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The purpose of this study was to identify and describe practices, procedures and patterns related to administration and financing of recreation and park services in major Montana municipalities. Thirteen municipalities which employed a full-time recreation and/or park administrator were selected for inclusion in this study.

Data collection for this study was carried out in two phases. The first phase was a detailed examination of reference works, public documents and previous studies of Montana municipal recreation and park services. The second phase was a survey of recreation and park department administrators. Data collected for this study included: 1) general municipal information, 2) specific information regarding administrative structure, department organization and personnel for municipal recreation and park services, and 3) sources of revenue, revenue generated through recreation and park services and budgeted expenditures for municipal recreation and park services.

Administration of recreation and park services in the municipalities included in this study involved two distinct levels of authority. The first level was the municipal agency with final administrative authority for recreation and park services. In the large majority of municipalities a single independent board or commission had final administrative authority for both recreation and park services. The second level of administration involved the municipal department organization for recreation and park services. At the department level recreation and park services were most often administered separately, by two different municipal departments.

Analysis of data regarding financing of municipal recreation and park services also revealed certain overall patterns. The primary source of revenue for supporting municipal recreation and park services was local property tax funds received through municipal appropriation. The second important source of revenue was federal aid and grants. The most important source of revenue generated through recreation and park services was from fees and charges for programs and activities. Finally, in the majority of municipalities the five most important expenditure categories included: 1) salaries, wages and benefits, 2) park maintenance and improvement, 3) facility maintenance, 4) equipment and supplies for recreation programs, and 5) administrative supplies and expenses.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the United States all levels of government have assumed major responsibility for providing a wide variety of public services. Traditionally these services have included such areas as education, public health, welfare and housing. Comparatively recently recreation has been added to this list as a major and basic public service responsibility of government.\(^1\) There is substantial justification for the contention that government organization is necessary to assure proper and comprehensive planning for and attention to recreation and park services. Also, public provision of recreation and park services is the only practical means of making recreation opportunities available to all the people, and in a way that assures continued public ownership.\(^2\)

In Montana the responsibility for providing municipal recreation and park services is shared by the state and units of local government. Much of the initial responsibility lies with the state: operating without a broad grant of "home rule" powers, Montana municipalities have been dependent upon the state legislature for authority to act.


Currently, Montana laws regulate general aspects of administration and financing of municipal recreation and park services. However, individual municipalities have major responsibility for developing specific procedures and practices necessary to provide recreation and park services within their jurisdiction. Within the confines of state enabling legislation, individual municipalities may determine 1) the department structure for administering recreation and park services, 2) the level of financing for those services, and 3) the type and extent of public recreation programs, facilities and services to be provided within the community. The purpose of this study was to provide a comprehensive overview and summary of the administration and financing of public recreation and park services in selected Montana municipalities.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to describe existing practices and procedures and identify patterns related to the administration and financing of recreation and park services, programs and facilities in selected Montana municipalities.

The steps followed in carrying out this study included:

1. Determining municipalities which met the criterion for inclusion in the study;

2. Delineating the information necessary for accomplishing the purposes of this study and establishing procedures for data collection;

3. Collecting and recording data from related literature and source documents;
4. Planning and carrying out a mail survey of recreation and park administrators in order to collect additional data regarding recreation and park services in each municipality included in this study;

5. Organizing and analyzing the data to determine the existence or absence of patterns in the administration and financing of recreation and park services in the municipalities surveyed.

**Delimitations of the Study**

This study was confined to Montana municipalities which employed a full-time administrator for a municipal recreation and/or park department. Thirteen Montana municipalities met this criterion for inclusion in the study: Billings, Great Falls, Missoula, Butte, Helena, Bozeman, Havre, Kalispell, Anaconda, Miles City, Lewistown, Glendive and Glasgow. On the basis of the data collected, it was not possible to generalize to municipalities not specifically included in this study.

Data collected for this study were limited to factual information concerning current administrative structure, personnel and practices of municipal recreation and/or park boards and departments and financing and budgeting for public recreation and park services, facilities and programs. In this study no attempt was made to assess public opinion or user satisfaction with respect to municipal recreation and park services. Analysis of the data included cross comparisons between municipalities, however no attempt was made to evaluate, either
individually or collectively, the public recreation and park services in Montana municipalities.

Limitations of the Study

Certain limitations should be pointed out and kept in mind in reviewing the findings of this study. Non-response to some of the items in the mail survey used to collect data for this study imposed minor limitations. Although respondents were contacted by telephone in order to obtain missing information it was not possible to use this procedure in all cases. In general, missing information did not pose a serious problem and areas where data were unavailable are identified in the specific sections affected.

Another limitation of this study was related to the ability to compare administrative practices in the municipalities included in the study. In the area of recreation and park service administration the data provided a basis only for general comparisons with certain reservations. In general this limitation stemmed from the lack of detailed information regarding the specific distribution of administrative functions and responsibilities between municipal recreation and park departments. For example, certain municipal park departments were responsible for functions that in other municipalities may have been delegated to the recreation department. In addition, it is likely that this variation in administrative structure, as well as other factors outside the scope of this study, were in part responsible for the variation observed in the type, number and respective salary range of personnel positions in the municipal recreation and park departments.
Finally, in the area of financing for municipal recreation and park services, the extreme variation in fiscal reporting procedures among the municipalities imposed certain limitations for this study. The two limitations which should be noted are related to sources of revenue and budgeted expenditures for municipal recreation and park services. Since there is no uniform system for itemizing municipal and department budgets in Montana municipalities it was impossible to make valid comparisons from the data as they appeared in the source documents. In two cases both municipal and department budgets were itemized in such broad categories that it was impossible to classify budgeted expenditures for comparison with other municipalities. In the majority of cases however, sources of revenue and budgeted expenditures were classified in categories defined solely for the purposes of this study. As a result, conclusions based on these specific data should be viewed with caution and may be open to varying interpretation.

Significance of the Problem

As recreation and park services become an increasingly important function of local governments it is necessary to review and understand existing practices and procedures in this area. This study provides a comprehensive summary of practices and procedures followed in thirteen Montana municipalities in administering and financing recreation and park services. Although it was not possible to generalize from the data beyond the specific municipalities included in the study, such a summary may provide useful information for local government officials in all Montana municipalities as well as for Montana professional recreation and park educators.
In addition, with ratification of a new State constitution in 1972, Montana citizens have focused increasing attention on local government reform. Montana has been engaged in "a comprehensive program of local government modernization based on the local government article of the 1972 constitution." In the area of local government services, this study may provide useful background information related to municipal recreation and park services.

**Definition of Terms**

For the purpose of this study the following terms are defined:

**Municipality** refers to an incorporated city or town.

**Units of local government or political subdivisions of the state** include incorporated cities and towns, counties, school districts and regional or consolidated recreation and/or park districts.

**Recreation and park enabling laws** refer to legislation granting units of local government authority to acquire, establish and maintain recreation and park areas, facilities and programs.

**Regulatory laws** are laws which control, license or prohibit specific practices or functions.

---

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

The discussion of literature related to this study is divided into three sections: 1) reference works and source documents, 2) studies related in method, and 3) general recreation and park literature and publications. Due to the fact that there was no comprehensive compilation of information concerning the administration and financing of recreation and park services in Montana municipalities, the literature most directly related to this study consisted primarily of reference works and source documents. Other materials included studies related in method. Reports of similar research, conducted in other states, were consulted during the planning stages of this study. The final section of this chapter deals with general aspects of administration and financing of municipal recreation and park services discussed in recreation and park literature and publications.

Reference Works and Source Documents

Reference works that provided basic information related to the administration and financing of recreation and park services in Montana municipalities included the Revised Codes of Montana\(^1\) and several other publications concerning municipal government in Montana and the laws governing municipal and county recreation and park services in Montana, Revised Codes, Annotated.\(^1\)

\(^1\)Montana, Revised Codes, Annotated.
Montana. The Revised Codes, which contain all statutes governing municipal governments and public recreation and park services, were referred to and cited throughout this study. Actually, however, the Handbook for Montana Municipal Officers\(^2\) was a more useful reference work in that it presented a well organized, systematic and complete summary of statutory provisions governing municipal corporations in Montana. In addition the Handbook was the source for 1970 census data cited in this study. The Guidebook of Montana Laws Governing Municipal and County Parks and Recreation\(^3\) also provided a summary of state statutes related to public recreation and park services. Because the information contained in the Guidebook was organized in the order that statutes appear in the Revised Codes and provided only a very general summary, it was of limited value for the purpose of this study.

The individual municipal budgets for the thirteen cities included in this study were essential source documents for gathering necessary information. In most cases copies of municipal and municipal department budgets were obtained directly from the city clerks; these documents were also on file at the Municipal Audit Division of the Montana Department of Intergovernmental Relations in Helena. These budgets, supplemented by information obtained directly from survey respondents, provided the basis for the analysis of practices and procedures concerning financing of recreation and park services contained in Chapter IV.


Studies Related in Method

Several studies which were related in method were reviewed during the planning of this study. These studies were of value in designing the survey instrument and in determining the methods of data analysis for this study. All of these studies were concerned, at least partially, with various aspects of administration and/or financing of municipal recreation and park services, however only one of the studies dealt with Montana municipalities.

"An Analysis of Community Recreation Offerings in Montana Cities and Towns" prepared by the University of Montana Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, was primarily an inventory of municipal recreation programs and facilities, however it did provide limited information concerning the department organization for recreation services in Montana municipalities. This study identified the type of municipal department organization responsible for public recreation services in twelve of the thirteen municipalities included in this study.

Three studies which utilized a questionnaire for collecting data regarding the administration and/or financing of municipal recreation and park services provided information regarding survey methodology. Singh conducted a survey of twelve municipal operations in Illinois. The survey instrument used was designed to collect information regarding

---


municipal department organization for recreation services, department personnel and sources of financing for public recreation services. Heeb\textsuperscript{6} surveyed recreation commissions in Kansas. The questionnaire used for the survey requested information concerning the composition, policies, practices, and financing of recreation commissions in Kansas. Mallory\textsuperscript{7} surveyed selected municipalities in Ohio on the topic of administrative structure and practices related to community recreation. The survey instruments utilized for the aforementioned studies were reviewed during the process of designing the questionnaire used for this study.

Other related studies analyzed data from source documents concerning municipal recreation and park administration and/or financing. Reviewing these studies suggested general methods of data analysis relevant to this study. Mrachek\textsuperscript{8} analyzed per capita expenditures for recreation services in five Colorado municipalities in order to compare the level of public support for community recreation in those cities. Kohler\textsuperscript{9} analyzed data from township budgets and annual reports for twelve Pennsylvania townships in order to describe major aspects of financing local public recreation services. This study focused on sources of


\textsuperscript{7}William G. Mallory, "The Administration of Community Recreation" (Master's thesis, Bowling Green State University, 1958).


\textsuperscript{9}Donald L. Kohler, "Financing Local Public Recreation in the Larger First Class Townships in Pennsylvania" (Master's thesis, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania).
revenue for supporting local public recreation services, public expenditures for recreation services and methods of budgeting for recreation services. MacDonald’s\textsuperscript{10} descriptive study of administrative structure and practices in California Park Districts was based on data from annual reports and other source documents and on information obtained through personal interviews with administrative personnel.

\textbf{Recreation and Park Literature and Publications}

Much of the literature in the field of recreation and parks discussed general principles, patterns and trends in various aspects of the administration and financing of municipal recreation and park services in the United States. The purpose of this section is to summarize the information contained in recreation and park literature regarding the administration and financing of municipal recreation and park services. Such information provided a basis for understanding and examining specific administrative and fiscal practices in Montana municipalities and for comparing practices and procedures in Montana municipalities to national patterns and trends.

\textbf{Administration of Municipal Recreation and Park Services}

In general it was apparent that most authors agreed with the premise that "there is no single pattern by which local government meets its responsibility for recreation service, nor is it necessarily
desirable that there be one."¹¹ Hjelte and Shivers pointed out that "essentially the organizational plan for administration of municipal recreation and park services depends on local conditions."¹² Factors which may have a significant effect on the type of municipal agency vested with responsibility for administering recreation and/or park services include: 1) state enabling legislation, 2) legal restraints and local bias affecting municipal agencies' ability to obtain funds, 3) traditional political influences and current political pressures, and 4) established patterns of administrative control of local recreation and park areas and facilities.¹³

Although in actual practice there is a wide variety of forms of administrative structure for municipal recreation and park services, one of the most fundamental issues is combined or consolidated versus separate administration of recreation and park services. In a combined or consolidated administrative structure a single local government agency or department is responsible for both recreation and park services. The most common forms of combined administration include:

1. A single municipal department established solely for the purpose of administering recreation and park services;

2. Administration of municipal recreation services by a previously established park department;


3. Administration of municipal recreation and park services by local school districts.¹⁴

In municipalities with separate administrative structure, responsibilities for recreation and park services are divided between two different local government agencies or departments. Examples include:

1. A municipal recreation department and a municipal park department;

2. Administration of recreation services by local school districts while park services are administered by a municipal park department.¹⁵

There are several major advantages and disadvantages commonly associated with combined and separate administration of municipal recreation and park services. In support of combined administration of recreation and park services Bucher and Bucher pointed out that since park and recreation functions are so closely interrelated it is much more efficient to administer them together.¹⁶ More than thirty years ago Hjelte commented on this same consideration:

As parks are more liberally interpreted as recreation places and as municipal park authorities depart from the traditional view that the function of a park department is only to preserve and enhance the beauty of the natural landscape, the two branches of municipal government will tend to be merged.¹⁷

Hjelte went on to suggest that combined administration of recreation and park services tends to minimize controversy between separate park and recreation agencies, eliminates unnecessary duplication of services, and

¹⁴Ibid., p. 94. ¹⁵Ibid.


encourages development of comprehensive and diversified recreation and park programs. On the other hand, it has been pointed out that separate administration of recreation and park services focuses greater attention on the specific functions in each individual area. With separate recreation and park departments, each department has a single primary concern, funds administered by the department are used solely for that concern and it is more likely that department personnel will be selected with specific attention to the most appropriate qualifications.

In addition to discussing various administrative alternatives, much of the literature summarized national patterns and trends in municipal administration of recreation and park services. The 1970 Local Agency Survey conducted by the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) of 1,119 local park and recreation agencies found that 66 percent of the local agencies administered both recreation and park services jointly; 21 percent of the agencies administered either recreation or park services only. Hjelte and Shivers observed that "during the past few years there has been an unmistakable trend toward more effective organization and integration of the several functions of municipal government ..." Although separate administration of recreation and

18 Ibid., p. 61-64.  19 Ibid., p. 60
20 Bucher and Bucher, Recreation for Today's Society, p. 166.
22 Hjelte and Shivers, Public Administration of Recreational Services, p. 67.
park services is still a common practice, "it is apparent that there has been a clear trend in the direction of merging local park and recreation services under a single authority."23

Another important issue related to the administration of municipal recreation and park services concerns independent administrative boards and commissions. Although most municipal recreation and/or park departments have an independent policy-making board or commission to which they are responsible,24 in many cases the individual department head is directly responsible to either the mayor and city council or to the city manager. In discussing these two alternatives Meyer and Brightbill stated that the former is generally "favored by professional recreation people" while "students and experts on total municipal government" tend to favor the latter. The major advantages of an independent board or commission are: 1) through overlapping terms of membership a board provides greater continuity of policy, 2) a board places responsibility in a group of interested citizens rather than in a more remote mayor, and 3) board members better reflect and influence public opinion. On the other hand it has been suggested that a single administrator is better able to 1) act more promptly and efficiently than a board, 2) exercise more adequate control over personnel selection, and 3) encourage inter-agency municipal cooperation. In addition,


"with a single administrator, it is easier to place responsibility."\textsuperscript{25}

In 1970 the NRPA Local Agency Survey reported that 45 percent of the agencies administering municipal recreation and/or park services were responsible to an independent policy-making board or commission.\textsuperscript{26}

Butler summarized specific patterns related to practices of independent recreation and/or park boards as follows:

Boards of five members are most numerous, although others with from three to seven members are not uncommon; terms of members generally overlap and run from three to five years—seldom for a longer period.\textsuperscript{27}

In most cases board members are appointed by the mayor, however in several states with independent park districts members of the park board are elected.\textsuperscript{28} The 1970 NRPA Local Agency Survey reported that for 70 percent of the boards, members were appointed, for 18 percent, members were elected, and for 13 percent, members were selected in some other manner.\textsuperscript{29}

Financing Municipal Recreation and Park Services

As with administrative practices, even the most general aspects of financing municipal recreation and park services are highly dependent upon local conditions. Major factors which may influence municipal financing for recreation and park services include: 1) the general


\textsuperscript{26}"Local Parks and Recreation," Parks and Recreation, p. 19.

\textsuperscript{27}Butler, Introduction to Community Recreation, p. 504.

\textsuperscript{28}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{29}"Local Parks and Recreation," Parks and Recreation, p. 19.
financial condition of the municipality, 2) limitations imposed by the legal tax structure, 3) peculiar needs of the community, 4) level of voluntary community support for recreation and park services, 5) the availability and ownership of recreation and park areas and facilities, 6) extent of recreational opportunities other than those provided by the municipality, and 7) the prevailing costs of personnel, services and supplies. 30

Noting the number of variables which may effect the level of funding required to provide a comprehensive system of recreation and park services, Carlson, Deppe and MacLean stated:

In 1952 the Athletic Institute staged a Nationwide Recreation Workshop in which participants confirmed the generally accepted standard that $6.00 per capita is needed to provide a comprehensive recreation program . . . . Most planners believe that a minimum of $10.00 per capita is a more realistic figure. 31

Unfortunately, in terms of actual per capita expenditures for recreation and park services, current data were very sketchy. The 1970 NRPA Local Agency Survey reported per capita operating expenditures for recreation and park services for only eleven selected cities. Per capita expenditures in these cities ranged from $4.93 to $17.78 and averaged $10.96, 32 however these data gave no indication of national averages or trends.

______________________________


31 Carlson, Deppe and MacLean, Recreation in American Life, p. 104.

Although it is difficult to determine the current applicability of his observations and conclusions, it was interesting to note that in 1966 Butler found that the level of financing for recreation and park services in most municipalities was well below the suggested per capita expenditures. Based on expenditures reported in the 1961 Recreation and Park Yearbook only 6 percent of reporting cities spent $8.00 or more per capita, 14 percent spent $6.00 or more per capita and 86 percent spent less than $6.00 per capita.\textsuperscript{33}

In addition to per capita expenditures, which indicate the total level of financial support, the NRPA Local Agency Survey reported the overall distribution between capital outlay and operating expenditures by recreation and park managing authorities. In 1970, 70 percent of all expenditures by recreation and park managing authorities were for operating expenses while 30 percent went for capital outlays. In that year 75 percent of operating expenditures were for salaries and wages, and 25 percent for maintenance and operation. Expenditures for land acquisition comprised 33 percent of the total capital outlay and 67 percent went for construction and improvement.\textsuperscript{34}

Two significant trends related to certain municipal recreation expenditures were observed by Butler.

One is the increase in capital outlays, reflecting the marked expansion in recreation areas and facilities and structures. The other is the mounting total spent for leadership as a result of the growing recognition of the importance of employing qualified recreation leaders.\textsuperscript{35}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{33} Butler, Introduction to Community Recreation, p. 536.
\item \textsuperscript{34} "Local Parks and Recreation," Parks and Recreation, p. 21.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Butler, Introduction to Community Recreation, p. 534.
\end{itemize}
Sources of revenue was the second major aspect of financing municipal recreation and park services discussed in recreation and park literature and publications. In 1936 Hjelte found that by far the most important source of revenue for supporting municipal recreation and park services was general property tax levies. Figures reported in the 1970 Local Agency Survey supported the conclusion that municipal property tax appropriations continue to be the major source of revenue for financing public recreation and park services. According to that survey, 75 percent of all funds received by recreation and park managing authorities came from local public appropriations, 11 percent from state aid and grants, 5 percent from federal aid and grants, 5 percent from fees and charges and 4 percent from private donations, concessions and other sources.

In general, major sources of revenue for current operating costs of municipal recreation and park services include municipal property taxes, special park and recreation taxes and, to a lesser extent, fees and charges. Major sources of revenue for capital expenditures include funds from bond issues, special assessment taxes and gifts and donations.

Butler observed trends related to three specific aspects of financing municipal recreation and park services. In the area of revenue for land and improvements, there has been a recent trend toward increased financial assistance from federal programs and agencies and "a still greater expansion can be expected in the years ahead . . ." Butler

---

37 "Local Parks and Recreation," Parks and Recreation, p. 20.
38 Butler, Introduction to Community Recreation, p. 529.
also pointed out that "the need and justification for the special recreation tax have diminished as recreation has gained wide acceptance as an essential governmental function."\(^{39}\) Finally, Butler observed a significant trend in regard to fees and charges as a source of revenue for municipal recreation and park services. Although he concluded that in general fees and charges have not been successful on a money-making basis, he observed that "the number of agencies reporting receipts from fees and charges has increased considerably, and there has been an appreciable increase in the ratio of receipts from these sources to the total amounts made available for recreation."\(^{40}\)

\(^{39}\)Ibid., p. 530.  \(^{40}\)Ibid., p. 532.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

This study was concerned with describing and identifying patterns related to administration and financing of recreation and park services in major Montana municipalities. The discussion of procedures followed in completing this study is divided into three sections: study design, sources and procedures for collecting data, and organization and analysis of the data. The section on study design describes the preliminary procedures followed in preparation for data collection. These preliminary procedures included the method used to identify municipalities which met the criterion for inclusion in this study, an outline of the data to be compiled for each municipality, and preparations for data collection. The section dealing with sources and procedures for collecting data describes the methods and procedures used to gather related information. The final section of this chapter describes the methods used to organize, analyze and present the data.

Study Design

The first tasks in completing this study involved developing specific procedures for implementing various aspects of the overall study design. This study was confined to Montana municipalities which employed a full-time administrator for public recreation and/or park services.
In order to determine which municipalities met this criterion for inclusion in the study a comprehensive list of major Montana municipalities was compiled and then the city clerk from each was contacted by telephone. On the basis of information provided by the city clerks, municipalities that did not employ a full-time recreation and/or park administrator were eliminated from the list. The thirteen municipalities which met the criterion for inclusion in this study were Billings, Great Falls, Missoula, Butte, Helena, Bozeman, Havre, Kalispell, Anaconda, Miles City, Lewistown, Glendive and Glasgow.

A second preliminary task was to determine the specific type of data necessary for inclusion in this study. In general, the scope of this study was limited to administration and financing of municipal recreation and park services, however it was necessary to further delineate the specific data to be collected in each of these areas. At the same time additional related information necessary to analyze and interpret data in these areas was identified. Following is an outline of the data collected for each municipality:

A. General Municipal Information
   1. Population
      a. Municipal
      b. County
   2. City classification
   3. Form of municipal government
   4. Municipal finance
      a. Sources of revenue for financing municipal government services
      b. 1973-74 municipal budget

B. Administration of Municipal Recreation and Park Services
   1. Type of administrative authority
      a. Number of members
      b. Year of establishment
      c. Advisory boards
2. Municipal department organization
3. Recreation and park department personnel
   a. Type and number of personnel positions
   b. Salary

C. Financing Municipal Recreation and Park Services
   1. 1973-74 department budget
   2. Sources of revenue
   3. Revenue generated through recreation and park services

In addition to the aforementioned it was also necessary to
develop specific strategies for collecting information regarding the
financing of municipal recreation and park services. In particular, the
bases for data analysis had to be determined prior to data collection in
order to insure the gathering of comparable data from each municipality.
Because there is no uniform system for itemizing either municipal or
department budgets in Montana a classification scheme for data concerning
sources of revenue and budgeted expenditures was developed. The fol-
lowing categories were established for classifying sources of revenue for
financing municipal recreation and park services:

   1. Municipal appropriations
      a. Municipal general fund
      b. Revenue sharing funds
      c. Special improvement district funds
   2. County appropriations
   3. School district appropriations
   4. Gifts, bequests and donations
   5. State aid and grants
   6. Federal aid
      a. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
      b. Model Cities Program

Ten categories were established for classifying expenditures budgeted
for municipal recreation and park services:
1. Salaries, wages and benefits  
2. Administrative supplies and expenses  
3. Land acquisition  
4. Park maintenance and improvement  
5. Park development  
6. Facility construction  
7. Facility maintenance  
8. Facility rental  
9. Recreation equipment and supplies  
10. Taxes and miscellaneous expenditures  

Sources and Procedures for Collecting Data

Data collection for this study was carried out in two phases. The first phase was a detailed examination of reference works, public records and documents and previous studies of Montana municipal recreation and park services. General information concerning Montana municipalities and municipal government, administration of municipal services and administrative structure for recreation and park services was obtained via a systematic review of documents, records and related publications. Individual municipal budgets, on file in the office of the Municipal Audit Division of the Department of Intergovernmental Relations, were a source of general information regarding municipal finance and sources of revenue for financing municipal services as well as specific information regarding the financing of recreation and park services in each of the municipalities under consideration. The 1973-74 recreation and park department budgets contained itemized expenditure data which were recorded according to the classification system developed for this study.

Certain necessary data were not available from public records and documents; such data could be supplied only by the individual municipal
recreation and park departments. Therefore, the second phase of data collection involved planning and conducting a survey of recreation and park department administrators. A self-administered questionnaire, mailed to recreation and park department administrators, was used for this survey because it was considerably less costly than either personal or telephone interviews. In general, the most common disadvantage of a mail survey is low response rates. However, for this study, it was assumed that respondents would have a high degree of interest in the subject matter and would therefore be more willing to participate. In the course of conducting the survey this assumption proved accurate: many respondents expressed particular interest in the study and an overall response rate of 90 percent was achieved.

The first step in carrying out the survey was the development of a data collecting instrument. Questionnaires and instruments used in similar studies conducted in other states were examined prior to drafting the questionnaire for this study. Reviewing other questionnaires provided suggestions for question wording and questionnaire format. Following the outline of data necessary for this study, the final version of the questionnaire was comprised of five sections. The first section asked for general information about the individual municipality. The second, third and fourth sections requested specific information regarding municipal recreation and park administration, financing, facilities and programs. In the final section respondents were asked to provide additional information concerning state and federal assistance for municipal recreation and park services. The final version of the questionnaire was six pages in length and contained fifteen questions
with subparts. Appendices B and C contain a copy of the questionnaire and cover letter.

Due to the fact that this was a survey of the entire population of full-time recreation and park administrators in the municipalities included in this study, it was not possible to conduct a formal pretest of the instrument. Since the entire population numbered only twenty, a pretest sample would have exhausted too great a proportion of the main study population. Alternatively, the instrument was not amenable to pretesting outside the main study population because many of the questions, specifically designed to collect data from Montana municipalities, would not have been applicable to out-of-state respondents. In lieu of a formal pretest several professionals in the field of recreation and park administration and education reviewed the instrument; their suggestions and comments were incorporated into the final version of the questionnaire.

The second step in carrying out this survey was to identify eligible respondents. Names, addresses and telephone numbers for each of the recreation and park department administrators in municipalities selected were obtained from the Montana Park and Recreation Association. The total sample included twenty full-time municipal recreation and park department administrators in the thirteen municipalities included in this study.

As stated, the primary purpose of conducting this survey was to collect data not available from other sources. The survey was also designed to accomplish a secondary purpose. Since portions of the data necessary for the completion of this study had already been collected
from public records and documents this survey provided an opportunity to have respondents verify and, if necessary, correct and/or update the data. Therefore, prior to mailing the questionnaire, data which had already been collected were filled out in the appropriate sections. In the instructions accompanying the questionnaire respondents were asked to complete blank portions of the questionnaire and, if appropriate, to make additions or corrections to data that were supplied.

The first mailing to respondents for this survey was sent out during the last week of August, 1974. Each respondent received a cover letter, explaining the nature of the research and the purpose of the study, the questionnaire and a stamped, pre-addressed envelope for returning the completed questionnaire. Four weeks after this mailing all non-respondents were contacted by telephone. The purpose of the telephone reminder was to find out whether the questionnaire had been received and, if so, whether respondents planned to complete and return it. A second cover letter, questionnaire and return envelope were sent to two respondents who indicated that they had not received the first mailing. During the same time period telephone follow-ups were conducted with respondents who had returned the questionnaire but had failed to answer all the questions. In this way important missing information was obtained either from the respondent or from a knowledgeable staff assistant. Overall, eighteen out of twenty respondents completed and returned the questionnaire for a final response rate of 90 percent.
Organization and Analysis of the Data

For the most part, data collected for this study consisted of quantifiable information concerning the administration and financing of recreation and park services in thirteen Montana municipalities. Data collected from public records and documents and from the survey of municipal recreation and park department administrators were recorded in tables prepared for that purpose. Frequency distributions and simple cross tabulations for selected variables were then computed by hand.

In most cases data were organized and presented in tables indicating the response to each survey question from each municipality. In the few instances where it was more appropriate, data from all municipalities were presented in a summary format.

Two methods were used in analyzing the data. First, raw data were analyzed for the purpose of identifying and describing existing practices and procedures in administering and financing recreation and park services and facilities in each of the municipalities. Patterns in specific areas of municipal recreation and park service administration and financing were identified and discussed on the basis of the frequency distributions for the related variables.

Because the municipalities included in this study ranged in size from Billings, with a population of 61,581, to Glasgow, with a population of 4,700, raw data and frequency distributions did not provide consistent bases for comparing many aspects of municipal recreation and park services. In order to establish a comparable data base for all municipalities raw data were converted to percentage or per capita figures wherever possible. These data were also presented in tables and provided
the bases for comparative discussions of specific practices and procedures in the municipalities included in the study.
CHAPTER IV

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCING OF MUNICIPAL
RECREATION AND PARK SERVICES

The purpose of this study was to provide a comprehensive summary of the administration and financing of public recreation and park services in selected Montana municipalities. Factual information concerning administrative structure and practices and financing for public recreation and park services was collected from the thirteen cities in the state which employed a full time recreation or park administrator. In this chapter the data that were collected are presented and discussed in order to describe practices and procedures and to identify patterns related to these major areas of recreation and park services in the municipalities included in this study.

The Municipalities

Thirteen Montana municipalities met the criterion for inclusion in this study. They were Billings, Great Falls, Missoula, Butte, Helena, Bozeman, Havre, Kalispell, Anaconda, Miles City, Lewistown, Glendive and Glasgow. Geographically, these cities are located throughout the state. (Appendix A details the location of each municipality included in the study.)

In terms of total municipal population, these cities included thirteen of the fourteen largest cities in the state. In terms of city
classification\textsuperscript{1} all first class cities, all but one second class city and the largest third class city in the state were included in this study. Table 1 indicates the total population for each city and for

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Municipal Population, City Classification and County Population, by City}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
City & Municipal Population & City Classification & County Population \\
\hline
Billings & 61,581 & First class & 87,367 \\
Great Falls & 60,091 & First class & 81,804 \\
Missoula & 29,497 & First class & 58,263 \\
Butte & 23,368 & First class & 41,981 \\
Helena & 22,730 & First class & 33,281 \\
Bozeman & 18,670 & First class & 32,505 \\
Havre & 10,558 & First class & 17,358 \\
Kalispell & 10,526 & First class & 39,460 \\
Anaconda & 9,771 & Second class & 15,652 \\
Miles City & 9,023 & Second class & 12,174 \\
Lewistown & 6,437 & Second class & 12,611 \\
Glendive & 6,305 & Second class & 11,269 \\
Glasgow & 4,700 & Third class & 11,471 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}


\textsuperscript{1}Montana statutes classify cities on the basis of population as follows:

\begin{itemize}
\item First class city \hspace{2cm} 10,000 or more
\item Second class city \hspace{2cm} 5,000 - 10,000
\item Second or third class city \hspace{2cm} 5,000 - 7,500
\item Third class city \hspace{2cm} 1,000 - 5,000
\item Third class city or town \hspace{2cm} 1,000 - 2,500
\item Town \hspace{2cm} 300 - 1,000
\item May not incorporate \hspace{2cm} Less than 300
\end{itemize}
the county in which it is located and the city classification for each municipality which met the criterion for inclusion in this study.

**Administration of Municipal Recreation and Park Services**

In Montana there were two distinct levels of administration for municipal recreation and park services: the administrative board or commission, and the municipal recreation and/or park department. In terms of final administrative authority for recreation and park services, municipalities included in this survey had two basic options. In the majority of the municipalities included in this study an independent administrative board or boards had final authority for setting policy and for supervising recreation and park services. In other municipalities the city council or city commission performed this function directly. The second aspect of administration of public recreation and park services was the municipal department of recreation and/or parks responsible for executing policies set by the administrative authority and for directing the daily operation of recreation and park services, programs and facilities.

**Forms of Municipal Government and Administrative Authority for Recreation and Park Services**

The form of government under which a municipality operated had implications for the administration of recreation and park services within the municipality. The term "form of municipal government" refers to the statutory provisions regarding the structure, powers of and restrictions on municipal government. Specifically, the Montana
legislature has provided for three forms of municipal government: the mayor-council plan, the commission plan, and the commission-manager plan. Eleven of the thirteen municipalities included in this study operated under the mayor-council form of government; Helena and Bozeman had adopted the commission-manager form of government.

Under the mayor-council plan the city council is composed of aldermen elected from established wards within the city. The mayor is elected at large and is the chief executive officer of the municipality. In mayor-council cities, administrative duties related to recreation and park services may be delegated to an independent policy making and administrative board or boards not directly responsible to the mayor. In the absence of such an independent administrative board, the mayor may appoint, with the consent of the council, a park superintendent and/or recreation director. In ten of the eleven municipalities which operated under the mayor-council form of government an independent board or boards was responsible for administrative duties and policies related to recreation and park services. In only one of the mayor-council cities Kalispell, was the administration of recreation and park services a direct function of the city council; both the park superintendent and the recreation director were appointed by the mayor with the consent of the city council.

Under the commission-manager plan members of the city commission are elected at large.

In a Commission-Manager city the commission is the governing body of the municipality and determines the broad policies of the local government . . . and appoints the city manager. The manager appoints all other city officials and department heads, all of whom serve at his
pleasure... Five departments are established by statute... Department of Law, Department of Public Welfare, Department of Public Safety, Department of Finance. The directors of the departments are appointed by, responsible to, and removable by the city manager.2

In these cities the administration of public recreation and park services may be a function of the department of public service or a direct function of the city commission.

In the two commission-manager cities included in this study, the administration of recreation services was a direct function of the city commission. In Helena, the administration of park services was delegated to the City-County Planning Board. Table 2 shows the form of municipal government and the type of municipal administrative authority responsible for recreation and park services for each municipality included in this study.

Independent Administrative Boards

Montana statutes provide specifically for two types of administrative boards for managing municipal recreation and/or park services: 1) a board of park commissioners, and 2) a board of recreation. First and second class cities may create a board of park commissioners to supervise municipal recreation and/or park services.3 A board of park commissioners must be composed of seven members: the mayor, plus six others who are appointed by the mayor with the approval of the city council or commission. Board members are appointed for two year terms.

---

3 Montana, Revised Codes, Annotated, Title 62, Chapter 2.
TABLE 2

FORM OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY FOR
RECREATION AND PARK SERVICES, BY CITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Form of Municipal Government</th>
<th>Administrative Authority for Recreation and Park Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Board of Park Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Board of Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Board of Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Board of Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>Commission-Manager</td>
<td>City Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>Commission-Manager</td>
<td>City Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havre</td>
<td>Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Board of Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalispell</td>
<td>Mayor-Council</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda</td>
<td>Mayor-Council</td>
<td>City-County Park Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Board of Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewistown</td>
<td>Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Board of Park Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendive</td>
<td>Mayor-Council</td>
<td>County Park and Recreation Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Board of Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and qualifications for board members are the same as for mayor. The
board is required to meet at least once a month and members receive no
compensation other than reimbursement for actual expenses.

State law also specifies that any city, town, school district
or board of park commissioners may delegate its authority to operate a
program of public recreation and playgrounds to a board of recreation.
The law makes no provision for the number of members, method of appoint-
ment, terms of office, qualifications or meetings for such a board of
recreation and its members.
Table 3 indicates the title of the administrative board or boards, the number of members and the year in which the board was established for each municipality with an independent administrative board for recreation and park services. Ten of the thirteen municipalities included in this study had created independent administrative boards for recreation and/or park services. However only three municipalities had created a board of park commissioners and/or a board of

TABLE 3

TITLE, NUMBER OF MEMBERS AND YEAR OF ESTABLISHMENT FOR INDEPENDENT ADMINISTRATIVE BOARDS, BY CITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
<th>Year of Establishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>Board of Park Commissioners 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Recreation 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>Board of Parks and Recreation 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>Board of Parks and Recreation 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>Board of Recreation 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havre</td>
<td>Board of Parks and Recreation 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda</td>
<td>City-County Park Board 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Recreation 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>Board of Parks and Recreation 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewistown</td>
<td>Board of Park Commissioners 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Council 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendive</td>
<td>Dawson County Park and Recreation Board 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Board 10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aData unavailable.
recreation as provided in Montana statutes. Seven of the ten municipalities had established other types of administrative boards for recreation and/or park services. Five of the seven cities had created a single board of parks and recreation; in the other two municipalities authority for administration of recreation and park services was delegated to a county or to a joint city-county board.

The number of members of independent administrative boards ranged from a high of twelve to a low of four, however, the majority of these boards were composed of from six to nine members.

The Great Falls Board of Parks and Recreation had been in continuous operation the longest; it was created in 1901. The most recently created board, the Anaconda City-County Park Board, was established in 1973.

Separate Versus Consolidated Administrative Authority

Four of the municipalities included in this study had separate administrative authorities for recreation and for park services. Referring to table 3 it can be seen that Billings and Lewistown had created two independent administrative boards: a board of park commissioners and a board of recreation. In Anaconda recreation services were administered by an independent municipal board while administrative authority for park services was vested in a city-county park board. Helena had delegated administrative responsibility for park services to the city-county planning board; administrative authority for recreation services was a direct function of the city commission.
In the nine remaining municipalities recreation and park services were the responsibility of a single administrative authority. Six of these nine municipalities had created an independent board to administer recreation and park services. In two of these nine municipalities administrative authority for recreation and park services was a direct function of the city council or commission. In one municipality administration of recreation and park services was the responsibility of a county park and recreation board.

Advisory Boards

Montana statutes made no provision for creating advisory boards to the board of park commissioners or the board of recreation, however in four municipalities the administrative authority for recreation and/or park services established an advisory council on their own authority. In Bozeman a Community Recreation Board was established in 1973 and was composed of twelve members including city and county residents and representatives from the school districts. The advisory council to the Anaconda City-County Park Board was created in 1974. It was composed of seven members appointed by the city council and by the county commission. The Dawson County Park and Recreation Board established an advisory council in 1972. The fourteen members of this council were appointed by various public agencies: the city council, county commission, school districts, and college representatives. Finally, the advisory council to the Glasgow Parks and Recreation Board was created in 1970. Members were recommended by board members and appointed by the city council.
Municipal Recreation and Park Departments

Throughout this study the term "department organization" is used to refer to the municipal agency or agencies responsible for executing policies set by the administrative authority and for directing the daily operation of recreation and park services, programs and facilities. In Montana municipalities policies and procedures related to department organization for the administration of public recreation and park services were determined solely by the individual municipalities.

Table 4 shows the type of administrative authority and the type of department organization for recreation and park services for each municipality. In eight of the municipalities responsibility for recreation and park services was divided between two separate departments. In the five remaining municipalities administration of recreation and park services was the responsibility of a single consolidated department. Although department organization was not necessarily related directly to the type of administrative authority, all of the cities with separate administrative boards for recreation and for park services also had separate departments for recreation and for park services. Five of the seven municipalities with a single administrative board operated with a single department of parks and recreation. All of the municipalities with no independent administrative board for recreation and park services had separate department organizations for recreation and for park services.

In twelve of the thirteen municipalities included in this study a municipal department was created to be solely responsible for either
## TABLE 4

**TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY AND DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION FOR RECREATION AND PARK SERVICES, BY CITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Administrative Authority</th>
<th>Department Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two Separate Independent Administrative Boards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>Board of Park Commissioners</td>
<td>Park Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Recreation</td>
<td>Recreation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda</td>
<td>City-County Park Board</td>
<td>Park Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Recreation</td>
<td>Recreation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewistown</td>
<td>Board of Park Commissioners</td>
<td>Park Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Council</td>
<td>Recreation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single Independent Administrative Board</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>Board of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Park Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>Board of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Department of Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>Board of Recreation</td>
<td>Department of Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havre</td>
<td>Board of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Department of Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>Board of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Park Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendive</td>
<td>County Park and Recreation Board</td>
<td>City Engineer's Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City-County Recreation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Board of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Department of Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Independent Administrative Board</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>City-County Planning Board</td>
<td>Park Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Commission</td>
<td>Recreation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>City Commission</td>
<td>Park Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalispell</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Park Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
recreation and/or park services. In Glendive the responsibility for park services was delegated to the City Engineer's Department.

Recreation and Park Department Personnel

The aspects of department personnel considered in this study included the number of full-time and part-time personnel positions by functional category and the salary range for the various personnel positions within each department. In all of the municipalities included in this study the policies and procedures regarding department personnel were established by the administrative authority, after consideration of recommendations submitted by the department.

For the purpose of this study department personnel positions were classified into four categories: administrative, supervisory, leadership and custodial/maintenance. Administrative personnel included the chief administrator of the department, assistants and secretarial and clerical staff. Personnel with major responsibility for supervision of distinct functional areas within the department or of a specific facility or service were classified as supervisory personnel. Leadership personnel included recreation program leaders, activity supervisors and instructors. Custodial/maintenance personnel performed park or facility maintenance duties.

Table 5 shows the number of full-time and part-time personnel positions by functional category for each recreation and/or park department. As one might expect, the five largest municipalities employed

\[\text{Table 5 shows the number of full-time and part-time personnel positions by functional category for each recreation and/or park department.}^4\]  

\[^4\text{Complete data for the municipalities of Great Falls and Kalispell were not available; therefore they were excluded from the discussion in this section.}\]
TABLE 5

NUMBER OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME PERSONNEL POSITIONS BY FUNCTIONAL CATEGORY, BY CITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Supervisory</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Custodial/Maintenance</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT^a PT^b</td>
<td>FT PT</td>
<td>FT PT</td>
<td>FT PT</td>
<td>FT PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>5 1</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>0 11</td>
<td>11 30</td>
<td>18 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0 4</td>
<td>5 8</td>
<td>8 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>11 11</td>
<td>14 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 6</td>
<td>3 0</td>
<td>7 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havre</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 10</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>2 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewistown</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendive</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>0 25</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>2 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>3 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a FT = Full-time personnel positions.
^b PT = Part-time personnel positions.

The greatest number of full-time personnel, ranging from eighteen in Billings to seven in Bozeman. Generally the greatest number of full-time positions was in the custodial/maintenance category, followed by administrative positions. Approximately half of the municipalities included in this study employed one or two full-time supervisory personnel and none of the municipalities employed full-time leadership personnel.
Only three of the municipalities employed part-time personnel in administrative and in supervisory positions. Approximately half of the municipalities employed part-time leadership personnel; the number of such positions per municipality ranged from six to twenty five. As with full-time positions, the greatest number of part-time positions was in the custodial/maintenance category.

Survey respondents were asked to indicate the salary range for each of the full-time personnel positions within their department. Table 6 shows the salary range for each category of personnel position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Position</th>
<th>Annual Salary Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>$15,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>11,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial/Clerical</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Supervisor</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Forman</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial/Maintenance</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the fact that survey respondents were asked to indicate the salary range rather than actual figures for each type of personnel position, it was not possible to compute average salary or salary means for the various types of positions.
in the municipal recreation and park departments. It should be noted that the variations within and between functional categories may have been due to a number of factors outside the scope of this study: job qualifications, number and extent of duties, related factors of municipal finance and total municipal population served. It is interesting however, to observe the large difference in salary range between recreation supervisors and maintenance foremen.

Financing Municipal Recreation and Park Services

Three major aspects of financing public recreation and park services were considered: sources of revenue, revenue generated through recreation and park services and expenditures budgeted for the 1973-74 fiscal year. All financial data discussed in this section was for the 1973-74 fiscal year; July 1, 1973 through June 30, 1974. Except for Table 7, where the total budget for each department in each of the municipalities is shown, the revenue, appropriations, expenditures and budget figures for the cities which have two departments were combined and shown as a total for recreation and park services. In addition, several of the municipalities made appropriations for separate and individual recreation and park facilities and services as well as for the municipal recreation and/or park department. Since these appropriations were administered through the recreation and/or park department they were included in the total combined figures for recreation and park services.
Sources of Revenue

In Montana, property taxes are the primary source of revenue for supporting local government services. Montana municipalities may collect either multiple, specifically authorized levies or a general all-purpose levy. All of the municipalities used the all-purpose levy to finance local government services.

Sources of revenue for financing public recreation and park services and facilities which were available to the municipalities surveyed for this study include: revenue from local property tax levies, revenue from special improvement district levies, funds contributed by the county or school district; revenue from the sale of general obligation and revenue bonds, state and federal grants, and gifts, bequests and donations.

Procedures by which municipal recreation and/or park departments received funds varied according to the source of the funds. Revenue from local property tax levies was appropriated by the city council or commission from the municipal general fund. Montana law permits the creation of special improvement districts and assessment of special improvement district levies in addition to the all-purpose levy, for construction of municipal swimming pools and other recreation facilities. Revenue from special improvement district levies for recreation facilities was deposited directly to the appropriate department account. The county and local school districts may appropriate funds directly to municipal recreation and/or park departments whether or not the department is a city-county or consolidated agency. The city council or commission may issue general obligation or revenue bonds for the purpose
of purchasing and improving lands for public parks and for constructing, furnishing and equipping a variety of recreation facilities. Revenue from municipal bonds is earmarked for the purpose for which the bonds were issued. State assistance to municipal recreation and/or park departments is appropriated directly to the municipal department; federal grant funds may also be appropriated in this manner or they may be appropriated via the municipal general fund. Finally, municipal recreation and park departments were authorized to directly accept gifts, bequests and donations.

Table 7 shows the total budget for recreation and/or park departments included in this study. In order to make comparisons between departments table 7 also shows the total department budgets as a percent of the total municipal general fund budget. In the seven municipalities which had two separate departments these figures ranged from 1.2 to 12.3 percent. In five of the departments the budget for recreation or park services comprised between 1.2 and 4.2 percent of the total municipal general fund budget, and for eight of the departments these figures ranged from 5.7 to 9.5 percent. In the municipalities with two separate departments the budget for recreation departments was proportionately lower than the budget for park departments with the exception of Anaconda, where the budgets for both departments were equal.

Table 8 shows the total combined budget for recreation and park services for each municipality and that total as a percent of the total municipal general fund budget. There was a great deal of variation in these percentage figures, from 28.5 to 6.2 percent, which was, in many cases, due to variations in fiscal reporting procedures among the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Municipal General Fund Budget</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Department Budget</th>
<th>Percent of Municipal General Fund Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>$8,503,283.00</td>
<td>Park Recreation</td>
<td>$633,127.96</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106,162.52</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>5,815,584.00</td>
<td>Park Recreation</td>
<td>359,476.00</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>166,484.00</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>2,936,177.70</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>247,040.00</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>4,757,905.78</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>374,720.32</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>2,193,319.11</td>
<td>Park Recreation</td>
<td>125,324.00</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66,029.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>3,285,160.54</td>
<td>Park Recreation</td>
<td>196,750.00</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71,450.00</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havre</td>
<td>882,780.00</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>79,650.00</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalispell</td>
<td>909,642.00</td>
<td>Parks Recreation</td>
<td>72,438.00</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38,198.00</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda</td>
<td>326,281.00</td>
<td>Park Recreation</td>
<td>31,000.00</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31,000.00</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>1,065,661.00</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>65,685.00</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewistown</td>
<td>644,476.00</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>121,816.17</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendive</td>
<td>545,416.91</td>
<td>Park Recreation</td>
<td>67,300.64</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42,000.00</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>305,799.83</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>87,050.00</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8

MUNICIPAL RECREATION AND PARK BUDGET AS A PERCENT OF MUNICIPAL GENERAL FUND BUDGET, BY CITY -- 1973-74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Municipal General Fund Budget</th>
<th>Municipal Recreation and Park Budget</th>
<th>Percent of Municipal General Fund Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>$8,503,283.00</td>
<td>$739,290.48</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>5,815,584.00</td>
<td>525,960.00</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>2,936,177.70</td>
<td>247,040.00</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>4,757,905.78</td>
<td>374,720.32</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>2,193,319.11</td>
<td>191,353.00</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>3,285,160.54</td>
<td>268,200.00</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havre</td>
<td>882,780.00</td>
<td>79,650.00</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalispell</td>
<td>909,642.00</td>
<td>110,636.00</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda</td>
<td>326,281.00</td>
<td>62,000.00</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>1,065,661.00</td>
<td>65,685.00</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewistown</td>
<td>644,476.00</td>
<td>121,816.17</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendive</td>
<td>545,416.91</td>
<td>109,300.64</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>305,799.83</td>
<td>87,050.00</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...municipalities. For example, depending upon procedures followed in individual municipalities, federal grant monies received by a municipal recreation and/or park department may or may not have been included in the total municipal general fund budget. Although the percentage figures in table 8 are therefore inconsistent as a basis for comparisons between municipalities it is interesting to note that in the six cities...
with the greatest population the total budget for recreation and park services represents a smaller percent of the total municipal general fund budget than for six of the seven municipalities with the least population.

A more consistent basis for comparing municipalities was the per capita appropriation for municipal recreation and park services received from local property tax and special improvement recreation and park district levies. Generally this was the amount that the municipality contributed from its general and special fund revenue sources for recreation and park services. For this reason, these per capita figures provided the most straightforward gauge of the relative level of municipal support for public recreation and park services. Table 9 shows the per capita appropriation for recreation and park services made by each municipality included in this study. Overall the per capita appropriations ranged from $17.28 in Glasgow, to $4.81 in Anaconda. In Glendive and Kalispell the per capita appropriation was $10.91 and $9.56 respectively. The per capita appropriations in the eight remaining municipalities ranged from $5.21 to $7.82.

Unique fiscal practices in Glasgow and Glendive accounted, at least partially, for the relatively high per capita figures in these two municipalities. Revenue generated through public recreation and park services is discussed in greater detail in the following section, however it is an important consideration in understanding the relatively high

---

6 Since the appropriation to the recreation department in Bozeman was for county-wide recreation services it was not possible to compute the per capita appropriation for that municipality.
### Table 9

**PER CAPITA APPROPRIATION FOR RECREATION AND PARK SERVICES, BY CITY — 1973-74**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Per Capita Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>$ 7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havre</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalispell</td>
<td>9.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewistown</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendive</td>
<td>10.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>17.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per capita appropriation in Glasgow. Overall, Glasgow employed the greatest number of fees and charges for recreation programs and, unique to this municipality, the total amount of revenue from this source was appropriated directly back to the recreation and park department. For the 1973-74 fiscal year nearly one half of the municipal appropriation for recreation and park services came directly from fees and charges. In all other municipalities included in this study, revenue from fees and charges was proportionately less and did
not provide such a direct source of revenue for recreation and park departments.

Fiscal practices with regard to recreation and park services in Glendive also varied significantly from those in the other municipalities. Glendive is one of only two municipalities in which a special improvement district for park maintenance had been created. The per capita appropriation for Glendive was figured using the total amount appropriated from the special improvement district fund and from the municipal general fund. It is significant to observe that in both of the cases where the primary source of the municipal appropriation was from sources of revenue other than that from local property tax levies, the per capita appropriation for recreation and park services was substantially higher than for the remaining municipalities.

Table 10 provides an analysis of the amount of revenue received from each source for recreation and park services. Table 11 indicates the percent that the amount from each source of revenue comprised of the total budget for recreation and park services in each municipality included in this study. Municipal general fund appropriations were a major source of revenue for financing recreation and park services in all of the municipalities. In many cases, however, the amount of the municipal general fund appropriation shown in the department and municipal budgets was misleading for the purposes of this analysis. The municipal general fund appropriation included not only funds over which the municipality had discretionary power (revenue from local property tax levies, from fees and charges for recreation programs and activities, and from the federal revenue sharing program)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Municipal General Fund Appropriation</th>
<th>Revenue Sharing</th>
<th>Special Improvement District Funds</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Gifts, Bequests and Donations</th>
<th>State Aid and Grants</th>
<th>Federal Aid</th>
<th>Bureau of Outdoor Recreation</th>
<th>Model Cities Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>$657,233</td>
<td>$25,785</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$56,272</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>420,395</td>
<td>105,365^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$200^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>191,565</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$2,500^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7,050^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>45,925^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>159,272</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$8,000^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>103,724</td>
<td>$103,724</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>148,686</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$29,157</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$510^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>261,200</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7,000^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havre</td>
<td>54,995</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24,655^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalispell</td>
<td>100,636</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10,000^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>10,000^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5,000^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>61,598</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4,087^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewistown</td>
<td>41,583</td>
<td>79,983</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>250^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendive</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>11,250</td>
<td>67,301</td>
<td>29,250</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>81,205</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5,845^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aIn individual department budgets these amounts were included in the total municipal general fund appropriation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Great Falls</th>
<th>Missoula</th>
<th>79.93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal General Fund Appropriation</td>
<td>88.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Sharing Funds</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Improvement District Funds</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts, Bequests and Donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Aid and Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Outdoor Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Cities Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE II**

Revenue for Recreation and Park Services as a Percent of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and Park Budget, by City --- 1973-74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Great Falls</th>
<th>Missoula</th>
<th>79.93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal General Fund Appropriation</td>
<td>88.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Sharing Funds</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Improvement District Funds</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts, Bequests and Donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Aid and Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Outdoor Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Cities Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Great Falls</th>
<th>Missoula</th>
<th>79.93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal General Fund Appropriation</td>
<td>88.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Sharing Funds</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Improvement District Funds</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts, Bequests and Donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Aid and Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Outdoor Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Cities Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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but also funds specifically earmarked for recreation and park services (revenue from special improvement districts, from respective counties and school districts, from gifts, bequests and donations, from state aid and grants and from federal aid and grant programs). In table 10 the municipal general fund appropriation shown in the department budgets was reduced by the total amount of revenue sharing and earmarked funds included in that appropriation. In this way, the figures in table 10 present a more accurate picture in terms of the actual sources of revenue for supporting municipal recreation and park services.

Municipal general fund appropriations were the primary source of revenue for financing recreation and park services in ten of the thirteen municipalities included in this study and was a source of revenue in all of the municipalities. In four municipalities the municipal general fund appropriation provided over 90 percent of the revenue for financing recreation and park services and in nine municipalities funds from this source provided over 75 percent of the revenue for financing recreation and park services. In the three municipalities where municipal general fund appropriations were not the primary source of revenue for financing recreation and park services (Butte, Lewistown, and Glendive) revenue from this source constituted 42.51, 34.14 and 1.37 percent respectively.

Federal aid from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and from the Model Cities Program was the second major source of revenue for financing municipal recreation and park services. During the 1973-74 fiscal year nine of the thirteen municipalities included in this study
received revenue from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and two munici-
palities received revenue under the Model Cities Program. In Butte, federal aid constituted 55.36 percent of the total budget for recrea-
tion and park services. In seven of the nine other municipalities that received federal aid, revenue from this source constituted less than ten percent of the total budget for municipal recreation and park services.

For the purpose of this analysis federal revenue sharing funds were considered separately. Although these funds are from federal grants, municipalities had discretionary power in appropriating them. Federal revenue sharing funds were a source of revenue for financing recreation and park services in five of the municipalities. In Lewistown, federal revenue sharing funds constituted 65.66 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services. In three municipalities revenue from this source constituted between 10 and 20 percent of the total recreation and park budget; in Billings 3.49 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services came from federal revenue sharing funds.

Glendive and Helena were the only municipalities which received revenue from a special improvement park district. Revenue from special funds constituted 61.6 and 15.24 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services in Glendive and Helena respectively.

During the 1973-74 fiscal year only two of the thirteen munici-
palities received revenue for financing recreation and park services from their respective county (Missoula and Glendive) from local school districts (Butte and Anaconda) and from gifts, bequests and donations
(Great Falls and Missoula). In Glendive revenue from the county accounted for 26.76 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services; in Anaconda 8.06 percent of the recreation and park service budget came from the local school district. In all other municipalities revenue from these three sources constituted less than 2.5 percent of the municipal budget for recreation and park services.

State aid was the least common and only a minor source of revenue for financing public recreation and park services in the municipalities included in this study. Only one municipality, Helena, received state aid for recreation and park services and revenue from this source constituted only 0.27 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services.

Revenue Generated Through Public Recreation and Park Services

Revenue generated through public recreation and park services included revenue from fees and charges for recreation and park programs and activities, from concessions, from the lease of park lands, from park land trust funds, and from other miscellaneous sources. In all cities included in this study revenue from these sources was deposited in the municipal general fund. Revenue generated through public recreation and park services was not necessarily appropriated back to municipal recreation and/or park departments and was therefore considered separately in this study rather than as a direct source of revenue for financing recreation and park services.

The amount of revenue generated through recreation and park services depended partially upon the municipal population. The amount
of revenue generated from fees and charges, in particular, also
provided some indication of the policies set by individual munici-
palities regarding the extent and amount of specific fees charged for
recreation programs and activities.

Table 12 shows the amount of revenue generated through recrea-
tion and park services from each source described above. The percent-
age figures in table 13 indicate the proportion that each amount would
have constituted of the total municipal budget for recreation and park
services if the total amount had been appropriated for recreation and
park services. Helena was the only municipality in which no revenue
was generated through public recreation and park services.

Revenue from fees and charges was the primary source of all
revenue generated through recreation and park services; twelve of the
thirteen municipalities received revenue from fees and charges for
recreation programs and activities. In relation to the total budget
for recreation and park services Bozeman, Anaconda and Great Falls
received the greatest amount of revenue from this source: 33.37,
24.19 and 23.82 percent respectively. Six municipalities (Glasgow,
Lewistown, Kalispell, Butte, Havre and Missoula) received between 6
and 12 percent of their total budget for recreation and park services
from recreation and park fees and charges. The three remaining
municipalities received less than 2 percent of their total recreation
and park service budget from fees and charges for recreation and park
programs and activities.

Great Falls, Butte and Glasgow received revenue from conces-
sions while Great Falls, Havre and Glasgow received revenue from the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Fees and Charges</th>
<th>Concessions</th>
<th>Lease of Park Lands</th>
<th>Interest on Park Land Trust</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>125,250</td>
<td>$2,450</td>
<td>$390</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>128,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>35,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>89,500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>91,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havre</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalispell</td>
<td>9,375</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>15,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6,680</td>
<td>6,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewistown</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendive</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Fees and Charges</td>
<td>Concessions</td>
<td>Lease of Park Lands</td>
<td>Interest on Park Land Trust</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>23.82</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>24.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>33.37</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>34.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havre</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalispell</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda</td>
<td>24.19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>10.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewistown</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendive</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lease of park lands. Bozeman was the only municipality to receive revenue from interest on a park land trust fund. Revenue from each of these sources in each municipality amounted to less than 3 percent, and in most cases less than 1 percent, of the total municipal budget for recreation and park services. Revenue generated through recreation and park services from unspecified miscellaneous sources was significant in two of four municipalities. In Miles City and Kalispell 10.17 and 5.97 percent, respectively, of the total budget for recreation and park services came from miscellaneous sources; in Billings and Great Falls less than 0.05 percent of the municipal recreation and park service budget was accounted for by miscellaneous revenue sources.

**Expenditures Budgeted for 1973-74**

Data regarding expenditures budgeted for the 1973-74 fiscal year were collected from three major sources: 1) the official municipal budgets, 2) municipal recreation and/or park department budgets and special municipal account budgets,\(^7\) and 3) data supplied by survey respondents. Because there was no uniform system for itemizing either municipal or department budgets, data from each of these sources were analyzed in order to classify budgeted expenditures into ten major categories as follows:

1. **Salaries, wages and benefits** included the amount budgeted for actual salaries and wages for all department personnel.

---

\(^7\)Special municipal account budgets which were administered by a municipal recreation and/or park department were included in the discussion of financing.
and for employee benefits such as social security and industrial accident insurance.

2. Administrative supplies and expenses included the amounts budgeted for office supplies, postage, telephone, advertising and printing, transportation, subscriptions and dues to professional organizations.

3. Land acquisition included the amount budgeted for purchase of land for public parks and recreation facilities.

4. Park maintenance and improvement included the amounts budgeted for park maintenance equipment (lawn mowers, sprinkler systems, maintenance vehicles, etc.) and supplies (gas and oil, seed fertilizer, etc.) for improving existing park and playground facilities and equipment, and for landscaping and planting.

5. Park development included the amounts budgeted for developing park lands and for purchasing and constructing new park and playground facilities and equipment.

6. Facility construction included the amounts budgeted for construction of all recreation facilities other than park and playground facilities, such as swimming pools, tennis courts, gymnasiums and multi-purpose recreation centers.

7. Facility maintenance included the amounts budgeted for utilities, swimming pool chemical supplies and building repairs.

8. Facility rental included the amounts budgeted for renting facilities from schools, the county or private organizations.
9. **Equipment and supplies for recreation programs** included the amounts budgeted for sports and activity equipment, instructional materials and supplies and clothing.

10. **Taxes and miscellaneous** included the amounts budgeted for taxes and unspecified miscellaneous items.

Table 14 summarizes the budgeted expenditures by category for each municipality included in this study. This table shows the total dollar amount budgeted for each category; table 15 indicates the percentage that that amount constituted of the total amount budgeted for recreation and park services by each municipality. These percentage figures provided a basis for comparing budgeted expenditures in each municipality.

In nine of the eleven municipalities for which data were available the amount budgeted for salaries, wages and benefits constituted the largest percent of all budgeted expenditures. In these nine cities the percent of the total budget for recreation and park services budgeted for salaries, wages and benefits ranged from 39.7 percent in Billings, to 79.1 percent in Helena. In seven municipalities this figure was over 50 percent.

The percent of the total budget allocated for administrative supplies and expenses was highest in Great Falls, 10.9 percent; in three municipalities it ranged from 3.0 to 6.3 percent, and in the remaining seven municipalities the amount budgeted for administrative

---

8 Both municipal and department budgets in Bozeman and Glendive were itemized in such broad categories that it was not possible to break budgeted expenditures down for this analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Buildings</th>
<th>Salaries, Wages, and Benefits</th>
<th>Taxes and Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Facility Maintenance</th>
<th>Facility Construction</th>
<th>Parks Development</th>
<th>Parks Improvement and Acquisition</th>
<th>Supplies and Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>$292,573</td>
<td>$7,585</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$176,779</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$128,789</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>$353,871</td>
<td>$57,196</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>$151,443</td>
<td>$2,035</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>$128,043</td>
<td>$1,330</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalispell</td>
<td>$69,086</td>
<td>$6,975</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewiston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budgeted Expenditures for the 1973-74 Fiscal Year, by City

Table 14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxes and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Equipment and Supplies</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Rental</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Maintenance</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Construction</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Maintenance and Improvement</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Benefits</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewiston</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalispell</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havre</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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supplies and expenses constituted less than 1.2 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services.

Only one municipality, Billings, budgeted funds for recreation and park land acquisition. The amount budgeted for this purpose was 10.8 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services.

Park maintenance and improvement was a major budget category in all municipalities for which data were available. Percentage figures in this category ranged from 4.2 percent in Glasgow to 21.8 percent in Miles City. In five municipalities expenditures for park maintenance and improvement accounted for between 10.0 and 21.8 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services.

Funds were budgeted for park development in six of the eleven municipalities for which data were available. In Butte, park development was the primary expenditure item, and accounted for 53.5 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services. In three of the remaining five municipalities, between 13.0 and 17.5 percent of the total recreation and park service budget was allocated for park development. The amount budgeted for this item was less than 5.0 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services in two of these six municipalities.

Seven municipalities budgeted funds for recreation facility construction. In Lewistown 61.5 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services was budgeted for recreation facility construction, which made this category the primary expenditure item in the 1973-74 fiscal year. In Havre this item accounted for 12.6 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services. Less
than 6.5 percent of the total recreation and park service budget was
allocated for recreation facility construction in the five remaining
municipalities.

Facility maintenance was an important budget category in all
municipalities for which data were available. In four municipalities
the amount allocated for facility maintenance ranged from 9.0 to 13.0
percent of the total budget for recreation and park services. In the
remaining municipalities this figure ranged from 5.6 to 0.5 percent.

Facility rental was a budget item in three municipalities. In
Havre, Billings and Missoula 4.0, 0.5 and 0.4 percent, respectively,
of the total budget for recreation and park services was budgeted for
facility rental.

Ten of the eleven municipalities for which data were available
budgeted for equipment and supplies for recreation programs. This
item constituted less than 3 percent of the total recreation and park
service budget in eight municipalities. Anaconda and Havre allocated
16.1 and 6.5 percent respectively, of the total budget for recreation
and park services for equipment and supplies for recreation programs.

Five municipalities budgeted for taxes and unspecified
miscellaneous expenditures. This category was a relatively minor one
in all but two cities, Miles City and Glasgow, where the amounts
budgeted for taxes and miscellaneous expenditures constituted 13.1
and 10.6 percent, respectively, of the total budget for recreation
and park services.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Data collected for this study were analyzed in order to describe practices and procedures and to identify patterns related to major aspects of administration and financing of public recreation and park services in selected Montana municipalities. To meet the criterion for inclusion in this study each municipality employed a full-time recreation and/or park administrator. The thirteen municipalities from which data were collected for this study were located throughout the state and included thirteen of the fourteen largest cities in the state.

Administration of Municipal Recreation and Park Services

Administration of municipal recreation and park services in the cities included in this study involved two distinct levels of authority. The first level was the municipal agency with final administrative authority for recreation and park services. In ten of the thirteen municipalities final authority for recreation and park services was delegated to one or more independent administrative boards; in three municipalities the city council or commission administered public recreation and park services directly.

In nine of the thirteen municipalities, administration of recreation and park services was the responsibility of a single agency.
Recreation and park services were administered separately, by two different agencies, in four of the municipalities included in this study.

The second level of administration of municipal recreation and park services involved the municipal departments responsible for executing policies set by the administrative authority and for directing the daily operation of recreation and park services, programs and facilities. The four municipalities with separate administrative boards for recreation and for park services had also created separate municipal departments for recreation and for park services. Overall, eight of the thirteen municipalities had separate department organizations for supervising recreation and park services; in five of the municipalities a single department had responsibility for both recreation and park services.

For the purpose of this study municipal recreation and park department personnel positions were analyzed in terms of four functional categories: administrative, supervisory, leadership and custodial/maintenance. In general the municipalities with the greatest population employed more full-time personnel than did cities with less population, however, several of the smaller municipalities employed a greater number of part-time personnel than did the larger cities. Overall, the greatest number of personnel positions, both full-time and part-time, was in the custodial/maintenance category, followed by administrative positions.

Financing Municipal Recreation and Park Services

Data regarding three major aspects of financing municipal recreation and park services were analyzed in this study. These aspects
included sources of revenue, revenue generated through recreation and park services and expenditures budgeted for the 1973-74 fiscal year.

In order to compare the relative level of financing for recreation and park services in the municipalities included in this study, department budgets were examined in relation to the total municipal general fund budget. In nine of the thirteen municipalities the total recreation and park budget comprised from 6 to 13 percent of the municipal general fund budget. In the other four municipalities the recreation and park budget ranged between 19 and 29 percent of the municipal general fund budget.

Per capita appropriations were also used to compare the level of financial support for recreation and park services in the municipalities included in this study. Overall per capita appropriations ranged from $17.28 to $4.81. In the majority of cities however, the per capita appropriation ranged from $7.82 to $5.21.

Generally, the primary source of revenue for supporting municipal recreation and park services in the cities surveyed was revenue from local property taxes which departments received through municipal appropriation. In nine of the thirteen municipalities included in this study over 75 percent of the revenue for financing recreation and park services came from municipal general fund appropriations. Federal aid was the only other consistently significant source of revenue for financing municipal recreation and park services. A total of ten municipalities received direct federal grants while the three remaining municipalities received federal funds indirectly through the Revenue Sharing Program.
The most important source of revenue generated through recreation and park services was from fees and charges for recreation programs and activities. Twelve of the thirteen municipalities included in this study received revenue from recreation and park fees and charges. In seven of these twelve municipalities revenue generated from fees and charges approached or exceeded an amount equal to 10 percent of the total municipal budget for recreation and park services.

Expenditures budgeted for municipal recreation and park services were classified into ten functional categories for the purpose of this study. As might be expected the three most important expenditure categories included 1) salaries, wages and benefits, 2) park maintenance and improvement, and 3) administrative supplies and expenses. In the eleven municipalities for which data was available expenditures budgeted for salaries, wages and benefits ranged between 38 and 80 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services. In seven of these municipalities this figure exceeded 50 percent. Expenditures budgeted for park maintenance and improvement ranged between 4 and 22 percent of the total municipal recreation and park budget. In approximately half of the municipalities for which data was available this figure exceeded 15 percent. Although the percentage figures for expenditures for administrative supplies and expenses were considerably lower, this category was third in importance. In eight municipalities the amount budgeted for administrative supplies and expenses constituted less than 4 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services. In the three remaining municipalities these figures ranged from 6 to 11 percent.
Conclusions

Administration of Municipal Recreation and Park Services

At both levels involved in the administration of public recreation and park services Montana statutes provided a variety of options for municipalities. Analysis of data regarding administrative practices revealed that municipalities included in this study utilized several different options with only a few overall patterns emerging.

One of the most significant patterns related to administrative structure concerned the final administrative authority for municipal recreation and park services. In a large majority of the municipalities, a single independent board or commission had final administrative authority for both recreation and park services.

Since only two municipalities operated under the commission-manager form of government, the data did not support a firm conclusion, however, it may be observed that in both commission-manager cities recreation and park services were administered directly by the city commission. In all but one city operating under the major-council form of government an independent administrative board was responsible for the administration of recreation and park services.

The second pattern related to administrative structure concerned the relationship between final administrative authority and department organization for municipal recreation and park services. All of the municipalities with two separate administrative boards for recreation and park services also had separate municipal recreation and park departments.
The final pattern in the area of administrative structure was related to municipal department organization. In eight of the thirteen municipalities recreation and park services were administered separately by two different municipal departments. Although in a majority of the municipalities recreation and park services were administered jointly by a single administrative board, at the department level separate administration of recreation and park services was the pattern.

Financing Municipal Recreation and Park Services

Analysis of data regarding financing of municipal recreation and park services in the thirteen municipalities included in this study revealed several overall patterns. In some cases however, the exception to a general pattern was as significant as the apparent pattern.

The first pattern emerged in analyzing data regarding sources of revenue. The two most important sources of revenue for supporting municipal recreation and park services were revenue from local property taxes and revenue from federal programs and grants. Of the two, municipal general fund appropriations from local property tax funds were the primary source of revenue for recreation and park services in the municipalities included in this study.

The one exception to this pattern occurred in Glendive and it may be significant to note the differences in that case. In Glendive, where municipal appropriations and federal aid were not major sources of revenue, the total budget for recreation and park services was considerably higher in relation to the total municipal general fund budget than in eleven of the other municipalities. The total budget for
recreation and park services equalled 20 percent of the municipal general fund budget in Glendive; in the majority of the other municipalities the total budget for recreation and park services constituted less than 13 percent of the municipal general fund budget. In addition, on a per capita basis the total budget for recreation and park services was substantially higher in Glendive than in all but one of the other municipalities included in this study. In the majority of the other municipalities there was no apparent relationship between the total budget for recreation and park services in relation to the municipal general fund budget and the per capita appropriation for recreation and park services.

In the six municipalities with the greatest population the total budget for recreation and park services was smaller in relation to the total municipal general fund budget, than in six of the seven municipalities with the least population. Per capita appropriations, on the other hand, did not reflect this pattern. In view of this discrepancy and within the limitations of this study, it was not possible to hypothesize any direct relation between municipal population and level of overall funding for municipal recreation and park services.

Another general pattern that emerged in analyzing the data concerns the relative level of financing for municipal recreation versus park departments. In the seven municipalities with separate recreation and park departments the recreation department budgets were, in all but one case, substantially lower than park department budgets in relation to the total municipal general fund budgets. Since this study did not explore the extent to which park departments were responsible for
providing public recreation programs and activities it was difficult to
determine the significance of this pattern.

Finally, there was a general pattern revealed by analysis of
data regarding budgeted expenditures for municipal recreation and park
services. This pattern gave some indication of the relative importance
of various recreation and/or park department functions in the municipalities
included in this study. There were five functional categories for
which some portion of the funds for recreation and park services in each
municipality were budgeted, although there was considerable variation in
the actual amounts budgeted by each municipality in these five categories.
In order of relative importance these five categories included: 1) sala-
ries, wages and benefits, 2) park maintenance and improvement, 3) facility
maintenance, 4) equipment and supplies for recreation programs, and
5) administrative supplies and expenses. The consistent pattern of bud-
geting observed in these categories implied that the functions represented
by these categories were the most essential in terms of providing municipal
recreation and park services. Conversely, functions represented by
categories of less vital importance, implied by less consistent funding
included: 1) facility construction, 2) park development, 3) facility
rental, and 4) land acquisition.

As previously noted, the lack of a uniform system of itemizing
municipal and department budgets in the municipalities included in this
study made analysis of data regarding budgeted expenditures difficult
and conclusions based on these data may be open to varying interpreta-
tion. Patterns identified in the analysis of these data should be
interpreted cautiously due to the fact that the categories used to
analyze data were defined by the author for the purposes of this study since it was impossible to make meaningful comparisons from the data as they appeared in the original source documents.

**Discussion**

Much of the discussion of recreation and park literature contained in Chapter II concerned national patterns and trends in major areas of administration and financing of municipal recreation and park services. The preceding sections in this chapter summarized existing practices and patterns in the administration and financing of recreation and park services in selected Montana municipalities. Although the data collected for the purposes of this study were too limited to provide a basis for firm conclusions they did provide a basis for discussing similarities and differences between nationwide patterns and those found in Montana municipalities.

There were several areas related specifically to administrative structure and practices for municipal recreation and park services where data permitted comparison of patterns found in Montana municipalities to those that have been observed nationally. First, in keeping with the trend toward consolidation of municipal services, Meyer and Brightbill observed a national trend toward merging recreation and park services under a single administrative authority.¹ In general the pattern of administrative structure for recreation and park services found in Montana municipalities included in this study reflected the national

trend. Although several Montana municipalities divided administrative authority for recreation and park services between two separate agencies, in a clear majority of the cities administration of recreation and park services was the responsibility of a single agency.

On the other hand, patterns of municipal department organization found in Montana municipalities did not reflect a trend toward consolidation. At this level, the administration of recreation and park services was divided between two separate municipal departments in a majority of the cities included in this study.

In a second area related to the administration of public recreation and park services Bucher and Bucher pointed out that most municipal recreation and/or park departments were responsible to an independent policy-making board or commission. Here again, the pattern observed in Montana municipalities appeared similar to the national pattern. In ten of the thirteen municipalities included in this study an independent policy-making board had final administrative authority for recreation and park services.

Finally, in terms of composition and method of selection for administrative boards, practices followed in Montana municipalities were similar to common national practices. In the majority of Montana municipalities independent administrative boards were composed of from five to seven members who were appointed by the mayor.

There were three distinct areas related to financing of municipal recreation and park services in which it was possible to observe

similarities and differences between national patterns and those found in Montana municipalities. The first of these was in the area of per capita expenditures for recreation and park services. While only two Montana municipalities met the $10.00 per capita expenditure recommended by Carlson, Deppe and MacLean\(^3\) this was quite in keeping with the national pattern. Nationwide, Butler found that in the vast majority of cities actual expenditures for recreation and park services fell well short of recommended per capita expenditures. Although very possibly coincidental, it was interesting to note that per capita expenditures reported in the 1970 NRPA Local Agency Survey for eleven selected cities ranged from $4.98 to $17.78 and averaged $10.96.\(^4\) Per capita expenditures for the selected Montana municipalities included in this study ranged from $4.81 to $17.28, but averaged somewhat less at $8.06.

A well established national pattern related to financing municipal recreation and park services was the fact that municipal appropriations from property tax funds have long been the primary source of revenue for recreation and park services. The 1970 Local Agency Survey found that 75 percent of all revenue received by recreation and park managing authorities came from local public appropriations.\(^5\) In twelve of the thirteen Montana municipalities included in this study municipal general fund appropriations were a major source of revenue for financing recreation and park services.

\(^3\)Carlson, Deppe and MacLean, *Recreation in American Life*, p. 104


\(^5\)Ibid., p. 20.
Data from Montana municipalities also provided some evidence of similarity to the three national trends regarding sources of revenue observed by Butler. First Butler noted a recent national trend toward increased federal assistance for municipal recreation and park services. For all municipalities included in this study federal funds were an important source of revenue for financing recreation and park services. Second, Butler observed a rapidly diminishing need and justification for special assessment taxes for recreation. Only two of the municipalities included in this study received revenue from special recreation or park improvement district funds and in only one instance were such funds the major source of revenue. Finally, Butler cited a general trend related to fees and charges for recreation and park services. He found a steady increase in the number of municipalities reporting receipts from fees and charges and in the amount of revenue generated through fees and charges in relation to total recreation and park expenditures. Eleven municipalities included in this study received revenue from fees and charges for recreation programs and activities and in six of these cities the amount exceeded 10 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services.

Expenditures for recreation and park personnel was the final area related to financing of municipal recreation and park services in which the pattern found in Montana municipalities was similar to the national trend. Again it was Butler who observed a trend toward

6 Butler, Introduction to Community Recreation, p. 529.
7 Ibid., p. 530. 8 Ibid., p. 532.
increasing expenditures by municipalities for recreation and park leadership. In 1970 it was reported that an average of 53 percent of all expenditures by recreation and park managing authorities were for salaries and wages. In seven of the eleven Montana municipalities for which data were available expenditures for salaries, wages and benefits exceeded, and in several cases well exceeded, 50 percent of the total budget for recreation and park services.

Overall, it was significant to note that in almost every area where data permitted comparison, patterns of administration and financing for public recreation and park services found in the Montana municipalities included in this study were generally similar to national patterns and trends.

**Recommendations**

Although the primary purpose of this study was descriptive in nature, analysis of the data revealed certain patterns and led to tentative conclusions regarding administration and financing of recreation and park services in major Montana municipalities. Further research however, is necessary in order to achieve greater confidence and understanding of the patterns and conclusions suggested by this study.

There are several areas where further research would be particularly valuable. First, one of the limitations of this study was lack of detailed data regarding the distribution of administrative

---

9Ibid., p. 534.

responsible between municipal recreation and park departments and agencies. Further research directed toward this aspect of the administration of recreation and park services would be extremely valuable for the purpose of identifying and explaining patterns in administrative practices and procedures, the number, type and salary level of department personnel positions, sources of revenue and expenditures budgeted for recreation and park services. Furthermore, additional data in this area is necessary in order to compare practices and procedures followed in various municipalities. Such comparisons would be valuable as a means of identifying viable alternatives and evaluating relative effectiveness and efficiency of specific practices.

A second important area needing further research which was beyond the scope of this study is the identification of trends in administrative and fiscal practices. Data for this study were limited to current administrative practices and procedures and financial information from only one fiscal year. Identification of trends would require analyzing data in each of these areas over a number of years. Further research aimed at identifying trends would provide valuable information concerning specific aspects of administration and financing which are receiving increased emphasis and would provide a basis for anticipating future developments in municipal recreation and park services.

A final recommendation for further research involves sources of revenue and allocation of financial resources for municipal recreation and park services. Certainly these are two of the most crucial aspects of providing any public service. Analysis of the data for this study suggested a possible relationship between specific sources of
revenue and level of funding for public recreation and park services. The obvious importance of financing for recreation and park services and the tentative nature of the conclusions from this study point to a need for further research in this area. Such research would require more extensive information and more complex analysis than was possible within the confines of this study. Further research into the relationship between sources of revenue and level of funding for recreation and park services could be of significant practical value to public officials responsible for planning and administering municipal recreation and park services.
APPENDIX A

Montana Municipalities Included in the Study
MONTANA MUNICIPALITIES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

X Havre
X Kalispell
X Great Falls
X Missoula
X Helena
Δ Anaconda
X Butte
X Bozeman
X Billings

† Glasgow
Δ Lewistown
Δ Miles City
Δ Glendive

X First Class Cities
Δ Second Class Cities
† Third Class Cities
APPENDIX 3

Survey Questionnaire
SURVEY OF MONTANA MUNICIPAL RECREATION AND PARK SERVICES

City ___________________________ Contact ___________________________
County __________________________ Position ___________________________
Phone __________________________ Address ___________________________

In order to reduce the time necessary to complete this survey, information that is available from other sources has already been filled in. In these instances you need only check to see that the data is accurate; please make any necessary additions or corrections. Thank you.

A. General Municipal Information

1. City population (1970 census) __________________________

2. Classification of city:
   ____ First class city
   ____ Second class city
   ____ Third class city

3. County population (1970 census) __________________________

4. Form of local government:
   ____ Mayor-council
   ____ City-manager

5. Amount of 1973-74 city budget:
   Total dollar amount __________________________
   Mills __________________________
B. Administrative Structure for Recreation and Park Services

1. Type of managing authority:
   ____ Board of Park Commissioners
   ____ Board of Recreation
   ____ Board of Parks and Recreation
   ____ Open Space Land Planning Commission
   ____ Open Space Land Commission
   ____ Other (please specify) ________________________________

For each board or commission: Title: ________________________________

   a. Year formed ______________

   b. If Board of Recreation, formed by:
      ____ City
      ____ School District
      ____ Other (please specify) ________________________________

   c. Number of members of the board or commission ________________

   d. Is there an advisory council to the board or commission? _____Yes. _____No
      If yes: Year formed ______________
              Number of members ______________
              Method of appointing members ______________________________

   e. Does the board or commission issue a formal report or policy statement?
      _____Yes. _____No. If yes, how often? __________________________
2. Type of department organization:
   - Parks department
   - Recreation department
   - Combined parks and recreation department
   - Other (please specify)

For each department: Title: ________________________________

   a. In the spaces provided below, please list all current FULL-TIME department personnel by position or title and fill in or check the appropriate columns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POSITION</th>
<th>APPROX. SALARY</th>
<th>YRS. OF PREVIOUS EXP.</th>
<th>EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>AREA OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of Position</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.S.</td>
<td>Parks, Recreation, Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pks. Rec.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. In the spaces provided below, please list all current PART-TIME department personnel by position or title, and fill in or check the appropriate columns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POSITION</th>
<th>APPROX. SALARY RANGE</th>
<th>YRS. OF PREVIOUS EXP.</th>
<th>EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>AREA OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adm. Supervisory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lead. Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial/ Maint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


c. In the spaces provided below, please list all SEASONAL department personnel by position or title, and fill in or check the appropriate columns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POSITION</th>
<th>APPROX. SALARY RANGE</th>
<th>YRS. OF PREVIOUS EXP.</th>
<th>EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>AREA OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adm. Supervisory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lead. Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial/ Maint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Total amount of 1973-74 budget
2. Total amount requested for 1973-74
3. Sources of revenue for 1973-74 budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal general fund appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General obligation bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special improvement district levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special improvement district bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial development project financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funds from other units of local government (please specify):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gifts, bequests and donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Revenue generated through public recreation and park services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fees and charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue from concessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue from lease of park lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue from sale of plants and trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Expenditures for 1973-74:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salaries, wages and benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative supplies and expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park maintenance and improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment and supplies for recreation programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for each department. Title: _____________________________

1. Please describe the type and amount of assistance received from the following STATE agencies during the 1973-74 fiscal year:
   a. Department of Fish and Game ____________________________________________
      ____________________________________________
   b. Department of Intergovernmental Relations __________________________________
      ____________________________________________
   c. Department of Public Instruction _________________________________________
      ____________________________________________
   d. Governor's Council on Physical Fitness ______________________________________
      ____________________________________________
   e. Dept. of Social & Rehabilitation Services _________________________________
      ____________________________________________
   f. Other (please specify) ___________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________

2. What types of assistance do you think appropriate for the state to provide?
   _______________________________________________________________________
   How should such assistance be administered? _______________________________________________________________________

3. Please describe the type and amount of assistance received from FEDERAL agencies during the 1973-74 fiscal year:
   a. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation ___________________________________________
      ____________________________________________
   b. Model Cities Program (HEW) ____________________________________________
      ____________________________________________
   c. Department of Labor, Recreation Support Program __________________________
      ____________________________________________
   d. Other (please specify) ___________________________________________________
APPENDIX C

Cover Letter
Letter sent to Superintendent of Parks and/or Director of Recreation in the cities of Billings, Great Falls, Missoula, Butte, Helena, Bozeman, Havre, Kalispell, Anaconda, Miles City, Lewistown, and Glendive.

Dear :

I am conducting a study of municipal recreation and park services in thirteen of Montana's largest cities. The purpose of this study is to compile a comprehensive summary of municipal recreation and park services which I hope will provide useful information for both state and local officials. A summary of the results will be sent to you upon completion of the study.

The results of this survey will also be used as a part of my master's thesis, presently being conducted under the direction of Dr. Joel Meier, Professor of Recreation Studies. Other members of my graduate committee are Dr. Lloyd Heywood and Dr. Ellis Waldron.

In order to complete this study I need your help in filling out the enclosed survey. I know of the many demands made on your time and have therefore gathered as much information as possible from public records and previous studies; data that is available from these other sources has already been filled in on the enclosed survey. In these instances I request only that you check to see that the data is accurate and that you make any necessary additions or corrections. The remainder of the information requested is available only from your office and is essential for the completion of the study.

For your convenience in returning the completed survey form, I have enclosed a stamped, self-addressed envelope. I will be most grateful for your cooperation and assistance in completing this study. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Eastman
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