

ARTS ADVOCACY AT THE LOCAL LEVEL:
HOW ADVOCACY FOR ALTERNATIVE FUNDING SOURCES FROM
MUNICIPALITIES IMPACTS THE CREATIVE SECTOR

Rebecca Brown

Major paper submitted to the faculty of Goucher College in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Arts Administration

2019

Abstract

Title of Thesis:	Arts Advocacy at the Local Level: How Advocacy for Alternative Funding Sources from Municipalities Impacts the Creative Sector
Degree Candidate:	Rebecca Brown
Degree and Year:	Master of Arts in Arts Administration, 2019
Major Paper Directed by:	Margie Reese Welsh Center for Graduate and Professional Studies Goucher College

This research intended to demonstrate how organizations and their stakeholders can harness advocacy strategies to effect positive change within their local governments' arts and culture funding systems. Limitations of municipal general funds for art and cultural investment and funding, methods of municipal art and cultural funding sources, and how cities are implementing effective, innovative funding sources were reviewed in this research.

The funding systems for nonprofit arts at the local government level in South Art states' cities with population sizes between 45,000 and 400,000 were the parameters for the research. Both onerous and innovative public funding systems for mid- to small-sized cities and their arts and cultural organizations were explored.

General funds systems hindered some development of arts and cultural investment from municipalities, however, funding systems that utilized municipal general funds and alternative funding sources were better suited to harness communities' assets and were more effective in sustaining arts and cultural resources. Diverse municipal funding sources provided stable levels of funds for the arts and cultural sector.

Understanding funding systems at the local level plays a vital role in preparing arts and cultural organizations to advocate for the arts. Effective public advocacy for the arts begins with understanding the external pressures that both negatively and positively impact the cause. The effectiveness of advocacy to local government occurs when the arts and cultural sectors adopt the methods utilized by other sectors.

ARTS ADVOCACY AT THE LOCAL LEVEL:
HOW ADVOCACY FOR ALTERNATIVE FUNDING SOURCES FROM
MUNICIPALITIES IMPACTS THE CREATIVE SECTOR

Rebecca Brown

Major paper submitted to the Faculty of Goucher College in partial
Fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Arts Administration
2019

Reader's Committee

Margie Reese, MA, Chair

Ramona Baker, MFA

Gregory Lucas, MBA

Nicolle Wasserman, MA

Copyright by
Rebecca Brown
2019

This paper is dedicated to my father for his patience and guidance and to my mother for her joyful approach to learning and giving. To my most avid advocate, Jordan, thank you for the endless encouragement every step of the way.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Ramona Baker's ability to make a crowded room of strangers feel at home inspired me to be open to change and the opportunities that lie ahead—and I thank her for it. I would like to thank Margie Reese for her dedication to the practical and for her forward-thinking perspective. Also, I would like to thank Greg Lucas for his patience and unyielding attention to detail and Nicolle Wasserman for her unbiased and professional guidance. I am grateful for Malyn Brown's first thoughts and recommendations. To my cohort, whose humor and tenacity inspired me every day, I would like to thank them for their support during these past years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction:	DEFINING SCOPE AND DEFINING TERMS	1
Chapter I:	GENERAL FUNDS: LIMITATIONS	7
	Private Funding	8
	Federal Funding	9
	State Arts Funding	11
	Local Arts Funding	12
	South Arts	15
Chapter II:	BEST METHODS IN INVESTMENT PROGRAMS AND SOURCES OF FUNDS	29
	Methods of Municipal Investment	30
	Sustainable Methods	33
Chapter III:	IMPACT, SUSTAINABILITY AND GROWTH	35
Chapter IV:	ARTS ADVOCACY FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUNDING	41
	Advocacy Methodologies	42
	Advocacy in Local Government	44
	Advocacy's Impact at the Local Level	45
Conclusion		47
Appendix	Tables of South Arts States: Local Municipal Arts and Cultural Funding through the General Fund and Percentage Changes	51
Works Cited		60

LIST OF TABLES

Tables

1	Per Capita Spending by State Art Agencies with Ranking within USA in 2017	3
2	South Arts States and Municipalities included in Scope of Research	4
3	Alabama: Sample of Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund	16
4	Florida: Sample of Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund	18
5	Georgia: Sample of Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund	19
6	Kentucky: Sample of Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund	21
7	Louisiana: Sample of Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund	22
8	North Carolina: Sample of Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund	24
9	South Carolina: Sample of Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund	25
10	Tennessee: Sample of Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund	27

Introduction

Arts and cultural organizations cannot ignore any potential funding source considering the limited funding available on the state level from state arts agencies, the national level from the federal government, and from private foundations. Municipalities' arts investment programs are capable of filling in the gaps where private and national funding programs are inconsistent. Municipalities have innovative ways to collect and disburse local public funds for cultural and arts programming throughout the United States.

While nonprofit arts and cultural organizations of all sizes and structures need to focus on many contributed income sources, small and mid-size organizations face limitations. National arts funding and state arts funding is limited in terms of total available funds and the process by which those funds are disbursed. Private funding applications can be burdensome and are often not available to rural communities with smaller population sizes. Avenues for federal and private funding can be onerous for mid- to small-sized cities and their arts and cultural organizations.

Local funding from municipalities provides a faster, more linear path to obtain resources since municipalities are familiar with their own local nonprofit organizations and the needs that foster the organizations and programs. Despite such advantages, when local governments take the initiative to fund and support their cultural and artistic communities, they rely on general funds. General funds are the broad-purpose revenues

of cities and counties. Also, general funds are the same revenue sources that finance public safety, public works, and education—services that must be addressed and provided first by municipalities. General funds used for cultural and arts funding programs may not be sustainable—especially when, in many cases, cities’ available funds for the arts have decreased or have become stagnant. Limitations with general funds in relation to arts and cultural funding will be explored and evidence of funding limitations of private foundations, national, and state arts funding will be provided.

Advocates for cultural and arts organizations must showcase other cities’ funding structures to their own local representatives to identify and highlight new, creative methods for local government to invest in arts and culture in a more sustainable way. The sources and impact of municipal funding sources for the arts and cultural sector will be explored in cities within South Arts states that have comparable population sizes. This topic is critical for arts and cultural nonprofit organizations and their stakeholders because these organizations have value in their communities—value that needs to be embraced by local leadership. The value arts and cultural organizations contribute to their own municipalities include the creation of jobs, the financial gains to their economies, and the education of their next generation of creative thinkers.

The landscape of local arts funding is shifting in Southern states. While many cities rely on their general funds, some cities are also looking for innovative ways to invest in their creative economies. Investment for nonprofit arts at the local level will be more sustainable if local arts and cultural organizations advocate for alternative funding sources in lieu of municipal general funds.

Defining Scope

Regional arts agencies function within geographically-defined states to assist states, state art agencies, and local communities by promoting and fostering the creative sector (“State and Regional”). The study will focus on cities within the South Arts’, a regional arts agency, purview. As the regional arts agency for Southeastern states, South Arts’ mission is to “build on the South’s unique heritage and enhance the public value of the arts” (“Mission and Goals”). South Arts partners with the state arts agencies of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. The states within South Arts were selected because these states have the lowest investment per capita for arts and cultural funding through the state art agencies in the United States. Of the nine states in South Arts, only one exceeds the national average—Florida.

Table 1

Per Capita Spending by State Art Agencies with Ranking within USA in 2017

State	Rank	Per capita spending
Georgia	49	\$0.11
Louisiana	40	\$0.45
Mississippi	34	\$0.53
Kentucky	33	\$0.60
South Carolina	29	\$0.68
North Carolina	26	\$0.73
Alabama	20	\$0.99
Tennessee	16	\$1.06
Florida	11	\$1.56

Source: *State Arts Agency Legislative Appropriations Preview Fiscal Year 2018*

By comparison, the national per capita average in state funding for arts and culture was \$1.36 in 2017. For fiscal year 2018, the per capita state arts agency

appropriations ranks four states in the South Arts region—Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Kentucky—in the bottom percentile of all fifty states, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico (*State Arts Agency Legislative*). States in South Arts are collectively falling behind the national average of state arts agency funding—which can affect art and cultural organizations’ ability to match and leverage federal funding or private funding.

Cities in this study were also limited by population size: the cities reviewed were limited to mid-size municipalities with populations between 45,000 and 400,000. Cities with larger population sizes were not included because they benefit from an expanded property and business tax pool. By narrowing the scope of the study-group, this research focused on redefining how cultural and arts organizations, without significant access to national art funds and state art funds, can encourage local government to invest in their creative economies.

Table 2

South Arts States and Municipalities included in Scope of Research

States	Cities
Alabama	Birmingham, Decatur, Huntsville, Mobile, Montgomery
Florida	St. Petersburg, Tallahassee, Gainesville
Georgia	Augusta (city-county consolidated government), Athens-Clarke, (city-county consolidated government), Columbus, Savannah, Sandy Springs, Macon, Roswell
Kentucky	Lexington-Fayette, Bowling Green, Owensboro, Covington
Louisiana	New Orleans, Baton Rouge, Lafayette, Lake Charles
Mississippi	Jackson, Gulfport, Southaven (suburb of Memphis, TN), Hattiesburg
North Carolina	Raleigh, Greensboro, Winston-Salem, Fayetteville, Greenville, Asheville
South Carolina	Columbia, Charleston, Mount Pleasant, Rock Hill, Greenville
Tennessee	Knoxville, Chattanooga, Murfreesboro

The study was also limited to a five-year span from 2013 to 2017 in local government spending. The United States had mostly recovered from the 2008 and 2009 economic downturn by 2013, with an increase in gross domestic product (“US GDP Growth”).

Defining Terms

Sustainable is defined in the scope of the research as the longevity of funding sources available, an increase in available funds for arts and cultural organizations, and the stable or growing number of organizations able to receive funding. The quality of impact on the communities will be included in the scope of sustainability, for example, performance measures related to audience development and number of services provided. Additionally, the definition of *sustainable* will include the funding sources’ ability to develop systems within the creative sector for employment and small business growth.

General funds are broad-purpose operational funds for municipalities. General funds are for current operations, and the funds cannot be carried over from year to year unless designated for specific projects. Each city can have general funds that are derived from different revenue sources. Normally cities collect 71% of their general funds “from own-source revenues, including 24% from property taxes, 13% from sales taxes, 3% from income taxes and 32% from fees and charges” (McFarland and Hoene). This is revenue from resident and business property taxes; sales tax on clothing, food, or beverages; water bills and fees from a variety of services, such as liquor licenses,

building inspections, and building and development permits. City administration and elected officials have discretionary authority to spend general funds.

Percentage or designated funding for the arts “generally apply to any municipal capital improvement project where a determined percentage of the total project budget is set aside for public art” through a city ordinance. This percentage may include private development or civic buildings and structures. For example, cities in the United States have implemented arts funding through private development; Los Angeles and Tampa “include private commercial development in addition to municipal projects” for their percentage for art program (Carlin). The process of purchasing and commissioning art and determining how the funds are handled is normally included in the ordinance and policies of the municipalities.

Municipalities can establish enterprise funds accounts, which are created as a way to account for specific, segregated-purpose revenue. The revenue created from the activities will be “devoted principally to funding all operations...including payment of debt services on securities issued to finance such activity” (*Glossary*). Most enterprise funds in municipal governments are used for the source of the revenue—parking fees dedicated to improved parking services and new parking garages as an example. In some instances, municipalities’ enterprise funds “may be...[used for] other purposes and to use other funds to pay costs otherwise payable from the enterprise fund” (*Glossary*). City leadership can determine how enterprise funds are used, unless the State statutes regulate such expenditures. The sources and diversity of municipal funding are integral to the financial health of cities, which in turn impacts cities’ ability to invest in their communities.

Chapter I

GENERAL FUNDS: LIMITATIONS

Nonprofit organizations can increase public funding as a part of their revenues by understanding various government funding systems. These systems are complex, limiting, and filled with bureaucratic tendencies that suppress new, unfamiliar constituents.

The hierarchy of government agencies, composed of city, county, state, regional, and federal strata, is itself a dizzying scheme, especially to people whose own nations have highly centralized, state-directed systems. It's no wonder, then, that the financial mechanisms of American arts policy and practice are poorly understood. (Wonronkowicz et al.)

Organizations are most able to engage their community representatives by understanding and dissecting the policies and priorities of municipal funding. Through active engagement, arts and cultural organizations can partner with local governments to affect local governments' financial investments towards arts and cultural services and enrich the lives of residents and visitors.

Arts and cultural organizations encounter obstacles while seeking to build revenue through public financial support. Limited practicable funding opportunities are available for nonprofit organizations at the federal level through the National Endowment for the Arts and at the state level through state arts agencies. Federal and state agencies have competitive funding processes due to the limitations of available tax revenue, the political

motivations of supporting the arts, and the numerous organizations applying for a small pool of funding. The process of applying and receiving national and state arts funding can be arduous for smaller, emerging, and grassroots-based arts and cultural organizations. Actual receipt of sustainable funding is improbable for new and emerging local arts and cultural organizations due to requirements such as equal cash-matching, documented previous experience, one-time and specific-purpose nature of the grants, financial accounting requirements, and the skill and resources needed to submit a grant application (“Grants for Organizations”). At the same time, local governments are a critical resource. Local arts and cultural organizations are hard-pressed to obtain funding from private foundation, state, and federal sources; therefore, the organizations must look toward local government for financial support.

Private Funding

Private foundation funding can be burdensome to obtain and is often not available to smaller, rural communities. The US Department of Agriculture determined that only 5.5% of large foundations’ domestic grant dollars are disbursed to rural areas (Pender). Four states primarily retain private foundations’ assets—California, New York, Illinois, and Texas—“accounting for 42% of foundation giving” (“Better Together”). This leaves minimal funds available for organizations outside of these four states. “Relegating arts support to the private sector alone would leave millions of people behind,” stated Pam Breaux, CEO of the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (“Better Together”). Private foundation funding for organizations in midsized and small cities is limited by location and available funds.

Federal Funding

The Federal government's arts funding for nonprofit organizations is limited to two agencies: the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Over the past twenty years, the National Endowments for the Arts (NEA) has awarded nearly \$2.8 billion to nonprofit organizations, however that is only \$140 million a year ("National Endowment for the Arts: Appropriations"). The NEA only comprised 0.004% of the overall federal budget in 2015 (Avins). The lack of available funds from the federal government weakens the NEA's ability to invest in arts and cultural organizations.

The lack of federal appropriation to the NEA leads to low per capita spending on the arts and cultural sector. The per capita spending on the arts is \$0.45 cents by the NEA (*National Endowment for the Arts: Promoting*). In comparison, the State of Minnesota's per capita spending on the arts was the highest nationally at \$6.35, and the average per capita spending for states was \$1.09 in 2018 (*State Arts Agency Legislative*). As the national standard-bearer and advocate for arts on national level, the NEA funding levels are inadequate at best.

Additionally, the NEA's funding patterns hinder mid-sized and small cities and their arts and cultural organizations. Thirteen percent of NEA funds are awarded to non-metropolitan areas. The NEA awarded 10% of available funds to metropolitan areas with populations under 250,000 persons. The areas in the United States that receive the highest percentage of funding have population sizes in excess of 1 million people ("\$82.3 Million").

Not only is the funding limited for small towns and midsized cities, but the process of applying and receiving funds is arduous at the national level for small and emerging organizations without development staff. The NEA grant process is competitive; five-thousand applications were received by the NEA in 2013 (“Grant Review Process”). NEA awarded 2,100 grants (“National Endowment for the Arts: 2013”). Arts and cultural organizations applying would have a 42% chance of receiving NEA funding. This is a risk for small nonprofit organizations, whose yearly operating budget could be close to the cost of a quality grant writer. Without development directors, managers, or full-time staff, raising funds can fall on board members, a single staff member, or volunteers. Applying for a public grant can require extensive staff time, around six weeks—time away from planning and implementing programming that affects the organization’s mission (Keithly).

This is not to dismiss the work of the federal government in support of the arts and cultural vitality of the nation. There is “compelling evidence...to demonstrate how federal funding for the arts combined with private sector and other public sector support has had a profound impact upon the health, education and economy of our nation” (Jordan). NEA funding activates the national economy. For each dollar of NEA funding, arts and cultural organizations can “leverage \$9 in matching funds” from earned income, private contributions and local matching funds (*Quick Facts*).

National funding should be pursued without regard to the limitation of available funds; however, organizations must recognize their own capacities and the federal government’s requirements. “According to federal statute, National Endowment for the Arts funding for state arts agencies must not be used to supplant nonfederal funding”

(“National Endowment for the Arts: 2013”). This policy encourages states arts agencies and their arts and cultural organizations to develop diverse revenue streams, yet, smaller and emerging organizations’ ability to provide higher-request matching funds might be limited. The federal matching fund limitation compels an organization to review other government sources, such as municipalities.

State Arts Funding

Nonprofits arts and cultural organizations also face challenges in their home states. State arts agencies’ funding is limited in all parts of the country; for example, in 2015, the total amount awarded nationwide by State Art Agencies was \$257 million, and from that only \$35 million was awarded to rural areas (*State Arts Agency Grant; Support for Arts*). For a comparison to a different sectors’ support, nationwide \$668 billion was spent on public elementary and secondary schools in 2015 (“Fast Facts Tool”). According to the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, “government funding is typically a small slice of the funding pie.” State arts agencies’ funds comprise 2.1% of total grantee revenue (*Fact vs. Fiction*). “Even though a majority of Americans claim to support public funding of the arts, state government spending on the arts is minimal—and may be losing ground relative to other types of state expenditures” (*State Arts Agency Legislative*). State Art Agencies have many limitations set forth for arts and cultural organizations.

The network of state arts agencies collectively holds a considerable portion of funding; but, compared to the whole contributed and earned income profile of a nonprofit organization, state art agencies are an insubstantial portion of public funding. Moreover,

state art agencies' funding is lower than the national per capita average within the South Arts states (Table 1). "Government arts funding declines have led to the elimination of numerous grant programs for small and large grantees alike" (Stubbs and Clapp). Since there are limited funds available from and granted by state arts funding, local governments within these states, who are interested in investing in their creative economies, should implement a variety of funding methods to support the arts. Smaller arts and cultural organizations are better served by seeking municipal funding in lieu of national and state funding.

Local Arts Funding

Arts and cultural organizations should turn to local governments as a potential revenue source since state and Federal arts funding is limited for small and emerging organizations. Arts and cultural organizations and local governments are seeking to fulfill similar goals—improving the overall quality of life for their stakeholders. Municipal governments can be a viable source of arts funding.

Nationwide, city and county funds are available for arts and cultural organizations. Nonprofits can diversify their revenue streams beyond state and federal income and lighten the load of staff members by seeking funds closer to their community. Local government representatives, who determine the funding, are present in their communities—giving arts and cultural organizations easier access to government representatives. The relationships that organizations build with city governments provide an opportunity for the organizations to showcase their arts and cultural programs offered in the community to elected individuals.

These relationships help shape the city government policy toward the arts and cultural sector. The relationship is shown in the local government and local arts agencies' ability to fund the arts and cultural sector: the 4,500 local arts agencies and nexus organizations "collectively invest an estimated \$2.8 billion in their local ecosystems" (Lord et al.). The nexus organizations are considered the local art agencies, which often have different structures than a city's arts or cultural department. The cities' investment of \$2.8 billion contained \$600 million available through a grant process, direct contracts, or loans towards a "direct investment in artists and organizations" (Lord et al.). In 2015, an estimated \$840 million was spent nationally by local governments on direct arts expenditures (Stubbs and Clapp). For comparison, in 2015, the NEA's total budget was \$146 million including their available funds for outside organizations, while state arts agencies granted \$257 million (*2015 Annual Report; State Arts Agency Grant*). Nationwide, local governments and their nexus organizations invest more in their creative communities than the state arts agencies and the NEA combined.

While the overall sum of funds available from local governments for arts and cultural organizations and artists is substantial, the figure represents a national picture which includes cities with large populations. For example, New York City invested \$43.9 million in arts and cultural organizations in 2015 (Selvin). This was a \$5.11 per capita spending on the arts ("US Census Bureau"). New York City has the revenues to support such active financial participation in the arts. Other cities with a large population exceed the national State Art Agencies' average of \$1.26 per capita art spending, including Cuyahoga County in Cleveland at \$12.48, Miami-Dade County at \$5.08, San Diego at \$4.63, and San Francisco at \$12.95 (Novak-Leonard and Baach). Cities with large

population sizes have invested significantly more per capita to arts and cultural programming because of larger cities' tax-bases and multiple revenue streams to support such services and organizations. Smaller and mid-size cities do not have comparable resources in their general revenues.

Traditionally, cities' arts and cultural funding comes from their general fund. Cities depend on past practices to guide their art and cultural spending decisions and often rely on general funds for art services. However, there are limitations on what expenses can be covered from the general fund source for the arts and cultural sector. Additionally, there is competition for general funds among political motivations, civic priorities, public improvements, and education. Municipalities, first and foremost, exist to provide services related to these priorities. In 2016, local governments spent \$177 billion on public safety, a civic priority, and \$1.46 trillion on education, with only \$36 billion directed towards leisure services, which includes arts and cultural funding (*2016 State & Local Government*). The US Census of Local Governments does not itemize local government budgets by arts and cultural expenditures, but instead summarizes arts, parks, and sports expenses into the same category.

Elected officials and municipal management considered the use of general funds for arts and cultural organizations as an enhanced service in contrast to the necessity of public safety. By understanding the cities' relationship to general fund spending, arts and cultural organizations can better grasp the funding requirement priorities and policies for local governments. This knowledge in turn will make local arts and cultural organizations more effective in applying for and receiving funds from cities.

South Arts

Many cities in the South Arts states have invested in arts and cultural programming; however, the growth in funding has occurred predominantly in cities that use alternative funding sources. During the period reviewed, cities in the South Arts had different financial resources garnered from their diverse community assets and job markets. The cities who proactively created arts funding sources, outside of the general fund, were able to foster art and culture organizational growth and build the capacity of their creative communities.

To understand the strengths and opportunities of municipalities' arts funding systems specifically from the general fund, the following analysis outlines each state within South Art's purview and how the cities within those states developed or decreased resources for arts and cultural organizations and programs.

Alabama

Birmingham, Alabama, had some modest annual increases in outside arts and cultural agencies' funding levels, but the city had an overall decrease in available funds over four years. Mobile increased its spending by over one million dollars—largely due to the city's support of the Mobile Museum of Art and the History Museum Board (*General Fund Budget*). Funding levels for arts and culture in Decatur, Huntsville, and Montgomery were stagnant or had decreased over the five-year period (Table 3). Decatur experienced a 34% decrease in available funding from the general fund from 2013 to 2017. Huntsville experienced a 25% percent decline over five years, and Montgomery experienced a 15% decline with \$480,000 available in 2017 compared to \$565,000 in

2013. The overall available amounts for Alabama were considerably small investments. With three cities experiencing a decline in available funding, Alabama's cities' general fund investment in their creative sector could include more sustainable methods of funding streams.

Table 3

Alabama: Local Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Decatur	\$173,500	\$113,500	\$113,500	\$113,500	\$113,500
		-34.58%	--	--	--
Huntsville	\$563,334	\$612,623	\$597,053	\$554,644	\$418,110
		9%	-3%	-7%	-25%
Montgomery	\$565,000	\$555,000	\$480,000	\$480,000	\$480,000
		-2%	-14%	0%	0%

Source: "Finance Department." *City of Decatur, Alabama*, www.decaturalabamausa.com/departments/finance-department/; "Finances and Budget." *City of Huntsville*, www.huntsvilleal.gov/government/finances-budget/; "Financial Reports." *City of Montgomery, Alabama*, www.montgomeryal.gov/city-government/departments/finance/financial-reports.

Florida

The State of Florida has the highest per capita funding, \$1.56, for the arts compared to other South Arts states, and of the three cities reviewed, both Gainesville and Tallahassee exceeded the per capita funding at the state level, at \$8.87 and \$3.14 respectively. St. Petersburg, Florida supported two methods of funding sources for arts and cultural programming and projects. The general fund source awarded funds to organizations located within the city and only awarded funds if the organization provided matching funds (*Adopted Operating*). St. Petersburg supported art through the "Arts in Public Places" program, where funds from "certain capital improvement projects within

the city [were] required by ordinance” to allocate a percentage of the development project for the acquisition of art. The percentage for arts ordinance was based on the overall budget of the capital project, for example if the construction cost was between \$100,000 to \$2.5 million, then 2% of the cost were allocated to the Arts in Public Places Fund (*Adopted Operating*). St. Petersburg is a prime example of diverse funding system that increased available funds comparing 2013 to 2017, however, in the more recent years the city did not match the highest funding level shown in 2015.

The City of Tallahassee invested in its local arts agency, the Council on Cultural and Arts, through the general fund. Awarded amounts from the City to the Council decreased by \$403,338 from 2015 to 2016 and remained at \$192,036 in 2017 (*Fiscal Year 2017*). Yet, due to the structure of the local arts agency as a non-profit, the Council receives support from other sources of private contributions and Leon County (“Overview”). In addition to Leon County direct financial support, the Council also receives \$20 per sale of Leon County’s car license plate specialty tags for the arts (“Florida”). Even when the City’s investment in the Council decreased significantly through the general fund in 2016, the Council’s diverse financial portfolio enabled it to provide the community with sustainable sources of arts and cultural investment through their partnerships with private funders, Leon County, and the State of Florida.

Gainesville, Florida, used three sources of funding for the arts, through its programs: the Cultural Affairs Fund, the Tourists Product Development Fund, and the Arts in Public Places Trust Fund (*City Manager’s Recommended Budget*). The Cultural Affairs Fund functioned as an enterprise fund, supporting its community’s arts and cultural programming with revenues from arts and cultural programming. The Tourist

Product Development Funds were sourced from Alachua County’s tax dollars, which were governed by the State of Florida (“Now Accepting”). Like St. Petersburg, Gainesville also has a percentage for arts program, which fluctuated year to year based on current public art projects.

Overall, all three cities reviewed in Florida experienced a decrease in funding from the City sources, including the Art in Public Places fund in Gainesville and St. Petersburg.

Table 4

Florida: Sample of Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
St. Petersburg	\$74,123	\$314,209	\$470,000	\$124,000	\$149,000
		323.90%	49.58%	-73.62%	20.16%
Tallahassee*	\$831,734	\$704,862	\$704,862	\$301,524	\$301,524
		-15.25%	0.00%	-57.22%	0.00%
Gainesville**	\$1,435,479	\$1,246,505	\$1,088,103	\$1,260,905	\$482,238
		-13.16%	-12.71%	15.88%	-61.75%

*Tallahassee supports a Local Arts Agency, Council on Cultural & Arts, and other cultural institutions through the general fund.

**Gainesville used multiple funding sources.

Source: “Budget Documents.” *City of St. Petersburg*, www.stpete.org/city_departments/approved_budgets.php; “Financial Transparency.” *City of Tallahassee*, www.talgov.com/transparency/transparency.aspx; “Financial and Operating Plan.” *Gainesville*, www.cityofgainesville.org/BudgetFinance/FinancialOperatingPlan.aspx.

Georgia

The cities of Sandy Springs, Savannah, and Columbus all experienced decreases in available general funds for arts and cultural organizations. Augusta reduced its arts and cultural spending by less than 3% in 2014; the available funds have remained relatively flat since that time. Savannah has experienced a decline of available funding by 10.58%

over five years. Sandy Springs decreased its art and cultural funding to zero in 2017 (Table 5).

Table 5

Georgia: Sample of Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Columbus	\$707,798	\$662,699	\$625,438	\$419,898	\$394,912
		-6.37%	-5.62%	-32.86%	-5.95%
Savannah	\$752,400	\$714,780	\$764,320	\$680,400	\$680,400
		-5.00%	6.93%	-10.98%	0.00%
Sandy Springs	\$310,000	\$59,500	\$133,135	\$63,000	\$0
		-80.81%	123.76%	-52.68%	-100.00%

Source: *Fiscal Year 2017 Operating Budget*. City of Columbus, www.columbusga.gov/finance/pdfs/budgetbook-FY17.pdf. “Office of Management and Budget.”; *City of Savannah*, www.savannahga.gov/493/Office-of-Management-Budget.; “Annual Budget.” *Sandy Springs*, www.sandyspringsga.gov/government/budget-and-finance/annual-budget.

Athens-Clarke County, a consolidated city-county government, had an average \$0.12 per capita spending on arts and culture from the general fund for 2013 to 2017. However, in 2017, the city used \$1.5 million dollars from the local Hotel/Motel tax collected by the State of Georgia to support a performing arts and multi-purpose auditorium (*FY2017 Annual Operating*). The Athens-Clarke was also supportive of their arts and cultural sector through the development of the Cultural Affairs Commission in 2010. Following the commission’s request in 2013, the City of Athens adopted an ordinance, where “a portion of each year’s capital funds [were] set aside for the Public Art Program” (*FY13 Annual*). The City and Athens Area Arts Council have piloted successful public art projects, combining resources and creating partnerships with multiple local entities to implement a public art project (“About Athens”).

Macon and Roswell partnered with community members to develop local arts agencies which have increased their cities' general fund expenditures on arts and cultural sector. Additionally, the City of Macon merged with Bibb County, which increased community arts and cultural spending (Gaines). Overall, four cities experienced a decrease in available arts and cultural funding. Those cities used general funds. The two cities—Macon and Roswell—that experienced an increase in available funding created local arts agencies. These cities' local arts agencies had gained income from the city's general fund, contributed income, and earned income.

Kentucky

Of the four cities reviewed, two cities—Lexington-Fayette and Owensboro—increased their arts and cultural spending (Table 6). Lexington-Fayette directly funded arts organizations, but the city also invested in LexArts—a nonprofit arts agency that acts as the arts council and a united arts funds (“About LexArts”).

Table 6

Kentucky: Sample of Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Lexington-Fayette	\$261,310	\$270,210	\$370,010	\$681,250	\$505,050
		3.41%	36.93%	84.12%	-25.86%
Owensboro	\$829,846	\$765,334	\$839,711	\$853,136	\$862,218
		-7.77%	9.72%	1.60%	1.06%

Source: *Adopted Budget FY2016-2017*. Lexington-Fayette, www.lexingtonky.gov/sites/default/files/2016-08/CAB%20combined_1.pdf; “Finance Department.” *City of Owensboro*, www.owensboro.org/page/finance-department.

Covington eliminated all art and cultural funding. However, in 2013 and 2014 Covington funded the Renaissance Grant Fund—a fund that developed into a nonprofit which focused on creative and economic development. Covington did not report any additional arts funding from the general fund. Bowling Green invested marginally less in 2017 than prior years and used general funds. Owensboro allocated significant funds in many arts and cultural organizations, nearing one million dollars through the general fund. However significant the funding was, Owensboro gave to the same arts and cultural organizations year after year, nearly at similar monetary levels.

Louisiana

New Orleans and Lafayette, Louisiana, increased their arts and cultural spending from 2013 to 2017, with Baton Rouge and Lake Charles remaining stagnant. New Orleans relied on a nonprofit to disburse its funds; the Arts Council of New Orleans administered both the municipal arts grants and the percent-for-art program (“Boards and

Commissions”). The two cities with flat available funding levels, Lafayette and Baton Rouge, both used general funds to support artistic and cultural programming.

Table 7

Louisiana: Sample of Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
New Orleans	\$921,382	\$846,403	\$1,024,681	\$1,024,681	\$1,024,681
		-8.14%	21.06%	0.00%	0.00%
Baton Rouge	\$1,548,550	\$1,523,700	\$1,523,770	\$1,523,670	\$1,523,700
		-1.60%	0.00%	-0.01%	0.00%
Lafayette	\$444,406	\$446,906	\$447,406	\$572,406	\$493,860
		0.56%	0.11%	27.94%	-13.72%
Lake Charles*	\$84,000	\$84,000	\$84,000	\$84,000	\$84,000
		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

*Lake Charles funds arts and cultural organizations through a Gaming & Boat fund and CVB.

Source: *2017 Adopted Budget*. City of New Orleans, Louisiana, www.nola.gov/mayor/budget/documents/2017-budget/2017-adopted-budget/.; *Annual Operating Budget*. City of Baton Rouge, 2017, www.brla.gov/DocumentCenter/View/3633/2017-City-Parish-Budget?bidId=. “Previously Adopted Budgets.” *Lafayette*, www.lafayettela.gov/Budget/Pages/archive.aspx.; *2017, 2018 Proposed Operating and Capital Budget*. City of Lake Charles, Louisiana.

Mat Young, the Director of Cultural Affairs Department in Lake Charles, Louisiana, reported that the riverboat and gaming state tax provide a portion of funds for the arts and culture sector in their city (Young). According to the Louisiana Gaming Association, the state tax rates on gaming are 21.5% of the adjusted gross revenue from the casinos, and the local governments collect about 4.5% of that tax revenue. The adjusted state-wide gross revenue was \$405 million in 2015 (*Casino Gaming Taxes*). The sizeable pool of funds allocates only \$39,000 to Lake Charles’ arts and culture sector;

however, Young noted the resource has potential to increase. Overall, Louisiana cities investments in their creative sector provided a consistent source of funding.

Mississippi

Southaven, Mississippi, reported no outside granting program for arts and cultural organizations (Duncan). Within the Department of Cultural Affairs for Southaven, a jazz band and orchestra are included in their spending; however, the groups are not outside agencies that receive funding ("Arts and Cultural"). Gulfport reported no outside arts and cultural agencies funding program ("Gulfport General Finance"). Jackson had a request-for-proposals program for arts and cultural organizations funded through the general fund (*Request*). In Hattiesburg, the Hattiesburg Arts Council exists as a nonprofit entity that receives support from the city ("History"). The available information from municipalities within Mississippi exhibited a lack of financial resources and diverse financial resources available for arts and cultural organizations.

North Carolina

North Carolina cities reviewed showed growth in arts and cultural spending in Raleigh, Greensboro, Winston-Salem, and Asheville. Of those cities that increased funding, Greensboro relied on some funding from its Economic Development department. Fayetteville remained flat in its arts and cultural spending.

Raleigh uses per capita spending as an indication of growth, outlining in the 2016 budget that "the current per capita allocation for arts is \$5.00 which, based on a population of 431,746, bring[s] the total arts per capita funding level for FY16 to

\$2,158,730, an increase of 2% over FY15” (*FY17 Annual Report*). Funding is distributed through the Raleigh Arts Commission—an advisory body (“Arts Commission”).

Winston-Salem also has an arts council, which began in 1950. The City states in its budget, that this “was the first municipal arts council in the country” (*Supplemental*).

Raleigh and Winston-Salem both illustrate how communities with active advisory boards can influence and increase funding (Table 8).

Table 8

North Carolina: Sample of Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Raleigh	\$2,160,010	\$2,571,244	\$2,765,745	\$2,732,230	\$2,775,450
		19.04%	7.56%	-1.21%	1.58%
Winston-Salem	\$614,120	\$532,500	\$753,180	\$797,480	\$882,920
		-13.29%	41.44%	5.88%	10.71%

Source: “Budget.” *City of Winston-Salem*, www.cityofws.org/Budget. “Budget and Management Services Department.”; *City of Raleigh*, www.raleighnc.gov/government/content/Departments/Articles/BudgetManagement.html.

South Carolina

Columbia, South Carolina, increased its arts and culture spending through the use of State Hospitality Tax (*Fiscal Year 2015-2016*). Charleston increased arts and cultural spending using an enterprise fund. Mount Pleasant increased its arts and cultural spending (Table 9). However, Greenville decreased its spending from 2014 to 2017 by more than half of the original allocation, as seen below in Table 16. They use alcohol permit funds for their “Art in Public Places” program (*Annual Operating*). Greenville also invests a significant amount in both outside arts and cultural agencies and in their

local arts council, the Metropolitan Art Council. In 2013 to 2014, Greenville invested \$400,000 in the Arts Council, however, the funding had declined to \$250,000 by 2017 (Table 9).

Table 9

South Carolina: Sample of Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

Mount Pleasant	\$25,000	\$24,647	\$5,000	\$25,000	\$30,000
		-1.41%	-79.71%	400.00%	20.00%
Greenville	Not available	\$1,145,000	\$445,000	\$606,800	\$562,300
			-61.14%	36.36%	-7.33%

Source: “Budget.” *Mount Pleasant, South Carolina*, www.tompssc.com/595/Budget.; “Office of Management and Budget.” *Greenville, South Carolina*, www.greenvillesc.gov/314/Office-of-Management-Budget.

Charleston, South Carolina, invests in the arts and cultural community through an enterprise fund for the Old Slave Mart Museum, a capital fund for earned income, and grants called Cultural Festival and Events fund. The city also has a matching grant program, the Lowcountry Quarterly Arts Grants Program, with small awarded amounts (“Lowcountry”). Charleston created a culturally vibrant community through its diverse revenue streams.

Mount Pleasant increased its spending from 2013 to 2017, but only by \$5,000. Additionally, the city removed all spending for arts and culture in 2015, allocating only \$5,000 for Art Fest. With a population size of approximately sixty-seven thousand, Mount Pleasant’s per capita spending in 2017 was \$0.44 (Appendix I, Table 15).

Another example of a system of diverse funding methods was observed in Rock Hill, South Carolina. Rock Hill is served by a local nonprofit arts agency, the Arts

Council of York County, whose mission is to “create art programming that encourages education, economic development and arts advocacy through unique art experiences that engage the community to make York County a regional arts destination” (“Who We Are”). Rock Hill allocates funding to the Arts Council through an Accommodations Tax. Through this allocation, the Arts Council implements a grant process that is focused on cultural tourism. Additionally, Rock Hill has a partnership with the Arts Council to program a city-owned building, the Gettys Building (Brown). Overall, South Carolina cities embraces alternative methods of funding sources.

Tennessee

Knoxville, Tennessee, funds community organizations through the general fund. The city also makes capital funding available for organizations. The city decreased the available funds by 27% from 2013 to 2017. In Chattanooga, arts funding remained relatively flat with an \$39,528 increase over five years. Chattanooga has a local nonprofit arts agency, called Arts Build, which the city funds through the general fund. Arts Build partnered with thirteen other arts organizations to fund and provide technical assistance with capacity building. The partnership between the city, Arts Build, and the other outside organizations, works to “use arts and culture as a tool in attracting new business, including creative professionals, retirees, tourists, and...business[es]” (*Fiscal Year 2016 Proposed*). Another city investing in its creative sector is Murfreesboro. Murfreesboro has remained consistent in its available funding—investing in nine organizations and its arts council. The funding amount is small, yet its population size is comparatively small with approximately 100,000 people (*Annual Budget*).

Table 10

Tennessee: Sample of Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Knoxville	\$551,000	\$371,000	\$389,500	\$390,000	\$400,000
		-32.67%	4.99%	0.13%	2.56%
Chattanooga	\$295,472	\$344,200	\$335,000	\$335,000	\$335,000
		16.49%	-2.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Murfreesboro	\$133,553	\$136,347	\$116,500	\$132,500	\$130,500
		2.09%	-14.56%	13.73%	-1.51%

Source: “Budget Archive.” *City of Knoxville*, www.knoxvilletn.gov/cms/One.aspx?portalId=109562&pageId=207352; “Proposed Budget 2017.” *City of Chattanooga*, www.chattanooga.gov/images/citymedia/finance/Budget2017/Proposed_Budget_2017pdf; *Annual Budget for Fy2016-2017*. City of Murfreesboro, <https://www.murfreesborotn.gov/DocumentCenter/View/4438/FY17-Budget?bidId=>.

Of the thirty-seven cities reviewed in the South Arts states, seventeen cities decreased their investment in arts and cultural spending and eighteen cities increased their arts and cultural spending. Of the cities with increased spending, four of the cities relied on hospitality or Hotel/Motel tax. Municipalities’ support for the creative sector is overwhelmingly directed towards larger arts and cultural institutions such as museums and orchestras. Over the five-year study period, many cities reviewed in the South Arts states have consistently funded the same organizations. These cities included Decatur, Huntsville, Mobile, and Montgomery in Alabama; Augusta, Savannah, Athens, and Macon in Georgia; Bowling Green and Owensboro in Kentucky; Lafayette, Louisiana; Winston-Salem, North Carolina; and Columbia, South Carolina. For example, Decatur, Huntsville and Mobile in Alabama funded the same organizations including symphonies, theatres, musical and visual arts organizations at the around same funding levels for five years. The analysis showed that cities’ use of general funds has provided fairly consistent

arts funding. However, this funding mechanism lacked evidence of its support of smaller, grassroots arts and cultural organizations and artists.

By identifying the shortcomings of general funds, arts and cultural organizations can better understand how policies and systems created as extra general funds can be replaced with flexible, diverse funding sources that are stable, long term, and with growth potential. An essential part of advocacy is understanding the external pressures that negatively and positively impact the cause. Arts and cultural organizations can become effective advocates for change by understanding local governments funding streams.

Chapter II

BEST METHODS IN INVESTMENT PROGRAMS AND SOURCES OF FUNDS

Communities are made stronger by cities' investing in citizens' creativity and growing creative economies. General fund allocations have limitations involving competition with civic priorities, political competition, and restricted expenditures—and other funding sources do exist within municipal governments. Better methods of municipal arts and cultural funding and investment can be implemented to ensure programmatic success with fewer barriers to entry for applicants and without a decline in funding available year to year. Arts and cultural organizations can credibly advocate to their own municipalities by understanding other municipal funding sources. Many of these funding methods are already administered in cities.

Municipalities have a range of investment options that support arts and cultural funding: Hotel/Motel tax, development tax, percentage for arts, enterprise funds, sales tax, and the creation of local arts agencies. In some cases, these methods are better suited than the general fund due to their ability to meet the needs of the community, to provide a positive impact, and to advance the creative sector through the flexible nature of the funding programs.

Methods of Municipal Investment

Hotel/Motel taxes, levied through a state statute, are often used by cities to support tourism. In some cases, the share of Hotel/Motel tax derived from visitors' stays at hotels and motels is given back by the state at a predetermined percentage to the local government to facilitate the local government's tourism efforts. Part of the tourism efforts could include supporting arts and cultural events and festivals that impact cultural tourism. However, the distribution of funds is often at the discretion of a tourism authority. In the South Arts states, Rock Hill, North Carolina; Asheville, North Carolina; Columbia, South Carolina; and Athens, Georgia, all allocate funds from their accommodation, Hotel/Motel, or hospitality tax toward the advancement of arts and cultural programs and institutions. This system is beneficial for cities looking to expand their tourism sector and could be potentially beneficial for organizations looking to expand their audience beyond the local community.

A development tax, referred to as percentage for arts, is used to fund public art works in communities as a part of building construction and development. Los Angeles, Tampa, New Orleans, and Houston all have percentage for arts programs. The percentage for arts can be applied to public or private building projects. Los Angeles and Tampa have "extend[ed] the reach of the percent for art ordinance to include private commercial development in addition to municipal projects" (Carlin). The Houston Arts Alliance receives 30% of its budget through the City of Houston's percent-for-arts program—which "supports commissions of new civic art projects as well as conservation of existing artworks" ("How").

The percentage for arts system is beneficial because it creates public and private partnerships, which impacts the cost to developers, as compared to the sales tax which is collected from all residents. However, there are limitations and push-back for a percentage for arts ordinances. In some areas, developers are contesting the percentage as an undue burden to the development projects and their stakeholders. In one case, developers sued the city arguing that the ordinance "...violated both the First Amendment, by requiring speech in the form of purchasing works of art, and the 'takings clause' of the Fifth Amendment, which limits a public entity's ability to take control of private property for public use" (Grant). Additionally, the percentage for arts funding is often limited by the type of expenditures that can be applied to the art projects. The art work may be restricted by its form; some governments have policies that stipulate that commissioned work must be "permanent installations." The ordinances would not allow "types of public art that are ephemeral in nature, such as performances and time-limited installations" (*State Policy Briefs*). This source of funding normally does not allow for re-granting or subcontracting to organizations or projects and programming. These policies on limiting the type of art, the longevity of art, and who receives the funds can hinder the cities' abilities to be inclusive to their audiences, artists, and arts and cultural organizations.

Enterprise funds generate revenue from user fees for services (Kemp). Enterprise funds provide revenues from and for direct-services based on the quantity of the services received. Examples of services include water, sewer, trash pick-up, and parking facilities. The important difference between enterprise funds and general funds is that enterprise funds use excess funds to support related enterprise purposes; for example, the net

revenues from parking services in an enterprise fund can be used to construct parking garages. Enterprise funds are beneficial because “the revenues associated with most types of enterprise funds have increased at a faster rate than general fund revenues” (Bunch). In 2003, Jeffrey Molinari and Charlie Tyer at the University of South Carolina found that enterprise funds in large cities used 10.8% for recreation and 2.9% for community development (Molinari and Tyer).

The net income available from enterprise funds can create an opportunity for investment in the local community, while supporting the department providing the service. For example, the City of Charleston, South Carolina, has a few enterprise funds sources that are “all tourism related activities supported by residents and non-residents” through its City Market fund, Charleston Adventure fund, and Auditorium fund (Molinari and Tyer).

The sales tax system uses funds from the sale of goods and services in a variety of sectors within a community to support public institutions and infrastructure. Sales tax ordinances that are directed towards arts and cultural spending are enacted in Denver, Colorado; Allegheny County, Pennsylvania; and St. Paul, Minnesota (Molinari and Tyer). This system is beneficial because it can earn revenue consistently from tourists, visitors, and residents; however, the sales tax method can “disproportionately [impact] lower-income consumers” (Coventry).

A similar method to sales tax percentage for the arts is implemented in a South Arts’ city. Greenville, South Carolina, designated alcohol permit fees for their program “Art in Public Spaces” (*Adopted Annual Budget*). Fees and sales taxes are alternative

ways for governments to earmark spending to ensure it is stable relative to the amount of revenue the source of funds can generate.

The creation of Local Arts Agencies (LAA) enables local communities to create organizations with diverse revenue streams. Local governments can create or operate LAAs and use the cities' general funds to support the agencies on a yearly basis ("What Is a Local Arts Agency"). LAAs can receive local government funding but can also solicit individual, corporate, and earned income in ways that a local government cannot. Cities within South Arts that rely on an LAA system include Tallahassee, Florida's Council on Cultural & Arts; New Orleans, Louisiana's Arts Council of New Orleans; Fort Lauderdale, Florida; Roswell, Georgia; and Greenville, South Carolina. The LAAs outside of governments' purview are able to more easily receive funds through solicitations and are also able to disburse funds to individual artists and arts and cultural organizations.

Sustainable Methods

Sustainable arts funding mechanisms must first be based on the assets of the community—such as businesses, geographic location, community capital, tourism, and volunteerism—for which artists and art organizations are advocating. Funding sources that account for the communities' assets and characteristics are better suited to serve the creative sector than general funds. Alternate sources funding systems leverage communities' assets. For example, Hotel/Motel tax funding for the arts are beneficial for communities with an expanding tourism sector.

The local arts agencies' partnerships with city governments provide the greatest opportunity for diverse financial stability. Local arts agencies (LAA) are flexible in nature—which improves the quality of resources available for the community. As nonprofit entities, LAAs can grow their financial assets—as compared to general funds which “generally are expected to be used or liquidated within a year” (“Touring”). The LAAs allow for organizational and artistic growth by removing potential applicants' barriers to receive funds. Often, local governments limit who can receive funds and what expenses can be covered. LAAs do not have such limitations. The LAA funding sources provide a path to expand the idea of who is eligible. This structure of funding develops more complex systems within the creative sector, for example, employment and small business growth, due to its flexible nature compared to local governments.

While special arts allocation funding provides greater flexibility, it lacks some of the accountability and funding control normally found in cities' general funds. Additionally, the alternative funding sources fluctuate from year to year, like all local government revenues. Understanding available municipal funding mechanisms in the arts will build organizations' ability to expose local elected officials to potential paths to invest in their creative economies, paths that are reflective of their communities' assets.

Chapter III

IMPACT, SUSTAINABILITY AND GROWTH

Municipalities can implement beneficial, sustainable funding mechanisms beyond their reliance on general funds to support their creative sector. These alternative municipal funding methods have positively affected the organizations and their stakeholders. Through municipal financial support of the creative sector, municipalities can support their communities' own success. "A society that supports the arts and the humanities is not engaging in philanthropic activity so much as it is assuring the conditions of its own flourishing" (*Creative America*). The alternative arts and cultural funding methods move beyond budgeted line-items toward practices that incorporate a fundamental understanding of the value of the arts and cultural sector.

The best cultural and arts funding programs are those that align with the resources of the community. Asheville, North Carolina; Savannah, Georgia; Rock Hill, North Carolina and Knoxville, Tennessee, have robust tourism sectors. By relying on a Hotel/Motel tax, in coordination with their state legislatures, the cities outsource the financial burden from property owners and residents to travelers with greater disposable incomes while, at the same time, developing events and activities that support tourism.

Asheville, North Carolina, uses Hotel/Motel tax to support cultural tourism, with 25% of revenue collected dedicated to community projects. Stephanie Pace Brown, CEO of Explore Asheville, stated that, "1983 is the biggest reason behind the city's tourism success. That's when local hotels volunteered a self-imposed lodging tax that's now six

percent” (Zatkulak). Asheville’s funds have promoted and supported an artistic community recognized nationally.

Savannah, Georgia, has experienced an increase in cultural tourism. The number of people visiting Savannah has been growing at a steady pace since the 1990s—over 13.5 million people visit annually (“Vision”). The Savannah Convention and Visitors Bureau, CVB, repeatedly invested in the same arts and cultural organizations on an annual basis from the CVB’s portion of Hotel/Motel tax. Continuous public support of organizations can lead to organizational growth, yet, the available funds from Savannah’s CVB have not been inclusive of emerging organizations or artists.

Knoxville, Tennessee, has seen growth in its tourist sector. According to the Tennessee Department of Tourist Development, Knoxville’s “travel expenditures...rose by 6.2 percent in 2014 to just under a billion dollars--\$988 million to be exact” (Sullivan). However, the City provided general funds for arts and cultural spending and decreased the amount of available funds for arts and cultural organizations.

Rock Hill, North Carolina, uses an accommodation tax to fund its arts council. The arts council in turn provides a granting process for arts and cultural organizations. The organizations “are awarded funding based on the tourist activity that they bring in” and the funding available was under \$50,000 from 2013 to 2017 (Brown). While the overall amount of funding available is low, the funding source was consistently available.

Additionally, Columbia, South Carolina, has used hospitality tax to support larger cultural and arts institutions consistently since 2011 (*City Of Columbia Budget*). Athens, Georgia, uses Hotel/Motel tax to support its Classic Center, which is an entity of its government. The Classic Center receives about \$1.5 million from the six percent

Hotel/Motel tax which is managed by the Convention and Visitors Bureau (*FY2017 Annual Operating*). While this source is not for external organizations, the city showcases a model of funding that supports a component of its cultural community.

Outside of South Arts states, cities are implementing systems where a percentage of Hotel/Motel taxes are given to arts and cultural programming and organizations. The City of Garland, Texas, “administers the sub-granting program through 15% of Hotel/Motel tax funds along with additional corporate and private donations” (“Garland”). Fort Collins, Colorado, disburses grants funded through an allocation of lodging tax in accordance with provisions of the city’s code. Fort Collins has a population of 161,175 and invested \$384,780 in 2017—giving \$2.38 per capita towards the cultural activities (“Sec. 25-244”).

The LAA for King County, Washington used a surplus lodging tax for the past twenty years to invest in arts and cultural programming. Unlike the other cities discussed, King County was able to advocate for guaranteed funding for the arts through “the Washington State legislature pass[ing] ESSB 5834, which finally guaranteed that Lodging Taxes would fund King County cultural programs for the long-term” (“Revenue Sources”). Working towards legislation for arts and cultural funding for years enabled King County to secure long-term financial security for its creative sector.

Hotel/Motel tax is utilized in the Houston Alliance (HAA), which was developed in “2006 as a public-private initiative to support the arts and culture in Houston and to advance Houston’s reputation as an arts and culture destination.” Houston Alliance’s budget is composed mostly of the Hotel/Motel tax—55% of its total budget. The City of Houston supports the Alliance through the percent-for-art program and the “remaining

15% of HAA's budget comes from private fundraising for programs and special projects" ("How").

All these cities are investing in their own arts and cultural tourism efforts through a tax that is largely collected from visitors. This method is advantageous for cities looking to expand their creative economies; however, it is limiting for organizations that are not focused on regional and national audiences and that are providing services directed toward local residents.

Other municipal funding programs for arts and culture exist that relate to and use community assets, for example an environment amendment and a sales tax for a multi-county district. The Minnesota's Clean Water, Land, and Legacy Amendment was created as a voter-approved program that used funds from sales tax and "appropriated \$93 million in funding to support arts and cultural projects between July 2009 and July 2011" (Wonronkiewicz et al.) The state was able to invest in educational programming, events, artists and state-wide initiatives. The program will continue through 2034 and will receive 19.75% of the sales tax revenue ("Clean").

Sales taxes are also used in the Denver Scientific and Cultural Facilities District. Since 1988, when the sales tax was implemented, the "district collected and distributed \$13.8 million. It grew to \$50 million without the tax levy changing, through the natural expansion of the retail economy" (Rinaldi). The sales tax supports "cultural and natural history, natural sciences, and visual and performing arts throughout the city's greater metropolitan area" (Cole).

These innovative funds allow governments to use community resources to invest in arts and cultural community development. They have created an opportunity for

economic development by allowing their governments to invest in artists and arts and cultural organizations.

Another alternative method of creative funding that supports the community is the creation of Local Arts Agencies (LAA). The method does not create new revenue for cities but allows cities to contribute funds. Local Arts Agencies in Macon and Roswell, Georgia, Lexington-Fayette, Louisiana, New Orleans, Rock-Hill, North Carolina, and Chattanooga, Tennessee are all examples of arts agencies in the South Arts states that have partnered with or been created by their cities. Roswell's Local Arts Agency experienced a net increase over three years of 247%, from a budget of \$82,895 to \$288,175 (Table 5; Table 6). Lexington-Fayette, Kentucky invests in LexArts, which received \$489,050 in 2017 compared to no allocation in 2015. LexArts also has two endowments from a Community Foundation and a private individual (“Timeline”).

In Louisiana, The Arts Council of New Orleans received approximately \$400,000 from the city for the period reviewed for re-granting purposes (*2017 Adopted Budget*). In Tennessee, Chattanooga's Arts Build, funded through the general fund, received \$275,000 for re-granting consistently for three years (*Proposed Budget 2017*). The creation of LAAs, while not providing a new revenue stream from their cities, affords the opportunity to use community assets like individual contributions, private partnerships with business, sponsorships, while still receiving local public funds.

Arts and cultural stakeholders can advocate for local governments to adopt alternative funding—yet, not without risk. Any loss of potential funding is problematic, including the loss of general fund revenue for arts and cultural organizations. However, arts and cultural communities experience benefits when their affiliated governments

move beyond funding the arts through general funds. The governments are most successful when the development of funding programs is reflective of the resources of the community. Arts funding through alternative funding streams can create lasting systems of funding and relationships between local government and the arts and cultural sector.

Chapter IV

ARTS ADVOCACY FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FUNDING

Advocates for cultural and arts organizations must educate local representatives about new, creative, and sustainable methods of arts funding. Arts advocates must create an environment where arts and cultural activities are a priority for politicians and their constituents. “As a society, we set our priorities through the government budget process. We may say we love arts and culture, but the proof is where we as a people choose to spend our tax dollars. Successful advocacy does more than increase budget lines; it teaches the public how to value the arts and culture” (Rosenberg and Hunter). Arts and cultural organizations’ stakeholders can play an active role in relationship building with the local government.

Arts advocacy can be complex and difficult for nonprofit organizations. The IRS limits the amount of advocacy work by nonprofit organizations. The code indicates that:

a tax-exempt organization will lose its tax-exempt status and its qualification to receive tax-deductible contributions if a substantial part of its activities [is] carried on to influence legislation. “Substantial part” is not defined in the tax code; however, the suggested IRS guidelines is five percent of total expenditures in pursuit of the nonprofits mission. (Rosenberg and Hunter).

The rule is limiting but not entirely prohibitive; nonprofits may work on public policy issues like “conduct educational meetings, prepare and distribute educational materials, or otherwise consider public policy issues in an educational manner” (“Charities”). If an

organization intends to “propose, support, or oppose legislation”, the IRS will regard their activity “attempting to influence legislation” (“Charities”). Additionally, the IRS provides another way to measure of lobbying activities of a nonprofit organization through an expenditure test. Nonprofits who complete the IRS Form 5768, “also known as ‘taking the 501 (h) election’”, can create a lobby expense cap following a “sliding scale based on a nonprofit’s annual exempt purpose expenditures” (“Taking the 501(h) Election”). With the 501 (h) election, organizations can create a safeguard, with proper legal advice, against overstepping the boundaries of excessive lobbying or advocacy work about the benefits of supporting and investing in the creative sector.

Working within the confines of the IRS nonprofit code, arts and cultural organizations and their stakeholders can find ways to educate and inform their local governments and the general public.

Advocacy Methodologies

Advocacy work begins by first understanding what the organization and stakeholders are advocating for—that arts are an integral part of the foundation and ecosystem of the community. The process may include identifying stakeholders, building leadership roles, planning for sustained engagement, and utilizing effective advocacy methods (Reese).

Organizations should have a solid capacity and framework for how to disseminate information on resource building and local arts support. This framework should specify who conducts the advocacy work. The messengers should be people whose lives have been significantly affected by local support for the arts. These may include audiences,

parents, children, arts and cultural organizations, board members, staff, volunteers, and participants. Advocates must be able to animate their stories of success and how they benefitted from local support. Arts and cultural organizations can build leadership roles that support and amplify their stakeholders' voices. For instance, an organization could develop a youth council that works with the nonprofit board of directors to learn about the art form, management, or event planning. The educational component may be of interest to a city council member who is passionate about issues young people face.

Arts advocates must keep stakeholders engaged and motivated in the advocacy work, and stakeholders must be able to see clearly the potential outcomes from their work. Arts and cultural organizations provide valuable services that enrich the lives of their participants and audiences—highlighting those benefits with the end-user in mind can create a community conversation. Leaders and advocates must plan, create, and sustain conversations that hold the interest of arts participants and funding decision-makers.

Arts and cultural stakeholders need to be aware of effective advocacy for arts and cultural funding—and utilize other sectors' advocacy practices. Educational advocacy practices often have clear objectives with strategies suited to their environments in order to implement successful tactics (Porter Magee). These basic practices, of a hierarchy of steps from broad to specific, are effective guidelines for arts and cultural organizations. Art advocates can build successful strategies and tactics by using other fields' advocacy techniques as examples, those that built on community engagement. Social service advocacy includes using all stakeholders—such as young people, business entities,

medical professionals, veterans, and parents. Their voices are amplified when the stories they tell are relatable, meaningful, and outcome-based.

Organizations should have clear objectives when approaching local government advocacy work. Defining the objectives by understanding what the organization wants the public to be informed about and outlining the issues facing the arts and cultural sector should result in more concise and effective messaging. By having a “strategy to match the environment,” arts administrators must frame the conversation around civic priorities. Developing talking points around the arts and cultural sector’s ability to: “provid[e] a fast-growth, dynamic industry cluster; providing critical ingredients for innovative places; [and] catalyzing community revitalization” (Geltman). A strategy to match environment means that arts advocates are using terminology of the public sector. Arts advocacy should highlight examples of other cities or partnerships that benefit the community.

Advocacy in Local Government

Investment in arts and cultural activities can remain a priority to political stakeholders. By finding the government’s priorities, organizations can approach advocacy at the local level as an organization would approach an individual donor. These priorities of city elected officials are normally based on their constituents’ needs and wishes. The public has the political will to support the arts: 60% of Americans approve of arts investments at the local level and are “twice as likely to vote in favor of a candidate who increases federal arts spending from forty-five cents to one dollar per person” (*What Americans*). The general public is usually more supportive of local

government than the federal government. “With the federal government mired in gridlock and hyper-partisanship, local leaders are stepping up to advance solutions to their unique economic, social, and environmental challenges. As a result, the public maintains high trust in local government while its faith in federal institutions has eroded dramatically” (Vey). By understanding the politicians’ desire to get re-elected and serve the community, artists and arts advocates can frame the message.

Framing the message can take many forms. For example, if the unemployment rate is high, messaging should focus on the capacity of the arts to increase the number of available jobs to fit the community needs. If the priority in a community is education, arts-messaging must discuss how literacy improves when reading is taught concurrently with community-based arts. If tax revenue has decreased over the years, the conversation can be about how investment in arts and culture impacts the government’s tax base through economic development and community development—“the arts return \$27.5 billion in revenue to federal, state, county and municipal governments” (*Fact vs. Fiction*).

Each component of local government has political elements and consequences; arts and cultural organizations can develop their advocacy objectives by understanding their representatives’ individual interests and objectives.

Advocacy’s Impact at the Local Level

Arts and cultural organizations actively involved with local governments create an opportunity to develop collaborations or partnerships, which in turn could develop additional financial resources. The impact of advocacy is first defined by the objectives and decisions that face the community and who are the key influencers. The key

influencers may include citizens, leaders of arts councils, school board members, parents of home-schooled children, community foundations, corporations, citizens, and small-business entities. All of these stakeholders are connected to the community and could have an interest in the arts and cultural sector.

Arts and cultural communities have experienced an increase in revenue due to arts advocacy. Through the use of an economic impact study, an arts council executive director reported that the study was “used successfully to increase ‘the ammunition art advocates had’” and that the advocacy led to the creation of a “permanent hotel/motel tax allocation” for the arts (Radich and Foss). Additionally, the Americans for the Arts Action Fund asserts that \$200 million additional appropriation have been given since 2004 due to its advocacy work (“Learn”). Revenue building occurs when arts advocacy is effectively implemented and continually practiced.

Yet, arts and cultural organizations must know and avoid risks when advocating for new funding sources. Arts advocates may have a tendency to support any funding without regard to the source. This defense of the status quo ignores opportunities for growth and public education. Arts advocates must have knowledge of national platforms, policies, and systems that redefine local municipal funding distribution. Arts and cultural organizations and stakeholders can begin to advocate for systems that are accessible, equitable, and enriching.

Conclusion

Local governments are an attainable funding source for the arts and cultural organizations due to municipalities' capacity to support their community. In the pursuit of funding, arts and cultural organizations encounter limited available funds at the national and state level. State arts agencies, federal arts agencies, and private foundations have restrictive award processes and the amount of available funds are often low, especially for small-sized organizations—like emerging and grass-roots organizations. Smaller arts and cultural organizations confront challenges when seeking national and private funds, including limited staff time, securing audits, and grant-writing expenses. An opportunity exists for arts and cultural organizations to have accessible participation in funding processes from local government funding sources.

Local governments are capable of providing funding to the arts and cultural sector—and have done so in creative ways across the nation. Enterprise funds, percent for art programs, sales taxes, boat and gaming taxes, alcohol and license plates fees, and the creation of Local Arts Agencies were all alternative funding sources from municipalities or distributed by municipalities that financially supported the creative sector.

In spite of local government's innovative investment methods, most of the local governments reviewed rely on general fund sources and these general funds sources pose issues. The amount of available funding for arts and cultural agencies in South Arts cities varied—cities' arts and cultural spending increased in some cities while decreased or

remained stagnant in others. Of the thirty-seven municipalities reviewed, eighteen municipalities increased their arts and cultural spending, seventeen decreased, and two remained flat. Cities with stagnant or declining funding were characterized by the absence of arts councils and interest groups as observed in this analysis.

Other methods of local government funding sources are available. Research showed that arts and cultural organizations were best sustained by funding sources in addition to the general fund. Those cities financially supported programs and services that were produced by small and large, established and innovative organizations. Active participation of citizens was an approach for many communities to create municipal revenue streams through advocacy or simply by the creation of arts councils.

Investment for nonprofit arts at the local level can be more sustainable if local arts and cultural organizations advocate for alternative funding sources in lieu of municipal general funds. Reasonable funding and investment methods, that are reflective of community assets, can be implemented at the local level. The alternative funding methods can create lasting partnerships and foster effective collaboration among arts organizations, arts participants, and local governments.

South Arts cities had more funding sources for the arts when arts organizations were involved in their communities. When the city and community are informed about best practices in arts and cultural municipal funding sources, they both can create and sustain capital for the arts and cultural sector. The reliance on general funds is not problematic as long as the cities provide some other source of funds, and the arts organizations take proactive steps towards educating the public and the city government officials on arts and cultural issues.

Advocates of arts and cultural organizations must be aware of funding methods and appeal to their local representatives on creative and sustainable revenue methods for the arts and culture sector—because arts and cultural organizations develop educational resources, increase the number of jobs available in their community, and expand tourism through cultural events. By understanding potential funding methods, arts and cultural organizations can effectively inform municipalities. Any local arts advocacy from arts and cultural organizations is an advantageous practice.

The future funding systems for arts and culture may shift from present day municipal models. In order to adapt to change, arts and cultural organizations and their stakeholders should learn about funding methods based on community needs and derived from community resources. New sectors of local financial development, and new economies will emerge. Priorities of generations will shift. In order for the arts and cultural sector to be considered a vital component of society, individuals with political capital now and the next generation of civic leaders need to be informed about how arts and culture affect individuals. By tapping into established revenue sources, like the hospitality tax or development percentage, the creative sector can begin to shape policy making for arts funding that is more inclusive and integral to local budget development; not just a footnote to the general fund.

Financial systems currently implemented in local governments create and perpetuate limitations—barriers to entry, to access, to empowering the arts and cultural sector and its citizens through standardized revenue sources and awarding practices.

The desired outcome of equitable development is the establishment of communities of opportunity that are characterized by just and fair inclusion, that

build public will for equity solutions, and that expand the capacity of local leaders and residents to drive resources toward improving the quality of life in underinvested communities. The power of arts and culture to engage community leverages that outcome and is exemplified by innovative state- and local-level arts and culture agencies that offer equity considerations to partnerships integrating arts, culture, and community development. (*Creating Change*)

Potential funding sources and innovation towards sustainable arts funding for arts and cultural organizations should reflect the communities' needs and resources. Investment in arts and cultural activities can remain a priority to political stakeholders if art and cultural organizations actively incorporate advocacy into their organization's work. Through advocacy, a support system within communities for the arts can prove to municipalities that the cultivation of arts and cultural organizations can transform cities into vibrant creative communities.

Appendix I
Tables of South Arts States: Local Municipal Arts and Cultural Funding
Through the General Fund and Percentage Changes

Table 1

Alabama: Local Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Birmingham	\$965,849	\$1,047,014	\$848,800	\$849,386	\$961,600
		8.40%	-18.93%	0.07%	13.21%
Decatur	\$173,500	\$113,500	\$113,500	\$113,500	\$113,500
		-34.58%	--	--	--
Huntsville	\$563,334	\$612,623	\$597,053	\$554,644	\$418,110
		9%	-3%	-7%	-25%
Mobile	\$2,313,336	\$2,470,588	\$2,297,385	\$3,433,017	\$3,579,292
		6.80%	-7.01%	49.43%	4.26%
Montgomery	\$565,000	\$555,000	\$480,000	\$480,000	\$480,000
		-2%	-14%	0%	0%

Table 2

Alabama: Percentage Changes, Arts and Cultural Funding, General Fund

City	Funding Change	
Birmingham	net change over 4 years	-0.44%
	average % change year to year	0.69%
Decatur	net change over 4 years	-34.58%
	average % change year to year	-9%
Huntsville	net change over 4 years	-25.78%
	average % change year to year	-6%
Mobile	net change over 4 years	54.72%
	average % change year to year	13%
Montgomery	net change over 4 years	-15.04%
	average % change year to year	-4%

Table 3

Florida: Local Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
St. Petersburg	\$74,123	\$314,209	\$470,000	\$124,000	\$149,000
		323.90%	49.58%	-73.62%	20.16%
Tallahassee	\$831,734	\$704,862	\$704,862	\$301,524	\$301,524
		-15.25%	0.00%	-57.22%	0.00%
Gainesville*	\$1,435,479	\$1,246,505	\$1,088,103	\$1,260,905	\$482,238
		-13.16%	-12.71%	15.88%	-61.75%

*Gainesville used multiple funding sources.

Table 4

Florida: Percentage Changes, Arts and Cultural Funding, General Fund

City	Funding Change	
St. Petersburg	net change over 4 years	101.02%
	average % change year to year	80.01%
Tallahassee	net change over 4 years	-63.75%
	average % change year to year	-18.12%
Gainesville*	net change over 4 years	-66.41%
	average % change year to year	-17.94%

Table 5

Georgia: Local Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Augusta	\$496,500	\$481,750	\$481,660	\$481,660	\$481,660
		-2.97%	-0.02%	0.00%	0.00%
Athens-Clarke	\$1,200	\$12,000	\$15,000	\$21,000	\$21,000
		900%	25%	40%	0%
Columbus	\$707,798	\$662,699	\$625,438	\$419,898	\$394,912
		-6.37%	-5.62%	-32.86%	-5.95%
Savannah	\$752,400	\$714,780	\$764,320	\$680,400	\$680,400
		-5.00%	6.93%	-10.98%	0.00%
Sandy Springs	\$310,000	\$59,500	\$133,135	\$63,000	\$0
		-80.81%	123.76%	-52.68%	-100.00%
Macon*	\$121,000	\$73,000	\$608,000	\$577,550	\$578,600
		-39.67%	732.88%	-5.01%	0.18%
Roswell	\$0	\$0	\$82,895	\$193,130	\$288,175
		--	--	132.98%	49.21%

*The City of Macon was consolidated with Bibb-County in 2015.

Table 6

Georgia: Percentage Changes, Arts and Cultural Funding, General Fund

City	Funding Change	
Augusta	net change over 4 years	-2.99%
	average % change year to year	-0.75%
Athens-Clarke	net change over 4 years	1650.00%
	average % change year to year	241.25%
Columbus	net change over 4 years	-44.21%
	average % change year to year	-12.70%
Savannah	net change over 4 years	-9.57%
	average % change year to year	-2.26%
Sandy Springs	net change over 4 years	-100.00%
	average % change year to year	-27.43%
Macon*	net change over 4 years	378.18%
	average % change year to year	172.10%
Roswell	net change over 3 years	247.64%
	average % change year to year, 3 years	91.10%

Table 7

Kentucky: Local Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Lexington-Fayette	\$261,310	\$270,210	\$370,010	\$681,250	\$505,050
		3.41%	36.93%	84.12%	-25.86%
Bowling Green	\$62,640	\$87,640	\$52,640	\$52,640	\$54,220
		39.91%	-39.94%	0.00%	3.00%
Owensboro	\$829,846	\$765,334	\$839,711	\$853,136	\$862,218
		-7.77%	9.72%	1.60%	1.06%
Covington	\$500,000	\$554,592	\$0	\$0	\$0
		10.92%	-100.00%	--	--

Table 8

Kentucky: Percentage Changes, Arts and Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	Funding Change	
Lexington-Fayette	net change over 4 years	93.28%
	average % change year to year	24.65%
Bowling Green	net change over 4 years	-13.44%
	average % change year to year	0.74%
Owensboro	net change over 4 years	3.90%
	average % change year to year	1.15%
Covington	net change over 4 years	-100.00%
	average % change year to year	--

Table 9

Louisiana: Local Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
New Orleans	\$921,382	\$846,403	\$1,024,681	\$1,024,681	\$1,024,681
		-8.14%	21.06%	0.00%	0.00%
Baton Rouge	\$1,548,550	\$1,523,700	\$1,523,770	\$1,523,670	\$1,523,700
		-1.60%	0.00%	-0.01%	0.00%
Lafayette	\$444,406	\$446,906	\$447,406	\$572,406	\$493,860
		0.56%	0.11%	27.94%	-13.72%
Lake Charles*	\$84,000	\$84,000	\$84,000	\$84,000	\$84,000
		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

*Lake Charles funds arts and cultural organizations through a Gaming & Boat fund and Convention and Visitors Bureau.

Table 10

Louisiana: Percentage Changes, Arts and Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	Funding Change	
New Orleans	net change over 4 years	11.21%
	average % change year to year	3.23%
Baton Rouge	net change over 4 years	-1.60%
	average % change year to year	-0.40%
Lafayette	net change over 4 years	11.13%
	average % change year to year	3.72%
Lake Charles*	net change over 4 years	0.00%
	average % change year to year	0.00%

Table 11

Mississippi: Local Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Jackson	\$276,000	\$276,000	\$151,032	\$285,445	\$140,000
		0.00%	-45.28%	89.00%	-50.95%

Table 12

Mississippi: Percentage Changes, Arts and Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	Funding Change	
Jackson	net change over 4 years	-49.28%
	average % change year to year	-1.81%

Table 13

North Carolina: Local Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Raleigh	\$2,160,010	\$2,571,244	\$2,765,745	\$2,732,230	\$2,775,450
		19.04%	7.56%	-1.21%	1.58%
Greensboro*	\$329,475	\$1,250,725	\$808,600	\$698,600	\$609,850
		279.61%	-35.35%	-13.60%	-12.70%
Winston-Salem	\$614,120	\$532,500	\$753,180	\$797,480	\$882,920
		-13.29%	41.44%	5.88%	10.71%
Fayetteville	\$179,250	\$179,250	\$179,250	\$179,250	\$179,250
		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Asheville	\$4,000	\$0	\$14,000	\$9,000	\$9,000
		-100.00%	--	-35.71%	0.00%
*Funded by Economic Development Fund & General Fund					

Table 14

North Carolina: Percentage Changes, Arts and Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	Funding Change	
Raleigh	net change over 4 years	28.49%
	average % change year to year	6.74%
Greensboro*	net change over 4 years	85.10%
	average % change year to year	54.49%
Winston-Salem	net change over 4 years	43.77%
	average % change year to year	11.19%
Fayetteville	net change over 4 years	0.00%
	average % change year to year	0.00%
Asheville	net change over 4 years	125.00%
	average % change year to year	-45.24%
*Funded by Economic Development Fund & General Fund		

Table 15

South Carolina: Local Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Columbia*	\$2,081,600	Not available	Not available	\$2,822,457	\$3,036,257
		--	--	--	7.57%
Charleston**	\$189,071	\$289,000	\$322,000	\$350,000	\$217,853
		52.85%	11.42%	8.70%	-37.76%
Mount Pleasant	\$25,000	\$24,647	\$5,000	\$25,000	\$30,000
		-1.41%	-79.71%	400.00%	20.00%
Rock Hill****	\$45,000	\$48,442	\$50,000	\$46,667	\$45,446
		7.65%	3.22%	-6.67%	-2.62%
Greenville	Not available	\$1,145,000	\$445,000	\$606,800	\$562,300
		--	-61.14%	36.36%	-7.33%
* Use Enterprise funds. **Charleston's funding for events and programming is through the department of cultural affairs, whose budgets do not provide line. ***Hospitality Tax ****Accommodations Tax					

Table 16

South Carolina: Percentage Changes, Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	Funding Change	
Columbia	net change over 4 years	45.86%
	average % change year to year	Not available
Charleston	net change over 4 years	15.22%
	average % change year to year	8.80%
Mount Pleasant	net change over 4 years	20.00%
	average % change year to year	84.72%
Rock Hill	net change over 4 years	0.99%
	average % change year to year	0.40%
Greenville	net change over 3 years	-50.89%
	Average % change year to year	-10.70%

Table 17

Tennessee: Local Municipal Arts & Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Knoxville	\$551,000	\$371,000	\$389,500	\$390,000	\$400,000
		-32.67%	4.99%	0.13%	2.56%
Chattanooga	\$295,472	\$344,200	\$335,000	\$335,000	\$335,000
		16.49%	-2.67%	0.00%	0.00%
Murfreesboro	\$133,553	\$136,347	\$116,500	\$132,500	\$130,500
		2.09%	-14.56%	13.73%	-1.51%

Table 18

Tennessee: Percentage Changes, Arts and Cultural Funding through the General Fund

City	Funding Change	
Knoxville	net change over 4 years	-27.40%
	average % change year to year	-6.25%
Chattanooga	net change over 4 years	13.38%
	average % change year to year	3.45%
Murfreesboro	net change over 4 years	-2.29%
	average % change year to year	-0.06%

WORKS CITED

- “\$82.3 Million in Grants Will Support Art Projects Nationwide.” *NEA*, 10 May 2016,
www.arts.gov/news/2016/823-million-grants-will-support-art-projects-nationwide.
- 2015 Annual Report*. National Endowment for the Arts, 15 Apr. 2016,
www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/2015%20Annual%20Report.pdf.
- 2016 State & Local Government Finance Historical Datasets and Tables*. U.S. Census Bureau, www.census.gov/data/datasets/2016/econ/local/public-use-datasets.html.
- 2017 Adopted Budget*. City of New Orleans, 1 Jan. 2016,
www.nola.gov/mayor/budget/documents/2017-budget/2017-adopted-budget/.
- “About Athens Area Arts Council.” *Athens Area Arts Council*,
www.athensarts.org/about-us/.
- “About LexArts.” *LexArts*, www.lexarts.org/about-us/about/.
- Adopted Annual Budget Fiscal Year 2014-2015*. City of Greenville, South Carolina,
www.greenvillesc.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/72.
- Adopted Operating and Capital Improvement Budget, Fiscal Year 2016*. City of St. Petersburg,
www.stpete.org/city_departments/docs/Fiscal_Year_2016_Final_Budget_updated2.pdf.
- Annual Budget for FY 2016-2017*. City of Murfreesboro, Tennessee, 15 May 2016,
www.murfreesborotn.gov/DocumentCenter/View/4438/FY17-Budget?bidId=.
- “Annual Budget.” *Sandy Springs, Georgia*,
www.sandyspringsga.gov/government/budget-and-finance/annual-budget.

“Annual Budgets.” *City of Fayetteville, North Carolina*,

www.fayettevillenc.gov/government/city-departments/budget-evaluation/annual-budgets.

“Annual Operating Budget.” *Bowling Green, Kentucky*, www.bgky.org/reports/annual-operating-budget.

Annual Operating Budget Fiscal Year 2016-2017. City of Greenville,

www.greenvillesc.gov/.

“Arts and Cultural Affairs.” *City of Southaven*, www.southaven.org/93/Arts-Cultural-Affairs.

“Arts Commission.” *City of Raleigh*,

www.raleighnc.gov/safety/content/BoardsCommissions/Articles/ArtsCommission.html.

Avins, Jenni. “Who Will Lose If the US National Endowment for the Arts Is

Eliminated?” *Quartz*, www.qz.com/932332/who-will-lose-if-the-us-national-endowment-for-the-arts-is-eliminated/.

“Better Together: Public and Private Funding for the Arts.” *The Andrew W. Mellon*

Foundation, 8 June 2017, www.mellon.org/resources/shared-experiences-blog/better-together-public-and-private-funding-arts/.

“Boards and Commissions: Arts Council of New Orleans.” *City of New Orleans*,

www.nola.gov/boards/arts-council-of-new-orleans/.

Brown, Lisa. 10 Feb. 2019.

“Budget.” *Mount Pleasant, South Carolina*, www.tompsc.com/595/Budget.

“Budget.” *Rock Hill, South Carolina*, www.cityofrockhill.com/departments/office-of-

management-budget/more/budget.

“Budget and Evaluation.” *Greensboro, North Carolina*, www.greensboro-nc.gov/departments/budget-evaluation.

“Budget, Finance and Revenue Collections.” *Charleston, South Carolina*, www.charleston-sc.gov/index.aspx?nid=121.

“Budget Management Division.” *Lafayette, Louisiana*, www.lafayettela.gov/budget/Pages/default.aspx.

“Budget Process.” *Asheville, North Carolina*, www.ashevollenc.gov/departments/finance/budget/process.htm.

“Budgeting.” *City of Lexington, Kentucky*, www.lexingtonky.gov/departments/budgeting.

“Budgets.” *City of Augusta, Georgia*, www.augustaga.gov/164/Budgets.

Bunch, Beverly S. “Changes in the Usage of Enterprise Funds by Large City Governments.” *Public Budgeting & Finance*, vol. 20, no. 2, Jan. 2000, pp. 15–29, doi:10.1111/0275-1100.00009.

Carlin, Brad. *Percent for Art Ordinances*. Americans for the Arts, 31 Dec. 2004, www.americansforthearts.org/by-program/reports-and-data/legislation-policy/naappd/percent-for-art-ordinances.

Casino Gaming Taxes.

www.revenue.louisiana.gov/Miscellaneous/Tax%20Budget%20Structure%20Task%20Force%20PP.pptx. Louisiana Casino Association.

“Charities and Non-Profits: Lobbying.” *Internal Revenue Service*, www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/lobbying.

City Manager's Recommended Budget FY17. City of Gainesville, Florida,
www.cityofgainesville.org/Portals/0/bf/FY17ProposedBudget.pdf.

City of Columbia Budget Summaries FY2012. City of Columbia, South Carolina,
www.columbiasc.net/depts/budget-office/docs/extprod002510.pdf.

"City of Hattiesburg." *City of Hattiesburg, Mississippi*, www.hattiesburgms.com/.

"City of New Orleans' Budget." *City of New Orleans, Louisiana*,
www.nola.gov/mayor/budget/.

"Clean Water Land and Legacy Amendment." *Minnesota Department of Agriculture*,
www.mda.state.mn.us/clean-water-land-and-legacy-amendment.

Cole, Gail. "How Sales Tax Shapes the Arts." *2017 Tax Management Inc.*, 29 June 2017,
www.bna.com/sales-tax-shapes-n73014460968/.

Coventry, Kate. "Dedicated Sales Tax for the Arts Represents Large Increase Over
Historic Funding and Puts Arts Ahead of Other Priorities Going Forward." *DC
Fiscal Policy Institute*, 24 May 2018, [www.dcfpi.org/all/dedicated-sales-tax-for-
the-arts-represents-large-increase-over-historic-funding-and-puts-arts-ahead-of-
other-priorities-going-forward/](http://www.dcfpi.org/all/dedicated-sales-tax-for-the-arts-represents-large-increase-over-historic-funding-and-puts-arts-ahead-of-other-priorities-going-forward/).

Creating Change through Arts, Culture, and Equitable Development | *PolicyLink*.
www.policylink.org/resources-tools/arts-culture-equitable-development.

Creative America: A Report to the President. President's Committee on the Arts and
Humanities, Feb. 1997,
www.americansforthearts.org/sites/default/files/Creative%20America_0.pdf.

Duncan, Loretta. Interview by Rebecca Brown, 10 Feb. 2019.

Fact vs. Fiction: Government Arts Funding. National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, 2017, www.nasaa-arts.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/FactvsFiction.pdf.

“Fast Facts Tool.” *National Center for Education Statistics*, 2018, www.nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=66.

“Finance.” *City of Montgomery, Alabama*, www.montgomeryal.gov/city-government/departments/finance.

“Finance.” *Macon-Bibb County, Georgia*, www.maconbibb.us/finance/.

“Finance.” *Southaven, Mississippi*, www.southaven.org/128/Finance.

“Finance.” *City of Knoxville, Tennessee*, www.knoxvilletn.gov/government/city_departments_offices/Finance.

“Finance Department.” *City of Decatur, Alabama*, www.decaturalabamausa.com/departments/finance-department/.

“Finance Department.” *City of Columbus, Georgia*, www.columbusga.gov/Finance/.

“Finance Department.” *City of Owensboro, Kentucky*, www.owensboro.org/page/finance-department.

“Finance Department.” *City of Baton Rouge, Louisiana*, www.brla.gov/193/Finance-Department.

“Finance Department.” *City of Lake Charles, Louisiana*, www.cityoflakecharles.com/departments/index.php?structureid=12.

“Finance Department, City of Owensboro.” *City of Owensboro, Kentucky*, www.owensboro.org/page/finance-department.

“Finances and Budget.” *City of Huntsville, Alabama*, www.huntsvilleal.gov/government/finances-budget/.

“Financial and Administrative Services.” *Greensboro, North Carolina*, www.greensboro-nc.gov/departments/financial-administrative-services.

“Financials Annual Reports.” *City of Covington, Kentucky*,
www.covingtonky.gov/government/financials.

Fiscal Year 2015-2016: Budget in Brief. City of Columbia, South Carolina, 20 Dec. 2011, www.columbiasc.net/depts/budget-office/fy_15-16_budget_in_brief_for_web.pdf.

Fiscal Year 2016 Proposed Budget Summaries. City of Chattanooga, Tennessee, 2016.

Fiscal Year 2017 Funding for Outside Agencies. City of Tallahassee,
www.talgov.com/uploads/public/documents/fm/fy17budget/fy17_outside.pdf.

“Florida Arts License Plates.” *Council on Culture and Arts*,
www.coca.tallahasseearts.org/about-coca/florida-license-plates.

FY13 Annual Operating and Capital Budget. Athens-Clarke County, Georgia, 1 June 2012, www.accgov.com/DocumentCenter/View/10465/FY13-Annual-Operating--Capital-Budget?bidId=.

FY17 Annual Report: Raleigh. City of Raleigh, 2016,
www.raleighnc.gov/government/content/Departments/Articles/BudgetManagement.html.

FY2017 Annual Operating and Capital Budget. Athens-Clarke County, Georgia, 1 July 2016.

Gaines, Jim. “Macon-Bibb Merger: First Year in Review.” *Macon Telegraph*, 3 Jan. 2015, www.macon.com/news/politics-government/article30163788.html.

“Garland Cultural Arts Commission.” *City of Garland Texas*,

www.garlandtx.gov/gov/eg/arts/about/gcac/default.asp.

Geltman, Nancy, editor. *New Engines of Growth: Five Roles for Arts, Culture and Design*. National Governors Association, National Assembly of State Art Agencies, May 2012.

General Fund Budget. City of Mobile, Alabama, 2017,

www.cityofmobile.org/announcement_files/fy2017_adopted_with_pics_pending.pdf.

Glossary of Municipal Securities Terms. www.msrb.org/glossary/definition/enterprise-fund.aspx.

Grant, Daniel. “Developers Fight Efforts to Make Them Pay for Public Art.” *The New York Times*, 11 July 2018. *NYTimes.com*,

www.nytimes.com/2018/07/10/business/art-real-estate.html.

“Grant Review Process.” *NEA*, 4 June 2013, www.arts.gov/grants/apply-grant/grants-organizations/grant-review-process.

“Grants for Organizations.” *National Endowment for the Arts*,

www.arts.gov/grants/apply-grant/grants-organizations.

Gulfport General Finance. www.gulfport-ms.gov/gen_finance.shtml.

“History.” *Hattiesburg Art Council*, www.hattiesburgartscouncil.org/History.html.

“How We Are Funded.” *Houston Arts Alliance*,

www.houstonartsalliance.com/about/funding/.

How We Are Funded---. <http://houstonartsalliance.com/about/funding/>.

- Jordan, Michael H. *A Federal Investment in Culture: The Arts Mean Business in America*. Americans for the Arts, 30 Dec. 1996, www.americansforthearts.org/by-program/reports-and-data/legislation-policy/naappd/a-federal-investment-in-culture-the-arts-mean-business-in-america.
- Keithly, Beth. "Part One: How Long Does It Take to Write a Grant? In Praise of Going Slow." *University of Texas Dallas Research*, 3 Jan. 2017, www.research.utdallas.edu/blog/part-one-how-long-does-it-take-to-write-a-grant-in-praise-of-going-slow.
- Kemp, Roger. "The Use of Enterprise Funds in America's Local Governments." *American Society for Public Administration, PA Times Online*, 16 May 2017, www.patimes.org/enterprise-funds-americas-local-governments/.
- "Learn a Little About Us." *Americans for the Arts Action Fund*, www.artsactionfund.org/about/about-us.
- Lord, Clayton, et al. *Strategies to Achieve Equitable Investment by Local Arts Agencies and Nexus Organizations*. Americans for the Arts, Jan. 2019, www.americansforthearts.org/by-program/reports-and-data/legislation-policy/naappd/strategies-to-achieve-equitable-investment-by-local-arts-agencies-and-nexus-organizations?utm_source=MagnetMail&utm_medium=email&utm_term=rbrown02@savannahga.gov&utm_content=DEI%5FReport%5FeBlast%5F01%2E23%2E19&utm_campaign=Cultural%20Equity%20Progress%20Report%20Release.
- "Lowcountry Quarterly Arts Grants Program." *City of Charleston, South Carolina*, www.charleston-sc.gov/index.aspx?nid=576.

Lowell, Julia, and Elizabeth Heneghan Ondaatje. *The Arts and State Governments: At Arm's Length or Arm in Arm?* RAND Corporation, 2006.

McFarland, Christiana K., and Christopher W. Hoene. *Cities and State Fiscal Structure*. National League of Cities, Center for City Solutions and Applied Research, 2015.

"Mission and Goals." *South Arts*, 2016, www.southarts.org/about-us/mission-and-goals/.

Molinari, Jeffery, and Charlie Tyer. "Local Government Enterprise Fund Activity: Trends and Implications." *Public Administration Quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 3–4, 2003, pp. 369–91.

"National Endowment for the Arts: 2013 Annual Report." *National Endowment for the Arts*, Apr. 2014, www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/2013-NEA-Annual-Report.pdf.

"National Endowment for the Arts: Appropriations History." *NEA*, 10 May 2013, www.arts.gov/open-government/national-endowment-arts-appropriations-history.

National Endowment for the Arts: Promoting Creativity and Public Access to the Arts. 2014, www.tcg.org/pdfs/advocacy/NEA_2014.pdf.

Novak-Leonard, Jennifer L., and Patience E. Baach. "Public Funding for Art: Chicago Compared with 12 Peer Regions." *Cultural Policy Center, University of Chicago*, p. 42.

"Now Accepting FY19 Tourism Product Development Grant Applications." *Alachua County*, www.alachuacounty.us/News/Article/Pages/Now-Accepting-FY19-Tourism-Product-Development-Grant-Applications.aspx.

"Office of Management and Budget." *City of Savannah, Georgia*, www.savannahga.gov/493/Office-of-Management-Budget.

"OpenGov Birmingham." *OpenGov*,

www.birminghamal.opengov.com/transparency#/22078/accountType=expenses&embed=n&breakdown=67161fe1-9b6b-4735-b6b7-e848f1d44237¤tYearAmount=cumulative¤tYearPeriod=years&graph=pie&legendSort=coa&proration=true&saved_view=null&selection=26C389A3990552107600FEA4F5571E86&projections=null&projectionType=null&highlighting=null&highlightingVariance=null&year=NaN&selectedDataSetIndex=10&fiscal_start=earliest&fiscal_end=latest.

“Overview of Council on Culture and Arts.” *Tallahassee Arts Guide*,

www.tallahasseearts.org/overview/.

Pender, John. “Foundation Giving to Rural Areas in the United States Is

Disproportionately Low.” *United State Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service*, www.ers.usda.gov/amber-waves/2015/august/foundation-giving-to-rural-areas-in-the-united-states-is-disproportionately-low/.

Porter Magee, Marc. *The 50CAN Guide to Building Advocacy Campaigns*. Nov. 2017,

www.50can.org/research-showcase/50can-guidebook/.

Proposed Budget 2017. City of Chattanooga, Tennessee,

www.chattanooga.gov/images/citymedia/finance/Budget2017/Proposed_Budget_2017pdf.

Quick Facts. National Endowment for the Arts, www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/nea-quick-facts.pdf.

“QuickFacts: New York City, New York.” *U.S. Census Bureau*,

www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/newyorkcitynewyork/PST045217.

Radich, Anthony, and Sonja Foss. *Economic Impact Studies of the Arts As Effective Advocacy*. National Conference of State Legislatures, 1986,
www.sonjafoss.com/html/Foss34.pdf.

Reese, Margie. 13 Jan. 2019.

Request for Proposals. City of Jackson, Mississippi,
www.jacksonms.gov/documentcenter/view/901.

“Revenue Sources.” *4Culture*, www.4culture.org/about-4culture/revenue-sources/.

Rinaldi, Ray Mark. “Big Questions about the Future of SCFD.” *The Denver Post*, 30 Apr. 2015, www.denverpost.com/2015/04/30/big-questions-about-the-future-of-scf/.

Rosenberg, Stan, and Dan Hunter. *Fundamentals of Arts Management: Cultural Advocacy*. 5th Edition, Arts Education Service, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 2007.

“Sec. 25-244. Use of Tax.” *Code 1972, § 103-2(B)*, vol. Ord. No. 127, 1989, 9-19-89, 1989,
www.library.municode.com/CO/fort_collins/codes/municipal_code?nodeId=CH25TA_ARTIVLOTA_S25-244USTA.

Selvin, Claire. “With Largest-Ever Allotment for Department of Cultural Affairs, New York City Grants \$43.9 M. to Arts Programs.” *ARTnews*, 23 Oct. 2018,
www.artnews.com/2018/10/23/largest-ever-allotment-department-cultural-affairs-new-york-city-grants-43-9-m-arts-programs/.

“State and Regional Arts Organizations.” *NEA*, 7 May 2013,
www.arts.gov/partners/state-regional.

State Arts Agency Grant Making and Funding. National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, 2016, p. 7. www.nasaa-arts.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/2016_grant_making_and_funding.pdf.

State Arts Agency Legislative Appropriations Preview Fiscal Year 2018. National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, 1 July 2017.

State Policy Briefs: Percent for Art. National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, 2013, www.nasaa-arts.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/NASAAPercentforArtPolicyBrief.pdf.

“Strategic Planning and Budgeting.” *Roswell, Georgia*, www.roswellgov.com/government/departments/finance/strategic-planning-budgeting.

Stubbs, Ryan, and Henry Clapp. “Public Funding for the Arts: 2015 Update.” *Grantmakers in the Arts*, www.giarts.org/article/public-funding-arts-2015-update.

Sullivan, Joe. “Knoxville Tourism Grows With Visit Knoxville’s Efforts.” *The Knoxville Mercury*, Aug. 2015, www.knoxmercury.com/2015/08/18/knoxville-tourism-grows-with-visit-knoxvilles-efforts/.

Supplemental Information: Budget. City of Winston-Salem, 2016, www.cityofws.org/Portals/0/pdf/budget/FY%2017%20Docs/Adopted%20Budget/13%20-%20Supp%20Info.pdf?ver=2016-10-21-112941-333.

Support for Arts in Rural Communities. National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, 2016, p. 3, www.nasaa-arts.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/RuralGrantmakingFactSheet0217.pdf.

“Taking the 501(h) Election.” *National Council of Nonprofits*,

www.councilofnonprofits.org/taking-the-501h-election.

“Timeline.” *LexArts*, www.lexarts.org/about-us/history/timeline/.

“Touring the Financial Statements, Part III: The Governmental Funds.” *Governmental Accounting Standards Board*, Nov. 2007,

www.gasb.org/cs/ContentServer?cid=1176156735732&d=Touch&pagename=GASB%2FGASBContent_C%2FUsersArticlePage.

“U.S. GDP Growth by Year: 1990-2017.” *Statista*,

www.statista.com/statistics/188165/annual-gdp-growth-of-the-united-states-since-1990/.

Vey, Jennifer S. “Why We Need to Invest in Transformative Placemaking.” *Brookings*,

14 Nov. 2018, <https://www.brookings.edu/research/why-we-need-to-invest-in-transformative-placemaking/>.

“Vision.” *Visit Savannah*, www.visitsavannah.com/about-visit-savannah/who-we-are.aspx.

What Americans Believe About the Arts, Americans Speak Out About the Arts in 2018:

An In-Depth Look at Perceptions & Attitudes About the Arts in America.

Americans for the Arts, 2018,

www.americansforthearts.org/sites/default/files/ARTS_FullInfographic_FINAL_0.pdf.

“What Is a Local Arts Agency.” *Americans for the Arts*, 20 May 2016,

www.americansforthearts.org/by-program/networks-and-councils/local-arts-network/what-is-a-local-arts-agency.

“Who We Are.” *Arts Council of York County, South Carolina*,

www.yorkcountyarts.org/who-we-are.

Why Should Government Support the Arts. p. 14.

Wonronkiewicz, Joanna, et al. *How the United States Funds the Arts*. National

Endowment for the Arts, Office of Research and Analysis, Nov. 2012,

www.files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED536820.pdf.

Young, Mat. *Lake Charles, Director of Cultural Affairs*. 8 Feb. 2019.

Zatkulak, Karen. “Cost of Growth: Tourism Impact.” *WLOS*, 18 Apr. 2018,

www.wlos.com/news/news-13-investigates/cost-of-growth-tourism-impact.

