

6

Fundraising

Local arts agencies have been established through local initiative in communities throughout the country for the purpose of supporting the arts. They currently represent a significant source of financial, administrative, promotional, and other service support for professional arts institutions, individual artists, neighborhood arts groups, and nonprofessional arts organizations. They are committed to play an increasingly effective role in creating a climate and the material conditions in which the arts can thrive.

The 1979 membership survey conducted by NACAA showed that, overall, such agencies were providing more than \$70 million in grants and services for support of the arts. Those dollars assisted the following groups or types of efforts:

Professional arts institutions and programs (symphony orchestras, dance companies, museums, etc.)	30 %
Arts services (promotion, facilities operations, arts in education, etc.)	27 %
Individual, professional artists (including those funded by CETA)	18 %
Cultural pluralism (festivals, folk, ethnic, and minority programs)	16 %

Nonprofessional arts activities (community theater, choruses, etc.)	9 %
---	-----

A similar profile using data gathered in December 1980 for a current-year sample of 12 cities and counties ranging in size from Chicago (population 3,369,357; current operating budget \$3,297,673) to Salinas, Kansas (population 37,714; operating budget \$165,000). The sample shows an interesting relationship to the 1979 NACAA figures above:

Professional arts institutions and programs	40.0 %
Arts services	15.2 %
Individual, professional artists	31.0 %
Cultural pluralism	9.3 %
Nonprofessional arts activities	4.5 % ¹

In the last decade, the number of local arts service organizations that perform the united arts fund function has increased to more than 51 in 27 states. In 1981, these groups raised more than \$31 million (see Table 4). A united art fund raises money for the operating support of at least three separate arts organizations, which are in some way restricted from individually approaching the donors to the combined campaign. North Carolina, where the private council movement started early and has stayed strong, has eight such councils, more than any other state. The united arts fund service organization that raises monies for the arts in a federated or joint appeal serves to solidify the private sector around this activity. The concept of getting the community behind one gift for the arts has the advantages of reducing the number of solicitors and of placing the responsibility for allocations with persons who have made it their sole business to know the arts community. Problems can come when the drive that generates monies does not keep up with the individual organizational needs in the community. For those communities, there are, in general, significant amounts raised; without such a concerted effort, the results might not be nearly as impressive.

Of the over 51 united fund drives, about one-third are in one of the 50 largest cities. In those cities, a few have another agency servicing the arts, usually called a council; it may be private, as in Houston, but in some cases, it is a municipal agency. What does this say about the needs in these cities? Probably only that they are sufficiently diverse that no one agency can handle them all.

United arts fund organizations range widely. There are those whose sole purpose is to raise monies from the corporate sector alone, such as the

TABLE 4
A Ten-Year History of United Arts Funds

United Arts Fund	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
Alamance County, NC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	26.2	30.0
Atlanta, GA	626.8	637.9	643.0	749.0	749.0	763.6	956.0	960.7	1115.2	1322.4
Battle Creek, MI	51.7	53.4	55.1	57.3	74.5	90.0	105.5	108.6	124.1	132.1
Binghamton, NY	102.3	123.8	134.8	139.7	157.8	181.8	159.1	165.6	2129.4 ^a	2865.1 ^c
Business Arts Foundation, NJ	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	400.0	400.0
Canton, OH	—	—	—	—	217.4	245.1	270.0	286.7	298.0	326.5
Charlotte, NC	161.8	161.0	184.3	228.4	271.6	372.6	512.7	580.1	660.6	740.7
Chattanooga, TN	241.4	250.6	257.5	297.4	348.7	368.7	389.6	405.2	425.4 ^b	451.5
Cincinnati, OH	618.4	1079.3	1003.3	1031.0	1112.0	1261.4	2009.2	2244.9	2447.3	2745.9
Colton, CA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	278.9
Columbus, IN	—	—	—	45.0	44.0	43.0	74.9	72.9	75.6	80.0
Corporate Theatre Fund, NY	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	125.0	154.0
Dayton, OH	—	—	—	—	234.0	234.3	301.3	330.0	418.0	485.1
Duluth, MN	—	—	—	—	—	113.9	128.4	140.9	162.0	162.5
Durham, NC	28.4	23.1	33.2	29.9	—	34.9	—	90.3	113.6	138.1
Dutchess County, NY	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	81.0	103.4
Erie, PA	74.8	72.6	67.7	74.8	101.5	101.5	—	266.9	238.4	163.6
Fargo, ND	—	—	—	—	—	—	151.2	117.0	108.2	103.0
Fort Wayne, IN	149.7	184.4	180.3	181.0	193.0	225.2	284.0	287.5	287.5	295.6
Fort Worth, TX	243.4	211.0	234.0	413.7	480.6	651.5	743.0	720.0	836.9	850.0
Goldsboro, NC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20.0	32.7
Grand Rapids, MI	124.8	150.3	162.5	198.2	210.0	195.0	260.0	285.0	285.0	308.0

Greensboro, NC	133.0	115.0	146.0	164.6	180.0	189.0	—	286.5	322.7	347.0
Hartford, CT	332.8	339.0	365.4	419.8	443.4	530.0	551.6	649.0	743.0	859.2
High Point, NC	—	—	—	—	16.1	24.1	52.5	54.5	38.4	70.5
Houston, TX	—	465.0	440.0	465.0	515.3	585.3	673.0	731.1	731.1 ^c	796.0
Hutchinson, KS	11.2	12.2	12.7	11.8	9.4	9.0	—	19.9	—	—
Ithaca, NY	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	32.1
Lawton, OK	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	52.7	72.2	81.4
Lexington, NC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	16.9	—	—
Lincoln Center, NY	1204.2	1283.2	1477.4	1496.3	1685.4	1742.2	2116.9	2549.7	2855.2	3326.5
Lincoln, NE	—	—	—	—	—	30.0	45.7	39.0	50.0	n.a. ^d
Los Angeles, CA	1850.0	1800.0	1785.0	1850.0	2475.0	2570.0	2938.9	3564.6	4091.3	4868.7
Louisville, KY	400.0	450.0	486.0	493.0	536.5	605.0	705.0	800.0	1021.0	1225.0
Manchester, NH	—	—	—	43.1	43.2	53.3	60.0	80.0	87.0	102.0
McPherson, KS	—	—	—	—	8.8	10.9	9.1	9.7	9.7 ^c	13.6
Memphis, TN	154.4	157.7	210.0	206.4	320.0	252.0	327.2	428.9	517.0	600.0
Milwaukee, WI	789.0	918.2	1075.0	1138.8	1350.0	1553.0	2040.0	2199.3	2313.9	2449.9
Mobile, AL	112.6	130.8	134.2	137.2	114.8	131.7	128.4	132.0	81.0	n.a. ^d
Natl. Corp. Fund for Dance, NY	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	450.0	500.0
Oklahoma City, OK	319.9	280.3	356.0	382.4	450.4	450.0	525.0	641.7	754.2	1007.7
Providence, RI	239.4	255.0	271.1	250.0	252.1	243.2	146.1	157.5	144.6	130.0
Rapid City, SD	—	—	—	—	20.4	26.3	32.6	36.1	41.2	51.8
Reno, NV	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	45.0	—
Rowan County, NC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	21.0
San Diego, CA	129.0	108.0	105.0	550.8	646.7	715.0	251.1	312.7	388.8	466.7
San Jose, CA	—	—	—	—	70.0	—	90.0	122.4	155.7	145.7
Seattle, WA	259.9	252.9	268.0	300.0	442.5	464.3	566.1	661.4	783.0	876.5
Springfield, MA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	242.0	302.7	325.9

(continued)

TABLE 4 (continued)

United Arts Fund	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
St. Louis, MO	1007.0	1075.0	1400.0	1411.4	1512.7	1590.0	1708.0	1903.6	2004.0	2134.0 ^e
St. Paul, MN	1041.5	1046.7	1108.7	1114.0	1300.9	1300.8	1224.8	1450.0	1450.0 ^c	1349.0
Wausau, WI	—	—	—	—	49.3	60.9	65.0	86.0	79.8	86.0
Westchester County, NY	—	—	—	280.0	220.0	329.0	415.0	420.0	555.0	451.2
Winston-Salem, NC	142.1	183.0	216.3	227.3	295.9	316.5	391.7	430.6	6719.2 ^a	6936.6 ^a
GRAND TOTAL	10549.5	11819.4	12812.5	14387.3	17152.9	18664.5	21408.5	25150.6	28335.5 ^f	31628.4 ^f

Source: Robert Porter, ed. *United Arts Fundraising: 1981* (New York: American Council for the Arts, 1981). Reprinted by permission of the American Council for the Arts. Copyright 1982.

Note: All figures in thousands of dollars.

^aFigures show cumulative totals from three-year united arts fund/capital fund drive.

^bThis figure has been adjusted from the 1980 report to show an additional amount raised of \$20.2.

^cFigure is repeated from previous report. Respective drive was not completed at time of completion of report.

^dNot available.

^eThis figure is the latest reported figure as of 11/1/81. . . .

^fTotal does not include figures referred to in footnote ^a. If included for 1981, the new total would be \$41430.1.

Corporate Council of Seattle, and those for whom broad-based fundraising is only one of many activities like the united arts fund councils described in Chapter 4. Those with the focus on fundraising alone would probably be reluctant to be called arts councils. For purposes of these discussions, they are, however, one of the council species.

Although it started as a foundation in 1927, the Cincinnati Institute of Fine Arts became a united arts fund in 1949, making it, along with the Louisville group that started the same year, the oldest of such organizations. In 1949, Cincinnati raised \$250,000; in 1982, the total was \$3,000,000. It raises the greatest united monies, aside from the Lincoln Center Fund and the Performing Arts Council of the Music Center of Los Angeles County. Cincinnati has a population of 400,000; the SMSA population is 1,500,000. Since 1975, starting with General Electric, 45 corporations in the community have instituted payroll deduction plans, and 10 percent of the total campaign is gained from these gifts, which range from \$1 up. Of the total of 25,000 donors to the Cincinnati Fund, 17,000 give at their place of employment, and 23,000 are individual donors. From 1949 to 1978, the Fund distributed operating or sustaining monies to four major arts organizations; since then, the number has increased to eight, and 30 to 40 project grants a year were instituted to emerging or smaller organizations.

The united arts fund councils tailor their structures to serve the needs of their particular communities. The breakdown of those drives—their policies, procedures, and administrative characteristics—is included in yearly *United Arts Fundraising* monographs by ACA. For instance, in 1981, 15 of these funds solicited individuals at their workplaces. Of these, some only solicited executives, some all employees. There were ten involved in payroll deduction plans to raise monies. In 1981, 34 funds solicited the general public mostly by telephone or direct mail. Government appeals were made by 46.8 percent (36.2 percent of which include all or part of these in their campaign) and private foundation appeals by 68.1 percent in that year.²

The ACA monographs also analyze the use of the funds and the allocations for symphonies, operas, dance, theater, museums, visual arts, etc. These charts are worth examining for those interested in the intricate details of the united arts funds, but show that while most funds distribute monies to symphony and chamber orchestras, fewer have supported visual arts groups, and still fewer arts centers.

Typically, the roots of united arts funds, like those of the Greater Hartford Arts Council, come from the business community itself as a conduit for its patronage. In 1980, \$743,000 was raised there by 860 contributors for 34 arts groups.

Michael Newton points to the fact that “from the united fundraising effort may emerge a strong community council that can carry out many

other valuable functions in the community.”³ He also points to the fact that the united arts fund many times is not only a salvation for the small or medium-sized organizations unable to attract a board of top community leaders, but can present an opportunity for their development as well. The small or medium-sized organizations are the major arts council constituents.

One former state and community arts council administrator, now in the professional fundraising business, sees the private council functioning more and more in the fundraising area. The real contribution of the arts council in this field is that it has sensitized the community to the needs of the smaller organization, so that there is an understanding that they are important. The arts council, in his opinion, will lean toward fundraising for the smaller organizations, while the larger ones, already expert anyway because of the large amounts of money they must raise to exist, will do their own private fundraising. In many cities, they do so now; it is in the cities with united fundraising that this would be a shift.

Some of the united fund administrators are looking at incentives for fund allocation to stem the complacency that develops when organizations learn to depend on funds that they think will be available indefinitely. Some of those incentives might include assuring an increased audience by a stated percentage; reaching so many schoolchildren; and so on. Some of the incentives sound like reasoning from the public sector — affecting accessibility and outreach.

Critics of united funds feel that there is a need for an even better way to stimulate the best corporate giving. Some point to the avenue of employee deductions used by United Way and by ten united funds.

Some arts councils that have not chosen to undertake united fund drives may have done so because of the problems attributed to such drives, such as weaker giving of special individual gifts, allocation process problems that occur, atrophy on boards of benefiting agencies, and the amount of hard work needed to put the drives together.⁴ Problems can come when the fund drive does not keep up with the organizational needs in the community. In some cities, it is surely true that more can be raised by the individual support groups than for the arts collectively. Even in the case of many of the challenge grants to a group of organizations under an umbrella, the matching monies are usually sought by each group individually, just as the proposals have been written and planned individually. With all organizations, large or small, there will be the need to plan well, to write solid proposals, and to be responsible for carrying out well-managed organizations and programs. The smaller organizations will always need help. They will never have enough staff members to cover all skills expertly.

The policy of what organization is eligible for funds and for what

purposes (sustaining or project) differs as the structure and purposes of the fundraising agency are laid out.

There are some agencies that have focused only on specific kinds of fundraising, or fundraising for a small number of institutions, for most of the years. As has been said, even these are reassessing their policies, faced with new pressures on the private sector. (Most such would not call themselves arts councils, even though some arts councils function as united fund drives.)

The St. Paul-Ramsey (Minnesota) Arts and Science Council was started in 1959 and began the United Arts Fund of St. Paul, raising funds for six arts organizations. Since 1980, it additionally provides operating grants to smaller arts organizations with funds set aside from its Arts Development Fund. Added as well were service and planning functions to help the groups become self-sufficient. Since 1978, over 400 artists and 78 organizations have been individually assisted.

Fundraising for the arts in Seattle is intriguing because there are two public arts councils (Seattle and King County) and several organizations in the private sector raising arts monies. Particularly interesting have been the divisions of labor, the understood roles, and the kind of leadership each group has had. They have, in essence, "picked every pocket."

The Seattle Arts Commission, with a budget of about \$900,000 in 1982, is a city agency that has evolved from an older municipal group. It has contracted for millions of dollars of services from artists and arts organizations over the years, and performed a wide range of services. The King County Commission, working in the area around Seattle, was formed in 1967 and operated as a voluntary agency until 1972, when its first director was hired. Funds are provided to arts organizations for the purchase of free services for the public, as well as reduced price tickets and program activities in the performing arts, visual arts, community arts, literature, and media. The commission produces a catalogue of performances and workshops to make the services known. The major regional institutions are provided funds by formula.

The Seattle Corporate Council for the Arts (listed as a united fund) is operated as a nonprofit agency for the business community to process corporate contributions for the arts. It offers its members a comprehensive and equitable means of distributing dollars to the arts. As with the United Way, this is for sustaining dollars only, and contributors will not be further solicited by recipient arts groups for additional sustaining dollars. The Corporate Council guarantees a "return on investment" by careful scrutiny of art groups' fiscal and budgetary performance and by equitable distribution of dollars. It does not fund special projects, capital drives, endowment drives, or individual artists. In 1979, the Corporate Council provided 17

percent of the collective contribution needs of the Puget Sound arts community; in 1981, it generated \$876,500. Their ultimate goal is to provide from 20 to 25 percent of the collective need. "Ongoing support is vital, but not glamorous."

The Downtown Seattle Development Corporation has a "fundamental commitment to the arts" through direct funding for projects, in-kind services, and such programs as free concerts and events called "Out to Lunch." Program dollars are raised from more than two dozen businesses. Unlike sustaining funds, which usually come from the corporate contributions divisions of the corporations, these funds come from marketing and public relations areas. There are acknowledged publicity and public relations values for the corporations in their "giving."

Since 1963, a volunteer group of arts patrons in Seattle called PONCHO has raised close to \$4 million through an annual auction (it raised \$237,250 in 1980). Its leadership are patrons of the arts and corporate leaders. No policy for distribution is spelled out to the applicants, but applications are reviewed by a rotating 11-member review committee. The grants are varied — for capital, operating, and program expenses. PONCHO has mostly funded projects, but its members essentially divide the dollars any way they see fit.

One cannot speak of Seattle's systems of support for the arts without mentioning in the same breath the group behind the groups, Allied Arts, Inc. "They are where you go if you want to *do* something," says one of the city's leading citizens. They have pulled everyone in that city into support for the arts. But their definition of their concerns is a broad one, and over the years has included the beautification of the city and the saving of a marketplace, as well as being key to the development of the Seattle and King County Arts Commissions. "They broke up the old businessman's network; they had vision and knew how to get to the heart of a budget and the appointments. This is exactly the key to their success," says one of their most ardent admirers. The Allied Arts Foundation, a separate organization whose sole function is fundraising, has mostly supported small and emerging arts groups.

In Seattle, then, with two public councils, more than three private fundraising groups, and a citizen advocacy support group, most of the possible fundraising roles are covered.

More cities are starting to divide up their fundraising functions. Such cities as St. Louis and Atlanta each have two arts agencies; one is a united fundraiser, the other a more public arts council group. In Atlanta, a third group is developing to gain support for smaller arts groups to complement the fundraising of the Atlanta Arts Alliance, which concentrates its effort on the Atlanta Memorial Arts Center and its five major arts institution units. In addition, a new public agency, The Fulton County Arts Commission,

has started to administer public monies. We will perhaps see more of this phenomenon as the pressures for fundraising in the private sector increase.

In the private sector, it should be noted that in cities with strong foundations and corporations, the possibilities for innovation and local initiative always exist. The Lilly Endowment has often served as a focus for generating public cultural projects in Indianapolis. There is the example of the Cleveland Foundation and its work in behalf of a challenge grant for six performing arts groups in Cleveland and Playhouse Square. The agreement between the McKnight Foundation and four major arts organizations in the Twin Cities to establish a \$20 million investment fund is another example. The foundation will provide \$10 million, and the groups will provide the other \$10 million. They will all share in the proceeds proportionately, except for \$100,000 to be given to smaller organizations.⁵ These efforts represent important commitments to local cultural stability, apart from the efforts of arts councils.

There are some private arts councils that function to allocate public monies to arts organizations. One of the largest private councils to do so is also one of the newest (formed in 1978) — Houston's — with a 1982 budget of about \$3 million, of which \$2,779,575 is for allocations. Allocation monies are generated from part of the hotel/motel tax. This allocation process is the major function of that agency, as it is in Columbus, Ohio, where the Greater Columbus Arts Council will distribute hotel/motel tax money of \$425,000 to \$475,000 in 1982. In Columbus, 20 percent of the hotel/motel tax is designated for this purpose by city code.

Chapters in two different publications, "Alternatives for Public Financing of the Arts,"⁶ and "Funding Local Arts Outside the General Fund,"⁷ summarize the ways in which public funds have been generated for the arts in different communities. Although arts councils, because of their newness, have not always been the force behind the generation of public funds in the past, some have evolved from them and have been the beneficiaries, along with the arts organizations in the community. The generation of each source of funds has complicated details not worthy of reporting, unless one is researching them for local adaptation. Each locale has laws both in common with others and unique to its location.

Now that the arts in some communities have benefited from sales taxes (Erie County, New York, and Birmingham, Alabama), liquor taxes (Huntsville, Alabama), racing taxes (Tampa, Florida, and Aurora, Illinois), tobacco taxes (Birmingham), property taxes (St. Louis; San Francisco; Hennepin County, Minnesota; and Chicago), hotel/motel taxes (Chicago; San Francisco; at least 56 Texas cities⁸; and Columbus, Ohio), bonds (Dallas, Charlotte, Salt Lake City, Minneapolis, and Chicago), cable franchise money (Atlanta), revenue-sharing funds (Dodge City, Kansas), and the percent for art laws discussed in another chapter, arts councils of the fu-

ture will be involved in generating those that are appropriate for their given community.

There are few examples of councils that have really done the key job of pulling the private and public sectors into a partnership in regard to their arts support. It's not that there has not been a desire to do it on the part of some, but, rather, that there is an inability to cross the threshold well. As commissioners of several large city councils have said, "It would be competitive if we solicited the private dollar; that is the purview of the arts institutions themselves." The united fund councils have generally focused on the individual and corporate gift, and some have been able to gather government funding as well, but not in significant amounts. And yet, the potential is probably greater for the private council to build the bridges between sectors, for they represent the greatest ongoing strength and ongoing community leadership.

Examples of private-public relationships of significance come from cities such as San Antonio and Buffalo. From a private role, reorganization in San Antonio (which grew out of basic research and planning for a National Endowment for the Arts City Spirit grant) caused the agency to assume a quasi-public or designated role. The city was giving \$450,000 to three organizations in 1975; as of 1982, there are about 40 organizations receiving over \$2 million. A purpose of the Arts Council is stated to "increase support for and development of the arts for the people of the city to become involved in the arts." Business and corporate support has increased by almost 500 percent.

In Buffalo, the Arts Development Service, a publicly designated private arts council, receives monies from both the city of Buffalo and Erie County. It also has been the coordinating force in generating a county allocation to the area's arts organizations of now more than \$4 million, and regrants monies from the state to these organizations.* This was one of the first sites for the Endowment's CityArts program.

The secret of Buffalo's success has been good solid private leadership and commitment, innovative and sound management, and, therefore, local respect and trust—credibility, which is the key to the link with government. The success has been attributed to subtle personal relationships that can work when action is needed. The whole organization reinforces local pride. Although a public agency has been brewing, it is believed that the service role of the Arts Development Service is so strongly respected that there would be no attempt to overlap. "It would be the role of a commission to implement laws," a former director of the Service points out.⁹

*The Arts Development Service helped them generate *new* monies; there were line-item grants to some larger cultural institutions before the development of the Arts Development Service organization.

It is the private council that can be middleman to the various sources of funds. An example of a private council with a major fundraising function is the Council for the Arts of Westchester County (New York). Their united fundraising initially solicited only corporations, but it has now expanded to include individual and public funds. Recently, some 50 arts organizations, with budgets ranging from \$1 million to \$1,000, received monies. Many councils have developed active business and arts communities as part of their services to stimulate awareness of need for corporate response.

The agencies that do fundraising best most likely find themselves friends of the major arts organizations, who receive the funding assistance as do the smaller organizations. The local public funds these organizations receive (when they are not line items of long standing) have usually come about because the arts council has pulled together the funds and developed a process for allocation.

When all is evaluated, however, this relationship with larger institutions is somewhat tenuous for most arts councils. In the Buffalo situation, the issues of sanction from those major institutions were taken care of in the beginning "when the clout on the council board settled the credit issue with their peers." Their membership in the council was sought so that they would form part of a "collective voice."¹⁰

There was a great deal of importance attributed to this "collective voice" in planning for the first tax monies that Cuyahoga County (the county in which Cleveland is located) would give to the arts. Beyond the Cleveland Area Arts Council's initial work, this collective effort has remained one continuity for future planning, and the amounts have increased annually.

Almost all cities with arts councils, especially those that are not united arts funds, have mentioned their desire to be more involved with the major institutions. In the smaller communities, these desires are mirrored. But the number of organizations are fewer, and their needs are on a different scale.

Fundraising makes arts councils useful to the arts organizations and forces them to explain the arts to the public. And yet there have been some that really have not seen this as *the* primary function. These councils have been busy meeting other needs of the community.

NOTES

1. Henry E. Putsch, "Background for Recommendations," Section III of *Local Community Arts Agency Policy Development* (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, 1981), p. 6.

2. Robert Porter, ed., *United Arts Fundraising: 1981* (New York: American Council for the Arts, 1981), p. 3.

3. Michael Newton, "Pros and Cons of United Fundraising for the Arts," in *United Arts Fundraising: 1981*, ed. Robert Porter (New York: American Council for the Arts, 1980), p. 6.
4. Ibid., pp. 7-9.
5. Charles C. Mark, *Arts Reporting Service*, no. 260 (February 9, 1981), p. 4.
6. Marcelline Yellin, "Business and the Arts," in *A New Kind of Currency: A National Conference on the Role of the Arts in Urban Economic Development* (Minneapolis: Minneapolis Arts Commission, 1978).
7. Luisa Kreisberg, ed., *Local Government and the Arts* (New York: American Council for the Arts, 1979), Chapter 13.
8. Cultural Arts Council of Houston, "1980 Hotel/Motel Tax Survey" *Houston Arts*, Summer 1981, p. 11.
9. Maxine Brandenburg, former Director, Arts Development Service. Personal communication, 1980.
10. Ibid.