

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
April 8, 1983

The House Appropriations Subcommittee on Education met at 8 a.m. on Friday, April 8, 1983 in Room 104 of the State Capitol. With Chairman Rep. Esther G. Bengtson presiding, all members were present. Executive Action was begun on the Cultural and Aesthetic Project grant proposals.

The Committee reviewed the proposals in the order in which they were heard.

Discussion took place regarding what the Committee's priorities should be when deciding which projects to fund. Rep. Peck said he felt that facilities tended to use up money very rapidly, and he felt this was more of a local responsibility. He rose in support of patterning the grants so they were evenly distributed geographically. He felt that the various areas of emphasis such as history, performing arts, etc. should all be funded equally, as well. He also felt the qualifications of the sponsors should be considered. He was opposed to funding which would be for long-term projects.

The Chairman referred the Committee to the criteria list which the Review Committee used; see Exhibit "A."

Sen. Hammond said he was in favor of accepting the decisions made by the Citizens' Review Committee.

Mr. Dave Nelson, Executive Director of the Montana Arts Council, reviewed the procedures which the Citizens' Committee went through in deciding which proposals to recommend for funding. Because there was no funding for the review process, it wasn't what they would have preferred it be; House Bill 110 would clear this up in the future. At their first meeting they set some ground rules, and arranged so that each grant proposal was read by at least two people. At the second meeting, the projects were all ranked on the criteria sheet (Exhibit "A") and each project was reviewed and appropriated a high figure and a low figure. He pointed out that the process which the Arts Council used in reviewing grants was much more extensive but due to the lack of funding this had not been possible for these projects.

Rep. Ernst pointed out that the Committee needed to consider House Bills 906, 905, 881, and 813 as well as the grant proposal. He added that there were some projects which the Citizens' Review Committee hadn't recommended which he wanted to give support to. Mr. Norm Rostöcki, LFA, pointed out that operating expenses also needed to be appropriated, for the Review Committee.

In response to the Chairman, Mr. Nelson said the assumption

in House Bill 110 was that the Montana Arts Council would visit most of the projects granted coal monies during the normal course of what the Council did in serving the State. Therefore, project evaluations could occur at no extra cost. However, the Council does not normally visit historical groups. The evaluation will be through the normal processes of the fact that the Historical Society and the Arts Council are well aware of the groups and have some kind of process of review.

Dr. Bob Archibald, Director of the Montana Historical Society, pointed out that in the current biennium, they had tried to adopt administrative rules but the authority to adopt them was challenged by the Administrative Codes Committee. Therefore, outside of some financial reporting requirements, there are no evaluative requirements currently.

Mr. Brian Cockhill, Historical Society, pointed out that he had received criticism from some groups and individuals who could not get sponsorship from local governments. One of the main reasons for requiring a government sponsorship was because of the importance of accountability. Mr. Nelson said he felt it would take about six years before the process settled down and began to operate smoothly.

Rep. Peck wanted to know if the projects would ever be audited. Mr. Nelson said there were no audits; he suggested the use of "desk audits." He said they would request that any organization that received the money, if audited, would send the Arts Council a copy. The Council wouldn't have the capacity to direct any group to be audited, however. He suggested that the rules adopted by the Historical Society be incorporated into the Committee bill for the Cultural and Aesthetic Projects. Mr. Rostocki compared these grants to DNR's alternative energy grants. He said that for parties receiving monies from the Dept. of Natural Resources and Conservation, reports had to show where the money had been spent before each quarterly allotment would be given. Mr. Nelson said the Historical Society's rules required that documentation be kept until the group is audited or three years lapsed.

In response to Rep. Peck, Mr. Nelson said the Review Committee considered several factors as being important in choosing which projects to fund: (1) statewide impact; (2) geographic distribution; (3) quality of the operation, etc.

Sen. Hammond wanted to know why the Shakespeare in the Parks proposal had been recommended for a higher level of funding than had been requested. Mr. Nelson explained that when the project applied for the grant, they thought they were applying for only one year.

The Committee then proceeded to review the projects in the order in which they were heard.

No. 5 - Butte-Silverbow Arts Chateau. Discussion took place regarding the question of granting money for bricks-and-mortar projects vs. having a physical place for the projects to get started. It was brought out that no mills were levied for this project in Silverbow County.

No. 8 - Carbon County Arts Guild. Mr. Cockhill said that the sponsor of this project was the Carbon County Commissioners. The only projects without sponsors were the Big Fork Festival of the Arts, and St. Helena Cathedral. The Chairman pointed out that there was a lot of community support for the arts in Red Lodge, as well as tourism.

No. 78 - Blaine County Museum. There was general support of this proposal. Rep. Peck pointed out that the project wasn't just for a museum but also proposed to do work at the battlefield, and he felt this was something which needed to be done.

No. 26 - Folklife Project. The Chairman said one of her concerns was that the agencies which had access to the budgeting process might have a conflict of interest, when items in their own budgets were being reviewed. She pointed out that some of the activity now taking place throughout the State probably came about because of the work done by the Folklorist and the Oral Historian. Discussion took place regarding whether or not these two projects should be funded on an ongoing basis. Rep. Donaldson suggested that the situation be reviewed in 1985 to see if the projects couldn't be funded differently. Mr. Nelson said that the budget was current level, for the Folklife Project. He said the Arts Council and the Historical Society would like to see their two projects compete for general fund rather than being funded from these monies. Dr. Archibald pointed out that the OBPP budget had carried these two projects as current level within the agencies' budgets. However, the Education Subcommittee did not adopt the OBPP recommendations.

The Chairman asked Mr. Nelson if he felt the Folklife Project should be a permanent project. He said that traditionally, other States had State Folklorists, which were ongoing programs. He pointed out that the program was one of three the Arts Council did, and he felt it was a very important program for both the State and his agency, and they wished it to be an ongoing part of their agency.

No. 34 - Montana School of Creative Arts. Discussion

took place regarding whether this wouldn't be underwriting a private business venture. Rep. Peck questioned the need for a full-time administrative director for the project. It was brought out that the Helena School District provided support at a level of \$7,155.

No. 22 - Jordan Museum. The Chairman said she felt it was incumbent on the Committee to encourage and give support to the small county museums. Rep. Peck said he felt the County commissioners should be encouraged also to use their mill levies to help support these operations. It was brought out that Garfield County didn't levy a mill. McCone County had used revenue-sharing money; however, they didn't levy a permissive mill, either. Rep. Ernst recommended a reduced level of funding. It was agreed that when the award letters were written that the Counties would be encouraged to levy a mill or part of a mill for museums.

No. 41 - Shakespeare in the Parks. Mr. Cockhill explained that the project had only asked for funding for one year, by mistake; and the Review committee reduced the level of funding and then doubled it, for two years. Some of the Committee members felt that after ten years the Project should be self-sustaining. It was brought out that their National Endowment for the Arts funding had been eliminated in 1981. It was brought up that using coal money to send groups out-of-State might not be fitting. Mr. Nelson explained that the groups went out-of-State to get earned income. Groups that tour to small towns in the State are always going to need support because the State is so large and sparsely populated that ticket sales aren't enough to support the operations. Rep. Ernst suggested that the project be funded at \$20,000.

No. 44 - Montana Association of Symphony Orchestras. In response to Rep. Peck, Mr. Nelson said the Montana Arts Council had supported the individual symphonies in the past, and they had worked hard to get them to get organized, on a Statewide basis. The Chairman felt that in time the organization would become self-sustaining.

No. 51 - Vigilante Players. The Chairman expressed concern about small touring groups disrupting the school day with their programs. There was general support for the group and Mr. Hosking's presentation.

The Committee then went back over the projects discussed thus far and took Executive action.

No. 5 - Butte-Silverbow Arts Chateau. Sen. Hammond

moved that they be funded at \$35,000, with encouragement to seek local support in the form of a mill levy. Motion carried unanimously.

No. 8 - Carbon County Arts Guild. Sen. Hammond moved they be funded at \$20,000. Motion carried unanimously.

No. 78 - Blaine County Museum. Rep. Peck moved that this project be funded at \$40,000. It was brought out that .86 mills were levied in Blaine County for museums. The question was called for; motion carried unanimously.

No. 26 - Folklife Project. Mr. Nelson pointed out that North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, and Wyoming all had folklorists. The most important thing the Folklife Project is doing is it is dignifying many of the traditions which have been being carried on by the people in the State. It has generated pride in carrying on these traditions. The money granted by the State is used to apply for money for programs from the National Endowment for the Arts Folklife Program.

Rep. Peck submitted that as long as funding was available from the coal tax, the Project would not be funded from general fund. He moved that the proposal not be funded. Sen. Haffey wanted to know if the Folklorist would remain on the Arts Council Staff if the project was not funded. Rep. Peck said he felt that the activities would continue as they had prior to the time the project was originated, and if the program was valid, it could be funded from the general fund in 1985. He submitted that funding on-going projects from the coal tax funds would deny the opportunity for other new groups to spring up under the sponsorship of the coal tax monies.

Mr. Nelson said if the program were cut rather than not funded at all, it could be kept alive. He added that if the funding for the project was taken away, the budget for the Arts Council would be dropping below current level. The Folklife project is one of three programs in the Montana Arts Council's budget; the other two are the Artists in the Schools Program and the Community Service Program.

Sen. Hammond wanted to know what would happen if the funding was cut in half. Mr. Nelson said if the Folklorist's salary could be paid he would be kept on board. Sen. Hammond made a substitute motion that the Folklife Project be funded at \$30,000. The question was called for on the substitute motion; motion carried unanimously.

No. 34 - Montana School of Creative Arts. No motion was made.

No. 22 - Jordan Museum. Rep. Ernst moved funding at \$4,000. Sen. Hammond suggested that they be instructed to consider levying a mill for museums. Motion carried unanimously.

No. 41 - Shakespeare in the Parks. Rep. Peck moved to fund them at \$20,000, to make up for the lost funding from the National Endowment for the Arts. Motion carried unanimously.

No. 44 - Montana Association of Symphony Orchestras. Discussion took place regarding whether a reduced level of funding would be effective. Sen. Haffey moved at \$13,000; motion carried unanimously.

No. 51 - Vigilante Players. Rep. Peck moved to fund them at \$5,000; motion carried unanimously.

The projects heard on March 30 were then reviewed.

No. 27 - Montana Authors Biographical Directory. It was brought out that this project was not heard, but it was recommended by the Review Committee. The Chairman felt this would be a valuable resource for libraries. Sen. Hammond moved that the request be funded; motion carried unanimously.

No. 25 - Eastern Montana Resource Coordination Project. It was brought out that the Project Director, John Koch, had said their budget could be reduced. There was general agreement that the Project was tentatively approved.

No. 12 - Custer County Arts Center. There was general agreement to give tentative approval for funding.

No. 58 - Young Audiences of Western Montana. It was agreed that the Program was well-developed and would stand on its own merits.

No. 66 - Tri-County Historical Society. Sen. Haffey said funding at \$58,000 would take care of the three structural repair jobs that were needed to keep the building from deteriorating any further.

No. 67 - Robert Yellowtail Film Documentary. There was general support for the project and its director.

No. 70 - K. Ross Toole's Montana. Rep. Peck pointed out that money had already been raised, and the project would have a State-wide impact.

No. 72 - Small Town Montana. (Historical Society's Oral History Project) Rep. Peck suggested funding at a lower level, in accordance with the reductions which many of the other projects were receiving.

No. 77 - Growth Through Art. The Chairman pointed out that this group had received a lot of volunteer support, and their fund raising efforts had been substantial.

No. 53 - Western Heritage Center. It was brought out that a mill levy was applied for museums in Yellowstone County. The statutes require that the County must own the museum and its holdings in order to be eligible for county funding, however, Dr. Archibald said. Tentative approval for the project was given.

The Committee went back and took Executive Action on the projects heard on March 30:

No. 25 - Eastern Montana Resource Coordination Project. Sen. Tveit moved it be funded at \$35,000. Motion carried unanimously.

No. 12 - Custer County Arts Center. Sen. Tveit moved the project be funded at \$12,000; motion carried unanimously.

No. 58 - Young Audiences of Western Montana. No motion was made.

No. 66 - Tri-County Historical Society. Sen. Haffey moved that the Society be funded at \$58,000. He pointed out that Arco had rejected their application for a grant. Motion carried unanimously.

No. 67 - Robert Yellowtail Film Documentary. Rep. Peck moved that funding be for \$28,000; motion carried unanimously.

No. 70 - K. Ross Toole's Montana. Sen. Hammond moved \$44,000 in funding; motion carried unanimously.

No. 72 - Small Town Montana. Rep. Peck moved to cut funding by 50%. Dr. Archibald explained that the Oral Historian's job was first and foremost to collect oral history for research purposes. He pointed out that this project had been proposed by the OBPP for funding from the general fund but this approach had not been adopted by the Education Subcommittee.

Sen. Hammond wanted to know what attempts the oral

historian had made to involve the local oral historians in the work, and how much the oral histories connected by amateurs were utilized. Dr. Archibald pointed out that the oral historian was the only professionally trained oral historian in the State. A professionally conducted oral history adds a systematic element to the process, and makes it more than an attempt to collect genealogical reminiscences.

Rep. Peck questioned how much use was made of the oral histories once they were collected. Dr. Archibald said the use was fairly dramatic.

Sen. Tveit made a substitute motion that the project be funded at \$60,000. In response to Sen. Haffey, Dr. Archibald said the oral history tapes were available both at the Historical Society and in the local communities from which they were collected. Dr. Archibald stressed the importance of collecting oral history that coherently represented major movements and changes in Montana history, rather than the more biographical type of oral history often collected by amateur oral historians. The question was then called for on Sen. Tveit's substitute motion; motion carried unanimously.

No. 77 - Growth Through Art. Sen. Hammond moved that the project be funded at \$30,000; motion carried unanimously.

No. 53 - Western Heritage Center. The Chairman suggested a reduced level of funding. Rep. Peck moved that it be funded at \$25,000; motion carried unanimously.

The Committee took a 15-minute recess.

Upon reconvening, the Chairman announced that \$460,000 thus far had been appropriated. The hearings from March 31 were then reviewed.

No. 76 - Bozeman Public Library Tapestry. Sen. Jacobson was in favor of having the local community provide support for artwork in the public library. It was brought out that this project and the Bozeman Public Library Mural project were for two different walls in the Library. No motion was made.

No. 29 - Montana Consort. No motion was made.

No. 35 - Rocky Boy Tribal Elders. Rep. Peck rose in support of the persons presenting the project, and the project itself. Concern was expressed about the funds being

administered by the tribal government, however. Dr. Archibald pointed out that tribes were eliglble to apply for the cul- tural and aesthetic monies, per an attorney general's opinion. No motion was made.

No. 48 - University of Montana, School of Fine Arts. Discussion took place regarding UM financing the project through its operating budget. No motion was made.

No. 49 - University of Montana "Magic Movers." Sen. Jacobson wanted to know if they would be able to get matching monies if they were only partially funded. Mr. Nelson said they were hard workers and would do what they could with the funding. Sen. Jacobson moved to fund them at \$10,000. Motion carried unanimously.

No. 50 - University of Montana, Repertory Theatre. Sen. Jacobson moved \$50,000. She rose in support of the quality of the group. The question was called for; motion failed on a tie vote. Rep. Peck pointed out that the amount requested was more than double what had been requested in 1981. In response to Sen. Haffey, Mr. Nelson stated that the Repertory Theatre had toured throughout the entire State. It was the only professional theatre in the western region of the country and it reached to Idaho and Whoming. It was pointed out that the Repertory Theatre provided workshops and was an inspir- ation to the small local theatre groups.

Sen Haffey moved that the Repertory Theatre be funded at \$25,000. Mr. Nelson pointed out that funding for such groups as the Repertory Theatre directly helped them travel to smaller communities because the money was used to help subsi- dize the cost. Rep. Peck wanted to know how much the Montana Arts Council did in the way of follow-up to see that the propo- sals had accomplished what they had proposed to accomplish, such as touring only to small communities. He replied that the Council had not had the responsibility for those projects in the past; however, there is a thorough follow-up evalua- tion including an on-site evaluation and report with Montana Arts Council grants. Discussion took place regarding whether or not smaller communities would be visited or whether larger ones would be. The question was called for on Sen. Haffey's motion; motion carried unanimously.

No. 11 - Conrad Public Library. Rep. Peck pointed out that there had been a lot of community support, and a lot of money had been raised privately. Sen. Hammond expressed re- luctance to fund library projects. Rep. Ernst moved \$2,000

to do the work on the window; motion carried with Rep. Bengtson and Sen. Hammond opposed.

No. 24 - M.A.G.D.A. It was brought out that the Arts Council had provided support for this group in the past. No motion was made.

No. 54 - Yellowstone Art Center. No motion was made.

No. 20 - Hockaday Center for the Arts. It was brought out that the Center was supported by both the City and the County. No motion was made.

The projects heard on April 1 were then reviewed.

No. 1 - Archie Bray Collection. No motion was made.

No. 13 - Helena Civic Center. No motion was made.

No. 37 - Paris Gibson Square. Sen. Hammond rose in support of the project, pointing out that for years the persons involved had done a lot of the work on their own. He added that there was a mill levied in Cascade County for such purposes. He moved that they be funded at \$50,000, on the condition that the rest of the money needed for the elevator had to be raised within two years. The money would not come from the State until the remainder had been raised. Motion carried unanimously.

No. 45 - Teachers' Center for Montana. No motion was made.

No. 73 - Montana International Christmas. No motion was made.

No. 31 - Montana's Sporting Heritage. No motion was made.

No. 79 - Montana Woman's History Project. No motion was made.

No. 30 - McCone County Museum. The Chairman said that 1.5 mills were provided from the general fund for the operation of the museum, per a communication from Orville Quick. It was pointed out that this was not from a permissive mill, however. Discussion took place regarding whether \$4,000 would be sufficient to make an impact on the project. Dr. Archibald pointed out that the Museum had a lot of volunteer support. He suggested that if the Committee were going to provide funding it should

be more than \$\$4,000, and possibly a matching provision similar to the one required of the Paris Gibson Square could be included. No motion was made.

No. 61 - Children Arts Center. No motion was made. Rep. Peck felt that this was the type of activity which should be supported by the parents.

No. 59 - Powell County Museum and Arts Foundation. (Golden Spike Ceremony) Sen. Haffey moved that \$15,000 be provided; motion carried unanimously. There was general agreement to incorporate the proposal into the Committee bill for cultural and aesthetic project funding, rather than to give House Bill 905 (which was the same proposal) a Do Pass.

No. 85. - Billings Symphony Chorale. (House Bill 813) The Chairman pointed out that the Chorale had raised locally over \$70,000 for the trip to Germany. She submitted that the trip would help enhance the image of Montana. Rep. Ernst moved that funding be for \$10,000. Sen. Haffey wanted to know if the Chorale proposal met the criteria contained in Exhibit "A." The question was called for; motion failed on a tie vote; see roll call vote sheet.

The hearings from April 4 were then reviewed.

No. 19 - Montana Irrigation Practices. No motion was made.

No. 6 - Butte-Silverbow Public Archives. The Chairman rose in support of the valuable services the Archives were providing for the community. Mr. Cockhill explained that the Archives were actually an outgrowth of the World Museum of Mining, which was also located in Butte. Rep. Ernst moved funding at \$8,600; motion carried unanimously.

No. 60 - St. Helena Cathedral. It was brought out that they had no sponsor, and had not come in for hearing. No motion was made.

No. 15 - Fort Missoula. The Chairman rose in support of the work the R.S.V.P. volunteers had done. In response to Chairman Bengtson, Mr. Nelson said the Review Committee would have liked to fund this and other projects, but there were not enough funds available; in addition, there was some concern about the number of Missoula projects already funded. No motion was made.

No. 63 - Missoula Children's Theatre. No motion was made.

No. 64 - Lincoln County Cultural Council. No motion was made.

No. 65 - Flathead County. No motion was made.

No. 69 - Museum of the Rockies. The Chairman pointed out the historical significance of the Gallatin Valley as being the original area where homesteading was done. No motion was made.

No. 33 - Montana Humor. No motion was made.

No. 56 - Missoula Museum of the Arts. No motion was made.

With \$562,000 appropriated, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.

Rep. Esther G. Bengtson, Chm.
Rep. Esther G. Bengtson - Chairman .

4/8/83

EXHIBIT "A"

COAL TAX GRANT REVIEW CRITERIA

APPLICANT NAME/NUMBER _____

1. QUALITY--Ability/experience of project staff; excellence of performers _____
2. CULTURAL IMPACT--How important is the project to the cultural development of the state? Will the project stimulate a large number of people or a number of communities [without prejudice to rural communities]? _____
3. PROJECT DIVERSITY--A variety of different interests and disciplines should be served [by the coal tax. This is an overall funding goal and not to be ranked for each individual applicant.] _____
4. GEOGRAPHICAL DIVERSITY--[Does the grant assist an area broader than a single community?] To the extent possible, the grants should assist the entire state. _____
5. COST OF PROJECT--[Is the amount requested realistic in terms of the services provided, and the resources and goals of this committee?] If grant funds are limited, some preference should be given to projects requiring smaller grants. _____
6. SEED MONEY REQUESTS--Will a grant enable the project or its sponsors to generate other funds or otherwise make the project self-sustaining? _____
7. AVAILABILITY/APPROPRIATENESS OF OTHER FUNDING--Can the sponsors raise funds from other sources or are there other sources of funding that are more appropriate to the project? _____
8. SELF-HELP--Does the sponsor seek full funding from the coal tax fund or has it arranged alternate financing to the extent possible? _____
9. CREATIVITY--Is the project so innovative, beneficial and practical that by example it will stimulate other similar projects? _____

[ITEMS IN BRACKETS [] ABOVE HAVE BEEN ADDED BY STAFF FOR CLARIFICATION OR AMPLIFICATION]

PLEASE RANK THE ABOVE CRITERIA FOR THIS APPLICATION WITH A PLUS (SOMETHING SPECIAL), A ZERO (AVERAGE), OR A MINUS (NOT ADDRESSED, QUESTIONABLE, OR UNSATISFACTORY).

COMMENTS: (USE ADDITIONAL SHEETS IF NECESSARY)