



Grantmakers in the Arts
2004 Conference

DANCING WITH DIFFERENT PARTNERS

Proceedings from the Conference

October 17-20, 2004
Renaissance Cleveland Hotel
Cleveland, Ohio

THE PUBLIC POLICY SQUARE DANCE

The square dance is an apt metaphor to describe the many complex steps and actions leading to good arts public policy. Panelists will discuss the strategies and tactics used to develop arts public policy from statewide (Ohio), municipal (New York City) and regional (Northeast Ohio) perspectives. Learn about the do-si-do and do-si-don'ts of public policy.

Session Organizer: Tom Schorgl, *president and CEO*
Community Partnership for Arts and Culture

Presented by: Tom Schorgl
Kinshasha Holman Conwill, *arts, museum*
and management consultant
Wayne Lawson, *Ph.D., executive director*
Ohio Arts Council

October 18, 2004, 2:30 p.m.

LAWSON: In 1991 we had our first real budget cut, twenty-four percent, lost eleven members of my staff, and wondered what the hell we'd been doing all those years. It seemed to be so right. We seemed to be so on top of what was public policy for the arts.

We then spent the next ten years reorganizing, readjusting, going through probably what a lot of you did during that time too, or are doing now. A lot of work with the media. Built that website. Built that website up so you can hook in, because that really would help make the difference.

Publications. My God, the number of publications, four-color, were pretty fantastic. Something should be happening here, and they shouldn't be lacking in terms of understanding the value of what we did.

Serendipitously, one day sitting talking to my deputy director, I said, my gut says something's wrong. Something is definitely wrong. We think the state is healthy, but what's the perception of that health of the arts versus the reality of it.

My fifteen-member board, a gubernatorial-appointed board, gave me enough money to go out, hire some researchers, and do some real honest research in what was going on in our state. In this state, we were the primary – and continue to be – funder of operating support for the Cleveland Orchestra, the Cleveland Museum.

Yet, we must go into twenty-nine of our eighty-eight counties, which are designated by the state as Appalachian, some of the poorest counties in our state. Forty-four institutions funded by us with operating budgets over \$1,000,000 up to \$38,000,000. Fifty percent of our budget to operating support.

Now, make sure because, after all, the legislature just changed, our leadership is Appalachian. They come from south of seventy, versus what was going on in the previous ten years. We thought we were on top of it legislatively and advocacy wise.

We then went out and did our State of the Arts report, and it was fascinating because we certainly had a strategic plan. We had a great mission statement. Our researchers went out and spent the next two and a half years researching the state with a true scientific methodology. Hadn't done that before. Key findings, how Ohioans assess the arts.

What happened is we came back, and we went into mild shock. What we didn't realize and which became important eventually, was that

in the last year the Ohioan has been to a sit-down restaurant forty-six times, been to a mall or shopping center thirty-six times, been to a health club or gym twenty-three. And been to a festival, three times. Finally, towards the bottom of the list, been to an art gallery or art museum eight times. At the bottom, been to a classical music concert one time.

We've been putting our bucks into all of these institutions, and we've been transacting business. We've been saying, "Here's your dollar to keep your doors open. You give us your facts and figures. How many seats did you fill? What kind of market are you drawing? Tell us about your marketing campaign."

It was a one-way transaction between us as funder, and that particular organization. It so happens that when we got this, we realized that we needed after the ten years to do another readjustment.

Fortunately for us, the Wallace Foundation came along. They knew we had been doing research. They had begun to talk about their own desire to work with a number of state arts agencies.

They had done some studies on participation, their RAND participation study, and a number of others, sent out the RFP, and thirteen of us went in. Shelly from Arizona represented one of those studies. We were granted enough money for some states to begin doing their research, and for some states like us to put our research in practice.

The reality of this kicked us in the backside to realize how egotistical we had been as public funders, to make assumptions about how healthy the state of the arts was in our state. It was the first time we had begun to use legitimate research and research methodology to take and change and alter how we create public policy. We now say it's about research into practice, and that was very, very important to us.

We learned through the Wallace study and through Mark Moore, who was hired from the Kennedy School to work with the thirteen states, that a change definitely had taken place. Bill talked about forty years of the match, and he says, "Let's applaud and move on. Let's look at the broader sector, and let's put it in context."

It's the same thing that happened to us in a different way. We were looking at the way we had done business under a context of presumption of what we thought was a healthy state of the arts, versus the reality of what it was and where people were actually going. We



needed to turn around and pay attention to the empty seats versus the seats that were full.

You hear the number of subscribers to X symphony, its zip code, its number of seats, never number of empty seats, and so we had to change around that particular methodology. While we had a very good operating environment, and we had value, and we had mission, and we had goals, there was a part of our triangle, what became known as our public value triangle that was missing. It was our authorizing authority.

I said to somebody on the phone not too long ago, authorizing authority, and she says to me, What are you talking about, authorizing authority? I said, Our grantees, our legislators, our mayors, the person who's attending the arts festival, those are authorizing authorities. And she said, You're listening to them? Why aren't you making the decisions to intervene in how they should face the future?

We didn't, fortunately. We now use that public value triangle. We now have an electronic grant system that's about ready to go up. We held six convenings around the state last year to warn people that we were leaving our twenty-eight discipline-based organization and moving to seven functional areas, and that we'd be going totally electronic November 1.

It has been five years from the time of this report until now in the transformation of how we would do business in the future. We've had our sixth meeting around the state talking about the new grant system, OLGA, Online Grants Applications. We'll have reached all of our constituents by October 22nd, and we'll be up and running.

We use this little magic marker. Notice it's in the form of a triangle, public value triangle. It says OLGA on the front of it. Now, you might think it's gimmicky. It's a toy. But it's a remembrance, and it tells a story. We are now big into telling stories about the value that exists in the arts in the various communities around the state.

The value of arts in Cleveland is very different from the value of arts in Athens, Ohio, Portsmouth on the river, in Cincinnati. We have three distinct areas of the state, Cleveland, north, very ethnic, very liberal. We come down to Columbus where we have farm immigration, a lot of colleges and universities. And then we get down south to Cincinnati. Phew, big difference from the north to the south.

We had been treating everyone in the state in the same way with the same guidelines for years and years and years. We'd not been listening to

the stories that these various communities have to tell, and it's made a very big difference now in the way we do business.

Five years in the making, very difficult to transition a staff. My average staff person has been there what, fourteen to sixteen years? I've been there longer than that. It's very, very difficult to teach those old people new tricks.

To get around the state and let people know that we're in this together and we're transitioning together and will no longer be transacting business, but we will be in the collaborative business of transforming how we work together.

I just want to tell you how I started off because it sets the story in much the same way that Bill Ivey was trying to set the story. It's how do we rise to the challenge of massive change.

Long gone are the days when we had the liberty of making change to just one aspect of our work, leaving all the rest the same. In today's world everything in our work environment, from the needs of the folks we serve and the capabilities of technology to government policies, is changing at the same time. Such a multi-dimensional shift demands an equally multi-dimensional response.

Those of us in public service, particularly those of us in the arts business, need to recast our strategies; we need to redesign our operating processes; perhaps reconfigure our organizational structures; reinvent our management practices; retool our infrastructures; even reshape our cultures. And we have to do it all at the same time.

To add fuel to the fire, the changes need to fit together seamlessly and take place while we continue to operate. We need to succeed in today's environment and not yesterday's environment. If we do not reinvent – and that's a key word of ours – and change our language, we're going to become irrelevant or we're going to become obsolete.

It's hard to imagine how we can survive such massive transformation, yet because we believe so deeply in the importance of the arts and the value they have to communities around the state, we can, against all odds, go on.

A clear vision of the future, steadfastness in the face of adversity, passion in the pursuit of ambitious goals, constant communication with people at all levels, these are the hallmarks we need to guide our organizations through transformation and into the future. And then we



jump into the actual transformation that we've gone through in the agency.

So far, so good. A five-year process in, basically, trying to take a tug boat and move the Queen Mary into dock.

SCHORGL: Thank you. Now that we have everybody in here, we didn't go through the audience and have you introduce yourselves, so we're going to ask you to do that. Tell us who you are and where you're from.

RICHARD: Sally Richard, Northern Ohio field representative for the Ohio Arts Council.

MCELHENNY: Aria McElhenny. I'm communications manager and acting director of research at New England Foundation for the Arts.

DAVIS: I'm Robin Davis. I was at the Cleveland Foundation.

PRINCE: Cass Prince, City of Irving Arts Center, Texas.

WEINER: Judy Kaufman Weiner, Alliance for New York State Arts Organizations.

JENNINGS: Judi Jennings, Kentucky Foundation for Women.

RAFOLS: Alberto Rafols, executive director of Cultural Council of San Cruz County, California.

BERGER: Ted Berger, executive director, New York Foundation of the Arts.

LOPEZ: Abel Lopez, and I'm with the Community Foundation for the National Capital Region c/o GALA Hispanic Theatre.

COHN: Shelly Cohn, Arizona Commission on the Arts.

BERENDT: Roberta Berendt, Operations and Grants Manager, City of Miami Beach, Tourism and Cultural Development.

BYE: Carolyn Bye with the Metropolitan Regional Arts Council in St. Paul, Minnesota.

SCHORGL: I'm going to talk about a multiple county approach in terms of public policy. One of the ways to start out is to give you a framework that we've worked in. This is not necessarily the only framework to work around in terms of public policy, but it's one that has served us well.

In particular, the definition. Many times, when I hear the word public policy I find that it's about

all sorts of things other than public policy. A few years ago I attended a conference where public policy was the number of state arts agencies talking about their strategic plans, which had really nothing to do with public policy but had a hell of a lot to do with who was going to get paid what.

One of the things that we've used is looking at the fact that all public policy relies on a commitment from some sort of government. That commitment needs to be something that's action-oriented. It affects certain segments of the government and certainly certain segments of the citizens.

Good public policy is developed through a dynamic, evolutionary process that engages, at different levels, the population it's intended to serve. Wayne gave you what they learned when they went back out. It wasn't necessarily the population of the orchestra attendees, it was the entire population that included everyone from Cleveland on the north, to Portsmouth in the South.

Successful public policy is something that looks at the prevailing public values, something that's always in change, something that's in action.

The framework that we looked at were triggers. You can read that yourself in the handouts. I'd like to take you through some of the things that we went through over the past few years starting in 1997, when the Community Partnership for Arts and Culture was brought into being by two foundations, the Cleveland Foundation and the George Gund Foundation, and talk to you about the triggers, the scope, the intensity, the timing, public agenda. I'm going to give you two examples of how that took place in two different counties in Northeast Ohio.

The trigger. Wayne talked a little bit about that in terms of changes. Clearly, in Northeast Ohio the changes in the local economic environment were significant. When you go from fifty national and international headquarters in fifty years to one, you're having a huge change in terms of your economy.

When you have funders leaving, especially major funders of arts and culture, and you only have two major funders of arts and culture in the city when you had something like fifteen, you know you've got a trigger that's being pulled.

Lots of reliance on the private sector in terms of the arts and cultural community in Northeast Ohio. But we also saw an increase in not-for-profit arts and cultural organizations, from ten about fifty years ago, to 110 today and growing,



just in the arts and cultural sector. This isn't to talk about the health and human services, the educational and the environment NFPs that have formed.

You also had a very significant change in the 104th Congress in terms of the feds disenfranchising themselves from Health and Human Services, passing those down to the states. Guess what the states did about five years ago? They decided to disenfranchise themselves in terms of Health and Human Services and pass it down to the locals.

In Ohio, in particular, which may be the case in some of your other states, is the change in how legislators or elected officials are elected and serve. In the state of Ohio where the general assembly has a tremendous amount of influence on county governments, when the legislative body moved from no-term to term legislation, and you had one party control the executive, the legislative and the judicial branches. I know how that affected the federal election a few years ago.

When that happens you really have an amazing environment. For instance, the scope in terms of these triggers in Northeast Ohio, there are 400 not-for-profit arts and cultural organizations in a seven county area. There are over 5,000 individual artists that have been reported to the last census.

In some of the research that we did, we identified 250,000 households of arts and cultural consumers, board members, volunteers, trustees, buyers. There was a big scope in terms of these public policy issues. The intensity, the economic impact, the educational impact and the social impact in Northeast Ohio, it's \$1.3 billion in economic activity, 4,000 full-time employed individuals in jobs in arts organizations.

Not less than three years ago, there were 4,000 full-time employed steelworkers. Today there are 1,000 full-time employed steelworkers. There are not quite 4,000, full-time employed arts and cultural administrators and 5,000 artists.

Education, \$15,000,000+ annually that the arts and cultural community puts into public education in terms of K through twelve. We know, from local research, that those students who go through one particular school in the Cleveland system have the highest graduation rates, have the highest test score rates and have the highest college placement, is the Cleveland School for the Arts.

Social impact. When you look around it's one of the few remaining assets that Cleveland has

left. When the river was on fire back in 1978? 1979? People were still coming, seriously, to see University Circle institutions and not making fun of them.

The other thing that we found is that the timing around these public policy issues couldn't be better. Cleveland is trying to rebuild, trying to go through another renaissance so to speak. It is trying to attract new workers, the knowledge-based worker, the idea-based worker. It is desperately trying to retain all of its young people who are educated either here or outside of Cleveland, to bring them back to work here and to build this economy and this community.

We moved from an old technology base to a knowledge base and to niche manufacturing. The other timing piece that was very important here is the arts and cultural strategic planning process.

The public agenda was formed when that plan was released in May of 2000 because it did give definition and it did give quantity as well as quality to the arts and cultural sector as an important player and an entity in a sector deserving of good public policy.

In addition, the media plays a huge part in this. When the Plain Dealer included arts and culture in a series that it did on all of the assets in Northeast Ohio and the troubles that they were facing, called "The Quiet Crisis," all of a sudden the arts and cultural issue bumped up a notch on that agenda.

Finally, there was a series of summits that the Cleveland City Council held to look at the issues in Cleveland around arts and culture and how those needed to be addressed if that asset, one of the few remaining assets that Cleveland could proudly say was national and international in scope, was going to be sustainable.

The agenda builders. In this community it has been the foundations. If you're part of a foundation in another community and you haven't started to work on public policy, I would urge you to start doing so very quickly, especially in the arts and cultural sector.

You have a tremendous amount of weight, and you have a tremendous amount of influence, and a lot of what has been accomplished in Northeast Ohio around good public policy would not have happened without the foundation community, and, in particular, the George Gund Foundation and the Cleveland Foundation.

Corporate funders were part of the agenda builders in terms of putting public policy in



the arts and cultural sector at the top. Some, by virtue of need because they couldn't continue to fund all of the small and medium-sized arts organizations that were coming to them. Others because they were on the boards of major institutions, they were the chairs and the executive chairs of some major institutions, and they knew that those institutions were not going to make it into the future without some change in public policy.

Elected officials in Northeast Ohio have come to the forefront. Organized labor was an extremely important part in Northeast Ohio, of framing public policy issues and putting them at the top of the agenda. Others like CDCs, community development corporations, chambers of commerce, conventions and visitors bureaus, etc.

There were at least three what I call provocateurs that kept these agenda builders focused on the arts and cultural agenda. You who are program officers for arts and culture at foundations, understand that sometimes your voices aren't heard because there are other program officers in the room also competing for those foundation dollars or at least to allocate them to certain areas.

Clearly, the program officers of the foundations in Northeast Ohio have been loud and clear towards their leaders, their executive directors, and the community in terms of the foundations, certainly organizations and artists. We can't underscore the importance of the media bringing attention to this particular issue.

To end, let me take you quickly through two public policy processes that, of course, are never-ending. By the way, this never ends; it goes on forever. So don't look for some pot of gold.

When the arts and cultural plan was released in May of 2000, and if you haven't met me yet, you haven't seen it. If you've met me, you've seen it, and you've got stacks of them this deep. If you want one, go to cultureplan.org and you can download it. It's almost over with too, that's good. I may have to do another plan.

The plan came out in May of 2000. Two arts administrators in Lake County, who had already developed a very strong relationship with their local elected officials, because Lake County is a tiny county in terms of population, came to our organization and said, "We'd like for you to make a presentation to our county commissioners."

The county commissioners said, fine. Make a presentation. They came in, made a presentation. Next thing I knew is that we were named in a resolution. The Community Partnership for Arts

and Culture is resolved to help put together the Lake County Arts and Cultural Task Force. And I thought, hell, this is easy! This is going to be fun! Put out a plan, get public sector funding in a couple of months! Well, it didn't quite happen that way.

What was interesting is that the Lake County folks move much faster than the Cuyahoga County people, and the Cuyahoga County commission, and I will go through that. They immediately set up this task force, which was very diverse, it not only had artists, arts and cultural organizations, but it had people from organized labor, the corporate community, the religious community, and a very strong cross-section of its population.

Those folks got to work saying, "Well, how should we do this?" They picked two different ways to frame their value. One was they did an inventory of all the programs and services that they had in Lake County, which we helped them put together, and an economic impact study.

Now, the county commissioners always do something I think is really great. They put together task forces and then they don't fund them. But they ask them for all sorts of money. So to get around that one of the things that the Lake County folks did is they went to the County Planning Commission.

How many know what a county planning commission is? It basically does variances in terms of real estate. It doesn't do a whole lot in the arts and cultural planning area. This group was savvy enough that it worked with the director and said, "Don't worry. We'll help you learn how to become a planning commission for arts and culture."

What that gave them was a much stronger portfolio when it came back to the commissioners because they had another county agency working for them to deliver information to the county commissioners.

After they did this inventory, they went through a deliberation period. This is 2001 to 2002, and in 2003 they came back to their county commissioners. They came back not to put an additional tax on the ballot for referendum, but we looked at what sort of taxes had not been achieved yet in terms of the ceiling, and one of the areas was the bed tax.

The bed tax had not been brought up to its ceiling, which was 3 percent, it was 1.5 percent. They went back, and it happened at the same time that a large community in Lake County was



trying to pay off its bonds for a sports stadium. It's funny how sports and arts come together when each have to raise some money.

In October of 2003, Lake County increased their bed tax by another 1.5 percent, part of that which is now in the form of project grants for arts and cultural organizations in Lake County.

Cuyahoga County was certainly different. We released the plan in May of 2000. The county commissioners at that point said, we want to see examples of what other communities have done.

We put together twelve funding models, and out of that they were very excited about bundling arts and culture with Metro Parks. Not all elected officials know what's going on in their own government, and we learned that when it came to Metro Parks, because they couldn't get a meeting with the Metro Park Commissioners!

We found out the reason they couldn't get a meeting with the Metro Park Commissioners, and they learned that they didn't appoint the Metro County Commissioners. The person that appointed the Metro County Commissioners was a probate judge. So the Metro County Park Commissioners said, We don't want to meet with you. And still haven't met with us.

We started to look at another piece, which was to bundle arts and culture with the Port Authority. Arts and culture with Port Authorities have been successful in New York, and you guys did something in Philly at one point.

Cataclysmic changes can happen in politics, and all of a sudden the mayor of Cleveland decided he wasn't going to run. All these county commissioners decided, maybe I should run for mayor! So our whole thing was put on hold for about one year. During that time one of the commissioners was elected mayor, and so they had to reappoint another commissioner.

In January of 2003, I call it the year of YAC, which is the year of arts and culture, the mayor, the county commissioners came out and said, "This is the year that we're going to pass public sector funding for arts and culture in Cuyahoga County. And we're going to do it with the health and human service issue, which will be coming up in March."

As February rolled around, the governor of the state, who had been running for election, after he got elected gave out his report in terms of what the real revenues would be coming in in 2003, which were nothing close to what he said they were going to be in 2002.

So Health and Human Services was out of the question because they had to now increase by several miles when they thought they were only going to have to increase by one mile. But it gave the arts and cultural sector an opportunity to help the Health and Human Services levy pass without getting anything out of it directly.

There was a lot of volunteer effort. It gave us a staging point to put together a campaign, and out of that we learned a lot. The Health and Human Services issue passed by two percentage points. The County Commissioners got up publicly and said, "One of those two percentage points was because of the arts and cultural sector."

The convention center then came in May of that year, at which point the city said that they would get 30 percent of a bond issue. The suburbs said that they would get 30 percent of a bond issue. The county said that they would get 25 percent of the bond issue. And the arts and culture could expect 15 percent. We said, Wow! Let's see, 30, 30, 25, 15. Seems like we're getting the low end of the deal, but you're wanting us to raise money for the campaign and do all this effort.

We took this back to the arts and cultural community, had an open public session with 110 different arts and cultural directors at that session. We came back and said, "Guess this isn't the right time for us. Thanks but no thanks."

Within one week, the county commissioners passed a resolution that said the convention center bond issue, if passed, will be 25, 25, 25, 25. That was a huge win for the arts and cultural community.

Now, immediately following that, the mayor pulled out, which meant the whole bond issue crumbled and we weren't able to go forward. This is all within one twelve-month period.

In August of that year, we wanted to continue the effort, so we asked the county commissioners to form a taskforce to come up with grant models, so when public sector funding became available we could go out and promote that.

That in fact happened, there are four different grant models that were passed by the county commissioners. Of course, we don't have any funding for them yet, but went forward and were very helpful in terms of Issue 31.

Issue 31 came in December of 2003, and out of that an economic development issue was put on the ballot. We learned, once that economic development issue was on the ballot that no specific relationship to any sort of business



forum could be in the referendum legislation. So we couldn't use the words arts and culture or anything else related to a business in that economic development referendum, which meant we had a big educational job on our hands.

We were asked to raise \$500,000, the arts and cultural community, of a \$750,000 campaign. We raised \$650,000 in three and a half weeks, and we formed a political action committee, which I think is one of the few political action committees for arts and culture at a local level anywhere in the United States. The co-chairman of that just joined us, Barbara Robinson. That particular group is still very active.

We lost the referendum by three percentage points. When we polled it at the beginning of the campaign, we were scheduled to lose by thirty percentage points, so we made up a whole lot of effort, but we just didn't have enough time to bring it home.

However, back in May 2004, we went back in and changed enabling legislation so that we could put a single-issue referendum on the ballot in the coming years.

The last thing is that in January of 2005 we will have a new commissioner coming on board, and this commissioner has publicly run on one of the planks of creating local public sector funding.

In summation, we have these factors in the trigger, and each county will do it a little bit differently. It never ends. It continues to go, but you do get small advances.

One of the small advances is that even though Issue 31 was defeated, the Cuyahoga County Commissioners took from the general fund the money to form the first project grant program called Arts, Culture and Economic Development.

So two counties in Northeast Ohio have a public policy effort when it comes to arts and culture that provides funding. A step forward, not the dedicated step that we want, but getting closer.

LAWSON: What I should have emphasized earlier, the term limit issue here is one that has made a big difference in how we do business. If you look at the old paradigm that Bill talked about from 1965 with the creation of the Endowment on up through the next forty years, the majority of us and the legislators were doing transactional business.

The legislators gave us funding. They expected X in return. We had advocacy. It was fine. Money, give something back. Done. The creator and the

person who signed in my legislation was the president of the senate, and he put himself on my board. The head of the House Finance Committee put himself on my board.

I have four legislators, non-voting legislators, two Ds, two Rs, two appointed by the president of the Senate, two appointed by the House. Up until the time of term limits it was very easy to do business on the phone, pick it up and say, "Senator, blah, blah, blah." And he'd say, "Yeah, yeah. You know we can put some funding there. We'll do it." He got something in return. She got something in return.

Term limits came along, a whole new ballgame. The research that we do now is playing a far more important role and part in dealing with these legislators. They want to hear the stories. They want to know the value. They are young, and they are eager. They no longer just transact business; they want to know what transformed somebody in their community.

We're now finding, in retrospect, that our research is paying off because we now see them as part of that public value triangle in a very, very different way. They were bypassed before, and they're no longer bypassed, because they're hearing the story of how the arts have transformed people or how we have recognized the value in their community.

The president of the senate oversaw the state. He transacted business. Frankly, he didn't really give a damn what was going on in another part of the state. Term limits bring us young, eager legislators. And we have a responsibility to treat them in a very different way than we used to treat them. This creates a whole different dynamic in the creation of public policy in this state.

Those other legislators, once they found out about term limits, a majority of them went on to hold other state offices. There are four mayors, including this one in this city, who are former legislators. They were used to doing transactional business. They all are in cities with high unemployment.

I can go on down the list, Toledo and Dayton and Youngstown and Cleveland. The Secretary of State, head of the Office of Budget and Management, they're all former legislators, appointed by the governor as soon as term limits took place and they couldn't be reelected.

On one hand you have a whole series of office holders here who are former legislators, used to doing business in a different manner than these new term-limited people. In this election, 80



percent House and Senate will turn over in this state, will be up for election, and we start again.

The research that we have done with the Wallace START project and our own research prior to that, is proving to be beneficial. When I talk about massive change, indeed, all of that plays into it. Tom had it interwoven through his story of change, here up in this area of the state, has to do with his county commissioners and his mayor.

It all goes back to that political climate for us, and I don't know how this is going to be for you.

I just wanted to emphasize that, because that plays such an important role in my emphasis on research now. Very different than what we're used to doing.

CONWILL: My name is Kinshasha Holman Conwill.

Three years ago, the guy sitting there I told him I wouldn't put his name on the tape this year. But this guy sitting here in front of Adele and behind Judy. This guy doesn't believe that it was three years ago that Peggy Amsterdam and Tom _____ and Virginia Smith and I were on a panel when the cultural blueprint that...okay Ted, and others of us in New York City worked on, had not yet been released. And actually I was holding back, refusing to give all the details and being quite cagey.

Greg had come to see us and Peggy had come to see us and everyone was so interested, everyone but the people in the City of New York. They called me, please come and talk! I went to London, and Shelly and I were in Charlotte. Everywhere we went they wanted to know.

But the politics part is key to this. I'm going to give you my little show and tell later, but I don't want you to look ahead. This was not yet published when we came to Mohonk Mountain House, that's three years ago, but it was coming out because what had held the presses was September 11th. For those of you who were at Mohonk you remember that was heavy on everyone's minds at the time.

Well, the trigger, to use Tom's word, for this document was term limits, the biggest change in city government in New York City in anybody's memory. All of the City Council was going to be changed because of term limits, and four of the five borough presidents, and there was going to be a new mayor.

The election was being held the Tuesday after the meeting of Grantmakers in the Arts. The primary

for our election was September 11th. Everyone thought some Democrat was going to be elected, would it be Mark Green? As you may have heard, it was this guy named Michael Bloomberg, and so we got a Republican, we got a business guy.

But a lot of what else happened after September 11th was a whole new change around the issue of who owns decision-making in New York City. While it still is a lot up for grabs, things like the fact that the City Council is made up of younger, eager people, even if they were the sons and daughters of the people who held the position, things were different.

As planning has become the huge thing, whether it's funding for lower Manhattan, funding for downtown Brooklyn, funding for the far west side of Manhattan, one of the things that the mayor, the governor and others are finding is that the Robert Moses days of the great impresario who wants to change the entire face of a city, and ruled those neighborhoods for the greater good, was now a different kind of situation.

For instance, the powers that be engaged a major architectural firm to come up with plans for the World Trade Center site. A coalition of planners, designers, civic folks, including some cultural people as well, came to the table at a big meeting called "Listening to the City," and people voted electronically, and everyone hated those plans. A huge and major development plan was stopped in its tracks by the people of New York. That is something that since Jane Jacobs many years before, has not happened.

The work that was the cultural blueprint and those several initiatives that the cultural community was engaged in after September 11th, the Arts Recovery Fund, The New Foundation for the Arts spearheaded Artists for Hope, and Arts for Healing. The many civic groups in New York, the Civic Alliance, New York Musicians, all of these, imagine New York, all of these efforts, which had as a catalyst or a trigger the events of September 11th.

What it also meant was a moment when the people of New York decided they wanted a place at the table and where artists and the arts and cultural community wanted a place at the table. You see in all the planning efforts now, a room for culture. It may not be exactly what we want, it may not be the way we would have done it, but the notion is no longer that you can plan a whole new part of New York City without arts and culture being at the table.

You have to understand that when we opened the door it was Ted and nobody else. And Shelly,



and so we were so stunned and excited to have all this.

But this wonderful publication includes a number of things. It includes contributions of over 1,500 New Yorkers, the first ever public participation survey. As with our colleagues up here, we found some interesting things about who was more into seeing arts and culture, and what people did other than that. The movies, of course, trumped everything, people went there much more.

A fair number of New Yorkers went to a lot of other things, but we also found that there were barriers to their participation, particularly in poorer children and older people. Some of our notions of who is taking advantage of our great cultural assets were challenged.

This has the results of one-on-one interviews with a lot of business and civic leaders, some pretty muckamuck people who gave us their time and energy. A guy named Greg Candell conducted our interviews. We had five town hall meetings, one in each borough, and they were terrific ways to hear from folks.

A real estate report, which seems almost optimistic compared to what actually happened to real estate in New York. It said things are looking tough, and since then the artists who basically created DUMBO, the District Under the Manhattan Bridge Overpass, have now, after doing their thing in record time, been kicked out. Soho, Tribeca, already gone.

One of my little pictures is a map, which I know you can't see, but this is to encourage you to go to micro.org and see your own version of this. We began to map out where arts and culture was in New York City and to show our impact. This was done with our friends at the Community Mapping Assistance Program of the New York Public Interest Research Group.

The kind of partners that we gathered for this project really were something relatively new for our community. We had to talk to the same people all the time, and we got all kinds of new friends, like the Center for Urban Future who did the real estate piece, the Florida Institute for Innovation in Social Policy, which did the participation profile.

Then we did our own research. We took statistical information from the census and from the NEA, NEH, NASAA and NOW and all the new names of those organizations, and the New York City Arts Coalition and the New York State Council on the Arts, and the Independent Budget Office of the City, which became a very good

friend of ours. We just would call them up, "Can you help me?" and then we'd hang up before they realized that they didn't actually work for us.

We did focus groups with individual artists because we thought it was important to capture their thoughts and ideas. Whoever wants this one can have it, because I'm not taking this back either. You can also download a version from Michael's website.

After September 11th and after the report was published, because the findings of this predated September 11th, though this came out shortly thereafter, we the cultural community became part of a much larger set of efforts to look at the issue of lower Manhattan. It almost became a metaphor for people and cultural organizations and artists wanting to have a voice in the future of this city.

Because the mayor and the governor had created the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation to focus attention on what would happen to the World Trade Center site, including the final selection of architects, which ended with Daniel Libeskind.

There are three cultural organizations chosen to have space at the World Trade Center site, the Drawing Center, a small visual arts center; the Joyce Theater; and the Museum of Freedom, which we don't know what they do. We'll see soon what that is. I'm sure it'll be fine.

Another set of us, including some of the usual suspects from the New York Foundation for the Arts, the New York City Arts Coalition and our friends at the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council, an organization very deeply affected by the events of 9/11, came up with a project called "Creative Downtown: The Role of Culture in Rebuilding Lower Manhattan."

This too can be found on the website of the New York City Arts Coalition. I always get that wrong, so just Google that and you'll be able to get this in PDF form.

We wanted to get into the mix with the many reports, New York Divisions, Pacific Alliance, where usually culture was mentioned but as an amendment. So there were whole sets of issues of what should be considered in terms of affordable housing, in terms of the actual site, down to sixteen acres of the site. We wanted to find a way to put the needs of artists and the arts community in the center of that.

The thing of the process and the product, part of that is to Tom's point, it never ends. The good



part about never ending is that once people are imbued with the spirit of taking charge of the future of their communities, they never lose that.

It also almost doesn't matter. To one thing in Bill Ivey's point, it doesn't matter to the consumer or the appreciator who you are. You can be an elected official, for the purposes of this kind of planning, you could elect yourselves to do the work. They don't care. They just like, as they did at the town hall meeting, that somebody gives a damn that they have something to say and is going to capture that and is going to deliver that somewhere.

When we first did Culture Counts, for instance, we thought it might be a kind of primer for some of those fifty-one new elected officials, and many of them actually took it quite seriously.

We also have found it living in the words of elected and appointed officials with no attribution whatsoever. If you can give that up, if you can say, I don't care, it's for the greater good, as long as someone is seeing that this is being done then you can do this work. Otherwise, your heart will be broken on a daily basis.

Were I could be inclusive, we did not have on our working group the kind of variety that you talked about, and I think we could have used some more preachers and househusbands and other workers of various backgrounds.

We had our working people, cultural people and then a citizen's group. The people came out more in the town hall meetings. If we had to do it again, I would have put people of all different stripes on our working groups to wrestle this day-to-day.

What we were part of, not to be immodest, was already ongoing. We helped to push along the notion of research being the basis for our work. People went in the years back from not knowing who the elected official was or when you'd say, "Could you tell me who your senator is?" They would mention their city council member. Or your city council member, they would mention their congressperson. That surely has changed a lot, and the whole notion of research.

Since then there have been many, many other documents, their new consortia, the New York State Artists Workspace Consortium, a brand new consortium of places like Smack Melon on the lower east side, a print shop. There's a brand new coalition of the New York City Arts Councils, it's called the League of New York City Arts Councils.

The whole idea of coming together and documenting what we do. Dance NYC did not exist back in the day, and they have done their own study about the dance community and the economics thereof.

The legacy of all of this work is that in the civic discussion and in the public policy discussion, at least in New York City, there's no longer the moment where top-down, big guys and girls only speak and say, "This is the way it will be." Or they may find that when they listen to the city, the city says, "No! We don't think that's going to happen."

SCHORGL: We'd like to open it up for questions, discussions. Yes, Peggy.

AMSTERDAM: It's interesting, thinking back to 2001, at a point where just before that time we all expected to have published cultural plans. Now it seems that it's not so much a cultural plan as a plan of process that's continual. It's great for me to hear that because I've been having a hard time coming to grips with at what point do I publish this plan? To me it's never really been a plan, it's constantly evolving.

To publish something seemed the wrong thing to me because so much was ongoing with this. I really like this idea of it's continuing and it's something that has to be almost living.

LAWSON: When I think of what the Pew Foundation was doing, Ford, Wallace, Rockefeller, research papers for years and years and years. I can only speak from a state arts council point of view. I don't know a lot of folks who were listening, because a lot of those papers and a lot of that research was being circulated amongst certain groups of people, and we thought, "Oh, it's another research paper."

Those were very important papers. They are becoming more and more important as they infuse our conversations. It certainly infused my process of public policy. Ben Cameron was out to one of Shelly's meetings, and I loved his quotation about "Building public value begins with speaking to where your audience is listening from."

When we field-tested our whole process, we began a program called What Was Then. We've changed it to the Faith-Based Institution Program. We brought all of our international performing arts groups into churches and synagogues throughout the state, utilizing in a non-faith way, the building, the temple, the altar, in the presentation of groups from Buenos Aires; Santiago, Chile; Mexico; etc.



We had been imposing in our normal way for years. You come and listen to where we're used to listening from. It made a big difference in the way we started to operate. It helped us to infuse our conversation, then, with more research.

We have a knowledge officer on staff. We have two reading afternoons a month in our office, where nobody may use their phone, everything is shut down, and they read information that's passed on by the knowledge officer, of what's going on in our field. That has changed the way we in our office do business. It's given us a different perspective of trying to find out where people are listening from.

I'm not talking about sitting down and reading a novel. I'm talking about a chapter out of a book, stories here, passed-on information. That has changed our processing of everything we do.

It's become transformational, not transactional. The more knowledge and the more research we have, and the more we put that into the way we think, the better public policy we're going to have. The term-limited legislators are coming up from a different educational point of view. They're more technology-wise. They're more informed of what's going on immediately. And they're not the same thinking person that that legislator was twenty-five years ago. Big, big difference.

CONWILL: Can I just say a couple of real quick things to that too? The fact is that you had a plan, Tom had a plan, this blueprint does give a benchmark and a place from which to build. To your point about the legislators, it is true that many of the people on the city council are much more used to hearing statistical data or hearing background or hearing evidence.

One of the things that's happening in the education field is the mayor thinks, "I'm just saying this, it should be so." The head of the education community, the council is like, "Well, no, I've got my own research. This is what I'm seeing, and I am not fielding your research." It is a different kind of arena. Those benchmark documents are very important.

LAWSON: You draw a line in the sand, and it's also if you do it in a way that articulates it, it can become a value statement. You have to prove that value day after day after day after day, with other examples and examples that some people get and some people don't, and then you've got to think about other examples. It's an iterative process, it goes on, and it changes, and it morphs.

AUDIENCE: Bill Ivey was really interesting today at lunch, and I'm thinking that what we're doing

is this cultural plan as this model that the forty-year-old model is running up to its edges.

What has happened with us in Louisville is we can't get all the arts and culture groups on one page. We have a United Fund that serves seventeen groups, and they're all in trouble with, or the Big Four is all in trouble, and they need \$8 million right now, and too bad for the little groups.

It's nasty! It is not pleasant! It's even like, is this even worth it? Because it's just so much bad feeling. So did you have any of that?

LAWSON: Who calls the question? In terms of Cleveland when the funders called the question, people listened. They may not have liked it, but they listened. What I found when I came to Cleveland is that there was a tremendous amount of energy around this planning process. There were people that were concerned that this was going to be a micro-management plan.

There were all sorts of different ways of hearing what the Community Foundation said, which was, "No, what we want you guys to get together and do is try to determine where you intersect with the public and the private sector." Where you intersect, that's where that plan could be. It could be there. It's not about micro-managing what you are or what you hope to be.

Small and medium-sized organizations and individual artists had a lot of energy around this, which was eagerness, because they have been disenfranchised. They were eager to get involved in this.

The major institutions had a lot of energy around this, which was anxiety, because they thought something was going to be taken away from them.

One of the strengths that we had is we kept the damn thing open! Whenever we learned something, we didn't wait until the end of the planning process to release it. We released it! We let people know what it was about.

We found that one thing that worked for us very well -- and this was early on -- is we designed research pieces that would not only inform the planning process, but would help the arts and cultural community. When we did a very simple marketing analysis, where all the arts and cultural organizations who participated in that, got a report on where they could find new consumers, they gave us their membership lists.



I had to sign a paper that said if I ever gave that membership list up to anybody else, I would be damned forever.

AUDIENCE: Did you just work with the nonprofits or did you work more broadly?

LAWSON: In terms of the plan? Just with the nonprofits for arts and culture and the individual artists. We did work with the for-profit community, the corporate community, who were involved in the planning process with us.

AUDIENCE: But I was thinking to Bill Ivey's point, the for-profit arts and culture community.

LAWSON: We included them in our research, they're part of it. They were part and parcel of the research.

AUDIENCE: And so what's the implication for them in the way that you are rethinking your grantmaking process?

LAWSON: Bravo, right behind us, they're at the meetings.

AUDIENCE: No, no, no. I mean, are they eligible to apply for grants through this public value discussion?

LAWSON: Yes, yes, they will be.

AUDIENCE: And how do you see that?

LAWSON: I don't.

AUDIENCE: How do you see that working with your existing constituents, those major institutions who are feeling anxious and threatened?

SCHORGL: I'll tell you how, let me just jump in. Because it's enabling legislation, and we're working on something right now. It's not only about increasing taxes and giving those taxes out, but increasing tax incentives for for-profits so that if they come to Ohio and Disney invests in a contemporary opera, they get tax incentives above and beyond the charitable contribution, which they can either save or sell.

LAWSON: Ours is balance, Shelly, and I'm not feeling, nor have I heard the same kind of anxiety from a state arts agency point of view. Possibly because we've kept a balance. We remain in every city in this state the largest operating support grantor, with the exception of the City of Cincinnati. So you've got balance over here, weighing against change coming down the road here.

Ask me that question in two years, and I might not be sitting here, so like what the hell happened to him? There was an uprising. I can't answer that yet.

LAWSON: Ted and then Sally.

BERGER: This issue of who calls the question, I think, is really an important one, because despite the people's love/hate relationship with the City of New York, there's really not that much leadership if we're honest about government or private funders in thinking through some of these issues.

The blueprint was an effort to pull a field together to take some leadership from this change, with the cooperation of agencies. In the past the city arts agency could just about cope with the increasing applications.

While there are a lot of funders there, they are often not invested seriously in the city, and certainly not in the diversity, either geographic or racially or ethnically in the city. There are parallel tracks between the city and state arts agencies. There's not a lot of leadership that comes, even though it's theoretically the cultural capital of the world. We had to create this figment of leadership in order to push this forward. The term-limit issue I think was really the driving force.

CONWILL: To Ted's point, even though I know you don't come up with this word intervention, but depending on your area, strategic interventions may work better than totalizing global efforts.

A project that Ted and I are both involved in, LINC, Leveraging Investments in Creativity, has projects in ten cities. They are trying to do big things like health insurance for artists, but not by attacking all fifty states all at the same time and trying to take over. Here's a project started in the Pacific Northwest, let's see what we can do here. For space, let's start with the thing in Boston.

We were able to do the blueprints because there was room to intersect or intervene in a place where somebody wasn't already doing that. Part of what we did was analyze the Department of Cultural Affairs and give them a picture of themselves that they did not even have in terms of analyzing where the money went, what the process was, what the basis of the de facto policy was for the City of New York.

RICHARD: I wanted to reinforce what you said about an informed public and keeping people on the same page with you while you're doing your research. As a citizen of the community of Cleveland, I think that happened very nicely.



As a staff member of the Ohio Arts Council, I also know that throughout this whole process we never stopped talking to our constituents. We talked and talked. I'm sure they wanted us to go away. That was really an important part of maintaining that trust factor.

SCHORGL: In what this transformation is doing, communication goes to the top of the list, and we have to keep putting that word up there on the board.

Another example, as our budget cuts came we sent warning flag letters out to our constituents saying, "In about a month, this is going to happen to you. We wanted to warn you now." In those 800 and some letters that went out, when the cuts came, we had one phone call and one complaint.

There were some severe budget cuts to institutions in this state. Not one major institution in this state called. All they did was drop a note saying, Sorry I guess we're all in this together. Sorry, thanks for warning us. Wow, can't believe this is happening. One complaint! That's due to that big word called communication, however we do it, whether it's by email or telephone or however.

LAWSON: You can't do it too many times. See this piece that I passed out, it was in Sunday's *Plain Dealer*. The thing I highlighted here is, "It's something we already knew without a study that Playhouse Square is a tremendous asset both in terms of economic development and pure entertainment value," said County Commissioner Jimmy Dimora. "But it's nice to have those kinds of statistics when you go out and try to get public support for the arts." "Just to have that kind of theater operation in your own backyard, do you know how many communities would die to have that? I just wish more people here would appreciate and understand that it's time we got behind the arts financially."

To have Jimmy Dimora say that is like the heavens opening up and all the gods of Hindu coming down. It took us, I've been here seven years, Barbara you've been here seven plus years, and it's taken a long time until that becomes second nature.

AUDIENCE: What role did the PAC actually play?

LAWSON: The PAC was challenged to raise \$500,000 of a \$750,000 budget. The commissioners were going to raise \$250,000 for the campaign. The PAC raised \$650,000 in three weeks, and the county commissioners were still trying to raise their \$250,000.

They also managed the campaign so that Issue 31 was not overshadowed by these sort of amorphous economic impact and economic development issues, that it was clear and it was focused on arts and culture means jobs, arts and culture retains jobs, arts and culture can mean that people will come back to our community to work. Missed it by 8,000 votes out of 300,000.

AUDIENCE: Can you talk a little bit about the enabling legislation that would increase tax incentives for private sector investment? We're involved with something like that in New York State, and we're in the process of trying to get it passed and move into the next session.

LAWSON: We will be going in front of the general assembly not until the spring session, not in the fall session.

AUDIENCE: Has it passed?

LAWSON: Oh, no, no, no, we're just starting to put that in the pipeline as they speak.

AUDIENCE: Because we've been working on it for a couple of years.

LAWSON: I can tell you the prototype for it, and that is the film industry's enabling legislation and state laws that give film companies tax incentives to come into their state. They get sales tax incentives; they get employment tax incentives. In Louisiana they get these tax credits that they can either sell or they can pass on. Well, it's all entertainment, folks.

SHELLY: I wanted to do a little counterpoint to what you said, Wayne, about term-limits. That is not at all the experience that we're having. Our experience is that the learning curve is so steep, and they are there for such a short period of time, that they are looking for short answers because they want to be perceived as a leader in the short term. Getting their attention on arts stuff is difficult because the leadership in our legislature is not arts-friendly, so they listen to the leadership because that's who's helping them sift through all of the information.

SCHORGL: Probably I would agree, except they like to hear stories. Which comes back to what we learned from the Wallace START Grant. I can sit down and tell a first-term legislator a story about a transformation. I can go over to Cambridge, Ohio with a senator when the Librarian of Congress is there and they're doing their vet stories. We bring in a traditional guitar player from Appalachia, and they turn around and go, "Oh! They're from my district!" Yes, sir, they are from your district! "I didn't know that!" Tell the story.



AUDIENCE: I'm with you. What our challenge is, is getting their attention and connecting to them to have them in the right place. Babysitting them to get them to the place where they are open to hearing that story. And because there's such a turnover of people, you're constantly in that process of educating.

LAWSON: Change the constitution and get back to get terms that go on forever.

AUDIENCE: When you talked earlier, you touched on it but you said it would have a role that that would play in the state. Is it an access issue? How will that increase your moving from transaction to transforming?

SCHORGL: Accessibility, actually, is what it's doing. It's so interactive – we're field testing it now – that I think we can collect stories, we can do it much easier that way, we've got to reduce staff. There's a simplicity to this and a necessity to this. But I think accessibility is the key.

AUDIENCE: We're about to do the same thing. When you said you rolled it out, how did you find it?

SCHORGL: Loved it, I was nervous about doing it. I thought when we got into Appalachia we'd have an uprising of people saying you're the poorest counties. Not at all. Out of these 800-some people, I think we've had, what, two, three complaints. Every county has got a library.

It's there, and I was shocked that in those twenty-nine counties in Appalachia out of eighty-eight, the majority of communicating what goes on in those counties takes place electronically because the distances are so far. I warned my staff, I said, "We're in big doo-doo here. We're going to get so many complaints!" It didn't happen.

Now, when it is up and running, and it's actually coming in, and we hired somebody who's going to do the desk, this person is going to be responding directly, and the staff is well trained, as I said to Shelly, "Give me a call next year, and we can list how many complaints we're going to get." But right now we're not looking too bad.

AUDIENCE: Is this in hopes of another initiative?

SCHORGL: It's another what?

AUDIENCE: Data-stream.

SCHORGL: Oh, absolutely! Absolutely. You're correct.

AUDIENCE: Back to your point made about communication, you talked about this process

and the staff has talked about this up and coming, so it wasn't a shock, it's been for the past year. Going back to telling them about our process that helped tremendously.

AUDIENCE: In some ways I think electronic is going to be a little easier, because there are certain things they won't have to redo every year.

SCHORGL: Material sent in, for instance. What we heard up here in Cleveland, somebody just said, "Oh! Using your work. What a relief! We're not going to have to do this?" "No." "Did you used to?" "Yes." "You mean, it's simplified?" "Yes."

We're going to be able to collect the stories that we need easier than we could when we were just shuffling through all of those damn final reports, which are endless and make staff go bananas. It's right there now. It's right there.

AUDIENCE: I'm wondering if you could use some more examples of some strategic interventions. For instance, you talked about upping the bed tax. It obviously would be that something that's effective. I'm curious about policies around arts and culture, tourism. If you could just cite some examples.

And I'll just give you some background. As I said, we are developing things we've never had. We have some funding mechanisms, but the kinds of things that are coming to mind for us, the kinds we need, like you mentioned the insurance, are issues around affordable housing, are issues around the fact that there is no arts in schools, so we have to do some educational stuff. There's a big debate about how else we can raise money via tourism.

I'd like some ideas of other policies because what so many in the arts community would say, "Well, give us more money!" Identifying the needs, and we haven't had the 11 triggers, for instance. We are in a situation where we're funded, so we'd like to do better rather than be motivated by need and abundance.

SCHORGL: Did you say abundance?

AUDIENCE: Yes.

SCHORGL: Where are you from?

AUDIENCE: Alberta.

SCHORGL: It's just that I haven't heard that word for so long.

AUDIENCE: Not for arts, you still have to spell it A-R-T and try and get their attention. We're trying to be very proactive rather than say, "Oh,



my God, things are falling apart, how are we going to deal with 24 percent cuts, etc.?"

I'm wondering if some policy pieces, not how you got there, but funding plans, that have been very effective.

LAWSON: Cleveland doesn't have a tax base, so Cleveland was never seen as a public sector funder in terms of public policy at a local level, because its tax base has deteriorated over the past 25 years, it continues to deteriorate. The infrastructure, just the sewer system alone, is so antiquated that you don't even want to try to go to anything else except the basics.

One of the things that Cleveland has an abundance of: vacant warehouses. An abundance, a surplus of vacant warehouses. We were able to work with some leadership people on the City Council who have artists in their district, and went out and did research on a whole lot of different live/work ordinances throughout the United States, and worked with the City Council to create a live/work ordinance in Cleveland that skips over the rezoning issue and creates what's called an overlay district. Any councilman or woman can elect to have this overlay district in an industrial zone or semi-industrial zone part of Cleveland, and doesn't have to go through the normal zoning channels.

It goes back to trying to make Cleveland artist-friendly, because compared to New York and Chicago and Los Angeles, we have a relatively inexpensive property and cost of living, so trying to attract those artists in and trying to keep the artists that have come out of our educational system, this is one way to do it. It certainly doesn't have any impact on increasing taxes.

Ted?

BERGER: Some other things about the states. The City of Providence and legislation that have freed artists from income tax.

There's also a concept that a number of us are looking at in New York City called the Cultural Land Trust. It's a relationship to affordable housing. There are cities all over the United States where there are these trusts set up for affordable living space. There are a lot of us there, particularly in the states, there have been more efforts trying to do things like that.

CONWILL: Is it Kentucky that has a big initiative?

SCHORGL: A huge initiative.

CONWILL: For arts. And when LINC's website is up in the coming weeks, there will be records not only about the projects it's working on, but its partners from LIST to Art Space to many others.

BERGER: A lot of the arts issues now in urban areas are really that of other people. We need to begin thinking through some of these issues about whether arts districts, for example, are the right approach. We're hearing more and more, let artists into a neighborhood, there goes the neighborhood in terms of gentrification and displaced folks.

What does that mean as we're building public policy in which we want the arts inclusive. That's where things like land trusts come in. We need to be thinking through our environmental impact on other people, and the partnerships and the relationships that we have. If we're going to do an arts district, maybe that's where we have a public health facility or something like that.

There's opportunity, because everybody's basically struggling, particularly on space issues. And I think there are some opportunities there that we haven't really explored.

AUDIENCE: One of the interesting things about being in my position, which is the go-to person for a lot of policy questions about how do you raise funds for the arts at the state level, is that you hear about a variety of really, really amazing ways of securing resources.

Everything from taxes to looking at portions of corporate planning, charging for vanity license plates to fund the arts, sale of surplus state properties. In Oregon, it's been one strategy that people are trying. Attaching excise fees to video and game rentals and things like that. There have been a couple of proposals around that.

The thing is that those are mechanisms to accomplish something that is very much about a particular window of opportunity at a particular moment in time where there's particular readiness to take a policy action about some other set of needs or goals or objectives about which there is a popular consensus.

Where we see a lot of efforts get stalled is that it's about the mechanism not about the public benefit. If you can get sustained action and sustained readiness over a generation, which is really what we're talking about in terms of the time necessary for transformation, if you can get that sense of public purpose and get that momentum built and sustained, the right window of opportunity in the policy stream to attach it to a funding mechanism will come



along. Then you'll succeed and somebody else will raid those funds and you'll start all over again, because that's the natural life cycle of these things.

But the piece, though, that makes me the most nervous is the discussion of that funding mechanism absent the discussion of the public consensus.

SCHORGL: It won't happen if you don't have that public discussion.

We appreciate very much the time that you contributed to us, and we hope that you have a good evening. If you have any other questions, let us know.

END

