

## MINUTES

### MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 53rd LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

#### JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LONG-RANGE PLANNING

Call to Order: By Rep. Ernest Bergsagel, Chairman, on January 18, 1993, at 7:00 AM

#### ROLL CALL

**Members Present:**

Rep. Ernest Bergsagel, Chair (R)  
Sen. Bob Hockett, Vice Chair (D)  
Rep. Francis Bardanouve (D)  
Sen. Ethel Harding (R)  
Sen. Eleanor Vaughn (D)  
Rep. Tom Zook (R)

**Members Excused:** None

**Members Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Jim Haubein, Legislative Fiscal Analyst  
Jane Hamman, Office of Budget & Program Planning  
Sandra Boggs, Committee Secretary

**Please Note:** These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

**Committee Business Summary:**

Hearing: CULTURAL AND AESTHETIC GRANTS  
Executive Action: DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS; DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES; AND DEPARTMENT OF LIVESTOCK

**ANNOUNCEMENTS/DISCUSSION:**

**CHAIRMAN ERNEST BERGSAGEL** announced that it was his goal to move the committee to Room 325 to hear testimony from Cultural and Aesthetic Grant applicants. He believed the committee would be able to move by 8:15 AM, and hoped to use the room for the next two weeks.

**HEARING ON CULTURAL AND AESTHETIC GRANTS**

Tape No. 1:A:010

**Informational Testimony:** Arlynn Fishbaugh, Executive Director, Montana Arts Council, referred the committee to the Cultural and Aesthetics Grants book. **EXHIBIT 1.** She emphasized the important role the Cultural and Aesthetics Trust has played in expanding and supporting the arts in Montana. The Trust is derived from interest on the Coal Tax. The Cultural Trust receives one and

two-thirds percent of the 38% of the coal tax not earmarked for the permanent portion of the Trust. This is the money that the committee deals with for allocation to Cultural and Aesthetics Grants.

**Ms. Fishbaugh** said that the Council would like to introduce a new piece of legislation in regard to the grant process. The amendment would address current and future issues facing the legislature and Cultural and Aesthetics Advisory Committee. She explained that the Cultural and Aesthetics Advisory Committee is made up of 16 members, eight are appointed by the Council, and eight are appointed by the Historical Society. **EXHIBIT 1, page iii**, shows the members of the Advisory Council for this Biennium. **Ms. Fishbaugh** explained that the Advisory Committee took care to include recommendations which reflect diversity in geographic locations, community size, and the variety of arts benefitting from the Trust. She stressed that the Advisory Committee encourages diversity in funding sources for all applicants, and uses that as a criteria in evaluating applications.

**Carleen Layne, Deputy Director and Accountant, Montana Arts Council**, reviewed budget projections, and provided updates. She said that \$1.5 million was allocated for FY92 and FY93 from this Trust. Approximately 40% was paid out in 1992, and the balance will be paid in 1993. The only reversion so far this biennium was \$1500 from Lewis and Clark County. They hired a new executive director and have not yet been able to pull that project together.

**Ms. Layne** said that since she does not have figures from the state on what the revenue will be for the Trust at the time she gives the information to the Advisory Committee, she always makes conservative estimates. She said that allows the Long-Range Planning Committee to make adjustments and changes with the additional money. She referred the committee to **EXHIBIT 1, Section I, Budget** for information on the 1994-1995 biennium budget. **Ms. Layne** said the \$20 million is the total of all the applications, not just the applications that were recommended by the Advisory Committee.

**Questions, Responses, and Discussion:** **REP. TOM ZOOK** asked why there was such an increase in the matching funds during this biennium, \$11.50 for the 1994-95 biennium over \$5.12 for the 1992-93 biennium. **Ms. Layne** said the estimated budget always reflects a higher match than what will actually be received. The revised budget will probably show a match that is half of what is shown by the estimated budget.

**REP. ZOOK** asked where the applicants got the money used to match the trust funds. **Ms. Layne** said the money comes from a variety of sources and referred the committee to **EXHIBIT 1, section IV, Statistics, page 6**, for more specific information.

**Informational Testimony:** **Dick King, Chair, Cultural and**

**Aesthetics Grants Advisory Committee**, explained how the Advisory Committee made decisions on grant recommendations. Each member receives eight - ten grant applications to review and present to the committee for consideration. He referred the committee to **EXHIBIT 1, section II, Criteria** for more information on the criteria each application was evaluated on.

**Mr. King** said four areas were critical to the committee for evaluating their decisions: geographic diversity; project diversity; cultural diversity; and, cost of programs. He stated that the Advisory Committee received 126 applications requesting \$3.3 million, or \$26,000 apiece. The Committee has recommended 102 projects for funding at approximately \$13,000 apiece. They recommended no funding for 23 projects. Almost all recommended projects are recommended for partial funding, few receive full funding. The Committee recommended funding for 36 rural applicants, 42 were urban, and 24 were state-wide applicants. He reminded members that although the statistics may seem to favor urban organizations, sometimes the urban organizations are being funded for state-wide projects that benefit many communities.

**Tape No. 1:A:976**

**Mr. King** stated there were five categories for grant applications. A simple application for small organizations and projects has been developed to encourage smaller volunteer organizations to apply. To qualify the organizations cannot have a full-time staff member. The other categories are special projects, operational support, capital expenditures and endowments. He explained that the difference between operational support and special projects is that operational support is to help keep an organization viable and alive. Special projects are for activities, and capital expenditures are for buildings. Endowment support is for establishing permanent endowment funds for an organization and must be matched three to one by the organization.

**Tape No. 1:A:228**

**Mr. King** said the Council will ask the committee members to deal with the issue of the Folklife and Historical Society Oral History office. Putting funds into these projects may be seen as tilting the scales from organizations not associated with the state. It is difficult for the Advisory Committee to evaluate the applications.

**Tape No. 1:B:003**

**Mr. King** said the Committee was also confused by the bill language which requires applicants that own buildings to match grant monies with cash and/or in-kind. The Advisory Committee proposes the language be changed to read cash or cash in kind to allow the Advisory Committee to evaluate which type of match would be appropriate for the applicant.

Mr. King said last biennium some reversions came back and the funds were allowed to be used to match some federal funds from the National Endowment of the Arts. He has been amazed by what those funds were used to accomplish. Places like Fort Peck and Miles City have had activities occur that would not have happened otherwise. He asked that a discussion be held to decide on the future availability of funds. He suggested an application process could be designed to allow the reverted monies to be re-granted quickly to small community organizations.

Tape No. 1:B:132

Mr. King said three new issues came up during the review process that they feel should be incorporated in the guidelines. The issues will be discussed by the Advisory Committee at their spring meeting. The issues are: Native American antiquities, moving historical buildings; and, arts education projects. The committee feels that a cautionary statement should be included to remind organizations of the sensitivity and legal limitations to be considered when dealing with Native American antiquities.

Mr. King said the Historic Preservation Office wants to include a statement in the guidelines to instruct organizations to contact the Office before moving any historic buildings. Movement can destroy the historic and cultural significance of buildings and sometimes may not be appropriate.

Tape No. 1:B:203

Mr. King stated that several applications this time deal with arts education in schools. The difference between a big community and a small community can be large when it comes to arts education. The resources available to a teacher in a bigger city are not available to teachers in small communities. He said the Advisory Committee did not have any specific recommendations, but wondered if it was fair to fund arts education in larger communities when small communities aren't getting any funding.

Questions, Responses, and Discussion: SEN. BOB HOCKETT wondered if a precedent was being set by funding FTEs out of the Trust fund for the rural arts specialist and folklore specialist. He asked if funding arts programs in rural areas would eat up all the funds available in the Trust.

Mr. King said every session the Advisory Committee, Arts Council, and the Historical Society have recommended the staff for the rural arts project, folklife project and the oral history project be funded from the general fund since they are state agencies. It has caused problems for the Advisory Committee, the perception is that the agencies have special access to the Trust funds.

Ms. Fishbaugh said the Arts Council has made a concerted attempt to get those positions funded out of the general fund this year. In response to Sen. Hockett's question, she said the rural arts

HOUSE LONG-RANGE PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

January 18, 1993

Page 5 of 22

specialist is more of an organizational development position. It was started by a grant from the NEA, and the Arts Council has tried to maximize the money there to help rural areas raise money and organize effectively. The Art Council's desire would be to have both FTE positions funded out of the General Fund. The Governor moved the positions out of funding from the general fund when he presented his budget, and gave them funding from the Trust.

Tape No. 1:B:369

Bill Pratt, Director of Organizational Services, said having the FTE positions compete in the grant process was uncomfortable for the Committee. The move by the governor to fund the positions out of the Cultural Trust removed the positions from competition with private organizations. One problem the programs have is that state agencies don't have the opportunity to raise funds privately without competing with organizations.

Mr. King directed committee members to EXHIBIT 1, section VI, Issues, for more information on the issues previously discussed. In closing, he thanked the committee and the legislature for the foresight in establishing the Cultural Trust. Montana is very privileged to have the Trust which makes many activities happen that would not occur otherwise.

SEN. HOCKETT asked Mr. King if the increase in applications from Native American organizations would tie in with economic development for reservations. Mr. King said the committee is very encouraged by the increased participation from the Native American communities. He said some projects will create products which can be sold to support the cultural activities on the reservation.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS

BUDGET ITEM #16 REPAIRS & IMPROVEMENTS, TOTAL \$185,000:

BUDGET ITEM a) RE-ROOF BILLINGS ARMORY:

Tape No. 1:B:678

Motion: SEN. ETHEL HARDING moved to accept the Capital Projects budget of \$50,000 to re-roof the Billings Armory.

Discussion: REP. FRANCIS BARDANOUVE asked if there was federal money available for any of the project. Col. Ken Cottrill, Facilities Manager, Montana National Guard, stated that the funding for repair and maintenance of the Armories is entirely the responsibility of the state. That was the agreement when the federal government agreed to pay 75% of the construction costs.

SEN. HOCKETT asked if the hail damage to the roof could mean reimbursement from an insurance company. Col. Cottrill stated that some insurance money was recovered. That money went to do

930118JL.HM1

repairs and would not have been enough to replace the entire roof.

Vote: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BUDGET ITEM b) RIFLE RANGE LEAD REMOVAL:

Tape No. 1:B:822

Motion/Vote: SEN. HARDING moved to accept the budget for \$75,000. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BUDGET ITEM c) BOILER/FURNACE REPLACEMENT:

Tape No. 1:B:852

Motion: REP. BARDANOUVE moved to accept the budget for \$60,000.

Discussion: SEN. HOCKETT asked A&E if there would be energy savings realized due to this replacement. Mr. Jim Whaley, Architecture and Engineering Division, Department of Administration, said there would be some savings but it would not be significant.

Vote: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BUDGET ITEM #48 PHASE III, VETERAN'S CEMETERY:

Tape No. 1:B:905

Discussion: Jim Haubein, Legislative Fiscal Analyst, reminded the committee that there are two sources of funding for this project: state special revenue funds and federal matching funds. He said the figures should be amended to \$75,000 for each source of funding as requested by the DMA.

Motion/Vote: SEN. HARDING moved to accept the amendment and the budget of \$75,000. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BUDGET ITEM #49 FEDERAL SPENDING AUTHORITY:

Tape No. 1:B:011

Discussion: Mr. Haubein stated the DMA is seeking spending authority of \$300,000 in federal funds for several maintenance projects.

Motion/Vote: SEN. HOCKETT moved to accept the \$300,000 budget. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Tape No. 1:B:046

Discussion: CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL noted that only one motion was made to authorize \$75,000 in spending for the Veteran's Cemetery and asked Mr. Haubein if it was necessary to have a separate motion for the other \$75,000 in federal spending authority. Mr. Haubein and the committee members said they understood the motion

to authorize \$75,000 in spending from both categories. **CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL** said the committee would proceed if that was the intent of the motion for the committee.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS

Tape No. 1:B:085

BUDGET ITEM #20 VARIOUS MAINTENANCE PROJECTS:

Discussion: **Mr. Haubein** said the \$100,000 would be spent on various maintenance projects on state lands.

Motion: **SEN. HARDING** moved to accept the \$100,000 budget.

Discussion: **REP. BARDANOUVE** asked if it was possible for the committee to come back and change the amount appropriated to projects if priorities change or an emergency comes up. If the projects are approved will the committee have no authority to make changes. He said he had no solution, but cautioned the committee to consider that if all the money is approved for all the projects there will be no money available for emergencies.

Questions, Responses, and Discussion: **REP. ZOOK** asked if the DSL could explain the construction costs included in the project proposals. **Randy Mosely, DSL**, said all the projects for maintenance are on existing statewide buildings. The construction costs are for small vehicle sheds to protect fire tankers from damage. The bulk of money is for maintenance.

Motion: **REP. ZOOK** offered a substitute motion to change the budget to \$50,000.

Discussion: **SEN. HOCKETT** noted that the initial request was reduced from \$438,700 to \$100,000. **Mr. Whaley** said that was correct, the A&E Division recommended a reduced amount of \$100,000. They would have liked to recommend \$200,000, but could not because of budget restraints.

Tape No.2:A:002

Questions, Responses, and Discussion: **SEN. HOCKETT** asked if reducing the recommended amount by 50% would mean essential projects could not be done. **Mr. Whaley** said he could not identify which projects would be done with \$50,000, but that there were many projects that were fairly critical which could not be done. This would mean the facilities would deteriorate further and not be maintained as they should.

**SEN. HOCKETT** asked if a project for a fire-fighting building that was before the committee last session was included in this request. **Mr. Whaley** said no, it was approved for \$230,000 during the 1991 regular session and then deleted during the special session. It was their number one priority for this session but was not funded. Currently they are operating out of a double-

wide trailer.

Tape No. 2:A:044

SEN. HARDING asked Mr. Whaley if the biggest share of the money would go for federally mandated handicapped access. Mr. Whaley said he did not believe so. Some would be used for that, but there was not enough money to do very much.

SEN. HOCKETT asked why some of the revenues generated by the DSL, such as timber, etc., could not be allocated to fund maintenance projects before going into the school fund. Mr. Mosely said all income produced from state trust lands goes to education trusts.

SEN. HOCKETT asked if the ability to produce income was being jeopardized. Mr. Mosely said he did not think the ability to produce income was being jeopardized. He did think the ability to keep facilities in good condition, and to keep equipment protected was being jeopardized.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL asked where the fire fighting equipment is currently kept. Mr. Mosely said the bulk of the equipment he is talking about is for direct protection responsibilities of the DSL. They protect approximately 5 billion acres of land, with most of it in western Montana. There are 18 different office locations, and the western five offices have the bulk of the fire fighting equipment. The storage facilities being requested would properly house the fire equipment.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL asked what percentage of the new construction would be lost if the amount was reduced to \$50,000. Mr. Mosely said that the original request was for \$400,000 and with \$50,000 the department would probably just do structural repairs and no construction.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL told the committee there was a substitute motion on the floor to fund the DSL various maintenance projects for \$50,000. He asked what the committee desired.

REP. BARDANOUVE said he supported the motion, but would like the committee to have the option of reconsidering the decision at a later time. He suggested that if no unexpected changes or emergencies come up, the committee may later feel that this is a higher priority and want to raise the amount appropriated.

REP. ZOOK said he had no problem with REP. BARDANOUVE's suggestion. He said in looking over the narrative on the maintenance projects he felt many of them were not critical.

Tape No. 2:A:159

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL asked if there was further discussion on the substitute motion.



**Vote:** MOTION TO FUND THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS VARIOUS MAINTENANCE PROJECTS BUDGET AT \$50,000 PASSED 3 TO 2 WITH SEN. HOCKETT AND SEN. HARDING VOTING NO.

Tape No. 2:A:172

**EXECUTIVE ACTION ON DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES**

**BUDGET ITEM #2 FIRE ALARM SYSTEMS AT PINE HILLS & MOUNTAIN VIEW SCHOOLS:**

**Questions, Responses, and Discussion:** REP. ZOOK asked if the \$627,000 included removal of the fire control panels from one building for installation in another. Mr. Whaley said the fire alarm panel would be re-located with the funds used for demolition of that building. If the demolition project is not funded, the panel would be moved with these funds.

REP. ZOOK asked when the request for removal of the fire panels was relayed to A&E. Mr. Whaley said he believed the demolition request, including the panel removal, had been made for at least the previous three bienniums. REP. ZOOK asked who made the recent request for the panel removal. Mr. Whaley said it came from the central office of DFS.

REP. ZOOK asked what portion of the \$627,000 would be used for relocating the panels. Mr. Whaley said he did not believe it was a significant portion of the money.

REP. ZOOK explained that there is a communication gap somewhere because the fire control panels have been removed and installed in another facility already at a cost of \$9,000. This was done back in July. He is surprised the A&E Division and others are not aware of this.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL asked someone to respond.

Mr. Jesse Munro, Deputy Director, Department of Family Services, said the \$627,000 is for fire suppressant systems for the facilities and was never intended to be for the control panel. The money is for suppressant systems, none of the sleeping lodges at either school have fire suppressant systems in them. They do have a control panel. Last year there were major problems with the fire control panel and it was moved. It has been suggested by the manufacturer that a new panel be purchased. They are having trouble getting and maintaining parts on the present panel. It is part of their plan to purchase a new panel if the demolition goes down. He does not want that to get confused with what this money is for. This is for fire suppressant systems to put out fires when they start.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL asked what the committee desired to do regarding the \$627,000 for the fire alarm systems.

REP. ZOOK commented that he believes the fire alarm systems are

important, but expressed his disappointment that the committee was misled by the video and testimony. He said he believed A&E was misled as well.

**CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL** asked the committee if their desire was to look further into this matter before approving the budget of \$627,000.

**MOTION:** **SEN. HARDING** moved that the committee receive a detailed explanation on the fire alarm system for the Department of Family Services.

**CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL** asked that the A&E Division make the presentation as soon as possible.

**VOTE:** MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**BUDGET ITEM #4 MISCELLANEOUS REPAIRS:**

Tape No. 2:A:362

**MOTION/VOTE:** **REP. ZOOK** moved that the budget of \$143,500 for miscellaneous repairs be accepted. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Tape No. 2:A:408

**EXECUTIVE ACTION ON DEPARTMENT OF LIVESTOCK**

**BUDGET ITEM #47 DIAGNOSTIC LAB ENHANCEMENT:**

**Motion/Vote:** **SEN. HOCKETT** moved to approve \$1,198,000 in state special revenues for work on the Marsh Lab. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Discussion:** **REP. BARDANOUVE** asked if HB 5 would have lump sum appropriations, or would it separately specify every project they have approved. **Mr. Haubein** said the projects under one department were included in the bill as a lump sum. If any part of the projects were amended by the committee he would then list them separately in the bill.

**CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL** asked the committee if they had any questions regarding the executive action taken or how HB 5 will be affected.

**SEN. HOCKETT** said he is concerned about how the DSL was treated. He respects **REP. ZOOK's** and **REP. BARDANOUVE's** comments and concerns, but feels the DMA got all their requests. The DMA's requests totalled more than the DSL total and asked if there would be an opportunity to do a modification later.

**CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL** said he believed the committee was in power and would do as the majority wished. **REP. ZOOK** said he hoped that would occur if the committee received new information on what money is available.

Tape No. 2:A:519

REP. BARDANOUVE asked for more clarification on appropriations contained in the bill. He stated that there is no language in the bill specifying that the \$185,000 for DMA will be spent on the projects approved by the committee. He said he's not picking on DMA but the bill language does not address specific projects and could possibly be spent elsewhere. Mr. Haubein said he could break that out to the three projects if the committee chose to do it that way. He stated that with all appropriations in the bill there was a chance the money could be spent on other things.

Tom O'Connell, Architecture and Engineering Division, stated that when the legislature appropriates money for projects the A&E Division administers the project by using the capital construction projects book. He said he knows what the money has been appropriated for and it is his responsibility to insure it is spent correctly. He said there are controls in place and to include a breakdown in the bill may be overly cumbersome.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL asked the committee if they wanted a breakdown of projects in the bill. The committee agreed that a lump sum appropriation was fine.

Tape No. 2:A:624

CULTURAL AND AESTHETICS GRANTS HEARING, Cont.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL informed the committee members that, according to the Arts Council, some of the grant applicants have chosen not to make a presentation to the committee.

Informational Testimony: Ms. Fishbaugh introduced Bill Pratt to go through the project grants book of the Arts Council. She explained that Mr. Pratt is the primary support staff and liaison with the Citizens Advisory Committee that ranks the grant proposals.

Ms. Fishbaugh referred the committee to EXHIBIT 5 for information on the issues and the legislation the Arts Council would like to introduce. Essentially the Council drafted the legislation to allow local governments owning cultural facilities to meet matching fund requirements with either financial or in-kind goods and services.

Discussion: Mr. Haubein said that if the committee chooses he could take this legislation and a bill request to the Legislative Council for drafting.

REP. ZOOK said he would hate to see the requirement dropped for a real cash match.

SEN. HOCKETT asked Mr. King to refresh the committee's memory on what the difficulty is for local governments to come up with

additional funding.

Tape No. 2:A:799

Mr. King said that it refers to applicants that own a cultural facility, so it does not pertain to every application. If a county government owns a museum and applies for a project in the museum, the current legislation says the applicant must provide cash and in-kind. This has caused confusion because it means the applicant must provide both. What they look for, in following the priorities set out by legislation, is what level of commitment is there. He said they strongly encourage cash support from local mill levies where possible. If a county has not tried a local mill levy, the Advisory Committee is not very interested in providing state funds for the project. He said, however, this is a simple analysis.

Mr. King said that a problem arose last biennium with the Archie Bray Foundation in Helena. The applicant for the project was Lewis & Clark County, but it is a private foundation located on county property. By law they couldn't approve funding for the project even though they felt it merited approval. The legislation currently creates problems in ranking the applications and making decisions. He assured the committee that the Advisory Committee looks for a reasonable local commitment in cash for each project. If the local taxpayers don't support the project or facility, the Advisory Committee finds it hard to justify recommending the project for funding. The proposed legislation would not remove this important consideration from the criteria the committee bases their decisions on. He said the application is very clear about the need for public support.

Mr. King said that by allowing alternatives, the Advisory Committee is able to assess the level of commitment the local community has provided for the project given any restrictions they may be under. Another technical problem is that a new facility may have been created recently which the local government can't help due to restrictions from I-105. This makes it very difficult for the local government to provide cash, but in some cases the in-kind support is as good as cash. He stated in conclusion that the change in legislation does not eliminate the need for local support before the state is asked to help. This is a competitive process and those organizations that cannot show local support cannot compete successfully with those that do. He said that because of the current legislation requiring cash and in-kind support there are some very good projects that cannot qualify for funding.

REP. BARDANOUVE said he preferred to leave the legislation as it is. If the local community cannot afford to begin the project with cash, we shouldn't get involved. They may not have enough financial resources to do the project. If the community gives the money upfront it is more likely they will be able to see the project through to completion. If they don't have the money, the

project is likely to fail. This committee required that local cash money be put up, not just in-kind support.

**Tape No. 2:A:274**

Mr. King said that the Advisory Committee is committed to the need for grant projects to have local support. As an example, he cited the restoration of the old Fox Theater in Billings into the Alberta Bair Theater. The city owns the building, and the city and community have provided substantial amounts of funding for the restoration project, and continue to support it. The Alberta Bair Theater may have a special project they want to pursue and request funding from the Cultural Arts Trust. Billings provides a property tax waiver, and a variety of in-kind services to reduce the cost of operating the facility, in addition to the earlier restoration support. If the city is required to support the special project with cash, the project can't be funded. If the Advisory Committee can take into the consideration the past support and in-kind services, the project could be funded. He stressed that the Advisory Committee does not want to weaken the requirement for local commitment, but would like to be able to respond to specific instances such as this one, and take into consideration past support, and other community support.

**CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL** said he believed the committee fears that local governments will start counting the facilities as their in-kind contributions and the Trust fund would be bled dry. He suggested that the Arts Council address that concern in the bill language. The committee would probably not be interested in changing the bill unless that language is in there.

Mr. King commented once again that organizations do everything they can to secure local funding before coming to the state. He told the committee that each project has a complex plan to finance the project. He encouraged the committee to ask questions of each applicant as they present their testimony.

**CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL** asked if it was the committee's wish to have the Arts Council design language that would allow organizations to utilize the facilities and not be penalized, but still not penalize the rest of the applicants for their chance at the money. The committee preferred that solution, and **CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL** asked them to do the work and schedule another review before their two weeks of hearings ended.

**Tape No. 2:A:528**

Informational Testimony: Ms. Fishbaugh explained that Bill Pratt is the main contact at the Arts Council for the Citizen's Advisory Council, and works closely with them.

Mr. Pratt explained that the Cultural and Aesthetic Project Grants book has information on all the applications the committee will be considering. He explained that the applications are

sorted by rank, type and alphabetically in the lists section. He further explained that each grant application was summarized, including information on their budgets and the Advisory Committee's recommendations and contingencies. The statistics section is broken down into analysis categories, including rank categories, geographic categories, and discipline categories.

Tape No. 2:B:002

The statistic section includes data on revenue sources to match grants over time and for this biennium. He said the grant awards have remained standard and have not been increased very much since the 1986-87 biennium, but the total amount of dollars has increased substantially. This year the Advisory Committee tried to reduce the workload by reducing the amount of grants. There is a 10% decrease in the amount of money recommended, but only a small drop in the number of grant applications. He believes an increase will occur next biennium as more and more organizations start up across the state.

The statistics section also contains the county mill levy history so that the committee can see which counties are supporting cultural and arts facilities. The money has not increased primarily as a result of I-105.

Tape No. 2:B:130

**Discussion:** CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL pointed out that when I-105 was enacted county governments that did not have a mill levy for libraries are now not allowed to do that. He suggested members take that into consideration. The county may want to support the activity but is forbidden to by law.

Mr. Pratt said that six groups exercised the option of not testifying because the grant is under \$4500. They were: #553, Fort Belknap Ventures; #555 Butte Symphony Orchestra; #510, The Treasure County 89'ers; #560, Mineral County Fair, #538, Northern Showcase; and, #492, Historic Lewistown Accord. He said #507, Granite County Museum & Cultural Center; #551, Miles City Arts, Cultural & Historic Community Center; #493, J.K. Ralston Studio; and, #571 Saelix'u/Aqlcmaknik Center were not present to testify. He asked if the committee would prefer him to go through the grants and speak briefly about each one.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL requested a brief overview of each project with time for questions after each one. Mr. Pratt referred the committee to each description in the book and briefly summarized each grant application.

Questions, Responses, and Discussion:

BUDGET ITEM #553 FORT BELKNAP VENTURES:

Tape No. 2:B:275

SEN. HOCKETT asked if there were other staff besides the director. Mr. Pratt said he believed there were.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL asked Mr. Pratt to describe what the \$2,950 in in-kind contributions would be. Mr. Pratt said the complete application asks for a budget narrative describing revenue and contributions. The only information included on their application is the project cash revenue (earned income), and a contribution of \$1,450 from the Campaign for Human Development.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL asked if they would be using the earned income for future development. Mr. Pratt said he believed they would be selling the book and updating it periodically.

SEN. HARDING asked about the change in operating income and expenses. There is a 62% difference in the next year's operating income.

Mr. Pratt said he had no information on the organizations operating budget. He said Ft. Belknap Ventures is an umbrella organization for a variety of organizations on the reservation. The tribe has aggressively pursued economic development in recent years and this is part of that. This small project is included as one of many small projects in Fort Belknap Ventures.

SEN. HARDING said her question was if the 62% was a change, but now hears it is part of the overall budget that relates to the coloring book. Mr. Pratt confirmed that.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL asked Ms. Layne to explain the operating figures. Ms. Layne explained that the operating expenses for 1992, 1993 and 1994 were for the whole organization. She said in some cases it would be the same for the application, but in most cases it is just a special project which is all that is included in the project budget.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL commented that the organization has operated at a loss for two years, but projects a profit of \$20,000 for the next year.

**BUDGET ITEM #566 GALLATIN COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY:**

**Tape No. 2:B:338**

**Informational Testimony:** Mr. Pratt explained that the Advisory Committee commented that the Society could be seeking money from the Montana Committee for the Humanities for their Photographic Conservation Project. He also said the Advisory Committee expressed concern about the application lacking information on the expertise of those individuals participating in the project, but felt the project should be funded at the full amount requested, \$4,000. EXHIBIT 1, page 76.

Lou Ann Westlake, President, Gallatin County Historical Society, presented copies of her written testimony. EXHIBIT 2. Phyllis

Smith, Archivist, Gallatin County Historical Society, passed around pictures from the Society.

Tape No. 2:B:500

Questions, Responses, and Discussion: CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL asked how much revenue had been received from the sale of prints. Ms. Smith said that \$1,200 in gross receipts had been taken in.

Proponent's Testimony: SENATOR DOROTHY ECK, SD 40, Bozeman, spoke in favor of the project. She said the project has real significance and offers low-cost and available resource for anyone doing research and writing on Montana.

Closing Statement: Ms. Westlake asked the committee to give the project serious consideration.

BUDGET ITEM #555 BUTTE SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA:

Informational Testimony: Mr. Pratt said the Orchestra decided to take the option not to testify. They requested a grant of \$4,000 and have been recommended for that full amount. He referred the committee to EXHIBIT 1, page 65, for an explanation of the project.

BUDGET ITEM #510 TREASURE COUNTY 89'ERS:

Informational Testimony: Mr. Pratt said the 89'ers also exercised their option not to testify. They requested a grant of \$4,500, and were recommended for full funding for their Cultural and Preservation Program. He referred the committee to EXHIBIT 1, page 21, for an explanation of the program.

Questions, Responses, and Discussion: SEN. HARDING stated that the in-kind contribution of \$6,000 from the community seemed quite large. Mr. Pratt said that in-kind contributions usually make up a large percentage of the requests because there is little money in the community. They are for custodial, curator and receptionist positions.

BUDGET ITEM #560 MINERAL COUNTY FAIR:

Tape No. 2:B:888

Informational Testimony: Mr. Pratt said they did not come to testify and referred the committee to EXHIBIT 1, page 70, for information on the grant request. They requested \$4500 and were recommended for \$2,000 for their Folklife Chautauqua project. He said partial funding was recommended because the Advisory Committee determined the project was not utilizing all resources available and made suggestions to them to do so.

BUDGET ITEM #538 NORTHERN SHOWCASE:

Informational Testimony: Mr. Pratt said they did not come to



testify and referred the committee to EXHIBIT 1, page 49.

Questions, Responses, and Discussion: SEN. HOCKETT commented that the Advisory Committee's statement that the audience is mainly university students and faculty was not the case. He stated that his experience has been that the community is very supportive of the performances as well.

Tape No. 3:A:033

Mr. Pratt said that the Advisory Committee works from the information included in the application. He acknowledged that sometimes there is personal knowledge of the application by committee members which is shared with other members during the review.

BUDGET ITEM #559 THEATER ARTS DEPARTMENT:

Informational Testimony: Mr. Pratt explained that the project was for a guest artistic director for the theater. The grant request was for \$2,000, but the committee had recommended \$600. He referred the committee to EXHIBIT 1, page 69.

Questions, Responses, and Discussion: SEN. HOCKETT asked if the \$600 which was recommended would be enough to hire a director. Mr. Pratt said that he assumed the Advisory Council believed it would be. He said the request was for contracted services. The committee's rationale was to match the earned income from sales and memberships from the theater department.

BUDGET ITEM #492 HISTORIC LEWISTOWN ACCORD:

Informational Testimony: Mr. Pratt explained that the project was for restoring and enhancing the existing physical structures of historic Lewistown. He referred the committee to EXHIBIT 1, page 3.

Questions, Responses, and Discussion: SEN. HARDING asked if the Accord and the other applicants had been notified of the amount recommended, as opposed to what had been requested. Mr. Pratt said all had been informed and had received copies of the Advisory Committee's comments.

BUDGET ITEM #513 MONTANA AGRICULTURAL CENTER & MUSEUM:

Tape No. 3:A:317

Informational Testimony: Mr. Pratt briefly reviewed EXHIBIT 1, page 24, for the committee. He said the Advisory Committee was concerned that this might be a natural history project as opposed to a historical project and therefore recommended partial funding.

Tape No. 3:A:326

**John G. Lepley, Director of Montana Agricultural Center & Museum,** stated that this is the official Montana Museum of Agricultural as decreed by the legislature in 1989 and it receives no state funding. Those funds appropriated through grants being the only exception. He informed the committee that the budget in **EXHIBIT 1, page 24,** included figures for six months, and should be doubled to arrive at an annual figure.

**Mr. Lepley** addressed the concerns of the Advisory Committee by saying that all the exhibits at the museum depict the people, culture, and times of Montana and therefore are historical in perspective. He stressed that the exhibits will depict the farming techniques used over the years and how this affected the farmer and the farm. He said the exhibits will address the importance and use of water in Montana agriculture as well. **Mr. Lepley** said he feels that the Advisory Committee perhaps did not understand the scope of the museum and exhibits.

**Questions, Responses, and Discussion:** **REP. BARDANOUVE** said the museum has done a remarkable job in a relatively short time. He said they have not had very much outside financial help but have still done well. **REP. BARDANOUVE** stated that he believed whatever project the museum undertook would make good use of the money appropriated.

**SEN. HOCKETT** agreed with **REP. BARDANOUVE**, and asked **Mr. Lepley** what the attendance has been. **Mr. Lepley** said that last year 226,668 people visited the Center and Museum. He said that figure has been increasing by approximately 2,000 each year. He said a large number of school groups visit and the Museum is beginning an outreach program.

**SEN. ELEANOR VAUGHN** asked what the fee was to visit the museum. **Mr. Lepley** said \$2.00 allows entrance to the Museum of the Upper Missouri and the Agricultural Museum.

**REP. BARDANOUVE** said the Museum was very lucky to obtain an abandoned machine manufacturing plant at a reasonable price and therefore have a good physical plant to work with. **Mr. Lepley** said they have 35,000 square feet of exhibit space. This makes it larger than all other museums in Montana except for the Museum of the Rockies.

**SEN. HARDING** asked how the Visions Project approved last biennium was turning out. **Mr. Lepley** explained that not very much has been accomplished. The other project grant approved last biennium for \$4,000 has been spent on 12 new displays.

**Ms. Layne** said that \$9,500 of the \$10,000 grant for the Visions project has been released. She has received no reports on the project. **Mr. Lepley** said that apparently the man doing the project has had family health problems and put the project on hold. **Mr. Lepley** said only one-third of the grant has been spent, and that was spent on making a video.

**CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL** asked if the Museum receives the grant money all at once or in parcels. **Mr. Lepley** said the money goes to the town of Fort Benton.

**Ms. Fishbaugh** informed the committee that **Mr. Lepley** has recently been awarded the Montana Historical Board of Trustees Outstanding Award for the outstanding work that he has done.

**SEN. HOCKETT** asked if Ted Warrel's collection of manuals for agricultural equipment could go to the museum. **Mr. Lepley** said that just before **Mr. Warrel** passed away last fall he built a new building on the farm for researchers. **Mr. Lepley** said that **Mr. Warrel's** son stated the collection would stay on the farm for now, but would eventually go to the museum.

**BUDGET ITEM #519 COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT ORGANIZATION:**

**Informational Testimony:** **Mr. Pratt** said that this grant was a capital expenditure grant for block house renovation. This would require a three to one match for the grant dollars to restore the oldest standing building in Montana. **EXHIBIT 1, page 30.** He said the grant was contingent upon receipt of documentation from the State Historical Preservation Office that the renovation had been approved by them.

**Mr. Lepley**, stated that SHPO recommended the organization go to the National Park Service first to evaluate the renovation. He disagreed with the Advisory Committee's comment that the building is not a cultural resource, and said it is the only standing structure left in Montana that had anything to do with the fur trade. He said the roof is identical to the way it was built originally. He said it is of historical value and would be a shame to lose it.

**Questions, Responses, and Discussion:** **REP. BARDANOUVE** said the committee has put money into a similar project in the Bitterroot Valley and should be able to justify the money for this grant.

**SEN. HOCKETT** informed the committee that the Community Improvement Organization in Fort Benton serves as a parent organization to all the nonprofit organizations in Fort Benton. He stated that he believes this cooperation has enabled the community to accomplish many things other small communities are not able to. **Mr. Lepley** said the Museum and Center operate under the 501(c)3 status of the Community Improvement Organization.

**REP. BARDANOUVE** asked how much money was needed to finish the renovation of the building. **Mr. Lepley** said that \$4,500 will complete the entire renovation project.

**BUDGET ITEM #577 JUDITH BASIN HISTORICAL SOCIETY:**

**Informational Testimony:** **Mr. Pratt** said that Judith Basin's project for Charlie Russell Brochure and Signs for a roadway

through the valley had been recommended for partial funding at \$2,000. **EXHIBIT 1, page 87.**

**Karen Timchak, Volunteer, Judith Basin Historical Society,** told the committee that the \$2,000 would fund the conceptual design to utilize the artwork of Charlie Russell to interpret the history of the Judith Basin. The interpretation will tell the story of wolves, Indians, miners, etc. as people experience the Old West through signs and brochures. She stated that there is no interpretation at this time in that area tying all of these areas together. The Charlie Russell Museum in Great Falls has offered the use of staff time and resources for historic research for the project. A staff archaeologist with the United States Forest Service has been working with the group for the past year.

**Ms. Timchak** said community enthusiasm and support has been great. She stated that in the past decade there has been an 11% decline in population in the Judith Basin. She stressed the need for cultural enrichment and development of tourism opportunities. She passed out the initial strategy for the interpretation. **EXHIBIT 3.**

In response to the Advisory Committee's comments, **Ms. Timchak** stated that the project was not premature because the Chamber of Commerce is working to get the highway named the Charlie Russell Highway. She said this would be complimentary to the project; however, if the Chamber is not successful, the project is not contingent upon that.

#### **ANNOUNCEMENTS/DISCUSSION**

Tape 3:B:002

**Mr. Pratt** told the committee that the rest of the applications to be heard today were not recommended for funding by the Advisory Committee. He told the committee that there was a real attempt to limit the number of applications this year, therefore if an organization had two applications, the committee tended to recommend only their highest priority for funding. The grant applications not recommended for funding included: #507, Granite County Museum & Cultural Center's Visual History Project; #551, Miles City Arts, Cultural & Historic Community's Cultural Connection; #493, J.K. Ralston Studio Inc.'s Center for Western Art; and, #571, Saelix'u/Aqlcmaknik Center's Dance Troupe Performances.

**SEN. HARDING** asked how city/county support breaks out for the Dance Troupe Performance project. **Mr. Pratt** said the original application listed mostly tribal funds supporting tribal activities. He also told her the earned income from performances and concession sales was \$3,831.

**SEN. HARDING** asked if they were ineligible because they had more than a half-time staff. **Mr. Pratt** said the Advisory Council did try to limit the smaller grant requests to volunteer

organizations and those with one half-time staff.

**Mr. Lepley** stated that the interpretive team doing the development study for the Upper Missouri Museum for the Bureau of Land Management will present their three options to the community on January 28th. He stated that the three options would be presented to the SHPO and suggested the committee contact SHPO if interested in the proposals.

**SEN. HOCKETT** asked **Mr. Pratt** if there were any big disagreements coming up between the Advisory Council and the grant applicants. **Mr. Pratt** said he did not believe there were any groups disgruntled with the way their applications were treated, as there were last time.

**REP. BARDANOUVE** said he has minutes from the Institutions and Cultural Education Subcommittee stating that the Arts Council granted \$100 million in projects. He said that seemed quite large. **Ms. Fishbaugh** said she did not have those figures with her and would have to check the data and report back to the committee. The figure did not sound familiar to her.

**Mr. Pratt** asked how the committee would like him to proceed with the grant applicants. Many of the future applications would have proponents testifying, so would it be necessary for him to read the exhibits? It was decided he would not; the committee would read the exhibits as the proponents give testimony.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 11:00 AM

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ERNEST BERGSAGEL, Chair

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SANDRA BOGGS, Secretary

EB/sb

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

LONG - RANGE PLANNING

SUB-COMMITTEE

ROLL CALL

DATE

1/18/83

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
SEN. BOB HOCKETT, VICE-CHAIR	✓		
REP. FRANCIS BARDONOUVE	✓		
SEN. ETHEL HARDING	✓		
SEN. ELEANOR VAUGHN	✓		
REP. TOM ZOOK	✓		
REP. ERNEST BERGSAGEL, CHAIR	✓		

1994 - 1995  
Cultural and Aesthetic Project Grants  
submitted by the  
Montana Arts Council  
and the  
Cultural and Aesthetic Projects  
Advisory Committee  
to the  
53rd Montana Legislature  
January 1993

The original is stored at the Historical Society at 225 North Roberts Street, Helena, MT 59620-1201. The phone number is 444-2694.



EXHIBIT 2  
DATE 1-18-93  
SB                     

January 18, 1993.

Remarks to the Long Range Planning Joint Subcommittee

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, for the record, my name is Lou Ann Westlake, President of the Gallatin County Historical Society in Bozeman; with me is Phyllis Smith, photo archivist for the Society. I am testifying on behalf of grant number 566 requesting funding for a special project grant for the photo archives.

Since we reported to you at the last session of the Legislature, the photo archives of the Gallatin County Historical Society in Bozeman has cataloged just under five thousand images. We continue to work on our backlog of photos; at the same time, we are cataloging those photographs that have been recently donated to the Museum.

We stated our intention to make prints from some three hundred glass negatives in our collection. That has been done. We also stated we would endeavor to have a negative made for each oversize photograph in our collection. That has been done. At the time we spoke to you last, we had three notebooks of xeroxed photographs available to our patrons for study. We now have twenty-six notebooks of xeroxed photographs.

2 EXHIBIT 2  
DATE 1-18-93  
SB

Our 1993 goals are to complete cataloging our backlog of photos and recently-donated images, to provide photographs to enhance our changing exhibits at the Museum, and to prepare photo collections for exhibit outside the Museum. We started in January 1992 with an exhibit at the Montana Winter Fair; we are proud to report to you that we received a blue ribbon for our efforts. Since then we have prepared exhibits for the Gallatin County Fair, the Emerson Center, the Gallatin County Historic Preservation fair, FirstBank Bozeman, the 1938 class reunion of Emerson School, and the Gallatin County Cowbells. Our forthcoming exhibits include the 1993 Montana Winter Fair, the annual meeting of the American Association of Retired Persons, the annual meeting of the Sons and Daughters of Gallatin County Pioneers, and the annual banquet of the Bozeman Chamber of Commerce.

Ten volunteers regularly serve in the photo archives and library. In 1991, thirty five researchers visited the archives and library; in 1992, we had just under two hundred research visits, an increase of 500%. The wood for framing the photographs and most of the framing itself is donated. We will be happy to answer your questions.

## INTERPRETIVE STRATEGY

for the

## CHARLIE RUSSELL TRAIL

The following organizations propose that US Highway 87 between Great Falls and Lewistown be commemorated as the "Charlie Russell Trail":

### Historic Societies

Judith Basin Historical Society  
Cascade County Historical Society  
Historic Lewistown Accord

Utica Historical Society  
Central Montana Historical Society

### Government

Cascade County Commissioners  
Judith Basin County Commissioners  
Lewis and Clark National Forest

Fergus County Commissioners  
Lewistown City Council

### Museums

C.M. Russell Museum

Lewistown Art Center

### Chamber of Commerce

Lewistown Chamber of Commerce  
Russell Country Tourism

Stanford Commercial Club

The goals of Highway Commemoration are:

- ☐ Preserve and interpret the rich history of the Judith Basin;
- ☐ Provide satisfying and rewarding experiences to visitors interested in western history; add "value" to their auto touring;
- ☐ Help diversify local economies by developing responsible tourism.

## INTERPRETIVE STRATEGY

When thinking about what makes a place special or unique, the land and the people as immortalized by Charlie Russell come to mind for the Judith Basin. The western epic was faithfully captured on his oil and canvas, and many of the scenes are from the Judith Basin. What better way to interpret our history to visitors than through the artwork of Charlie Russell?

The key concept of the interpretive strategy is to use the artwork of Charlie Russell to interpret the history of the Judith Basin. The interpretive effort does not focus so much on Charlie as this is done excellently at the C.M. Russell Museum in Great Falls. Rather, Charlie's art provides a window to the past to tell the story of Native Americans, buffalo and wolves, cowboys and the open range, mountain men and miners, and the inevitable change that came with progress- homesteaders, railroads, highways. And, the story is told where it happened- out on the range and in the mountains where people can experience the west as it was, and as it is today.

The strategy to develop the interpretive effort follows.

### Phase 1

Develop a planning committee with representatives from the local historical societies, C.M. Russell museum, Forest Service, and other interested groups.

The goal of the planning committee is to provide guidance and expertise for the interpretive planning effort to ensure interpretation is accurate and of interest to the general public.

The committee will seek out funding strategies including grants, partnerships, and the Transportation Enhancement Program (ISTEA).

### Phase 2

Develop an interpretive plan that identifies major themes and the location where these themes will be interpreted. For example, the Medicine Man, painted near Geyser, provides an excellent opportunity to interpret Native American use of the Judith Basin. First Furrow, painted near Stanford, presents an opportunity to tell the homesteading story and the life of the early pioneers.

20-25 interpretive sites along the trail will be identified and interpreted. A "side" trail to Utica and up the Middle Fork of the Judith will be included. Another "side" trail to Fort Benton is a possibility.

EXHIBIT 3  
DATE 1-18-93  
SB \_\_\_\_\_

### Phase 3

Incorporate into an auto-tour brochure. The brochure will include Russells paintings at places close to where they were painted, with appropriate interpretive text.

### Phase 4

Develop interpretive signs for key points along the route. Working closely with the Highway Department, develop additional turn-outs and "orientation" and "welcome" stations near Great Falls and Lewistown.

### Phase 5

Longer term- develop an audio cassette tour for along the Highway.

## INTERPRETIVE LOCATIONS AND THEMES

LOCATION	INTERPRETIVE THEME	RUSSELL'S PAINTING
GREAT FALLS	Intro to Charlie Russell Trail	Picture of Russell; Orientation map.
WEST OF BELT	Trappers and Mountain Men	"When All the World Was Before Us"
ARMINGTON JUNCTION REST AREA KIBBY CORNER	(May have intro here?) Indian Rock Art	"Americas First Printer"
GEYSER REST AREA	Indians and the Basin	"Medicine Man"
STANFORD-PRAIRIE PAST	The first homesteaders	"The First Furrow"
STANFORD	History of Stanford, White wolf.	"In Without Knocking", "Roping a Wolf"
WEST OF WINDHAM	When the grass was free-buffalo herds to cattle herds herds	"When Cows were Wild"
SODBUSTER MUSEUM	Wagon trains and trails	"When Wagon Trails Were Dim"
MOCCASIN	Railroad history	"Trail of the Iron Horse"
JUDITH RIVER CROSSING	Lewis and Clark, prairie ecosystem	"Before the Whiteman Came"
EDDIES CORNER	Flight of the Nez Perce	"Indian Chief" (Joseph)
ROSS FORK CROSSING	Demise of the Buffalo	"When Guns Were Slow"
MOORE AREA	Rustling/Vigilantes	"Paying the Fiddler"
LEWISTOWN	Orientation to Highway and CMR	picture of Charlie, map

# MEMORIAL WAY

## UTICA/SOUTH FORK SIDE TRAIL

LOCATION	INTERPRETIVE THEME	RUSSELL PAINTING
UTICA	Early settlements	"Quiet Day in Utica"
WERHTHEIMER RANCH	Winter of 86-87; end of the open range	"Waiting for a Chinook"
PIKE MILLER RANCH	Charlies cowboy days	"Bronc to Breakfast"
JUDITH GAME RANGE	Wildlife boom and bust	"Exalted Ruler"
TOLLGATE	Early mountain transportation	hoisting burrows sketch
YOGO TOWN	History of Yogo town	"The Prospector", "Placer Prospectors"
SAPPHIRE VILLAGE	Yogo sapphire story	
SOUTH FORK CANYON	CMR description of area	"A Doubtful Guest"
RUSSELL POINT	Kid Russell	"When I Was a Kid"
HOOVER CABIN	Jake the Mountain Man	"Mountain Retreat"
EAST OF UTICA	Bison Jump/Indians	"Brother Van Shooting Buffalo"
PHILBROOK	Stagecoach routes	"Old Fashioned Stage Coach"

## WAITING FOR A CHINOOK

Painted nearby, this wordless message told the story of the brutal winter of 1886-87. Heavy November snows continued into December, and then in January came a chinook, a thawing wind from the southwest. Late in January, a killer storm blew in with 60 mile an hour winds. Slush hardened into an icy shield, and livestock could not reach the grass beneath the crust. Before a chinook blew in in late February, some ranchers lost 90% of their cattle.

This winter changed the cattle business in Montana. No longer could the rancher count on mild winters with open range. Winter provisions in the form of hay became a necessity for many ranches. Fences were strung across the wide open prairie.



{NOTE: SAMPLE INTERPRETIVE SIGN/BROCHURE ENTRY. FINAL WILL BE PROFESSIONALLY DESIGNED. THE INTERPRETIVE LOCATION IS SOUTH OF UTICA NEAR WERTHEIMER RANCH}



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
VISITOR REGISTER

Long Range Planning SUBCOMMITTEE DATE 1/17/93  
DEPARTMENT(S) Cultural + Aesthetic Proj. Grants DIVISION \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE PRINT

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	REPRESENTING	
Bill FRUIT	MT Arts Council	
Carleen Layne	MT Arts Council	
Arlene Jonicaugh	MT Arts Council	
Debbie Schley	MT. CULTURAL ADV.	
Dick King	CULTURAL + AESTHETIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE	
Doug Booker	Dept. Military Affairs	
Chris Denning	Dept. of Military Affairs	
Gene PRENDERGAST	DEPT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS	
Ken Cottrill	Dept of Military Affairs	
Randy Mosley	MT. Dept State Lands	
John Skutera	Dept. of Livestock	
Larry Stackhouse	Dept of Livestock	
Cook Mortensen	Dept. of Livestock	
JESSE MUNRO	DFS	
AL DAVIS	DFS	
KAREN TIMCHAK	JUDITH BASIN HISTORICAL SOCIETY	
Jim WHALEY	A & E	
Tom O'Connell	A & E	

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED TESTIMONY WITH SECRETARY. WITNESS STATEMENT  
FORMS ARE AVAILABLE IF YOU CARE TO SUBMIT WRITTEN TESTIMONY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
VISITOR REGISTER

LONG RANGE PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE DATE 1/18/93  
JOINT CONL CULTURAL DEPARTMENT(S) AESTHETIC PROJECT DIVISION  
GRANTS

**PLEASE PRINT**

**PLEASE PRINT**

[illegible]

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED TESTIMONY WITH SECRETARY. WITNESS STATEMENT FORMS ARE AVAILABLE IF YOU CARE TO SUBMIT WRITTEN TESTIMONY.