

The Development of Cultural Trusts

A briefing paper prepared for the Nevada Arts Council

by

WESTAF

April 2000

Introduction

A cultural trust is a public or public/private endowment fund established to benefit cultural endeavors. For the purposes of this paper, the term *cultural trust* is limited to trust funds created by state arts agencies. Such trusts were developed by state arts agencies either to augment the funds they can allocate to the arts community or to move all or part of the state arts agency's fiscal dependence away from annual legislative action. Although no state arts agency yet has become entirely fiscally independent of its state legislature, a number of agencies have successfully created cultural trusts that supplement their funding.

Although cultural trust efforts share the overall goal of providing more money to the arts community, no two of them have been implemented in an identical manner. The approaches to cultural trust development that have been used reflect the individual philosophies of their leading advocates, the political and legislative environments of the states in which they were established, and the collective preferences and power positioning of the arts community in the respective states. In this respect, the trusts are unlike the grant-making systems of state arts agencies that are replicated with little differentiation from state to state.

The state arts agencies that developed cultural trusts did so outside the leadership and policymaking apparatus of both the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NASAA). Although the NEA did allocate challenge grant dollars to some early trust efforts, these trusts were limited to stabilization exercises and were not as far-reaching as subsequent cultural trust concepts. During the peak period of trust development, the Endowment was embroiled in a fight for survival. In doing so, it was attempting to underscore the concept of the maintenance and expansion of annual arts appropriations from a legislative body. Consequently, NASAA actively discouraged states from forming cultural trusts, believing that the process would diminish the incentive for state legislators to support state arts agencies with annual appropriations. Both the NEA and NASAA were dissenting observers rather than participants in the establishment of broad-based cultural trusts.

The dramatic decline in federal and state arts funding that occurred in the early 1990s has been partially reversed in most of the country, lessening the need for and interest in cultural trusts nationwide. In the West, however, where most states are seriously stalled in their efforts to advance in terms of legislative allocations, efforts to establish cultural trusts continue. The legislative environment of the West has left the state arts agencies in the region starved for funds, and such trusts, in the eyes of many, are one of the few ways to get out of the box created by state tax and spending limitations and the shifting of state discretionary dollars into high-growth programs in areas such as prisons and transportation.

Case Studies

In a 1995 publication, *Creative Solutions for Funding the Arts*, the National Conference of State Legislatures provided a snapshot view of cultural trusts of state arts agencies. At that time, the report listed 11 arts agency endowments on the books. Since then, another state (Arizona) has established a trust. In addition, Colorado launched a legislative effort to develop a cultural trust and another Oregon is engaged in research preparatory to the development of a legislative trust effort.

Cultural trusts are highly varied in concept and execution. Some trusts are narrowly focused and designed to serve very limited purposes such as service to individual artists. Other trusts are limited to support for major arts organizations. Still others have ambitious long-term goals but are structured to build up over a long period of time. Yet other cultural trusts have been designed as potential replacements for annual legislative funding of state arts agencies. Following are brief case studies of four cultural trusts that have been developed by state arts agencies. They were selected because they were successfully implemented and offer important models.

Utah

The Utah Arts Endowment Fund (UAEF) was created by the Utah legislature in 1990. The Endowment was established with a \$750,000 challenge grant from the NEA and \$2.3 appropriated by the Utah state legislature. The earnings from the UAEF corpus are available to non-profit arts organizations that elected to participate in the program. They did so by applying to the Utah Arts Council for approval of their eligibility and then raising matching funds on a one-to-one basis for groups that matched the funds with \$100,000 or less and a two-to-one match for organizations that provided a match of more than \$100,000. Arts organizations contributed a total of \$2,869,571 to the fund.

Most of the corpus of the fund is held by the state treasurer and invested as a part of the state treasurer's investment fund. The annual income from the fund has varied significantly since its founding. It has earned as much as 10% and as little as 5.5% annually. Participants receive monthly account statements and a check every June, and the funds may be used by the arts organizations for any purpose they choose. Organizations that participated in the matching program with \$50,000 or more and that had three-year income-averaged annual budgets of \$500,000 or more were allowed to manage their own endowment accounts. The state treasurer maintains two accounts for each participating organization, The first holding the principal and the second the interest.

The concept for the UAEF emerged from a discussion among the governing board of the Utah Arts Council. The Utah Symphony's secular of a \$1 million line item in 1989 allocated to the Symphony's endowment fund encouraged other arts organizations to seek similar line-item funding. In response, the Utah Arts Council decided that a collective approach to the legislature was preferable to independent advocacy and developed a united plan. The governor agreed to support the concept, and over a one-year period, the legislation that formed the basis for the fund was established. Following 11 town meetings that were convened statewide to discuss the trust, it was presented to the legislature.

A nonprofit corporation was created specifically for the purpose of raising matching funds for the UAEF during the three-year period that was authorized for the raising of such funds. Called *the Utah Arts Endowment Inc.*, the organization raised \$1.6 million and provided 71 arts organizations with funds to be matched by the UAEF. This mechanism allowed many smaller arts organizations to participate in the project and opened up many previously untapped private resources.

Following the implementation of the fund, the leaders in the arts community offered the following suggestions and observations:

- Fluctuating interest rates can have a major impact on the flow of funds. Although the funds are received by the arts organizations in a largely automatic manner, if these fluctuations could be eliminated from the system, the arts organizations receiving the funds would be more pleased with the program.
- If possible politically, all UAEF funds would be managed by the state treasurer, which would lessen the risk of losing some of the state portion of the funds.
- The pool of matching funds could have been larger.
- The establishment of the fund did not affect the legislature's annual appropriation to the Utah Arts Council. This was believed to be the case in part because the maintenance of the fund did not require an annual appropriation.
- Prior to each town meeting, the Council's chair and executive director met with legislators from the area, an approach that helped cultivate broad support for the measure.

Delaware

The Delaware Arts Stabilization Fund was established to address several core needs of the state's largest arts organizations. The \$21.5 million fund was established in 1992 through a partnership that included the state legislature, the private corporate/foundation sector, and the National Endowment for the Arts. Largely limited to assisting the state's eight major arts organizations, the effort was dependent on the strong support of the corporate community and the leadership of the state arts agency. Through their efforts, the project was a success, and the partners are now in the early stages of investigating a second round.

The endowment was conceptualized through a series of conversations among eventual beneficiaries, the staff and leadership of the Delaware Division of the Arts, and civic leaders. Peggy Amsterdam, the executive director of the state arts agency, emphasized the necessity for extensive and continuing communication among the partners throughout the process of the development of the project. She noted that building an understanding of the mechanics of a possible funding system and a level of trust among the participants was essential to the long-term success of the project.

The Fund was built with \$5 million from the state legislature that was made available on a matching basis over a five-year period, a \$750,000 NEA challenge grant, and matching funds from private foundations and corporations. The aggressive corporate support of the effort was particularly helpful in the Fund's development; the CEO of Du Pont, for example, was a critical and effective leader in the process. All involved in the effort were pleased with the rapidity with which public monies were matched and the fact that matching funds were raised prior to the close of the five-year window established by the legislature for securing the monies.

The fund-raising effort was organized by the Arts Consortium of Delaware (ArtCo), founded specifically for the purpose of facilitating the raising of monies and providing fund and distribution management once the funds were secured. The monies that were raised were divided into four funds. The first was dedicated to one-time debt reduction and totaled \$654,000. That total was the amount needed to retire the short-term operating deficits of the eight largest arts organizations in the state. In addition, a cash reserve fund of \$1.2 million was established that was designed as a short-term revolving fund to provide participating organizations with working capital. Monies borrowed from this fund are repayable within 12 months. Two permanent endowment funds also were created with a total corpus of \$19.6 million. These two funds are held in trust and each participating organization receives its agreed-upon share of the fund earnings. One of the endowment funds is designated for the preservation of existing facilities and the repair or replacement of equipment. The other is designated to be used to underwrite the costs related to the operation of facilities. In addition to allocating funds to the eight largest designated large organizations, 5% of all funds are set aside for stabilization projects that benefit other Delaware arts organizations.

Participants in the development of the Delaware Arts Stabilization Fund offer the following observations about their effort:

- Strong corporate leadership is a terrific asset to an effort that includes corporate and foundation fund raising. The closeness of the corporate and arts communities in Delaware contributed greatly to the success of the Stabilization Fund.
- Extensive dialogue with all partners is essential throughout the process. Many times, participants appeared to face insurmountable road blocks only to find that the trust they had built through a commitment to ongoing communication moved them through that challenge.
- Working with the state's largest arts organizations was the most practical and immediate means of building an effective coalition and creating a successful legislative package. In the future, an approach that results in the inclusion of many more arts groups is desirable. The primary barrier to such inclusion is the lack of ability of smaller arts organizations to bring matching dollars to the effort.
- The maintenance of a track record of successfully matching state funds is an ongoing goal. Arts organizations believe that a strong performance in this area will keep the door open for future state funding.
 - Moving past a presumption that the state arts agency must control and disseminate all state arts funds is helpful. The Delaware Division of the Arts made an early decision to become a partner in a project that benefited the arts and did not require that it serve as the controlling partner.

Arizona

In 1996, the Arizona legislature established the Arizona Arts Endowment Fund. The Fund will receive \$2 million per year for 10 years from the increase in the commercial amusement tax over 1994 receipts provided those receipts exceed a

base of \$25 million. The state tax funds are being matched by a private fund-raising effort with private funds considered as match even if they are raised as part of another endowment's fund-raising effort and designated for a specific arts organization. All Fund monies are held by the Arizona Community Foundation.

The Fund was conceptualized by Shelley Cohn, the executive director of the Arizona Commission on the Arts, in partnership with the leadership of the state's arts advocacy organization. The effort was viewed as a means of building state support for the arts in a climate where state government leaders wanted to contain or reduce the size of state government. In addition, the effort also was viewed as a means of continuing the positive impact of a recent National Arts Stabilization Fund program that had successfully worked with nine of the state's largest arts organizations. The first step after deciding to consider the establishment of a permanent endowment fund was the identification of a source of public monies that could be used to support such a fund. Arts advocates reviewed a long list of potential revenue streams and decided that the increase in the amusement tax was a good prospect.

The amusement tax is a sales tax on tickets to movies, sporting events, and other leisure activities. At the time of the trust's development, there was an understanding that the revenues from this tax source would increase substantially in the near term because Arizona was undergoing a dramatic increase in professional sports activity. After identifying the increase in that tax as a possible revenue source, arts advocates met with representatives of the sports community and successfully solicited their support for the effort. The advocates briefly considered taxing tickets to arts events but dismissed the idea because it would be a new tax and thus was likely to be unpopular with both legislators and the arts community. A bill was drafted and the cultural trust concept was presented to legislators at a gathering of arts advocates that a large number of legislators attended. Making the presentation was the influential head of the state's public service company.

Following the introduction of the concept of the cultural trust to legislators, state representative Robin Shaw assumed leadership of the effort to pass the bill and collected the signatures of 62 legislative co-sponsors out of a possible total of 90. Prior to her election to the state legislature, Shaw had been a member of the governing board of the Arizona Commission on the Arts. She was a passionate arts supporter and had a strong personal commitment to and understanding of the value of the arts. The bill's passage was unexpectedly quick, and the effort was broadly supported. The bill passed with a 45-15 vote in the House and a 20-9 vote in the Senate.

Although the legislation for the cultural trust passed easily, there were complications along the way. One was efforts by the few opposing the bill to eliminate the Arizona Arts Trust Fund. That fund is a revenue stream of \$1 million annually established in 1989 to funnel a portion of state filing fees to the Arts Commission. Some legislators argued that if a new fund were established, the old one should be eliminated. Another effort to kill the bill was led by the chair of a legislative committee, who refused to hear it while it was assigned to his committee. Use of legislative bill reassignment mechanisms ultimately transferred the bill to a more friendly committee, where it was approved. Also raising the prospect of problems was an exhibition at the Phoenix Art museum titled Old Glory, an exhibition that featured the American flag in art and generated public controversy. Because the exhibition was funded with private dollars,

however, state arts advocates were able to deflect the criticism of the exhibition in a manner that did not ultimately affect the cultural trust bill.

As of April, 2000, \$13.5 million in private monies have been raised to match the state dollars allocated to the endowment. Although most of the matching money was in the form of designated funds that only can be used to support the organizations that have contributed to the fund through the matching program, a total of \$1.5 million has been raised in discretionary funds. Those monies are invested, and the earnings from that investment will be made available to the broader arts community. All funds are managed by the Arizona Community Foundation, an arrangement that has been cooperative and positive.

Arizonans involved in the establishment of the endowment offer the following observations about the process:

- The lack of a provision in the legislation for the administration of a fund-raising effort has placed a burden on the administrators of the state's Arts Commission.
- The strongly committed and motivated legislator who led the passage of the bill was an extraordinary asset. The legislator was irreplaceable, and the arts advocates understand how fortunate they were to have her attention and commitment.
- The ongoing advocacy work of the arts community and the presence of its advocacy organization were integral to the development of the legislation and its endorsement by the arts community.
- Without the provision that money raised to match public dollars could be new endowment funding secured by and designated for individual arts organizations, the matching of the monies by the state's largest organizations would have been very difficult. In addition, their support of the legislation would have been a challenge to secure.
- More discretionary money needs to be raised to make certain that the state's smaller arts organizations benefit from the endowment fund.
- Once all public monies are matched, a second effort will be considered. The ability to succeed in the next round will be greatly aided by the strong success of the first.

Missouri

In the early 1990s the leadership of the Missouri Arts Council determined that the future of public arts funding in the state was not bright. Although the agency had a budget of approximately \$5 million, that budget had not grown for a number of years and was not projected to do so. New state tax limitations, expanding state expenditures on projects such as new prison construction, and a stagnation of state revenues due to the recession of the time all suggested that increasing the arts agency budget would be difficult. Under the leadership of Missouri Arts Council's executive director Anthony Radich, the Council staff developed a draft plan for the development of a cultural trust and began to consult with arts

leaders, legislative leaders, and the Council's governing board about implementing such an effort.

What came to be known as the *Missouri Cultural Trust* was a concept that was designed to build a \$200-million trust fund for the Council over a 10-year period. Ultimately, the effort was designed to remove the Council from the need to seek annual state appropriations and also to substantially increase funding for the Council. The effort had two key allies, the House majority floor leader Bob Ward and later the House budget committee chair, Sheila Lumpe. These two individuals made the success of the bill a priority and expended political capital to secure its passage.

Key to the establishment of the Trust was the identification of a stream of public monies that would create the trust corpus. The first attempt in this line was a proposal to remove the sales tax exemption on cable television bills and allocate a portion of that tax revenue to a cultural trust. Although this effort failed due to intensive lobbying by the cable television industry, the failure had a silver lining--it gave the arts advocates an opportunity to educate legislators, and many legislators ultimately became supportive of the establishment of the cultural trust. Following their rough treatment by the cable industry, many legislators stated that they would support almost any revenue stream in support of the cultural trust provided it was not related to the cable television industry.

With the assistance of representative Sheila Lumpe (later to be the House budget committee chair) and some legislative staffers and lobbyists, a second revenue stream was located. The fund was to be built on the Missouri state income tax paid by non-resident athletes and performers. This was not a new tax, it had been on the books for years, but the Department of Revenue had not enforced its collection. The tax stream had a number of benefits: a) it was a tax paid by non-residents; b) it was a tax that the arts community would pay in part (through the presentation of touring artists); and c) it was a tax that would increase the state's revenue base after the cultural trust was established.

In 1993, legislation authorizing the establishment of the Trust was approved by the legislature, and the revenue stream was voted into law in the 1995 session. Both passed the legislature with comfortable margins. In order to pass the legislation, the original bill was watered down to commit the state to no more than \$100,000 million (and no more than 50% of the revenues flowing from the tax) in funding over a 10-year period. The bill contained no matching requirements. Understanding that the fund needed to be much more than \$100 million, the Arts Council indicated it would seek to raise another \$100 million in funds to create the originally conceptualized \$200-million fund.

Passage of the revenue package and the authorizing legislation was not enough to put the trust into action. To initiate the Trust, the governor's administration was charged with estimating the tax stream and requesting the transfer of trust funds to the state treasurer's office. After several months of discussion, arts advocates became aware of the fact that the governor's office had no intention of taking such actions. The Arts Council staff then proceeded to develop the documentation that could be used to argue for a certain level of funds to be transferred. At the same time, the administration was lobbied to activate the Trust. Finally and reluctantly, the governor's administration agreed to an initial fund transfer of \$4.3 million for the first year--more than \$3 million below the conservative estimate of what the transfer should be. The Council

agreed to that amount because it set a precedent for future transfers.

The cultural trust legislation established a cultural trust board that was separate from the Missouri Arts Council but has strong Council representation. The board's charge is to supervise the fund's development and investment and to allocate all monies to the Council for distribution. The trust board is staffed by the Council staff. The board and Council have the benefit of approximately \$225,000 annually for fund raising and trust management. These monies were used to conduct two studies, one concerning the feasibility of private fund raising to benefit the Trust and the second dealing with ways to activate and extend the Trust. In the last two years, the Trust has been used to develop a number of pilot projects resulting in the development of designated endowment funds for organizations ranging from an opera company in St. Louis to a community arts council in Springfield to a community college art gallery in Sedalia. The capacity of the organizations to designate the funds they raised for match in a community foundation-like process was critical to the success of the pilot projects.

Following the securing of 50% of the revenue stream for the cultural trust, Representative Lumpe recommended that efforts be made by a broader group of the cultural community to secure the remaining 50%. Led by the Missouri Arts Council, the State Library, public broadcasting, the state humanities council, and the state historic preservation agency worked to secure 20% each of the unallocated 50% of the revenue stream. After one veto of the coalition effort's bill by the governor, the bill passed in the subsequent year and was signed. As a result, the Arts Council's receipts increase to 60% of the revenue stream.

Participants in the process of establishing the *Missouri Cultural Trust* offer the following observations:

- Strong support by legislative leaders is critical to the passage of such legislation, and support by legislative leadership is very advantageous.
- When politically less experienced groups such as the state humanities council were brought into the process, their lack of political expertise and finesse almost doomed the overall effort. If there is a way to bring such potential allies up to speed regarding the political structure and how to work with it effectively, all would benefit.
- Trust funds were allocated to the state treasurer's office. Although the state treasurer was a friend of the arts, the philanthropic community had an immediate distaste for such a placement. The final resolution of this barrier was the allowing of privately raised matching funds to be held apart from the treasurer's office.
- The ability to designate funds was critical to the success of the program. The community foundation approach was proposed immediately after the passage of the bill in its final form.
 - The linking of the Arts Council with other cultural entities established a coalition that was broad based and much more difficult for elected leaders to ignore.

- Due to unwise appointments made by the governor, the Missouri Arts Council has evolved into a highly politicized entity. The trust between the arts community and the Council that existed when the Missouri Cultural Trust was established has been greatly diminished. Although funds continue to flow to the Trust, the ability of the Missouri Arts Council to demonstrate leadership in the creative expansion of the Cultural Trust is in question.

Mechanics of Developing a Trust

The development of cultural trusts requires a complexity of factors to coalesce. In some of the existing trusts, there are recurrent patterns that may serve as indicators of key elements and strategies that should be considered when constructing a new trust effort. Following are some of the critical elements that are factors in the conceptualizations of, advocacy for, and implementation of a cultural trust.

Source of Vision

Although they are not always the original source, executive directors of state arts agencies are usually the originators of cultural trust efforts. Their familiarity with the technical options available to them in state government and the legislative process gives them the tools to place the concept of a cultural trust into a framework that is workable and scalable. In addition, their familiarity with the variety of trust approaches and the relative success of their implementation is shared through the national and regional professional networks in which executive directors participate and in the personal professional relationships they maintain.

Although the executive directors of state arts agencies are almost unanimously the individuals who conceive of cultural trust establishment, their embracing of the notion of a cultural trust does not occur in a vacuum. Usually, the executive directors are responding to the expressed needs of the field for additional state arts funding, and they often are frustrated in their attempts to secure such funding through regular legislative allocations. The multi-year plateauing of state funds to support an arts agency is a commonly occurring impetus found in states that engage in cultural trust efforts.

Selling the Vision to Arts Advocates

The vision for a cultural trust is usually not very difficult to sell to arts advocates. Those advocates are usually very knowledgeable about the barriers to legislative success that have been encountered by a state arts agency and welcome an alternative means of securing support. Although the concept is new to many in the broader arts community, conversation about a trust in this circle is usually centered on the degree to which a cultural trust will or will not compete with the fund-raising efforts of nonprofit arts organizations. In addition, supporters of a trust, need to assure advocates that not only will there be a larger pool of monies after its enactment but that those monies will be available to them. These and other issues are usually addressed in a series of public and private conversations with members of the arts community and supported with briefing papers.

Sources of Funding

There is no one revenue stream that can address the funding needs of each state through the cultural trusts. The common means by which a stream is

identified is for those advocating a cultural trust to draw up a list of possible funding sources and to discuss those funding sources at length with supportive legislators and legislative staff. These legislative insiders can provide insight into revenue streams that may not be known to others. In addition, these persons can help advocates evaluate the level of opposition and the level of support that can be expected for each type of revenue stream. Ultimately, the legislator handling the bill and his or her chief allies must endorse the revenue stream that is identified. If they do not, their ability and interest in fighting for it will be seriously compromised.

Structural Factors in the Design of a Cultural Trust

A number of factors need to be considered in the design of cultural trusts. Knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of each in advance of launching legislation will help advocates make those inevitable decisions regarding changes that must be made to pass trust legislation.

The primary item to consider in the design of a trust is the reliability of the public funding stream that will support all or part of the trust. If that stream is consistent and has a track record, then adequate projections of future trust corpus volume can be made. If, however, the revenue stream fluctuates wildly from year to year, provisions must be made in the legislation to address this factor. Another factor to consider is whether the stream from such funding is projectable. The revenue flow from a number of designated funding streams may be difficult if not impossible to capture, and thus even the passage of legislation allocating those revenue streams to a trust may not result in the building of a trust corpus because those funds never can be isolated.

The time horizon is also an important feature in trust development. In most of the existing cultural trust efforts, legislators have been unwilling to provide revenue streams in perpetuity. Those who design a trust must decide how many years of funding are needed either to accomplish their goals or to reach a level of funding that will energize advocates to pursue an extension of the time frame for funding.

The degree to which community foundation designated funds are allowed to encourage private fund raising is another consideration in the design of a trust. Raising discretionary funding for cultural trusts has been difficult work and the majority of such funding to date has come from designated funding strategies. A related consideration is that if the cultural trust that is being designed is to benefit a broad range of organizations, then consideration must be given to the capacity of those organizations to raise designated matching funds.

Although many have feared that the establishment of a cultural trust would curtail regular appropriations to the state arts agency, historic records do not indicate that this is a problem. The more common scenario is that the increased contact of the arts community with the legislature through cultural trust advocacy increases its stature and advocacy ability. As a result, several states with cultural trusts have received increased appropriations since the establishment of trusts. Some states, however, have considered the insertion of language in trust legislation that precludes the new trust from negatively influencing the annual legislative allocation to the state arts agency.

Involvement of the Legislature

The development of trust legislation goes hand in hand with the identification of legislators who will support the concept. Those legislators are usually involved in

the crafting of the legislation and are helpful in the cultivation of other supportive legislators. Although arts caucuses and co-sponsor mechanisms can be used to build support for a trust bill, there must be a key sponsor and some unshakable allies at the center of the effort.

Involvement of the Governor's Office

The role the governor plays in the development and passage of a trust varies substantially from state to state. In some states the office can actively prevent the state arts agency staff and governing board from proposing legislation the governor does not endorse. In other states, the governor's office will ignore arts agency legislative activity that it does not endorse and only deal with it if the legislation is passed and is presented to the governor for signature. In yet other states, the governor's office may not choose to oppose cultural trust legislation they do not endorse if that legislation is being carried by an influential legislator from whom they wish to secure legislative support for a gubernatorial initiative. Of course, a governor may support cultural trust legislation, yet even the benefit of this type of support is situational. If the governor is not of the same party as either or both of the houses of the legislature, then the support of the governor may be detrimental. Because the role of the governor's office in the legislative process does make a difference in the passage of cultural trust legislation, that role needs to be analyzed prior to seeking the support of a governor for such legislation.

Advocacy Strategies

Once a cultural trust bill is developed, it can be moved through the legislature using any number of strategies. If there is one constant in terms of the passage of cultural trust legislation, it is that no matter how a bill is managed by legislators, the support of the arts field and the larger community is always helpful. There are times when only home district public pressure will turn a legislator in support of a bill. In addition to broad-based public support, legislators often respond well to a bill to which there is no organized opposition and when that bill is structured to serve a broad cultural constituency and not the arts community alone. Like the governor's role in such an effort, an advocacy strategy must be developed with a keen sense of the situational nature of the legislative environment.

Conclusion

There is no one way to develop a cultural trust. Those who have successfully created such mechanisms have taken the general concept of a trust, decided whether it should supply supplementary or core funding to the arts agency, diagnosed the political environment, consulted with the arts community, and proceeded. Each story of the development of a cultural trust is laced with episodes of personal courage, ego barriers erected by personalities in the political, business and arts communities, and turns of good and bad luck. The creation of a cultural trust has always proven to be an adventure. Regardless of the outcome of such efforts, the arts community is usually far better off for having put an aggressive plan forward. Such a plan indicates their commitment to the cause—elected officials understand and appreciated that type of action.