plans with the aid of the planning commissions of the cities and counties and to draw up all contracts for at least one year for the use of the areas and facilities to avoid misunderstanding often associated with verbal agreements.
Personnel. The recreation district councils realized that some full-time and/or part-time paid personnel were necessary. Paid professional personnel are required in order, (1) to carry out the programs according to the aims and purposes of public recreation; (2) to achieve desired results; (3) to stimulate and maintain the interest of the participants in the leisure-time activities; (4) to prepare, maintain and repair areas, facilities and equipment so that they will be clean and attractive at all times.

The recreation district councils learned that some of the work could be carried on by volunteer individuals and organizations under the close supervision of professional workers.

The personnel found to be the most important for newly organized recreation districts, in their order of priority, were administrators, office workers, maintenance workers, supervisors and directors.

Finances. The factor of financing recreation districts was usually next to be considered. The approach to the study of setting up a proposed budget for the first fiscal year was the reviewing of some of the recognized formulas for determining public recreation budgets. This was followed by analyzing the budgets of several operating recreation districts.
The major budget items for expenditures are: personnel services; capital outlay; maintenance and repair; materials, supplies and services; transportation and contractual services. The major budget items for income are taxes, program income, gifts and donations. The capital outlay expenditure has more influence on the total amount of the fiscal budget than any other one major item. The required tax rate is determined by the total amount of funds required to balance the fiscal budget.

Selection of the type of public recreation authority. For this study, the selection of the type of public recreation authority depended upon the selection of one of the types of recreation districts. In the final analysis, the selection of the type of recreation district best applicable to a community is determined primarily by the five following factors: (1) the amount, kind and valuation of the territory to be included in the district; (2) the amount of population in the district; (3) the desired tax rate; (4) the amount of capital outlay expenditure for the development and maintenance of recreation areas and facilities; and (5) the type of governing board.

Legal procedures. The publicity campaigns to inform the residents of the districts of the advantages of having recreation districts usually starts about the same time as
the legal procedures. Every medium of publicity is used. The most effective one is speaking at community organization and public meetings, called to discuss the establishment of recreation districts.

The legal steps are prescribed in the Public Resources Code of the State of California and must be followed precisely. The recreation district councils consult the city and/or county district attorney's offices for legal advice.

When a majority of the votes are cast in favor of the recreation district and when the governing board is either elected or appointed, the recreation district is legally established and is ready for operation.

II. CONCLUSIONS

1. All recreation district councils responsible for organizing recreation districts sought aid and information, which indicated that a self-study guide of the factors involved in organizing recreation districts can be used as a source of assistance and information.

2. Almost all the surveys for organizing recreation districts and other public recreation authorities, that were studied, included the eight major factors involved in organizing recreation districts that were selected for this study. This is an indication that, at least, the eight major factors presented in this study should be thoroughly reviewed
before a community selects the best type of public recreation authority for itself.

3. Most of the recreation district councils were interested in the history and development of, and the reasons for, recreation districts. It is concluded that this information should be accumulated by the recreation district councils before the councils commence to study the factors involved in organizing recreation districts. An understanding of the need and reasons for recreation districts is necessary to get the most out of studying the factors involved in establishing recreation districts.

4. The findings of this study revealed that, in most communities, the original stimulus to establish recreation districts was started by local interested individuals or organizations. There is an indication here, that a self-study guide of the factors involved in organizing recreation districts might create the interest in more communities to investigate the possibility of establishing recreation districts.

5. It was found that many small cities and unincorporated areas went through a long period of evolution before finding the right type of recreation organizations for their communities. This indicates that small cities and unincorporated areas in California may arrive at a satisfactory
solution to their public recreation problems much sooner if
they first study the factors involved in organizing recrea-
tion districts.

6. The findings of this study showed that the local
people of many communities conducted most of the recreation
surveys. The purpose of these recreation surveys was to
determine the necessary information for making decisions
about the factors involved in organizing recreation dis-

7. This study found that in most communities the
discussions of the factors involved in organizing recrea-
tion districts were publicized. This indicates that the
public became aware of the factors involved in the
organization and operation of recreation districts and voted
with more discretion when the time arrived.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Communities organizing public recreation authori-
ties should study the factors involved in establishing
public recreation authorities before making their selection
of the type of public recreation authorities.
2. Community recreation surveys should be made to gather the necessary information before discussing each factor involved in organizing public recreation authorities.

3. Community recreation surveys, when supervised by state public recreation agencies, should include some self-study responsibilities for the local citizenry.

4. Committees responsible for the study of establishing public recreation authorities should consider, at least, the eight major factors described in this study.

5. Communities in unincorporated areas should investigate establishing recreation districts as one possible type of public recreation authority for their communities.

6. This self-study guide should be used as one source of information. The State Recreation Specialists and the Consultant in School recreation should be consulted whenever possible. Members of local public agencies should be used as valuable sources of information and continued assistance. Personnel and members of neighboring public recreation agencies also should be utilized as resource persons. In addition, interested recreation-minded individuals and organizations in the local community should be consulted extensively. Many sources of literature on this subject should be secured and studied in order for the recreation district councils and the people of the communities to
develop a broad understanding of the factors involved in establishing recreation districts.

In conclusion, it is believed that if communities study the eight major factors involved in establishing recreation districts presented in this study they would be more likely to select and organize the best type of public recreation authorities more quickly and efficiently.
An appraisal with recommendations contributing to a more effective public recreation service in the Greater Vallejo Area.

Plan for Development of Public Recreation Services in the Greater North Sacramento Area Serviced by the Grant Union High School District and Including the City of North Sacramento (Conducted by the State of California Recreation Commission, 1951), 22 pp.
Recommendations for establishing a Recreation, Park and Parkway district for the Greater North Sacramento Area.

A report of the operation of the Auburn Recreation, Park and Parkway District for its first year of establishment.

A statistical and narrative report of the program activities administered by the Auburn Recreation, Park and Parkway District over a period of three months.

A report of the second year of operation of the Auburn Recreation, Park and Parkway District.

This study contains recommendations for developing a public recreation program and the areas and facilities required to operate the program in Chico and surrounding area.

Appraisal of Public Recreation Services in Oroville, California (Conducted by the State of California Recreation Commission, 1950), 35 pp.
A survey of the community and public recreation programs, areas and facilities, with recommendations of several plans for improving the public recreation services in Oroville.
An appraisal of the existing community recreation programs, areas and facilities in the Auburn Recreation, Park and Parkway District with suggestion for future development.

Plan for Development of Public Recreation Opportunities in Clovis Memorial District, Fresno County, California (Conducted by the State of California Recreation Commission, 1949), 16 pp.
A set of guiding principles for the development of leisure-time recreational opportunities in the Clovis Memorial District.

A study of the factors involved in the developing of public recreation services in the Paradise Park, Recreation and Parkway District.

Plan for Development of Public Recreation Services in the Unincorporated Communities of Avenal and Kettleman City, Kings County, California (Conducted by the State of California Recreation Commission, 1950), 18 pp.
Suggestions for providing an adequate recreation program in the unincorporated communities of Avenal and Kettleman City.

A text-book interpreting community recreation, its significance, functions, objectives, program content, methods of operation and relationships.

A compilation of comparative data about the personnel and financial resources of public recreation and of recreation and park agencies in California communities.
Recreation and Park Districts, 5 pp.
Some factors to be considered by communities which are investigating the possibility of organizing recreation districts in California.

An abstract of the general and section meetings of the Second Annual Recreation Conference.

A report of the third year of operation of the State of California Recreation Commission, with a review of the accomplishments for the three years and compilations of data relating to public recreation in California.

Suggestions to be considered in the developing of public recreation services in the City of Kerman and the adjacent rural areas of the county.

An abstract of the general and section meetings of the Second Annual California Recreation Conference.

This survey, by the people of the community, was a self-study of the community and public recreation services, areas and facilities of South Pasadena.

Survey of Recreation in the Carmel Unified School District (Conducted by the California State Department of Education, 1951), 102 pp.
This study was a survey of the community and public recreation services, areas and facilities of the Carmel Unified School District and included recommendations for future development.

A study of the contributions of public school districts to the development of community recreation programs in California.
Deeringa California Codes, Education Code of the State of California, (Compiled by the Publisher's Editorial Staff), San Francisco: Bancroft-Whitney Company, 1944. 1002 pp.
Legislation relating to the operation of public school districts in California.

Public Resources Code of the State of California, (Compiled by the Publisher's Editorial Staff), San Francisco: Bancroft-Whitney Company, 1944. 408 pp.
Contains the legislation for establishing and operating recreation districts.

The purpose of this text-book is to point out some considerations that should be taken into account by both laymen and professionals who are participating or intend to enter into the recreation affairs of a community.

A text-book emphasizing the administrative aspects of public recreation.

The authors of this text-book have presented information concerning the operation of many types of community and public recreation organizations.

A survey of existing community and public recreation factors, with recommendations for future development in the community of Elsinore and surrounding unincorporated areas.

All types of recreation are described in relation to personality development in individuals, groups and communities.
Snyder, Gladys, Plans for Development of Public Recreation Services in the City of Walnut Creek, California and the Surrounding Unincorporated Area (Conducted by the State of California Recreation Commission, 1949), 11 pp. Following a community recreation survey, two plans for the development of public recreation services for the City of Walnut Creek and the surrounding area are suggested.

Youth Recreation Survey, Marin County (Conducted by the State of California Recreation Commission in conjunction with the California Youth Authority, 1950), 28 pp. A survey of the recreation agencies for youth in Marin County, followed by recommendations for improving the youth services in the future.