

In presenting the dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from the Georgia Institute of Technology, I agree that the Library of the Institution shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to copy from, or to publish from, this dissertation may be granted by the professor under whose direction it was written, or, in his absence, by the Dean of the Graduate Division when such copying or publication is solely for scholarly purposes and does not involve potential financial gain. It is understood that any copying from, or publication of, this dissertation which involves potential financial gain will not be allowed without written permission.

22

A SYSTEM OF OPEN SPACES FOR
OUTDOOR RECREATION IN METROPOLITAN AREAS

A THESIS

Presented to

The Faculty of the Graduate Division

by

Ritchey McGuire Marbury, III

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of City Planning

Georgia Institute of Technology

May, 1966

A SYSTEM OF OPEN SPACES FOR
OUTDOOR RECREATION IN METROPOLITAN AREAS

Approved:

[Handwritten signature]

Chairman
[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

Date approved by Chairman: 27 May '66

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The valuable assistance of Professors Howard K. Menhinick and Malcolm G. Little, Jr., of the Graduate City Planning Program of the Georgia Institute of Technology and of Mr. Willard C. Byrd, landscape architect, is gratefully acknowledged.

Gratitude is expressed to Miss Natelle Isley, Librarian of the School of Architecture, for her encouragement and valuable assistance in locating reference material.

Special gratitude is expressed to the author's parents, Mr. and Mrs. R. M. Marbury, Jr., who provided valuable financial assistance at a time when it was most needed.

The author dedicates this thesis to his wife, Fonda, who provided encouragement and assistance throughout its preparation and revision. To her is due much of the credit for the successful completion of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | ii |
| LIST OF TABLES | vi |
| SUMMARY | vii |
| Chapter | |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Factors Affecting the Demand for Outdoor Recreation | |
| Population | |
| Income | |
| Mobility | |
| Leisure | |
| Availability of Sites | |
| Scope | |
| Method of Study | |
| II. EXISTING METROPOLITAN PARK AGENCIES AND THEIR PROGRAMS | 10 |
| County Governments | |
| Sacramento County, California | |
| Spokane County, Washington | |
| Montgomery County, Pennsylvania | |
| Future Potential | |
| <i>Ad Hoc</i> Agencies | |
| Creation of the Agency | |
| Cleveland Metropolitan Park District | |
| Chicago Park District | |
| Cook County Forest Preserve District | |
| Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Authority | |
| Existing Programs and Facilities | |
| Cleveland Metropolitan Park District | |
| Chicago Park District | |
| Cook County Forest Preserve District | |
| Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Authority | |
| Advantages and Disadvantages | |

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------|
| II. EXISTING METROPOLITAN PARK AGENCIES AND THEIR PROGRAMS (Continued) | |
| Multi-Agency Organizations | |
| Functions of the Organizations | |
| Additional Provisions | |
| Private Programs | |
| Wind Creek Park | |
| Ida Cason Callaway Gardens | |
| Lake Spivey | |
| III. FINANCING METROPOLITAN OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES . . . | 32 |
| Property Taxes | |
| Bond Issues | |
| General Obligation Bonds | |
| Revenue Bonds | |
| Special Assessment Bonds | |
| Concessions and User Fees | |
| Grants-in-Aid | |
| State Grants-in-Aid | |
| New York: Park and Recreation Land Acquisition Act | |
| New Jersey: Green Acres Program | |
| Pennsylvania: Project 70 Open Space Program | |
| Federal Grants-in-Aid | |
| Planning | |
| Land Acquisition | |
| Gifts and Capital Outlay Funds | |
| IV. PLANNING THE SYSTEM. | 45 |
| Determining the Facilities Needed | |
| Acreage | |
| Types | |
| Regional Parks | |
| Special Water-Oriented Facilities | |
| Public Golf Courses | |
| Outdoor Sports Centers | |
| Additional Facilities | |
| Distribution | |
| Surveying the Facilities Existing | |
| Identifying the Gaps | |
| Selecting the Sites | |
| Establishing a Program | |
| For Acquisition | |
| For Development | |

| | Page |
|--|------|
| APPENDIX | |
| I. JOINT AGREEMENT OF COOPERATION OPEN SPACE LAND PROGRAM. | 66 |
| II. EXCERPTS FROM THE HOUSING ACT OF 1961. | 75 |
| III. EXCERPTS FROM THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965. | 80 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 86 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| 1. | Oglebay Park Revenues by Source | 37 |
| 2. | Application of the TIM Factor in the Cleveland Metropolitan Area | 49 |
| 3. | Acreage Required for Day Use Parks, Cuyahoga and Seven-County Region, 1960 and 1980 | 50 |
| 4. | Regional Park Standards | 51 |
| 5. | Metropolitan Outdoor Recreation Facilities. | 60 |
| 6. | Factors to be Considered in Determining Priorities for Open Space Acquisition | 63 |

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study is to present guidelines for the establishment of a system of open spaces for outdoor recreation in metropolitan areas. It includes only those open spaces which are used for outdoor recreation and which serve visitors from throughout the metropolitan region regardless of physical impediments to travel or political boundaries. The study does not include municipal parks, neighborhood playfields, private country clubs or any other areas that draw attendance from a single geographic section of the metropolitan area or for other reasons are not open to the entire metropolitan population.

Due to rapid increases in population, income, mobility and leisure time, the demand for metropolitan outdoor recreation areas is growing faster than these areas are being supplied. The actual quantity of land, however, is not yet in short supply. Through the implementation of long-range plans, future demand may be anticipated and met.

We have a rich heritage of metropolitan park agencies to serve as examples in developing metropolitan outdoor recreation programs. Four types of agencies were found to have been effective in providing these programs. They are (1) county governments; (2) *ad hoc* agencies; (3) multi-agency organizations; and (4) private agencies.

The financing of metropolitan park facilities is accomplished through the use of (1) property taxes; (2) bond issues; (3) concessions and user fees; (4) grants-in-aid; and (5) gifts and capital outlay funds.

The methods of financing will often be determined by the type of administering agency. Most successful metropolitan outdoor recreation programs utilize several methods of financing.

Guidelines are presented for planning a system of open spaces for outdoor recreation in metropolitan areas. The first step in planning the system is to determine the facilities needed. The facilities are discussed in terms of acreage, types and distribution. A survey of existing facilities should be conducted next, followed by an identification of the gaps, selecting the required new sites and establishing a program for acquisition and development. Once prepared, the plans must be reviewed continually by the administering and planning agencies and revised as new needs arise and other courses of action become desirable.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Us kids think we should have parks around our way. Everywhere we go we get chased away. When we play tag we get chased by the landlord, so we really have no place to go. We can't even run.¹

This little girl's letter, which was received by President Kennedy several months before his assassination, echoes the plight of scores of children and adults living in the metropolitan areas of the United States. It is the purpose of this study to present guidelines for the establishment of a system of open spaces for outdoor recreation in metropolitan areas.

Factors Affecting the Demand for Outdoor Recreation

People want recreation near home; and home for 119 million people of the nation-wide total of 187 million is in the rapidly expanding metropolitan areas.² Changes in amount and distribution of population, income, mobility and leisure time are significantly increasing the demand for outdoor recreation in metropolitan areas. The few sites available to meet this demand are either being engulfed by urban sprawl or are so costly that governing bodies within metropolitan areas are reluctant to purchase them. The demand, however, is not static and recreation land which may be acquired with difficulty today, may be impossible to acquire in the future.

Population

As the metropolitan population increases, the need for metropoli-

tan outdoor recreation areas is expected to increase proportionately. Nearly two-thirds of the people of the United States today live in metropolitan areas. In 1790, when the first census was conducted by the Federal Government, no metropolitan area existed.³ Since then the proportion of people living in metropolitan areas increased to 35 per cent in 1930,⁴ 58 per cent in 1950,⁵ and 63 per cent in 1960. By the year 2000, almost three-fourths of the nation's inhabitants, or 250 million people, are expected to reside in metropolitan areas.⁶

The major growth in metropolitan areas has occurred in the suburbs, since the already crowded central city can hold few more people than those replacing the suburban migrants. The central cities have grown only 10.7 per cent during the last decade. In terms of their 1950 boundaries, the population rise in central cities has amounted to only 1.5 per cent. The remaining 9.2 per cent increase came from territory added by annexation. The metropolitan suburbs, meanwhile, have grown 48.6 per cent despite the territory annexed by the central cities.⁷

The future metropolitan population is expected to increase in all age groups. Families are expected to increase both in size and number. Outdoor recreation facilities will be needed to provide for this growth.

Income

Participation in outdoor recreation depends, to a large degree, on the individual's ability to afford it. As the purchasing power of an individual rises above that necessary for food, clothing and shelter, more is available for discretionary spending. Some of this additional income will be used for outdoor recreation.

As per capita income increases, the number of days' participation in outdoor recreation also increases. Studies by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC) during the months of June through August, 1960, revealed a total of 33 activity days per person spent in outdoor recreation in the United States. During this period, families with annual incomes of less than \$3,000 a year spent an average of 18.5 activity days while families earning more than \$15,000 a year spent 49.7 activity days. The trend in metropolitan areas having a population of less than one million was similar to the national trend, while the larger metropolitan areas reported a higher rate of participation. Families living in all metropolitan areas with yearly earnings of less than \$3,000 were reported to have spent 24.8 days in outdoor recreation, while families living in metropolitan areas and earning more than \$15,000 spent 63.1 days.⁸

As would be expected, income affects the kind of recreational activity pursued; or more correctly stated, the lack of income limits the ability to participate in certain forms of recreation. At the time of this study, families earning more than \$15,000 per year are spending 3.2 days per person boating, while families earning less than \$3,000 annually spend only 0.2 to 0.5 days per person. The rate of participation between upper and lower income groups is more closely alike in less expensive activities such as fishing and pleasure walking, although the higher income groups still have a larger percentage of persons taking part in these activities.⁹

As has been stated, participation in outdoor recreation increases as income increases, and per capita income is increasing. Over a long

period of time there has been an upward trend in real per capita income (changes in income not due to changes in prices) of the general magnitude of 1.9 per cent annually. The average American will probably double his purchasing power over the next 35 to 40 years.¹⁰

Annual income of persons living within metropolitan communities is considerably higher than that of those living outside them. While the *Census* reported the median income of families living outside metropolitan areas in 1959 to be \$4,485, the median income of families living inside these areas was reported to be \$6,324.¹¹ This indicates a higher potential for recreation activity among the metropolitan population.

In studying the recreation needs of families living within metropolitan areas, the group with an annual income of less than \$3,000 should be particularly noted. This is the group which earns too little to provide its own recreational opportunities, and must look to the community for assistance in the form of nearby parks, playfields, swimming areas and other places where inexpensive recreation is possible.

There are more than four and one quarter million people in the United States who reside in metropolitan areas and earn less than \$3,000 a year. Sixty per cent of these people live in the central city,¹² and this is where the low-income families are continuing to move. The central city, therefore, deserves special attention when planning for future metropolitan open spaces.

In 73 metropolitan areas, including Atlanta, Georgia, and West Palm Beach, Florida, more than 20 per cent of the population earn less than \$3,000 annually; and in one metropolitan area, Laredo, Texas, more than 50 per cent have an annual income of less than \$3,000.¹³ These

regions may need more centrally located metropolitan parks and walkways than the wealthier ones, due to the many families unable to participate in the more expensive forms of recreation.

Mobility

With the increased mobility provided by the automobile, additional opportunity was made available for recreation away from one's home environment. Of the total number of overnight vacation trips taken by adults during a 12-month period between 1959 and 1960, only 3 per cent were less than 50 miles.¹⁴ This exemplifies the fact that the need for extensive, overnight facilities in metropolitan areas, which may have been substantial before the automobile, is relatively minor today.

All-day recreation areas have gained widespread popularity due to increased mobility. Higher income people are willing to travel 30 or 40 miles to all-day recreation areas today, where this would have been impossible before the automobile. In California the average one-way distance traveled by car for one-day trips for outdoor recreation is 35 miles.¹⁵ It is desirable that the roads leading to these areas be made as attractive as possible for pleasure driving and sightseeing. For low-income people, however, the need for metropolitan open spaces near centers of population is still acute.

Leisure

Participation in outdoor recreation would be impossible without the time to enjoy it. It is, therefore, not surprising to discover an increase in recreational activity with additional leisure. ORRRC reports that most people would like to engage in outdoor recreation much

more than they do at present. Lack of time is reported as the primary barrier. More than one-fifth of all leisure time goes into outdoor recreation today, and at least this much is expected in the future.¹⁶

A decreasing number of working hours is one measure of increasing leisure. Dr. Marion Clawson reports that in 1850 the average number of working hours per week was 70. This was reduced to 60 hours in 1900 and to 40 hours in 1950.¹⁷ By 1976 it is estimated that the standard scheduled work week will average 36 hours for the industrial work force as compared with 39 in 1960. By 2000 it may be reduced to 32 hours.¹⁸

In the 38-county New York-New Jersey-Philadelphia region the work week in 1960 averaged about 40 hours. By 2000 it is estimated that the work week will be reduced to 35 hours. Paid vacations, which are now estimated to average two weeks per employee, are expected to increase by four working days.¹⁹ Increased leisure can result from fewer working hours per day, fewer working days per week, or longer paid vacations. All three factors will have their effect in the future.

Availability of Sites

As the demand for recreational open space is increasing within the metropolitan region, the number of usable sites is decreasing. The consumption of open land resulting from the rapid growth of urban and metropolitan areas may be illustrated by this excerpt from a speech by Senator Harrison A. Williams of New Jersey introducing his "Open Space and Urban Development" bill:

We are now urbanizing at a rate of more than a million acres a year. In the last 15 years, we have put almost as much new land to urban uses as we did in all the previous years of the history of our country.²⁰

The typical building lot of a hundred years ago was 20 feet wide; it was 30 feet wide in 1900; 40 feet in 1924; 60 feet in 1950; and today it is 80 to 100 feet. A population increase of 1,000 people a century ago required 10 acres; 30 years ago it required 30 acres. Today it requires between 100 and 200 acres.²¹

If open space were consumed at an even rate, consumption would be high enough. Urban sprawl, however, has multiplied this rate as scattered growth occurs throughout every metropolitan area. Considerable land is left unused by this unplanned growth because it is often too poorly located or in too small parcels to serve as useful recreational open space.

Even with the forces of rapid metropolitan growth and urban sprawl consuming open land, the actual quantity of land is not yet in short supply. In the 38 communities in the metropolitan area between New York and Philadelphia, for example, only 1.5 million acres have been developed; 7.4 million acres are still in open countryside. Effective recreational use of existing open land appears to be the major problem. Due to poor roads or because of a lack of water and other facilities, many acres of this open countryside are available but are seldom used for recreational purposes.²² Metropolitan areas would do well to increase the usability of these existing recreation lands.

Along with the short-term solution of increasing the usability of existing recreation lands, additional land will be needed for the future. A study of the Northeast has demonstrated that potential recreation sites are well distributed even in the most densely populated

regions.²³ Such sites are often ravines, creek valleys, ponds and woods. Land prices may be higher near major population centers, but in terms of user benefits \$1000-an-acre land within a 30-minute drive may be a better investment than \$100-an-acre land four hours away.

Scope

The scope of this thesis will include only open space uses for outdoor recreation, and it will be confined to metropolitan open spaces. It is recognized that open space may be needed for agriculture, flood damage prevention, and other uses as well as for recreation. These uses, however, will be treated only as secondary.

The definition of certain terms will serve to clarify references to them in the future. The term "open space" as used herein, means space that is open in character and is used for leisure time pursuits. Open space may also include bodies of water. Leisure time pursuits include both active and passive recreation.

"Metropolitan open spaces" are those open spaces that serve visitors from throughout the metropolitan region regardless of physical impediments to travel or political boundaries. They do not include municipal parks and playgrounds, neighborhood playfields, tot lots, private country clubs or any other areas that draw attendance from a single geographic section of the metropolitan area or for other reasons are not open to the entire metropolitan population.

"Outdoor recreation" means the enjoyment of one's leisure time

while outside in the open air, regardless of what form this enjoyment takes.

The term, "metropolitan area," means a standard metropolitan statistical area as defined by the United States Bureau of the Census. The 1960 *Census of Population* defines an SMSA as a county or group of counties which contain at least one city of 50,000. In addition to the county, or counties, containing a city or cities, contiguous counties are included in an SMSA if, according to certain criteria given by the census, they are essentially metropolitan in character and are socially and economically integrated with the central city.²⁴

The "activity day," as used herein, is defined as the participation by one person in one activity on one day. One person, therefore, may be counted several times if he participates in several activities on a single day. Such a person might fish, camp, and swim during the course of one day. The person would then be considered to have spent three activity days in recreation. The number of activity days spent on a single activity gives some idea of the popularity of that activity.

Method of Study

Information for this study was derived from personal interviews, correspondence, and a review of pertinent literature.

CHAPTER II

EXISTING METROPOLITAN PARK AGENCIES AND THEIR PROGRAMS

In order to develop recommendations for a system of open spaces for outdoor recreation in metropolitan areas, it is first desirable to study those metropolitan areas which have open space programs now in effect. Four types of organizations have been effective in providing metropolitan outdoor recreation areas:

1. County governments
2. *Ad hoc* agencies
3. Multi-agency organizations
4. Private agencies

The success attained by each of these agencies is discussed below.

County Governments

Counties have a unique opportunity to provide a system of open spaces for outdoor recreation within metropolitan areas. At the time of the 1960 census 131 metropolitan areas were located within one county or parish. They comprised more than 60 per cent of the total number of metropolitan areas in the United States. Even when the metropolitan area includes two or more counties, individual counties within the metropolitan areas have been found in many cases to be extremely active in providing metropolitan parks. This is particularly true in Los Angeles County, California, and Westchester County, New York. In New

York's Westchester County, acting on a plan based on a study of needs to the year 2000, the county acquired more than 3,000 acres of park land between 1960 and 1964.²⁵

Normally, counties administer their outdoor recreation programs through a park board or a park and recreation board. The establishment of such boards requires general enabling legislation by the individual states. However, today nearly all states have passed general enabling legislation for recreation.²⁶

Sacramento County, California

Sacramento County, California, a single county including all of the Sacramento metropolitan area, is developing a system of metropolitan outdoor recreation areas, including a major parkway. In the decade since 1950 the population of Sacramento County nearly doubled. Some of the county's best remaining open space for outdoor recreation was being engulfed by urban developments. Attempts by the county's five cities and 13 park and recreation districts had not eliminated an open space shortage.

After discussion with several civic and conservation groups, the supervisors of Sacramento County established a County Department of Parks and Recreation, hired a competent professional director, and instructed the director to advise them on the acquisition and development of a county regional park system. An aggressive four-year land acquisition program coupled with only minimum development was recommended by the director.

Three sites for regional parks were selected and approved by the

county board of supervisors. With the selection of these sites, the concept of the American River Parkway began to evolve. The parkway concept envisioned a 5000-acre greenbelt along both shores of the American River from the center of the metropolitan area 23 miles upstream to Nimbus Dam. Plans contemplated retention of most of the scenic shoreline in its natural state.

The American River had changed little between the Gold Rush days and 1959. Although most of the shoreline was in private ownership, spring floods had prevented any intensive development. In the late 1950's, however, with the construction of two federal dams upriver to control flooding and to maintain summer flows, the shoreline became attractive for urban development.

Land acquisition for the parkway began in 1960. Initial purchases, however, turned out to be extremely costly and progress was slow. Scattered groups of civic-minded individuals were enthusiastic about the program, but the general public response was sporadic. In February, 1961, the county planning commission approved plans for a subdivision within 125 feet of the river. With this subdivision acting as an immediate threat to the feasibility of the parkway development, the needed catalyst was provided to stimulate public action.

Within a few days, leaders of conservation, civic and youth groups joined forces to form the Save the American River Association. Speakers appeared before civic clubs and service clubs. Pamphlets explained proposals. Color films were produced. Newspaper support was sought and obtained. The Association signed 2750 dues-paying members dedicated to the parkway concept.

What the planners and county board of supervisors wanted to do, now became politically feasible. In January, 1962, the board officially adopted a plan for the American River Parkway. More adequate county funds followed. Several private land owners turned down tempting offers from commercial developers and offered shoreline portions of their properties to the county at reasonable prices. Other land owners offered easements in return for assurances that they could continue to use their land for grazing livestock. A state agency, the California Wildlife Conservation Board, contributed a \$165,000 dollar fishing site. A federal agency, the Urban Renewal Administration, contributed \$420,426 in 30 per cent matching funds for the preservation of open space land.

By 1964 the county had bought 1,182 acres within the parkway area. The Boy Scouts, Campfire Girls, and City of Sacramento owned another 1,000 acres of recreation-dedicated land within the parkway area. Riding and hiking trails were opened, as well as cycling trails. Nearly completed was an 18-hole golf course. With the adjoining Folsom Lake State Park, almost 8,000 acres of river and lake shoreline were available for public enjoyment.

The Save the American River Association remains active as a focal point of citizen support. Much of its attention has now been turned to securing private donations for the purchase of the land needed to complete the parkway. Contributors are given certificates of recognition, and the county obtains title to the land.

Spokane County, Washington

The metropolitan area of Spokane, Washington, is located entirely within Spokane County. From modest beginnings, this county has developed

an expanding program for outdoor recreation. County park and recreation programs were authorized by the Washington State Legislature in 1949. Despite opposition, the governing body of Spokane County made plans to take immediate advantage of this new authority. At the end of its first year of operation, however, no land had been acquired, and \$72.29 had been expended.

A careful study was then made by the county commissioners to determine the need for county action in the field of outdoor recreation. Help was sought from the National Recreation Association, the Park Board of the City of Spokane, and others. Future demands for outdoor recreation were estimated. Priority needs were identified and a schedule for land acquisition and facilities development was laid out. As part of the planning process, a public education program was conducted.

In 1951, after losing a number of prime recreation areas, the county commissioners agreed to hire an experienced park and recreation director to develop and administer a long-range park and recreation program. Owing to the shortage of funds, the county agreed to concentrate its efforts in those communities that were willing to aid in acquiring land and developing facilities.

The Spokane Valley Rotary Club provided noteworthy public support. Over a period of 12 years the Rotary Club has built modern restrooms, a well and pump house, picnic tables, fireplaces, and other developments on a shoreline site along the Spokane River. Property, labor, and materials were donated by other organizations, individuals and businesses.

County appropriations had reached \$20,000 a year by 1957. By 1964 the park and recreation budget was more than \$160,000. The capital investment in lands and facilities amounted to nearly \$1,000,000. In 1964, Spokane County was operating 28 separate areas including regional parks. An 18-hole golf course had been acquired and paid for. Similar advances in metropolitan outdoor recreation areas are expected in the future.²⁷

Montgomery County, Pennsylvania

Although it is desirable that organizations administering a system of metropolitan outdoor recreation areas have jurisdiction over all or most of the metropolitan area, where this is not possible, extensive metropolitan outdoor recreation programs have been carried out by individual counties. An example is Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, located in the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania-New Jersey Metropolitan area.

Montgomery County has established a county open space program for the 1960 decade, consisting of three parts. Part I is a large new county park which the county intends to acquire and operate and which will include approximately 1500 acres of multiple-purpose facilities for swimming, boating, fishing, picnicking, walking sports and games, and most important, overnight camping for children's groups and short stays. Part II of the program includes grants-in-aid to municipalities. As part of this program, the county will agree to pay \$10,000 or 20 per cent, whichever is less, of the cost of an open space project developed by a municipality. Part III of the program includes acquisition of a county open space reserve.²⁸

Future Potential

The long-range potential for county operation of a metropolitan open space system is limited. Metropolitan areas which occupy a single county today may occupy several counties in the future. When the need for a metropolitan open space system extends beyond county boundaries, expansion of services may be extremely difficult. County officials, therefore, should undertake as soon as possible to establish intercounty agreements which could be used to expand the system when this becomes necessary.

Ad Hoc Agencies

A metropolitan *ad hoc* agency may be an authority or a special district. Both are functionally similar. The major difference between the two lies in the lack of power of an authority to levy taxes. Both may sue or be sued, make contracts, and obtain and dispose of property. Although there are some exceptions, most *ad hoc* agencies perform only one or a limited number of functions.

A metropolitan *ad hoc* agency may be a desirable solution to the problem of administering an open space program in areas in which there are no local governments with a metropolitan-wide area of service. Suitable open land is frequently found outside the governmental jurisdiction of the central city, although the central city may derive the greatest benefit from its use. The limits of most governments, today, are relatively rigid, despite the post World War II upsurge in annexation; and expansion of an existing government to metropolitan proportions in most cases is not feasible.

Creation of the Agency

A metropolitan *ad hoc* agency may be created only after the state has passed the necessary enabling legislation. Such legislation should specify the desired recreation functions, methods of financing, the membership and its selection, and the length of terms of office. It should also specify an area of jurisdiction, preferably the entire metropolitan area.

Cleveland Metropolitan Park District. The Cleveland Metropolitan Park District was established by Ohio State enabling legislation in 1917 to replace a county park board whose members, as county officials, had to be elected. The district was formed upon adoption of a favorable resolution by the several local governments involved and affirmative action by the probate court.

The primary purpose of the Cleveland Metropolitan Park District is to obtain and preserve or restore naturally scenic areas. In addition, it provides a wide range of recreation opportunities. The district is governed by three board members who are appointed by the probate judge for three-year staggered terms. The board members receive no compensation.²⁹

Chicago Park District. Efforts to create a park district in Chicago began in 1866, when the Illinois state legislature passed a bill authorizing the establishment of a park district upon approval of the voters of the affected area, which was to include the southern part of Chicago and three suburban towns. This proposal was rejected by the voters, but a similar bill was approved in 1869. Almost simultaneously the state legislature approved another bill setting up a park district in

the northern section of Chicago and the adjoining territory, but omitting the provision for voter approval. During the same legislative session a committee from the city council in Chicago was sent to the state legislature to urge enactment of a park and boulevard program throughout the entire city. When the committee discovered that bills had already been submitted for north and south park districts, it urged passage of a bill for a park district on the west side of the city also. This bill was also enacted and obtained the required voter approval. The three districts were authorized to carry out the construction, maintenance and policing of pleasure drives, boulevards and parkways, as well as park and recreational facilities.

The total area of these three districts did not at any time include all of Chicago, and, as the population increased, park needs in the unserved portion of the city also increased. The state legislature responded in 1895 by permitting additional park districts to be established through the initiating action of a small number of local voters following by majority voter approval. The law received prompt use within the Chicago area. One new district appeared in 1896, five others by 1910, and a seventh in 1911. By 1930 there were a total of 22 park districts operating within the city limits of Chicago.

As the number of park districts within Chicago increased, Chicago residents became increasingly critical of the organization and the operation of these districts. One survey by the Chicago Bureau of Public Efficiency estimated that unification of park activities under the city government would mean a savings of \$500,000 annually. Another investigation conducted by three University of Chicago faculty and research

members pointed out specific inequalities among the various park districts. Their report stated that the district in the southern part of the city had disproportionately extensive financial resources and park acreage relative to its population. The district on the west side of the city, which had the heaviest park needs in the Chicago area, was found to have inadequate funds and facilities.

In 1933 the state legislature passed the Park Consolidation Act and, by a referendum the following year, all districts were consolidated into one Chicago Park District. Its first five district commissioners were appointed for staggered terms by the mayor of Chicago with the approval of the City Council. The district has the same boundaries as the city of Chicago.³⁰

Cook County Forest Preserve District. The major sources of outdoor recreation in the Chicago Metropolitan Area outside the city limits of Chicago are the county forest preserves. During the first decade of the twentieth century, the Illinois Supreme Court declared unconstitutional Illinois State enabling acts providing for a system of county preserves. In 1915, however, a bill was passed which obtained judicial approval and the Cook County Forest Preserve District was established. Its creation was for the purpose of protecting natural forests and other scenic beauties within the district and for the education, pleasure and recreation of the public. Forest preserve districts have also been established in Lake County, DuPage County, Kane County, Will County and McHenry County. Approximately 93 per cent of the county forest preserve acreage in the Chicago Metropolitan Area, however, is in Cook County.³¹

Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Authority. The Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Authority is an excellent example of an *ad hoc* agency created through private efforts. The rapid increase in population in the Detroit metropolitan area in the early part of the twentieth century created a great need for recreational facilities. In 1937 a privately sponsored park and parkways organization was established for the purpose of utilizing the Huron and Clinton Rivers for recreational purposes. A survey of recreational facilities was made by the group, and a plan was prepared for parkways along the river valleys. In 1939 the state legislature passed a special act establishing the Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Authority and defining its boundaries to include Wayne County and four surrounding counties. The act was passed over the opposition of the Wayne County legislative delegation, who feared that taxpayers of Wayne County would pay an unfair proportion of the cost and that the bulk of the development would take place outside the county.

In order to bring the authority into legal existence, voter approval was required in each of the five counties. These approvals were forthcoming the following year by decisive majorities. The authority was empowered to provide parks, connecting drives, and limited access highways inside and outside its territorial limits.

The governing body consists of seven commissioners who serve without compensation. One resident from each of the five counties is selected for a six-year term by the board of supervisors. The governor appoints, for four-year terms, two additional commissioners from the area served by the authority.³²

Existing Programs and Facilities

The types of open space programs for metropolitan outdoor recreation areas depend on the administering agency, the funds available and the desires of the metropolitan population. All well-planned programs offer a variety of recreation opportunities for all age groups.

Cleveland Metropolitan Park District. Recreation facilities provided by the Cleveland Metropolitan Park District include regional parks, scenic drives, foot trails, bridle paths, bicycle trails, camping centers, softball and baseball diamonds, picnic grounds, playfields, golf courses, ice skating rinks, bathing beaches and swimming pools. All are part of a metropolitan park system. Although the district has the authority to assume administration and operation of municipal parks in cities within the district, this power has not been used. When it was suggested several years ago by a Cleveland park director that the district take over the city parks, district officials refused for three reasons: (1) Since funds were not available to finance the metropolitan park system adequately, the district could not be expected to assume the additional financial burden of a municipal park system. (2) District directors feared that the courts might rule that certain activities in a municipal park system were not proper functions of a metropolitan park district. (3) It was reasoned that the creation of a complete metropolitan park system was of primary importance and that attainment of this objective might be delayed by engaging in municipal park activities.³³

Another power of the Cleveland Metropolitan Park District that has remained dormant is its ability to annex territory. District directors have concluded that the district lacked sufficient money to carry out its

contemplated program within existing boundaries, and territorial enlargement would only increase the burden.³⁴

Chicago Park District. The Chicago Park District operates and pays for its own police force, as well as the lighting, engineering, traffic control maintenance, and improvements in the boulevards, parks, and shoreline under its authority. It presently owns 7,752 acres and has 338 developed parks, 334 playgrounds, 153 field houses, 42 outdoor and 11 indoor swimming pools, 594 tennis courts, 138 baseball diamonds, 134 ice rinks, 32 beaches and 14 miles of beach property, 7 marinas including 1,815 slips and mooring spaces for boats, four golf courses, two stadiums, a planetarium, two conservatories, a zoo, a large underground garage, and several large surface parking lots. It maintains the grounds around several institutions located on park lands, including the world-famous Museum of Science and Industry.

Facilities in the Chicago Park District have an estimated attendance of more than 40 million people annually. The four major attractions are the beaches, swimming pools, ice skating rinks, and fishing facilities. These accounted for approximately 30 per cent of the total attendance at all District recreation facilities, both indoor and outdoor.³⁵

Cook County Forest Preserve District. A Cook County Forest Preserve is within a 30-minute drive of all residents of the City of Chicago and within walking distance of many of the suburban residents. Picnicking is the most popular activity in the Cook County Forest Preserves, in which are provided 190 major picnic groves and 250 roadside picnic sites. During days of peak use, between 400,000 and 500,000 people use these

facilities.

Many recreational opportunities in addition to picnicking are available in the Cook County preserves. Facilities for horseback riding, hiking, nature study, fishing, day camping, boating, mushroom and berry picking or nut gathering, tobogganing, ice skating and sled-ding, and just plain relaxing are provided.

The area of the smallest division is approximately 1500 acres, while the area of the largest division is more than 12,000 acres. Because of its unusual success in performing the functions for which it was created, the state legislature in 1961 authorized the district to increase its total holdings from 46,000 acres to 55,000 acres.³⁶

Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Authority. The Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Authority has been extremely successful in providing recreation facilities for its citizens. Within the first eight years of operation the authority had acquired a total of 6,300 acres of park land. In its efforts to develop and preserve recreation facilities in the Detroit Metropolitan Area, it has constructed or is constructing a beach site, numerous parks, and an extensive connecting parkway 180 miles long. It has effectively cooperated with other park and road-building agencies of the local governments within the metropolitan area.³⁷

Advantages and Disadvantages

Since a special district differs from an authority only in the fact that the special district has the power of taxation, the decision to use an authority or a special district depends on whether or not the metropolitan area wishes to provide another governmental body with the power of taxation. Proponents of special districts argue that authori-

ties lack adequate financial ability to carry out necessary functions, that the cost of borrowing is greater and that the power of taxation is needed. They add that special districts may function as authorities by not using the taxing power when it is not necessary.

Supporters of authorities argue that the necessary dependence on income from sources other than the taxing power stimulates greater efficiency. The power to tax, they claim, is not necessary as authorities may be supported by taxes levied by communities which they serve. Authorities also show more potential than special districts for gaining interstate cooperation, since taxation is not an issue. Interstate cooperation is becoming increasingly important because more than one-half of the total metropolitan population live in metropolitan areas which either border or cross state boundaries.³⁸

Metropolitan *ad hoc* agencies are criticized primarily on the basis that they are piecemeal approaches to metropolitan problems. A metropolitan park authority or district could be one of many agencies, each primarily concerned with a single problem and each unrelated in planning and management to all others. It is argued that *ad hoc* agencies further fragmentize government, causing duplication and waste, uneconomical limited-purpose operations, and greater governmental complexity.

Ad hoc agencies are often denounced as "supergovernments," since they are not directly responsible to the will of the people. Governing body members are often difficult to remove. Despite the limitations, they have successfully achieved regional-wide systems of open spaces in metropolitan areas.

Multi-Agency Organizations

Few public agencies have authority to plan, acquire and develop open spaces for outdoor recreation throughout an entire metropolitan area. Between 1961 and 1965, however, the Housing Act of 1961 provided that grants for urban open space may be increased from 20 per cent to 30 per cent of the cost of land acquisition in the case of a public body that exercises open space responsibilities for an entire urban area.³⁹ Primarily due to this incentive, many multi-agency organizations were formed during this period.

Multi-agency organizations are generally formed by voluntary agreements which are authorized by State enabling legislation. The organization is usually composed of the city and county governments in the metropolitan area desiring the open space system or agencies having open space planning and acquisition responsibilities within the metropolitan area.

Functions of the Organizations

Multi-agency organizations have been established throughout the United States to develop metropolitan open space systems. The reason for these organizations is to achieve as nearly as possible that degree of coordination which could be obtained by a single agency. The statement of intent of the agencies within the San Francisco Bay Area is typical:

It is the intention of the parties hereto to cooperate with each other in the joint exercise of responsibility for the acquisition and preservation of permanent open space land in the Bay Area and in the development of such plans, policies and procedures as will best promote this objective.⁴⁰

Most multi-agency organizations which have been established to develop metropolitan open space systems have the function of reviewing and

coordinating open space land acquisition plans with the overall comprehensive plan for development. Where no comprehensive plan exists, many of the organizations have been authorized to develop such a comprehensive plan for the metropolitan area. The agreement of cooperation adopted by the governments within the metropolitan area of Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, is an example (see Appendix I, Paragraphs 13-20). The agreement provides for a joint planning and coordination committee called the "Committee" to carry out these functions.⁴¹

In cases where a member of the multi-agency organization has overall regional planning jurisdiction, it is general practice for this agency to assume the function of reviewing all open space plans for conformance with the master plan. Each member agency of the multi-agency organization prepares for submission to the reviewing agency an open space plan for that part of the metropolitan area for which it has open space jurisdiction. The *Memorandum of Agreement Relating to the Preservation of Open Space Land in the National Capital Region* stipulates that the National Capital Regional Planning Council is responsible for reviewing all open space plans for conformance with an overall comprehensive plan for the region.⁴²

Additional Provisions

Additional provisions relating to open space land within metropolitan areas are usually included in multi-agency organization agreements. One permits additional signatories to the agreement at some future date without rewriting or re-executing the agreement by the original parties. Another common provision is that the agreement shall become effective upon its execution by public agencies exercising open

space land responsibilities for at least 60 per cent of the geographical area involved within the metropolitan area. Some intergovernmental agreements, however, state that agreements become effective upon execution by certain specifically-named public agencies. For instance, the National Capital Region agreement became effective upon execution by the Regional Planning Council, the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission, and the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority.⁴³

Private Programs

Many metropolitan outdoor recreation areas are provided through private enterprise either for the purpose of profit or as a community service. Perhaps more important than the role of providing specific sites for recreation is the role of private enterprise in providing special facilities needed for outdoor recreation. This is particularly true for those activities usually associated with higher incomes, such as skiing, boating, horseback riding, and deep sea fishing.

Wind Creek Park

An excellent example of a private program which provides a metropolitan recreation area as a public service is Wind Creek Park located on Lake Martin near Alexander City, Alabama. This park was provided by the Russell Manufacturing Company. The company spent \$500,000 to develop a 2000-acre recreation area which it opened not only to employees but also to all who seek wholesome outdoor family recreation. This park has improved shoreline recreation facilities along its entire 8-mile lake-

side including 5 man-made beaches, boat launching ramps, 450 barbecue pits with picnic tables, fishing piers, shower dressing rooms, covered pavilions, and health department approved water and sanitation provisions. Except for a small fee for overnight camping, everything is free and enjoyed by thousands of families in the east Alabama and West Georgia area. Both construction expenses and operating costs are borne by the Russell Manufacturing Company.

Lake Martin, on which Wind Creek Park is located, is a 50,000-acre body of water created by Martin Dam which serves as a reservoir for the electric power system of the Alabama Power Company. The park itself is within eight miles of Alexander City, Alabama, and less than 40 miles from Montgomery, Alabama. Columbus, Georgia, site of the Army's huge Fort Benning, is less than one hour away, and Birmingham is within two hours' driving distance. Personnel at the Air University at Maxwell Field, Ft. Benning, and Gunner Air Force Base find the spot ideal for off-duty pleasure.⁴⁴

Ida Cason Callaway Gardens

Ida Cason Callaway Gardens is a model which might be used for future private metropolitan outdoor recreation areas. It is located 85 miles southwest of Atlanta in the southern foothills of the Appalachian Mountains. It is operated by the Ida Cason Callaway Foundation, a non-profit corporation established by Callaway Textile Mills. Its purpose is the "inspiration, education, and benefit of the people of the South and of the Nation."

Callaway Gardens is encircled by a drive five miles in length, known as the Five-Mile-Drive. Admission is 75 cents for adults and 35

cents for children. The drive is landscaped along its entire length with many varieties of trees, shrubs, and flowers. Between 15 and 20 thousand new shrubs are added annually.

Facilities at the Gardens are varied. The clubhouse area includes golf courses, picnic areas, dining rooms, a pavilion and a sightseeing boat that tours the five-mile shoreline of Mountain Creek Lake. Planned flower trails are located in the Meadowlark flower area. Callaway Gardens' main attraction is the Robin Lake beach area. The lake comprises 65 acres and will accommodate 15,000 people at one time. It has facilities for water skiing, canoeing, speedboat rides and pedal boating, as well as a large pavilion and restaurant, a children's playground and a public address system which plays semi-classical and popular music continually. Life guards are employed to protect the visitors at the beaches and the water is periodically tested by the department of health. Several motels and cottages are located within the vicinity of Callaway Gardens.

Callaway Gardens is visited by more than 350,000 people annually, of which approximately 20 per cent are from the Atlanta Metropolitan Area.⁴⁵

Lake Spivey

Lake Spivey, advertised as, "Atlanta's most fabulous Playground," is located 20 miles from downtown Atlanta. It provides a variety of outdoor recreation facilities for families as well as teenagers and young adults. The road to the ticket window is bordered by picnic areas, a softball diamond, and an area for pony rides. Upon entering the area and proceeding to the parking lot, one immediately spots the playland

rides and the two beaches which provide access to the clear waters of the lake. Facilities are available for sailboating and water skiing. The entire park has an atmosphere of freshness, cleanliness, and a feeling of relaxation.

It is estimated that in 1960 approximately 85 per cent of the visitors to Lake Spivey were from Atlanta. Admission charges are 75 cents for adults and 35 cents for children. This fee includes use of bath houses and picnic facilities. Managers of Lake Spivey contend that the park is geared to the non-country-club member and to the families who cannot afford to spend several weeks for summer vacations at considerable expense.

One-third of the total area of Lake Spivey is water, which allows a variety of water-oriented activities. In addition to swimming and sailboating, visitors may enjoy fishing, speed boat rides, water skiing, and a riverboat tour of the lake. A dance pavilion and a putt-putt golf course are provided. An area called Playland, which contains such rides as a merry-go-round, kiddie boats, helicopters, miniature ferris wheels and a miniature roller coaster, is especially designed for children. There are three large picnic areas with a total of 800 concrete picnic tables. For those not wishing to picnic, there is a cafeteria capable of serving 700 people. It is also worth noting that the health and welfare of the visitors are protected by the employment of a park policeman and the maintenance of a park first-aid station under the supervision of a park health director.⁴⁶

We have a rich heritage of both public and private metropolitan park agencies whose organization and programs have been discussed in

this chapter. The next chapter will discuss the financing of metropolitan outdoor recreation facilities.

CHAPTER III

FINANCING METROPOLITAN OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES

The acquisition and development of metropolitan outdoor recreation areas are financed by the use of (1) property taxes; (2) bonds; (3) concessions and user fees; (4) grants-in-aid; and (5) gifts and capital outlay funds.

Property Taxes

Property taxes are a major source of funds for the acquisition and development of metropolitan outdoor recreation facilities, especially in special park districts. Maximum assessment rates, specified by state legislative bodies, normally range between 0.25 and 0.50 mill for each dollar of assessed property valuation.

Most of the Cleveland Metropolitan Park District's income is obtained from a direct property tax which cannot legally exceed 0.5 mill. It normally averages about one-tenth of that amount. If approved by 55 per cent of the district electorate voting on the issue, the tax levy may be increased in any given year by an additional 0.3 mill. This additional levy, when imposed has most often been used for capital purposes such as land acquisition and permanent improvements. The Cuyahoga County treasurer and Cuyahoga County auditor serve without charge as the financial officers of the district.⁴⁷

Approximately 90 per cent of the revenue obtained by the Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Authority comes from a property tax which is levied

by the member counties for the authority. The tax rate must be uniform throughout the area over which the authority has jurisdiction and may not exceed 0.25 mill.⁴⁸

Bond Issues

Bond financing is available to nearly every metropolitan park agency. They may be authorized to issue: (1) general obligation bonds; (2) revenue bonds; or (3) special assessment bonds. The type of bond depends on the source of funds used for its retirement. Generally speaking, state constitutions prohibit indebtedness exceeding a certain percentage of the total assessment valuation of the governmental area and indebtedness which runs for more than a specific number of years. The State of California prohibits counties from issuing bonds for more than 40 years and for more than 5 per cent of the assessed valuation of the county.⁴⁹

The advantage of bond financing is that the repayment will be spread over a period of years, but the money is available for immediate expenditure. The disadvantage is the difficulty of getting voter approval that is often required and the fact that the cost of the project is increased through interest charges, bond printing and advertisement, fiscal agent's fees and special accounting costs.

General Obligation Bonds

General obligation bonds are backed by the full faith and credit of the local government, and all the sources of local revenue may be used for servicing the debt. For this reason, general obligation bonds are usually the most secure type of bond from the standpoint of the in-

vestor and can ordinarily be sold at lower interest rates than other types of bonds.

Much of the park and recreation development in Metropolitan Los Angeles, California, was made possible by a \$39,500,000 bond fund approved by the voters of the City of Los Angeles in May, 1957. The program was spread over a five-year period and included the following allotments: \$8,428,900 for new regional parks and playgrounds; \$2,251,000 for beach protection and development; and \$3,131,350 for improvement of existing park sites.⁵⁰

Revenue Bonds

Revenue bonds are issued for the financing of projects that are intended to be revenue producing. The amount for which the bonds are issued is in most states not included in debt limitations. Revenue bonds have the advantage of being paid for by the persons using the facility but interest rates are usually higher than for general obligation bonds.

Revenue bonds have been successfully used in financing many metropolitan outdoor recreation facilities. Revenue bonds in the amount of \$150,000 were utilized to finance construction of an outdoor ice rink at downtown Wheeling Park, Wheeling, West Virginia. This park serves the entire metropolitan area. During the summer the concrete portion of the rink is used for roller skating.⁵¹ Other facilities in metropolitan outdoor recreation areas which have been successfully financed by revenue bonds are swimming pools, golf courses, and fishing and camping areas.

Special Assessment Bonds

Special assessment bonds are used when a capital improvement facility will benefit primarily a particular area rather than the metro-

politan area as a whole. Many states, however, have laws stipulating that a specified percentage of land owners must consent to the assessment. It is often impossible to convince the required number of owners that they will benefit to any appreciable degree from the provision of open space. In any event, the zone of benefit and the amount of benefits are difficult to determine. The Cleveland Metropolitan Park District has the power to impose special assessments upon properties specifically benefited by the development of metropolitan parks; however, this power has not yet been used.⁵²

Concessions and User Fees

Concessions and user fees have been advocated by those who believe that a larger percentage of metropolitan park operations should be paid for by park users. It is argued that persons not resident in the governmental unit providing the recreation facility can in this way be made to pay a portion of the costs involved. Opponents of the use of user fees argue that the charges, especially if significantly high, would keep out the low-income people--those who need the parks most.

Oglebay Park, a 1000-acre, highly developed, metropolitan outdoor recreation area in Wheeling, West Virginia, is an example of a metropolitan park financed primarily by user fees. Although the park had its origin in the philanthropy of several citizens of Wheeling, and although donations and bequests have been a major factor in the park's development, these sources can no longer be relied upon completely. User fees are now the major source of revenue. Admittance to the park is free, but it is estimated that some revenue-producing facility in the park is

used by one-third of the visitors.

Table 1 lists revenue figures from various facilities in Oglebay Park that are operated by the Park Commissioners.

There were only two concessions at Oglebay Park in 1961, a riding stable and a gift shop, and these contributed little toward financing park facilities. Although the riding stable operates in a park-built and park-maintained stable, it pays no part of its very small profits to the park. The gift shop pays 8 per cent of its gross income to the park. This amounted to less than \$1,000 in 1960.⁵³

In some metropolitan parks, concessions have produced significant revenues. Concessions are usually leased to private operators with the provision that the operators pay to the park agencies either a specified percentage of their gross receipts or a flat fee plus a percentage of the gross receipts.

Grants-in-Aid

Grants-in-aid are available in many metropolitan areas from both state and federal agencies for assistance in financing park facilities. These grants should be carefully considered in any financial program for metropolitan outdoor recreation facilities.

State Grants-in-Aid

State parks have been provided in most states for many years and many state parks have been located near metropolitan areas. In 1960 the State of New York approved a grant-in-aid program to municipalities to defray part of the costs of acquiring local and metropolitan parks. Following the example of New York, the states of New Jersey, Wisconsin

Table 1. Oglebay Park Revenues by Source

| | 1959 | 1960 |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Dancing | \$ 15,200 | \$ 15,500 |
| Refreshment Stands | 87,200 | 94,000 |
| Wilson Lodge--Room Rentals | 115,100 | 132,100 |
| Restaurant | 246,800 | 274,500 |
| Gift Shop | 500 | 800 |
| TV Rental | 1,100 | 1,000 |
| Family Cabins | 56,600 | 59,200 |
| Swimming Pool | 39,200 | 41,600 |
| Tennis Courts | 3,100 | 3,600 |
| Golf Course | 40,800 | 45,200 |
| Golf Shop | 13,700 | 14,300 |
| Caddy Camp | 6,400 | 5,500 |
| Group Camp | 6,800 | 7,000 |
| Sports Day Camp | 3,600 | 3,400 |
| Lake | 13,800 | 11,800 |
| Driving Range | 12,200 | 13,600 |
| All Other | 24,789 | 27,975 |
| Total Revenues | \$686,889 | \$751,075 |
| Operating Costs | 339,250 | 421,163 |
| Salaries and Wages | 259,368 | 272,162 |
| Excess of Revenues | \$ 88,271 | \$ 57,750 |

Source: Diamond, Henry L. *Paying for Recreation Facilities*. ORRRC Study Report 12. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962, p. 82.

and Connecticut approved similar programs. Shortly thereafter, additional grant-in-aid programs were approved by the states of Florida, Pennsylvania and Ohio. It seems likely that additional states will follow these precedents.

New York: Park and Recreation Land Acquisition Act. On November 8, 1960, the people of New York state approved, by an almost three to one majority, a state bond issue of \$75,000,000 to acquire open land for state parks, conservation purposes and grants-in-aid to municipalities.⁵⁴ Again on November 6, 1962, the people of New York state approved an additional \$25,000,000 bond issue. These bond issues provided grants-in-aid for up to 75 per cent of the acquisition costs of parks and open spaces, with local governments providing the remaining 25 per cent.

The original bond issue allocated \$40,000,000 for local park acquisition. The supplementary bond issue added another \$10,000,000 with an aggregate distribution of \$17,000,000 to New York City, \$12,000,000 to other cities, and \$21,000,000 to counties, towns, villages and improvement districts. These allocations support a total acquisition program of more than \$66,000,000. Title to lands acquired remains with the local government.⁵⁵

Responses to the two Park and Recreation Land Acquisition Acts were immediate. Within the first two years after the project's approval, 14,418 acres of land had been acquired for open spaces within New York communities and additional acquisitions were being programmed or in progress.⁵⁶

New Jersey: Green Acres Program. On March 27, 1961, the Green Acres Land Acquisition Act was introduced in the legislative body of the

State of New Jersey and subsequently enacted. The act provided for a \$60,000,000 state bond issue for acquisition of land or rights in land for recreation or conservation purposes. \$20,000,000 of this total was earmarked for grants to local governments for up to 50 per cent of the actual price paid for lands to be used for permanent open space. To participate in the program, the local governments must have the authority to acquire title to or a permanent interest in open land. They must be able to provide the matching funds and must have the authority to contract with the state government and to receive and expend state funds.

There are no acreage restrictions on the lands to be acquired. Their permanent acquisition may be affected by easement agreements, as well as by purchase. The grants may be made, however, only for the acquisition of lands for purposes compatible with the open space concepts of the Green Acres legislation. Regulations may not exclude non-residents. The charge of user fees, a fee differential for non-residents, and requirements of use permits are considered local administrative controls of land use and generally are acceptable.

Two planning requirements must be met before an application for a Green Acres grant may be approved. First, the proposed use of the land for permanent open space is required to be in conformance with the comprehensive plan for the development of the local unit or a comprehensive plan for the entire metropolitan region. Second, the comprehensive plan must have the approval of the planning body of the local unit. In case a comprehensive plan covering the local unit has not been completed, an application for a Green Acres grant may be approved based on a planning program which has as one of its long-range objectives the develop-

ment of a comprehensive plan and capital improvement plan for the local unit.⁵⁷

Pennsylvania: Project 70 Open Space Program. Pennsylvania's "Project 70" open space program was submitted to the legislature by Governor David L. Lawrence on January 16, 1962, and subsequently enacted. The program included a \$70,000,000 open space acquisition program to be financed by a state bond issue.

The constitutional amendment for the bond issue was approved by the legislature in 1963. In the November, 1963, election, the bond issue was approved by the voters of Pennsylvania. The project won by 100,000 votes. Nineteen counties, mostly urban, accounted for the victory by outvoting 48 counties, mostly rural, which opposed the bond issue.⁵⁸

The three major elements of the Project 70 plan are:

1. \$40,000,000 is to be provided for regional parks and reservoirs in 43 urban counties.

2. \$20,000,000 is to be provided for matching funds to any regional, county, or municipal authority for local park, recreation, and open space acquisition purposes.

3. \$10,000,000 is to be provided to the Pennsylvania Fish and Game Commission for the acquisition of important fish, wild life, or boating areas threatened by impending private development.⁵⁹

Federal Grants-in-Aid

The Federal Government provides grants-in-aid for metropolitan outdoor recreation areas for: (1) planning; and (2) land acquisition. The primary authority for these revenues comes from Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 as amended and Title VII of the Housing Act of

1961 as amended.

Planning. Under Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, commonly called "701 Program," metropolitan and regional planning agencies may receive grants of up to two-thirds, and in the case of localities situated in redevelopment areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act or in areas in which there has occurred a substantial reduction in employment as the result of a decline in government employment or purchases, three-fourths of the total cost of an urban planning project. Plans for metropolitan outdoor recreation areas may be included as part of the comprehensive plan.⁶⁰

Land Acquisition. Title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 (see Appendix II) as amended by Title IX of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (see Appendix III) provides for federal grants of up to 50 per cent of the cost of acquiring and developing open space land or permanent interests therein, such as easements, where these lesser interests will serve the desired purpose. Grants of up to 90 per cent are authorized to carry out projects of special value for demonstrating new and improved methods and materials for urban beautification.⁶¹

To be eligible for the grants, the applicant must be a public body established by state or local law or by interstate compact or agreement. The applicant must have authority to acquire title or other permanent interest in open space land. It must be able to provide the non-federal portion of the cost, and it must have authority to contract with the federal government and to receive and expend federal and other funds.

The term "open space uses" is defined as any uses of open space land for: (1) park and recreational purposes; (2) conservation of land and other natural resources; or (3) historic or scenic purposes. Grants of up to 50 per cent of the cost of acquiring developed land in built-up areas and of clearing it for open space uses are also authorized. Grants covering the costs of development may include landscaping, basic water and sanitary facilities, walks, small shelters and installation of certain recreation facilities. The grant does not cover the cost of major construction projects such as amphitheaters, swimming pools or golf courses, or administrative expenses such as closing costs.

Approval of an application for an Open Space Land and Urban Beautification and Improvement Grant requires that such assistance must be needed for the provision and development of open space land as part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area.⁶²

In the first three years of the open space land program, 219 grants totaling more than \$32,000,000 were approved in 177 communities for a total of 101,947 acres of open space land. Nearly half of all the grants were made in metropolitan areas with a population of one million or more. All but 6 of the 24 metropolitan areas in the United States with a population of one million or more received grants. Nearly one-fourth of all grants went to metropolitan areas with populations between 500,000 and one million. Only 22 of the total of 219 grants went to applicants outside standard metropolitan statistical areas.

Before the 1965 amendments, grants varied from 20 to 30 per cent of the cost of acquiring open space land. Grants were increased from 20 to 30 per cent when applicants acquired open space to serve the entire

urban region. Since few public agencies had the authority to plan and acquire lands to serve an entire urban area, it was usually necessary for the local governments to form intergovernmental agreements to qualify for the 30 per cent grants. During the first three years of the open space land program 69 out of 99 grants were approved on the basis of intergovernmental agreements.⁶³

Gifts and Capital Outlay Funds

Gifts are always a possible way of acquiring income or land, and anyone developing a system of metropolitan outdoor recreation areas should not forget this possibility. In the Dallas Metropolitan Area, 27 per cent of the total amount of park land within the Dallas Park System is a result of gifts and endowments.⁶⁴ Many regional parks throughout the nation have been developed as a result of large donations by civic-minded philanthropists.

Some public fund should serve as a depository for gifts or bequeaths of funds for metropolitan recreation purposes. A capital outlay fund, into which the local government annually or at specified periods of time places a portion of its revenue, is often used for this purpose. This method of financing combines the advantages of spreading the cost of public improvements over several years and the advantages of the elimination of interest payments. The capital outlay fund has an especially appropriate use for land acquisition opportunities which come up quickly and which may be lost if not consummated before a succeeding budget period.

Capital outlay funds have the disadvantage that in periods of

rising costs, higher actual costs may result from deferring expenditures until sufficient funds accumulate. Another disadvantage is that cash reserves may be diverted to other purposes.

Metropolitan park facilities may be financed in a variety of ways which have been discussed in this chapter. The next chapter will suggest a procedure for planning the system.

CHAPTER IV

PLANNING THE SYSTEM

This study has presented the need for a system of open spaces for outdoor recreation in metropolitan areas, a review of existing metropolitan park agencies and their programs and a review of methods of financing metropolitan outdoor recreation facilities. This chapter will present guidelines for planning the system.

As was stated previously, this study is confined to metropolitan open spaces which are used for outdoor recreation. "Metropolitan open spaces" are defined as those open spaces that serve visitors from throughout the metropolitan region regardless of physical impediments to travel or political boundaries. Municipal parks and playgrounds, neighborhood playfields, tot lots, private country clubs or other areas which draw attendance from a single geographic section of the metropolitan area or for other reasons are not open to the entire metropolitan population are not included in this study.

Five steps in planning a metropolitan open space system for outdoor recreation are: (1) determining the facilities needed; (2) surveying the facilities existing; (3) identifying the gaps; (4) selecting the sites; and (5) establishing a program.

Determining the Facilities Needed

The first step in planning a system of metropolitan open spaces for outdoor recreation is to determine the open space needs of the metro-

politan area in terms of acreage, types of facilities and their distribution.

Acreage

There are no generally accepted acreage standards for metropolitan outdoor recreation areas. Neither are there accepted methods for arriving at standards. Most standards used today for metropolitan outdoor recreation areas are actually standards for one type of metropolitan outdoor recreation facility--regional parks. Occasionally acreage standards will be adopted for additional facilities such as public golf courses and beaches. More often, however, the acreage required for these additional facilities has been included in the overall acreage requirement for regional parks. Since facilities for most outdoor recreation activities are among those desirable in regional parks, methods for determining acreage standards for regional parks may also be used for determining acreage standards for other metropolitan outdoor recreation facilities. The oldest method of arriving at standards for metropolitan outdoor recreation areas is based on the assumption that the rate of future open space acreage requirements increases proportionately with the population. This method ignores the effect of increased income, mobility and leisure time on outdoor recreation. It is, however, the most commonly used method of determining outdoor recreation standards today. A standard of 10 acres of metropolitan outdoor recreation areas per 1,000 population is typical, although acreage requirements range from 7.5 to more than 40 acres per 1,000 population.

Some metropolitan areas have adopted standards which recommend that a certain percentage of the total land area be retained as open

space. This method ignores the changing population density. A standard recommending 10 per cent of the total land acreage to be used for metropolitan parks would equal a standard of 10 acres per 1,000 population only if the average density of population is 10 persons per gross acre.

The New York Regional Plan Association adopted standards for county parks which incorporate both of the previously described methods for determining acreage requirements. A standard of 12 acres per 1,000 population or 5 per cent of each county's land area, whichever is larger, was recommended.⁶⁵

A more accurate method for determining acreage requirements than the methods previously discussed is one based on not only population but also attendance data and anticipated changes in leisure time, income and mobility (the TIM factor). These factors were considered in selecting standards for regional day use parks in the Cleveland, Ohio metropolitan area.

The Regional Planning Commission in Cleveland, Ohio used as a base for present and future demands the peak hour attendance on an average summer Sunday. Their studies indicated that 6.6 per cent of the total population visited day use areas on an average Sunday. The peak Sunday hour population was 38 per cent of the daily total.

The TIM factor was utilized in considering the effect leisure time, income and mobility would have on the demand for regional day use parks. The "T" factor, or leisure time factor, was calculated as the anticipated per cent of increase in leisure time from 1960 to 1980. The "I" factor, or income factor, was calculated as the anticipated per cent of increase in per capita income from 1960 to 1980. The "M" factor, or

mobility factor, was calculated as the per cent of increase in per capita miles driven for recreation from 1960 to 1980. The cumulative TIM factor for the Cleveland metropolitan area was 48 per cent (Table 2).

The study of regional day use parks indicated that 20 acres of land could support an attendance of 31 persons; therefore, each person attending the park required 0.645 acres. This standard includes facilities for picnic grounds, hiking trails, informal playing fields and other general park facilities. It does not include special facilities such as golf courses and beaches. The application of the approach of the Cleveland Regional Planning Commission is presented in Tables 2 and 3.⁶⁶

Types

A wide variety of metropolitan outdoor recreation facilities is required to serve every segment of the population. The types of facilities needed depend on the types of outdoor recreation desired. Every metropolitan open space system, however, should have certain minimum types of recreation facilities. Minimum desirable types of metropolitan outdoor recreation facilities are: (1) regional parks; (2) special water-oriented facilities; (3) public golf courses; and (4) outdoor sports centers. Other facilities such as parkways, historic sites and hunting grounds are desirable additions to the system.

Regional Parks. Regional parks are defined as large reservations, usually with unique scenic characteristics, which contain facilities for a wide variety of activities and which attract people from throughout the metropolitan area. Other studies have called these parks, county parks, day use parks, metropolitan parks and nature preserves. They are the

Table 2. Application of the TIM Factor in
the Cleveland Metropolitan Area

| | Index Year (1960) | Index Factor (1980) |
|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Leisure Time | 1.00 | +0.15 (15%) |
| Income | 1.00 | +0.20 (20%) |
| Mobility | 1.00 | +0.13 (13%) |
| Cumulative TIM Factor | | +0.48 (48%) |

Source: Cleveland Regional Planning Commission,
Open Space for Our Citi-fied County. Cleveland, Ohio:
The Commission, January, 1964, p. 51.

basic element in a system of metropolitan open spaces for outdoor recreation.

Regional parks vary in size depending on natural advantages and other characteristics of the park. Some regional parks contain more than 1,000 acres while others contain as few as 100 acres. The minimum size for a regional park is considered to be 100 acres and a minimum of 250 acres is desirable. The amount of total acreage needed in a metropolitan area varies. The average is between 7.5 and 15 acres per 1,000 population. Table 4 lists standards for regional parks which have been used in several metropolitan areas.

Table 3. Acreage Required for Day Use Parks,
Cuyahoga and Seven-County Region
1960 and 1980

| Year | Unit and Population | 6.6% of Population | TIM + 48% | Total | Peak Hour 38% of Total | Total Land Required |
|------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1960 | Cuyahoga County (1,650,000) | 108,900 | 52,272 | 161,172 | 61,245 | 39,512 |
| | Seven-County Region (2,735,000) | 180,510 | 86,645 | 267,155 | 101,519 | 65,496 |
| 1980 | Cuyahoga County (2,165,000) | 142,890 | 68,587 | 211,477 | 80,361 | 51,846 |
| | Seven-County Region (4,108,000) | 271,128 | 130,141 | 401,269 | 152,482 | 98,374 |

Source: Cleveland Regional Planning Commission, *Open Space for Our Cited County*. Cleveland, Ohio: The Commission, January, 1964, p. 57.

Table 4. Regional Park Standards

| Locality | Acres/1000 Population |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Santa Clara County California | 30.0 |
| Denver, Colorado | 15.0 |
| Atlanta, Georgia | 10.0 |
| Baltimore, Maryland | 10.0 |
| Detroit, Michigan | 10.0 |
| Tulsa, Oklahoma | 10.0 |
| Chicago, Illinois (Actual, 1960) | 9.2 |
| Denver, Colorado (Actual, 1960) | 8.6 |
| Cleveland, Ohio (Actual, 1960) | 8.5 |
| Richmond, Virginia | 7.5 |

Source: Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission. *Regional Nature Preserves*. Atlanta Region Comprehensive Plan: Regional Parks and Open Space Study: Part 1. Atlanta: The Commission, December, 1963.

Regional parks may contain facilities for any type of recreation activity. In addition to the recreation facilities, drinking water, sanitary facilities and parking areas should be located throughout the park.

As a guide for the development of regional parks, a variety of desirable regional park recreation facilities have been listed. Well-planned regional parks will contain facilities from each of the major groups.

Water-Oriented Facilities

Swimming Pools
Water Falls
Rivers and Streams
Reservoirs
Beaches
Surf Fishing Areas
Fishing Ponds
Fishing Piers
Marinas
Boat Launching Ramps
Speedboat Areas
Water Skiing Areas
Canoeing and Sailboating Areas
Pedal Boating Facilities
Skin Diving Facilities
Underwater Marine Gardens
Ice Skating Rinks

Natural Area Facilities

Picnic Grounds
Day Camps
Family Campgrounds
Scenic Drives
Hiking Trails
Bicycle Paths
Bridle Paths
Native Forests
Nature Trails

Special Wildlife Facilities

Arboretums
Botanical Gardens
Wildflower Sanctuaries
Zoological Gardens
Zoos
Farmyard Zoos
Migratory Bird Sanctuaries

Cultural Facilities

Amphitheaters
Art Centers
Art Museums
Concert Halls

Cultural Facilities (Continued)

Science Museums
Historic Sites
Planetariums
Conservatories

Sport and Game Facilities

Golf Courses
Archery Ranges
Marksmanship Ranges
Hunting Preserves
Sports Car Centers
Winter Sports Centers
Softball and Baseball Diamonds
Tennis Courts
Child Play Areas

Special Water-Oriented Facilities. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission reports that water is the focal point of outdoor recreation. Water-based activities are preferred more than any other by 44 per cent of the population.⁶⁷ Although water-oriented facilities are important features of regional parks, special water-oriented facilities are often used as separate elements of the metropolitan outdoor recreation system. These special facilities include marinas, reservoir sites and coastal parks.

A *marina* is defined as a boat basin with facilities for berthing and servicing all types of recreational craft, as well as providing for adequate supplies, storage, maintenance and fuel. The need for marinas may sometimes be satisfied entirely by private enterprise. Such a situation would be perfectly satisfactory if they are properly regulated. Where private concerns do not supply the need, marinas should be constructed by a public agency.

A marina site should comprise at least 25 acres allowing the

marina to contain a minimum of 250 slips. In order to prevent excessive development costs, the site should be relatively level, particularly near the shoreline. Poor foundation conditions such as rock formations or the presence of silty soils should be avoided. Other considerations in the location of marina sites include the location of bridges, harbor lines, navigational channels and protected areas and fluctuation of the water level.

Facilities within a marina include boat slips and piers, retail establishments, storage and repair yards, launching facilities and mooring areas. These facilities should be carefully located with regard to function and relationship to each other. Enjoyment of a marina by the metropolitan population will depend largely upon its location and the arrangement of the facilities.⁶⁸

Reservoir sites provide a valuable addition to the metropolitan outdoor recreation system. The rate of growth for recreation uses of all federal reservoirs has been more than 10 per cent annually--a doubling of visitors every five to seven years.⁶⁹ Many federal reservoirs are located near metropolitan areas and should be included in the metropolitan outdoor recreation system. Examples are Lake Lanier near Atlanta, Georgia, and Norris, Fort Loudoun and Melton Hill reservoirs near Knoxville, Tennessee.

Water-supply reservoirs are often supplemented, as they grow older, with larger sources farther away from population centers. Since the older reservoirs are no longer the primary source of water supply, they should now be used for outdoor recreation if this is not already a use. They can still supply needed water during emergencies. Such a

decision by New York would open the entire Croton reservoir for public recreation, making available within 35 to 40 miles of city hall, 18 lakes and 186 miles of shoreline.⁷⁰

Facilities near reservoir sites should take full advantage of the reservoir's high recreation potential. Minimum facilities include boat launching ramps, picnic and camping areas, parking spaces and sanitary accommodations. Large lakes are adaptable to water skiing and speed boating. Smaller lakes should be reserved for rowboats, canoes and sailboats. Incompatible water uses such as swimming, water skiing, boat racing and fishing should be separated. Roads adjacent to the reservoir should provide ample opportunities for short stops to enjoy a view of the lake. Reservoirs also have a unique opportunity to act as wildlife sanctuaries for game, fish and migratory wildfowl.

Coastal parks should be developed wherever shoreline is available. The amount of shoreline available to the general public is decreasing while the need for shoreline is increasing. Although more than 35 million metropolitan residents live near the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts,⁷¹ only 336 miles on the Atlantic Coast and 296 miles on the Pacific Coast are in public ownership. This is less than 2 per cent of the total shoreline in the United States.⁷²

Coastal parks should provide facilities for swimming, sun bathing, skin diving, surf fishing, deep sea fishing and surf board riding. In bay areas facilities can also be provided for water skiing and all types of boating. Parking spaces and sanitary facilities should be located throughout the park.

Public Golf Courses. Every metropolitan area has people who enjoy playing golf. The National Golf Foundation reports that there are now more golf courses under construction than ever before in the history of the United States. Only about 15 per cent of all courses are publicly owned; however, about 40 per cent of all golf is played on these courses.⁷³

Golf courses vary in size from 50 to 90 acres for a nine-hole course and from 100 to 200 acres for an 18-hole course. A suggested standard is one 18-hole course for 20,000 population plus one 18-hole course for each 30,000 thereafter.⁷⁴ They may be located in regional parks or as separate facilities.

Golf courses should be located on gently rolling terrain with some woodland. Par-three courses, which require about 20 per cent as much land as full-length courses, could be located where land is limited. Development of a course ideally should provide for a club house, auxiliary buildings, a driving range, putting greens and parking spaces. A more detailed description of planning requirements for golf courses is provided by John B. Woodlief.⁷⁵

Outdoor Sports Centers. A facility is needed in every metropolitan area that provides for both participant and spectator-oriented activities in a variety of sports. One major outdoor sports center is recommended for each metropolitan area. An adequate size for a metropolitan outdoor sports center is about 200 to 300 acres.

Facilities for mass seating should be available in the sports center as well as large parking areas. Sports facilities may include a football field with running track and stadium, a baseball stadium, an

olympic swimming pool, tennis courts for tournaments and general use and a body of water for aquatic events.

Additional Facilities. Other special purpose facilities with regional appeal contribute to a comprehensive metropolitan outdoor recreation system. Such facilities might include parkways, historic sites and hunting grounds. These facilities, although valuable assets, are not essential in every metropolitan area. Beautified thoroughfares are not considered elements of the system since their primary use is not outdoor recreation. Parkway, when considered as metropolitan outdoor recreation facilities, are essentially elongated parks with roads running through them. They may be economically feasible only in the larger metropolitan areas. Hunting grounds may not be available near highly populated metropolitan areas, and the provision of these areas may, therefore, primarily be a state and federal responsibility.

Development should be compatible with the type of facility. Parkway might include hiking trails, bridle paths, scenic vistas and rest facilities. A minimum right-of-way width of 200 feet is desirable. Historic sites could include attractive signs or plaques explaining the historic significance of various points of interest. Hunting grounds require little additional development. Standards proposed by a committee of the Baltimore Regional Planning Commission recommended 20 acres per 1,000 population for natural land for sports such as hunting and fishing.⁷⁶

Distribution

The distribution of metropolitan outdoor recreation facilities depends on the type of facility and the characteristics of its users.

Because of their metropolitan-wide use, all should be easily accessible. Some facilities, however, may be located more distant than others from centers of population.

Regional parks should be served by public transportation and distributed in such a way that at least one park can be reached by automobile within 30 minutes to an hour from anywhere in the metropolitan area. The Detroit regional planning commission approached the problem of regional park distribution by first dividing the region into subareas and choosing the 1970 projected population of these subareas as the basis for computing recreation land requirements. Interviews were then conducted to learn recreation preferences. Based on these interviews, the commission recommended that regional parks be located along major traffic routes and not more than 30 miles from the population center of each subarea.⁷⁷

The need for regional parks to be located near places of residence is greater for low-income families than for high-income families due to the greater mobility of those with high incomes. As was stated earlier, 60 per cent of the people who reside in metropolitan areas and earn less than \$3,000 annually live in the central city,⁷⁸ and this is where low-income families are continuing to move. For this reason the need for regional parks within easy access of the central city is usually greater than at any other location.

Other metropolitan outdoor recreation facilities have different distribution requirements. Water-oriented facilities must be located wherever large bodies of water are available. The location of historic sites is also dependent on existing conditions. Since golf is generally

a sport participated in by middle to higher income families, the need for golf courses is greater in suburban areas (where the middle to higher income families live) than in the central city. One public golf course within 30 miles of every metropolitan resident is desirable. Outdoor sports centers need a central location served by public transportation while hunting grounds need to be removed from populated areas. Parkways are often used to connect facilities within the system.

Table 5 presents a summary of the type of facilities included in a metropolitan outdoor recreation system along with their space and distribution requirements.

Surveying the Facilities Existing

The survey of existing metropolitan outdoor recreation facilities should include all facilities whether administered by federal, state, local or private agencies. The location of each existing metropolitan outdoor recreation facility should be determined and delineated on a map. The acreage of each of these facilities should be noted. It is also desirable that a description of the types of outdoor recreation provided by each facility be included in the survey.

If a comprehensive plan has been prepared for the metropolitan area, much of the needed data will be already available. If this is the first element in a comprehensive plan, information obtained from this study will be useful in preparing other elements of the plan. Other sources of available information include aerial photographs, tax maps, U. S. Geological Survey maps, commercial maps and various governmental agencies on the local, state and federal levels.

Table 5. Metropolitan Outdoor Recreation Facilities

| Type | Space Requirements | Distribution |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Regional Parks* | 7.5 to 15 acres per 1,000 population. Minimum size, 100 acres. | One park within 30 miles of every resident. Served by public transportation. |
| Water-Oriented Facilities* | Large enough to accommodate the type of recreation use intended. | Wherever ample water is available. Served by public transportation. |
| Golf Courses* | One 18-hole course for 20,000 population plus one 18-hole course for each 30,000 thereafter. | One course within 30 miles of every resident. |
| Outdoor Sports Centers* | One for every metropolitan area. Large enough to provide ample auto parking and mass seating. Adequate size about 200 to 300 acres. | Central location desirable. Served by public transportation. |
| Parkways | Varies according to terrain and related facilities. Minimum of 200 feet of right-of-way desirable. | Located throughout the system. Often used to connect other facilities in the system. |
| Historic Sites | Large enough to encompass the entire historical setting. | Wherever available. |
| Hunting Grounds | 10 to 20 acres per 1,000 population. | Away from populated areas. |
| Other Special Purpose Facilities | Varies according to type of facility. | Varies according to type of facility. |

* Necessary in a comprehensive metropolitan outdoor recreation system. Regional parks may include any other type of metropolitan outdoor recreation facility.

Identifying the Gaps

As soon as all the facts concerning existing metropolitan outdoor recreation facilities have been collected, they should be evaluated and compared to the needs and standards which were established in the first step. This is the step in which the gaps in existing metropolitan outdoor recreation facilities are identified. Some facilities may have adequate total acreage, but be distributed in such a way that they are easily accessible only to certain portions of the population. Other facilities may be too small and some facilities may have been omitted entirely.

The gaps in metropolitan outdoor recreation facilities should be identified in terms of acreage, types, and distribution for both present and future needs. Once this has been accomplished, the planner may proceed with the selection of sites to fill the gaps.

Selecting the Sites

A survey of potential sites will be necessary to determine those areas available for filling the gaps in the metropolitan outdoor recreation system. It is recommended that those sites which should remain open for reasons other than outdoor recreation be the first to be considered. This would include stream valleys, airport approach zones, sanitary landfills, flood plains and others which can serve dual functions with recreation. Such sites, incidentally, may have very desirable recreation characteristics. For example, reclaimed sanitary landfills afford sites which are often within easy access of the central city residents. Additional sites would be selected from the remaining open

space suitable for use as a particular metropolitan outdoor recreation facility.

An immediate policy decision concerns whether to select sites in central areas of high land costs, where the need is usually greater, or in outer areas where land is less expensive. The Morris County, New Jersey, Park Commission approached this problem by assigning points to various site selection characteristics. Large sites received more points than small sites. Sites near centers of population received more points than outlying sites. Other evaluated site characteristics included cost per acre, topography and access. The site with a high point total was selected over sites with fewer total points.⁷⁹

Establishing a Program

The final step in planning a system of open spaces for outdoor recreation consists of establishing a program for open space acquisition and development. This step incorporates the element of timing. Since funds are usually limited, a schedule of available revenue must be prepared to provide a basis for scheduling specific action over a period of years. The schedule should include the source of funds and the date these funds will be available.

Decisions must be reached as to whether open space acquisition or development will be given top priority. Where selected open spaces now available are in imminent danger of becoming unavailable in the near future, it will often be desirable to give first priority to the acquisition of these areas. The development of existing open spaces can follow at a more leisurely pace.

For Acquisition

Immediate opportunities for acquiring metropolitan open spaces may be lost forever if their acquisition is postponed. Alternative areas which may be available in the future will often be less desirable, especially in terms of location and cost. A program establishing priorities for open space acquisition is essential.

The Atlanta Metropolitan Planning Commission considered four primary factors in assigning priorities for the acquisition of nature preserves. These were: (1) estimated land costs; (2) imminence of loss to the spreading city; (3) natural value of the site; and (4) balanced geographical distribution.⁸⁰ Table 6 lists factors to be considered in determining priorities for open space acquisition.

Table 6. Factors to be Considered in Determining
Priorities for Open Space Acquisition

| |
|---|
| Urgency of need |
| Availability of funds |
| Land costs and anticipated land value increases |
| Development costs |
| Potential for multiple use |
| Danger of loss to development |
| Balanced geographical distribution |
| Natural value of site |
| Availability of alternative sites |
| Possibilities for expansion |
| Citizen interest |

The legal aspects of land acquisition and control have been studied by William H. Whyte, Jr.,⁸¹ Shirley Adelson Siegel,⁸² and Norman Williams, Jr.⁸³

For Development

The program for development must be coordinated closely with the acquisition program. Priority should be given to the development of those facilities which are determined to be most critically needed.

The long-range plan specifies a series of annual coordinated programs for open space acquisition and development. The more specific requirements are for the initial programs. Cooperation between the public and all levels of government is necessary to make these programs successful. The plans should be studied continually by the administrative agency and the planning agency and should be revised as new needs arise and other courses of action become desirable.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I

JOINT AGREEMENT OF COOPERATION

OPEN SPACE LAND PROGRAM

This agreement, made this 25 day of February, 1965 by and among the following governmental subdivisions of the State of Oklahoma, to-wit:

Oklahoma City, Midwest City, The Village, Warr Acres, Moore, Del City, Yukon, Bethany, Nichols Hills, Edmond and Norman; and the Counties of Oklahoma, Canadian and Cleveland,

does hereby establish for the Metropolitan urban area comprised by the territorial and geographical jurisdictions of the signatory parties hereto, an Open Space Land Program to help curb urban sprawl and to help provide necessary recreational, conservation and scenic areas by preserving, with planning and financial assistance from the federal government, open space land essential to orderly long range urban development, and to achieve the mutual cooperation necessary to that end this agreement

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma has, by provisions of the Oklahoma Public Recreation Act, Laws 1953, sections 1 through 17 both inclusive has [sic] authorized cities of Oklahoma acting singly or in joint cooperation with each other or other governmental units to establish, maintain, construct, and conduct parks, playgrounds,

recreation center, atheletic fields, swimming pools, social and community centers, and other recreational facilities for the public welfare, and to acquire land and construct buildings for such purposes both within and beyond respective corporate limits of cooperating cities; and

WHEREAS, the Congress of the United States by provisions of Public Law 87-70, Title VII, Sections 701 through 706, both inclusive, of June 30, 1961, has provided for authority and financial assistance for cities in acquiring open-space land which has value for park and recreational purposes, and to provide technical assistance and make studies in support of such acquirement; and

WHEREAS, the City of Oklahoma City, containing a corporate area in excess of 650 square miles, and is part of an urban area located in the counties of Oklahoma, Canadian and Cleveland in the State of Oklahoma and containing other incorporated cities and towns, including:

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| Midwest City | The Village | Warr Acres | Moore | Del City |
| Yukon | Bethany | Nichols Hills | Edmond | Norman |

all of which, in the aggregate, forms an economic and socially related region, taking into consideration the factors of present and future population trends and patterns of urban growth, location of transportation facilities and systems, and distribution of institutional and other activities; and

WHEREAS, said region and the corporate areas located therein contain large acreages of open-space and undeveloped land of great value for future use for developing parks and recreational facilities for the future welfare of all the citizens and residents of said region; and

WHEREAS, the population growth and industrial development is

expanding at a rapid rate throughout said region and threatens severe problems of future urban and suburban living by virtue of the loss of valuable open space land in said region unless it is acquired, dedicated, and set aside and saved for recreational and conservation uses in the future; and

WHEREAS, the parties hereto desire to participate in the Metropolitan urban area open-space land activities and agree that the successful and complete preparation and prosecution of general planning for the future good government and welfare of the people of said urban region necessarily includes the factors of conservation and recreation possible only by the prompt acquirement, dedication, and setting aside and saving of much existing open-space land and designating the same for such use, and that this objective is necessary and can best be accomplished by joint cooperative efforts.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants and agreements hereinafter set forth, the parties hereto hereby agree as follows:

1. That each of the parties hereto will be guided by the provisions of this agreement and cooperate with each of the others to the fullest possible extent, subject to the specific limitations herein contained in establishing and carrying out the Open Space Land Program herein established for said Metropolitan Region.

2. That each party hereto will retain full autonomy in the care, management and control of its public property in their respective corporate and jurisdictional area, subject only to the limitations herein provided.

3. That each party agrees to acquire and preserve within its corporate and jurisdictional area a maximum amount of open-space land with a minimum of cost through the use of existing public land, zoning and subdivision controls, and continuation of appropriate private use of unimproved open-space land through acquisition and leaseback, acquisition of restrictive easements, and other available means.

4. That the fair market value appraised as of the time of acquisition shall be determinative of estimates of acquisition cost, subject to such revision as may be ordered by any court of competent jurisdiction in cases involving the exercise of powers of eminent domain. All plats, appraisals, options, purchase agreements, title evidence, negotiation records, deeds, and other data and documents relative to the acquisition shall be available for examination.

5. That acquisition of open-space land may involve a fee simple title or such lesser interest as is compatible with the proposed open-space use. Appropriate lesser interest may include long-term leases, development rights, easements, and remainder interests subject to life estates. Title may be subject to outstanding easements and other interests and to reservations in the former owner of interests, only if the outstanding interest or reservation will not conflict with the proposed open-space use of the land.

6. That open-space land will be acquired within the jurisdiction of the cooperating governmental units, parties hereto, and in accordance with Title VII of the Housing Act of 1961.

7. That open-space land may include land, or appropriate interests in land, for parks, playgrounds, parkways, conservation areas,

water sheds, and other specific open-space uses. No interest in property within the perimeter boundary of an open-space land area may be excluded from acquisition unless the exclusion is compatible with the proposed open-space use for the area.

8. That policies and procedure for the acquisition of open-space land shall conform to the pertinent public land acquisition practices of each cooperating governmental unit.

9. That the use of open-space land will not be restricted on any basis of race, creed, color, national origin, or place of residence.

10. It is agreed and understood by the parties hereto that this agreement is undertaken with the understanding that certain federal funds shall be available and appropriated by the Federal Government, and that this agreement shall be applicable to all open-space activities undertaken by any of the parties hereto.

11. This agreement shall take force and be in effect when the signatory parties executing the same represent, in the aggregate, as much or more than Sixty Percent (60%) of the land area comprised by the combined incorporated areas of the municipal subdivisions named herein, but this agreement shall not be applicable to or binding upon any municipal subdivision not signatory thereto.

12. Any municipal or county subdivision in this Metropolitan area not a signatory party at the time this agreement first becomes effective may become signatory to this agreement at some future date without necessitating the re-writing or re-execution of this agreement by the original parties signatory thereto.

13. It is agreed that for purposes of providing a joint approach to the mutual development problems of said Metropolitan area created by rapid urbanization, a joint planning and coordination committee, hereinafter called "Committee" is by the agreement created to undertake and prepare a comprehensive planning program which will produce a comprehensive plan for said Metropolitan Area, and to review and coordinate the future open space land acquisition plans and proposals of the parties hereto.

14. Each of the parties hereto shall appoint a representative to this Committee. The representative shall be appointed by the governing body of each party hereto and shall, by either professional training, or elective or appointive responsibilities, be qualified to participate in the joint planning and open-space coordinative activities of this Committee.

15. It is understood that the total membership of said Committee must consist of at least five (5) members as provided by 11 O.S. 1961, Section 545.7 and that terms of office shall not expire at one time. Accordingly it is agreed that the terms of office of the County representative appointed to the Committee shall be co-terminous with the terms of office of County Commissioners of the respective signatory Counties, and the terms of representatives appointed by signatory Cities shall be four (4) years; provided, that the terms of office of representatives first appointed to the Committee by the Cities of Oklahoma City, Edmond, Norman and/or Midwest City shall expire on the first Monday in January, 1967, and thereafter their successors in office shall be appointed for four (4) year terms. The terms of the remainder of

members appointed to the Committee shall expire on the first Monday in January, 1968, and thereafter their successors shall be appointed for four (4) year terms. Vacancies on said Committee occurring otherwise than by expiration of their term of office shall be filled by the presiding officer of the governing body only for the unexpired term of the member whose vacancy is being filled.

In the event expenditures for the purposes of this agreement shall be deemed necessary and desirable as determined by said Committee, each party hereto shall agree to provide their fair share of the cost of producing a comprehensive development plan for the urban area, and said expenditures shall be first approved and funds appropriated therefor by the respective City Councils and Boards of Commissioners. These costs shall include all studies, surveys, planning elements, and other activities leading to the production of the comprehensive development plan.

17. Each party hereto agrees to provide all necessary data and services required in the development of a comprehensive development plan for the urban area.

18. Each party hereto agrees to review and formally comment on all plans, proposals, and studies which may be developed as a result of the actions of this Committee and agrees to participate in those decisions of the Committee affecting the future growth of the urban area as a whole in the development of the Comprehensive development plan.

19. Each party hereto agrees that in the event an official agency, created by existing laws or resultant from State enabling legislation, is created to carry on comprehensive planning for the urban

area, the comprehensive planning functions of this Committee as subscribed to in this agreement shall become the sole responsibility of the planning agency so created.

20. Each party hereto further agrees that if a planning agency is created, as described above, the open-space coordinative functions of the Committee as specifically enumerated in Sections 13, 17, 21, and 22 of this agreement, shall remain in full force and effect, binding upon the parties hereto, so that this agreement will continue to provide a coordinated approach to the joint and individual open-space responsibilities of said Metropolitan Area.

21. Each of the parties hereto will prepare an open-space plan for that portion of the urban area for which it exercises open-space jurisdiction. Each open-space plan will be in accord with the overall future land use and the open-space planning goals of the entire urban area.

22. Prior to acquisition of open-space land, or lesser interests in open-space land, or prior to the submission of an application for assistance under the provisions of Title VII of the Housing Act of 1961, each public body will submit to the Committee an acquisition proposal which shall, as a minimum, contain (1) a map indicating the location of the land to be acquired, and (2) a statement indicating the proposed open-space use or uses for which the land is being acquired.

23. The Committee shall review each acquisition proposal for conformity to the long-range land use and open-space planning goals of the Oklahoma City Urban Area.

24. It is understood and agreed that the parties hereto will be guided by the review of the Committee in undertaking each open-space acquisition proposal and will be guided in the exercise of open-space responsibilities by the policies and plans developed by the Committee; provided that nothing herein is intended to require any public body to take any action which it is not authorized to take, pursuant to Federal, State or Local Law under which such public body is created or under which it exercises responsibilities for the preservation of open-space land in all or a portion of the Oklahoma City Urban Area.

25. This agreement is entered into for an initial term of one year from its date, and the term thereof shall continue from year to year thereafter without necessity for formal renewal by any signatory party, but any signatory party, by resolution of its governing board, may terminate the same as applied to such party upon any annual anniversary date of said agreement by giving written notice of intent to terminate at least 90 days in advance of such anniversary date. Said notice shall be addressed to the chief executive officer and governing body of each of the other signatory parties, and a copy thereof shall be filed by the party giving notice with the appropriate City Clerk or recording officer of each signatory.

APPENDIX II

EXCERPTS FROM THE HOUSING ACT OF 1961

Public Law 87-70
42 U.S.C. 1500

TITLE VII--OPEN SPACE LAND

Findings and Purpose

Se. 701. (a) The Congress finds that a combination of economic, social, governmental and technological forces have caused a rapid expansion of the Nation's urban areas, which has created critical problems of service and finance for all levels of government and which, combined with a rapid population growth in such areas, threatens severe problems of urban and suburban living, including the loss of valuable open-space land in such areas, for the preponderant majority of the Nation's present and future population.

(b) It is the purpose of this title to help curb urban sprawl and prevent the spread of urban blight and deterioration, to encourage more economic and desirable urban development, and to help provide necessary recreational, conservation, and scenic areas by assisting State and local governments in taking prompt action to preserve open-space land which is essential to the proper long-range development and welfare of the Nation's urban areas, in accordance with plans for the allocation of such land for open-space purposes.

Federal Grants

Sec. 702. (a) In order to encourage and assist in the timely

acquisition of land to be used as permanent open-space land, as defined herein, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized to enter into contracts to make grants to States and local public bodies acceptable to the Administrator as capable of carrying out the provisions of this title to help finance the acquisition of title to, or other permanent interests in, such land. The amount of any such grant shall not exceed 20 per centum of the total cost, as approved by the Administrator, of acquiring such interests: Provided, That this limitation may be increased to not to exceed 30 per centum in the case of a grant extended to a public body which (1) exercises responsibilities consistent with the purposes of this title for an urban area as a whole, or (2) exercises or participates in the exercise of such responsibilities for all or a substantial portion of an urban area pursuant to an interstate or other intergovernmental compact or agreement. The faith of the United States is pledged to the payment of all grants contracted for under this title.

(b) The Administrator may enter into contracts to make grants under this title aggregating not to exceed \$50,000,000. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts necessary to provide for the payment of such grants as well as to carry out all other purposes of this title.

(c) No grants under this title shall be used to defray development costs or ordinary State or local governmental expenses, or to help finance the acquisition by a public body of land located outside the urban area for which it exercises (or participates in the exercise of) responsibilities consistent with the purpose of this title.

(d) The Administrator may set such further terms and conditions for assistance under this title as he determines to be desirable.

(e) The Administrator shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior on the general policies to be followed in reviewing applications for grants. To assist the Administrator in such review, the Secretary of the Interior shall furnish him appropriate information on the status of recreational planning for the areas to be served by the open-space land acquired with the grants. The Administrator shall provide current information to the Secretary from time to time on significant program developments.

Planning Requirements

Sec. 703. (a) The Administrator shall enter into contracts to make grants for the acquisition of land under this title only if he finds that (1) the proposed use of the land for permanent open space is important to the execution of a comprehensive plan for the urban area meeting criteria he has established for such plans, and (2) a program of comprehensive planning (as defined in section 701(d) of the Housing Act of 1954) is being actively carried on for the urban area.

(b) In extending financial assistance under this title, the Administrator shall take such action as he deems appropriate to assure that local governing bodies are preserving a maximum of open-space land, with a minimum of cost, through the use of existing public land; the use of special tax, zoning, and subdivision provisions; and the continuation of appropriate private use of open-space land through acquisition and leaseback, the acquisition of restrictive easements, and other available means.

Conversions to Other Uses

Sec. 704. No open-space land for which a grant has been made under this title shall, without the approval of the Administrator, be converted to uses other than those originally approved by him. The administrator shall approve no conversion of land from open-space use unless he finds that such conversion is essential to the orderly development and growth of the urban area involved and is in accord with the then applicable comprehensive plan, meeting criteria established by him. The Administrator shall approve any such conversion only upon such conditions as he deems necessary to assure the substitution of other open-space land of at least equal fair market value and of as nearly as feasible equivalent usefulness and location.

Technical Assistance, Studies, and Publication of Information

Sec. 705. In order to carry out the purpose of this title the Administrator is authorized to provide technical assistance to State and local public bodies and to undertake such studies and publish such information, either directly or by contract, as he shall determine to be desirable. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to provide for such assistance, studies, and publication. Nothing contained in this section shall limit any authority of the Administrator under any other provision of law.

Definitions

Sec. 706. As used in this title--

(1) The term "open-space land" means any undeveloped or predominantly undeveloped land in an urban area which has value for (A)

park and recreational purposes, (B) conservation of land and other natural resources, or (C) historic or scenic purposes.

(2) The term "urban area" means any area which is urban in character, including those surrounding areas which, in the judgment of the Administrator, form an economic and socially related region, taking into consideration such factors as present and future population trends and patterns of urban growth, location of transportation facilities and systems, and distribution of industrial, commercial, residential, governmental, institutional, and other activities.

(3) The term "State" means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

* * * *

Approved June 30, 1961.

APPENDIX III

EXCERPTS FROM THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Public Law 89-117

89th Congress, H.R. 7984

TITLE IX--OPEN-SPACE LAND AND URBAN BEAUTIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Change in Name of Program; Findings and Purpose

Sec. 901. (a) The heading of title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE VII--OPEN-SPACE LAND AND URBAN BEAUTIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT"

(b) Section 701 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and inserting after subsection (a) a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Congress further finds that there is an urgent need both for the additional provisions of parks and other open-space areas in the developed portions of the Nation's urban areas and for greater and better coordinated local efforts to beautify and improve open space and other public land throughout urban areas to facilitate their increased use and enjoyment by the Nation's urban population."

(c) Section 701 (c) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (b) of this section) is amended--

(1) by striking out "preserve" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) provide, preserve, and develop"; and

(2) by striking out "purposes." and inserting in lieu

thereof "uses, and (2) beautify and improve open space and other public urban land, in accordance with programs to encourage and coordinate local public and private efforts toward this end."

Development Grants for Open-Space Uses

Sec. 902. (a) The first sentence of section 702(a) of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended--

(1) by inserting "and development" after "acquisition" the first place it appears; and

(2) by inserting before the period the following: ", and the development, for open-space uses, of land acquired under this title."

(b) Section 702(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "development costs or."

(c) Section 709 of such Act (as redesignated by section 906 of this Act) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(4) The term 'open-space uses' means any use of open-space land for (A) park and recreational purposes, (B) conservation of land and other natural resources, or (C) historic or scenic purposes."

Increased Grant Level for Preservation and Development of Open-Space Land

Sec. 903. The second sentence of section 702(a) of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows: "The amount of any such grant shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost, as approved by the Administrator, of such acquisition and development."

Contract Authorization

Sec. 904. Section 702(b) of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$75,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "\$310,000,000: Provided, That of such sum the Administrator may contract to make grants under section 705 aggregating not to exceed \$64,000,000, and grants under section 706 aggregating not to exceed \$36,000,000".

Open-Space Planning and Program Requirements

Sec. 905. Section 703(a) of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Administrator shall enter into contracts to make grants under sections 702 and 705 of this title only if he finds that such assistance is needed for carrying out a unified or officially coordinated program, meeting criteria established by him, for the provision and development of open-space land as part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area."

Grants for Provision of Open-Space Land in Built-Up Urban Areas
and for Urban Beautification and Improvement

Sec. 906. Title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended by redesignating sections 705 and 706 as sections 708 and 709, respectively, and by inserting after section 704 two new sections as follows:

"Grants for Provision of Open-Space Land
in Built-Up Urban Areas

"Sec. 705. The Administrator is further authorized to enter into contracts to make grants to States and local public bodies to help finance the acquisition of title to, or other permanent interests in, developed land in built-up portions of urban areas to be cleared and used

as permanent open-space land. The Administrator shall make such grants only where the local governing body determines that adequate open-space land cannot effectively be provided through the use of existing undeveloped or predominantly undeveloped land. Grants under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of acquiring such interests and of necessary demolition and removal of improvements.

"Grants for Urban Beautification and Improvement

"Sec. 706. The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts to make grants, as herein provided, to States and local public bodies to assist in carrying out local programs for the greater use and enjoyment of open-space and other public land in urban areas. The Administrator shall establish criteria for such programs to assure that each program (1) represents significant and effective efforts, involving all available public and private resources, for the beautification of such land and its improvement for open-space uses; and (2) is important to the comprehensively planned development of the locality. Grants made under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the amount by which the cost of the activities carried on by an applicant during a fiscal year under an approved program exceeds its usual expenditures for comparable activities: Provided, That, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Administrator may use not to exceed \$5,000,000 of the sum authorized for contracts under this section for the purpose of entering into contracts to make grants in amounts not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost of activities which he determines have special value in developing and demonstrating new and improved methods and materials for use in carrying out the purposes of this section."

Labor Standards

Sec. 907. Title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 is further amended by inserting after section 706 (as added by section 906 of this Act) the following new section:

"Labor Standards

"Sec. 707. (a) The Administrator shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of construction work financed with the assistance of grants under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended. The Administrator shall not approve any such grant without first obtaining adequate assurance that these labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a), the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276c)."

Use of Funds for Studies and Publication

Sec. 908. The second sentence of section 708 of the Housing Act of 1961 (as redesignated by section 906 of this Act) is amended to read as follows: "The Administrator is authorized to use during any fiscal year not to exceed \$50,000 of the funds available for grants under this title to undertake such studies and publish such information."

Conforming Amendments

Sec. 909. (a) The heading of section 702 of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows: "Grants for Preservation and Development of Open-Space Land".

(b) Section 702(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "acceptable to the Administrator as capable of carrying out the provisions of this title".

(c) Section 702(e) of such Act is amended by striking out in the second sentence "served by the open-space land acquired" and inserting in lieu thereof "assisted".

(d) Section 704 of such Act is amended by striking out in the first sentence "for which" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the acquisition of which".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LITERATURE CITED

1. Crafts, Edward C. "A National Approach to Outdoor Recreation," *Planning and Civic Comment*, Vol. 28, No. 2, June, 1962, p. 1.
2. U. S. Bureau of the Census. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1965*. 86th ed. Washington: U. S. Government Printing, 1965, p. 18.
3. Clawson, Marion. *The Dynamics of Park Demand*. New York: Metropolitan Regional Council, Regional Plan Association, April, 1960, p. 13.
4. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. *Outdoor Recreation for America*. Washington: The Commission, January, 1962, p. 145.
5. U. S. Bureau of the Census. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1960*. 81st ed. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960, pp. 12, 14.
6. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, *loc. cit.*
7. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. *Governmental Structure, Organization, and Planning in Metropolitan Areas*. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961, p. 6.
8. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, *op. cit.*, table 6, p. 214.
9. *Ibid.*, table 8, p. 215.
10. Clawson, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
11. U. S. Bureau of the Census, *U. S. Census of Population: 1960. General Social and Economic Characteristics, United States Summary*. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961, p. 1-241.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 1-241. Computed from *Census* data.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-295--1-297. Computed from *Census* data.
14. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, *op. cit.*, table 14, p. 217.

15. California Public Outdoor Recreation Plan Committee. *California Public Outdoor Recreation Plan, Part I*. Sacramento, California: The Committee, March, 1960, pp. 26-27.
16. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
17. Clawson, *op. cit.*, p. 21.
18. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, *loc. cit.*
19. Hewes, Lawrence I., Jr., and Hammett, Francis X. *The Future of Outdoor Recreation in Metropolitan Regions of the United States*. ORRRC Study Report 21. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962, Vol. II, p. 77.
20. Williams, Harrison A., Jr. "Urban Sprawl and Open Space," *Congressional Record*, 98th Cong., 1st Sess., Vol. 107, No. 24, February 9, 1961.
21. American Institute of Park Executives, Park Education Committee. *The Crisis in Open Land*. Wheeling, West Virginia: The Institute, 1959, p. 12.
22. Cross, Gilbert, "The Costly Crush to Get Outdoors," *Fortune*, Vol. LXVI, No. 1, July, 1962, p. 158.
23. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, *op. cit.*, p. 82.
24. U. S. Bureau of the Census, *U. S. Census of Population: 1960*, *op. cit.*, p. x.
25. National Association of Counties. *County Action for Outdoor Recreation*. Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1964, p. 3.
26. Van Der Smissen, Betty. *State Laws for Parks and Recreation*. Aurora, Illinois: American Institute of Park Executives, Inc., 1955, p. 3.
27. National Association of Counties, *op. cit.*, p. 33.
28. Montgomery County Planning Commission. *The Preservation of Open Space in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, During the 1960's*. Norristown, Pennsylvania: The Commission, January 8, 1962, pp. 1-3.
29. Bollens, John C. *Special District Governments in the United States*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 1961, pp. 71-72.
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 132-38.

31. Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission. "Outdoor Recreation: Needs and Preferences of the People of the Chicago Area," *The Future of Outdoor Recreation in Metropolitan Regions of the United States*. ORRRC Study Report 21. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962, Vol. 1, pp. 252-53.
32. Bollens, *op. cit.*, pp. 77-79.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 72-74.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 73.
35. Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, *op. cit.*, pp. 251-52.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 252-54.
37. Bollens, *loc. cit.*
38. Bollens, *op. cit.*, p. 66.
39. U. S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, Office of the General Counsel. *Summary of the Housing Act of 1961*. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961, Title VII, Section 702, p. 29.
40. Association of Bay Area Governments. *Agreement Relating to the Preservation of Open Space Land in the San Francisco Bay Area*. San Francisco: The Association, August 11, 1964. (Typed.)
41. Oklahoma City, *et al.* *Joint Agreement of Cooperation, Open Space Land Program*. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: The Committee, February 25, 1965. (Typed.)
42. National Capital Regional Planning Council, *et al.* *Memorandum of Agreement Relating to the Preservation of Open Space Land in the National Capital Region*. Washington: The Parties, January 17, 1963, pp. 3-4. (Typed.)
43. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
44. "Private Property--Please Come In," *Planning and Civic Comment*, Vol. 28, No. 4, December, 1962, pp. 16-19.
45. Gibson, Frank K. "The Future of Outdoor Recreation in the Atlanta Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area," *The Future of Outdoor Recreation in the Metropolitan Regions of the United States*. ORRRC Study Report No. 21. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962, Vol. 1, pp. 156-59.

46. *Ibid.*, pp. 161-62.
47. Bollens, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-73.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 78.
49. Pacific Planning and Research. *A Report on the Park and Recreation Space Needs of the Sacramento Metropolitan Area*. Sacramento, California: Sacramento County Planning Commission, July, 1960, p. 46.
50. Hewes, Lawrence I., Jr., and Hammett, Francis X. *The Future of Outdoor Recreation in Metropolitan Regions of the United States*. ORRRC Study Report 21. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962, Vol. III, p. 36.
51. Diamond, Henry L. *Paying for Recreational Facilities*. ORRRC Study Report 12. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962, p. 81.
52. Bollens, *op. cit.*, p. 73.
53. Diamond, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-82.
54. State Council of Parks. *A Program for State Park Land Acquisition*. New York: New York State Park Commission, December 19, 1960, p. 1.
55. _____. *Two Year Progress Report on Land Acquisition for Parks and Recreation Under the \$100,000,000 Bond Issue Program*. New York: State of New York Conservation Department, 1963, p. 2.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
57. New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development. *Green Acres Assistance Program: Procedural Guide*. Trenton, New Jersey: The Department, January, 1965, pp. 1-3.
58. "State Park Notes," *Planning and Civic Comment*, Vol. 29, No. 4, December, 1963, pp. 35-36.
59. Montgomery County Planning Commission. *Programs for Open Space Preservation*. Norristown, Pennsylvania: The Commission, 1962, p. 1.
60. U. S. Congress. *Housing Act of 1954*. Public Law 560, Chapter 649, H. P. 7839, 83rd Cong., 2nd Sess., 1954, Section 701(d), p.52.
61. _____. *Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965*. Public Law 89-117, H.R. 7984, 89th Cong., August 10, 1965, Section 906, pp. 45-46.

62. *Ibid.*, Title IX, pp. 44-47.
63. U. S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, Urban Renewal Administration. *Preserving Urban Open Space Land . . . The First Three Years*. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, August, 1964, pp. 1-7.
64. Dallas, Department of City Planning and Department of Parks and Recreation. *Parks and Open Spaces, Dallas Metropolitan Area*. Dallas, Texas: Dallas Area Master Plan Committee, April, 1959, p. 14.
65. New York, Regional Plan Association. *The Race for Open Space*. New York: The Association, September, 1960, p. 11.
66. Cleveland, Regional Planning Commission. *Open Space for Our Cited County*. Cleveland: The Commission, January, 1964, pp. 50-61.
67. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, *op. cit.*, p. 173.
68. Briggs, Donald Bruce. *Planning for Recreational Boating*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Graduate Program in City Planning, Georgia Institute of Technology, 1960, pp. 19-47.
69. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, *op. cit.*, p. 179.
70. Cross, Gilbert, "The Costly Crush to Get Outdoors," *Fortune*, Vol. LXVI, No. 1, July, 1962, p. 196.
71. U. S. Bureau of the Census. *U. S. Census of Population: 1960*, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-292--1-294. Computed from Census data.
72. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, *op. cit.*, p. 70.
73. Holland, Roy, "Golf Courses--Status and Prospects Through 2000," *Texas Town and City*, June, 1961, pp. 10, 26.
74. Chicago Park District. *Suggested Goals in Park and Recreation Planning*. Chicago, Illinois: The District, September, 1959, p. 18.
75. Woodlief, John Berkeley. *Golf Courses in Urban Areas*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Graduate Program in City Planning, Georgia Institute of Technology, June, 1966.
76. Strong, Ann Louise. *Open Space for Urban America*. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965, p. 18.
77. *Ibid.*, p. 19.

78. U. S. Bureau of the Census. *U. S. Census of Population: 1960*, *op. cit.*, p. 1-241. Computed from Census data.
79. Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 24.
80. Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission. *Regional Nature Preserves*. Atlanta Region Comprehensive Plan: Regional Parks and Open Space Study: Part 1. Atlanta: The Commission, December, 1963, p. 16.
81. White, William H., Jr., "Securing Open Space for Urban America: Conservation Easements," *Urban Land Institute Technical Bulletin* 36, December, 1959; and Whyte, William H. *Open Space Action*. ORRRC Study Report 15. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.
82. Siegel, Shirley Adelson. *The Law of Open Space*. New York: Regional Plan Association, January, 1960.
83. Williams, Norman, Jr. *Land Acquisition for Outdoor Recreation--Analysis of Selected Legal Problems*. ORRRC Study Report 16. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

OTHER REFERENCES

- Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission. *Open Land/Regional Problems and Opportunities*. Atlanta Region Comprehensive Plan: Regional Parks and Open Space Study: Part II. Atlanta: The Commission, June, 1964.
- Berks County Planning Commission. "Open Space Preservation," *Information Bulletin* Number 11, October, 1964.
- Boeyi, Reynold Angelo. *Preserving Open Space on the Rural-Urban Fringe: The British Experience Applied to the American Scene*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Graduate School of Regional Planning, Cornell University, 1960.
- Butler, George D. *Standards for Municipal Recreation Areas*. New York: National Recreation Association, 1967.
- California, Department of Parks and Recreation, Division of Recreation. *County Regional Parks and Regional Recreation Areas--A Planning Guide*. Sacramento, California: The Division, 1965.
- Candeub, Fleissig and Associates. *Connecticut Open Space Grant-in-Aid Program*. Newark, New Jersey: Council on Agriculture and Natural Resources, November, 1963.
- Clawson, Marion. *Land and Water for Recreation*. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally & Company, 1963.
- _____. *Methods of Measuring the Demand for and Value of Outdoor Recreation*. Washington: Resources for the Future, Inc., 1959.
- _____ and Knetsch, Jack L. *Outdoor Recreation Research*. Washington: Resources for the Future, Inc., 1963.
- Community Studies, Inc. *The Shawnee-Mission Park District Master Plan Study*. Kansas City, Missouri: The Studies, January, 1956.
- Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission. *Home Survey of Regional Recreation Activities. Part III: Recreation in the Detroit Region*. Detroit: The Commission, January, 1960.
- Great Lakes District Program Standards Committee. *Evaluation of Community Recreation*. New York: National Recreation Association, 1965.
- Hay, Raymond G. *Public Parks and Recreation, Northern Virginia Region*. Arlington, Virginia: Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission, 1962.

Herring, Frances W. *Regional Parks and Open Space: Selected Conference Papers*. Proceedings of two conferences. Berkeley, California: Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, December 11, 1959 and January 27, 1961.

Illinois, University of, Department of City Planning and Landscape Architecture. *A Procedure for Open Space Planning in an Urban County*. Urbana, Illinois: The Department, January, 1962.

Krasnowiecki, Jan Z. and Paul, James G. N. "The Preservation of Open Space in Metropolitan Areas," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol. 110, 1961.

Maryland State Planning Department and Baltimore Regional Planning Council. *Open Spaces*. Technical Report No. 5. Baltimore: The Department, November, 1960.

_____. *Standards for Parks, Recreation Areas, and Open Spaces*. Technical Bulletin No. 2. Baltimore: The Department, November, 1958.

Michigan, Department of Conservation and Michigan, University of, School of Natural Resources. *Hunting in the United States--Its Present and Future Role*. ORRRC Study Report 6. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

Michigan State University, Department of Resource Development. *The Quality of Outdoor Recreation: As Evidenced by User Satisfaction*. ORRRC Study Report 5. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

Nashville, Tennessee, Metropolitan Planning Commission. *Recreation Space--1980*. Nashville, Tennessee: The Commission, February, 1965.

National Capital Regional Planning Council. *Public Open-Space Programs and Activities, National Capital Region*. Technical Report 1. Washington: The Council, December, 1963.

National Recreation and Park Association. *Outdoor Recreation Space Standards*. New York: The Association, February, 1966.

New York, New York, Department of Parks. *28 Years of Progress*. New York, New York: The Department, June, 1962.

Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission. *Parks, Recreation and Open Space*. Arlington, Virginia: The Commission, February, 1960.

Raleigh, North Carolina, Department of Planning. *Parks and Recreation*. Raleigh, North Carolina: The Department, August, 1960.

Saint Louis County Planning Commission. *The Study of Growth*. Saint Louis, Missouri: The Commission, 1965.

San Francisco State College, Frederic Burk Foundation for Education. *Federal Agencies and Outdoor Recreation*. ORRRC Study Report 13. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

San Mateo County Planning Commission. *Parks, Recreation Areas and Open Space in San Mateo County*. San Mateo, California: The Commission, May, 1961.

Santa Clara County Planning Commission. *Parks, Recreation and Open Space*. Santa Clara, California: The Commission, February, 1962.

Springfield, Illinois, Department of Business and Economic Development. *Outdoor Recreation in Illinois*. Springfield, Illinois: The Department, 1965.

Strong, Ann Louise. *Open Space in the Penjerdel Region--Now or Never*. Philadelphia: Penjerdel, 1963.

_____. *Preserving Urban Open Space*. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, February, 1963.

Tennessee Valley Authority. *Outdoor Recreation for a Growing Nation*. Knoxville, Tennessee: The Authority, September, 1961.

The Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies. *Open Spaces and Our Cities*. Washington: The Center, March 30, 1961.

Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission. *1975 Metropolitan Tulsa Public Recreation Land Needs*. Tulsa, Oklahoma: The Commission, May, 1960.

Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission. *Metropolitan Parks--An Initial Investigation*. Saint Louis, Missouri: The Commission, 1961.

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. *Potential New Sites for Outdoor Recreation in the Northeast*. ORRRC Study Report 8. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

_____. *Private Outdoor Recreation Facilities*. ORRRC Study Report 11. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

U. S. Department of Agriculture. *Rural Recreation, a New Family-Farm Business*. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, September, 1962.

U. S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. *Water for Recreation--Values and Opportunities*. ORRRC Study Report 10. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.