

# THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO: A *CASE STUDY* *IN MUNICIPAL SUPPORT OF THE ARTS*

*by Marie Acosta with Jeff Jones*

---

*Prepared for the*



## FORWARD

At the June 2013 annual meeting of Americans for the Arts, keynote speaker Dr. Manuel Pastor, Professor of Sociology and American Studies & Ethnicity at the University of Southern California, offered these words:

***"The issue of equity and inclusion, which often get left as the last thing you bring to the table, ought to be the first thing you bring to the table in order to engage the upcoming demographic."***

The Latino Arts Network of California (LAN) agrees. The Network launched an initiative to study **to what extent are equity and inclusion reflected in the distribution of Sacramento's public funding for the arts?**

According to the State Department of Finance's January 2013 release of new population projections, California's Latino population will equal the number of non-Hispanic whites by mid-2013.<sup>1</sup> Sacramento's current population breakdown, much like the rest of the state, is becoming browner and younger:

- Of Sacramento's 466,488 inhabitants, 126,276, or 26.9 percent are Latino; and
- The Latino school-age population is more than 50 percent of the total public school enrollment.<sup>2</sup>

THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO: A CASE STUDY IN MUNICIPAL SUPPORT OF THE ARTS, authored by Marie Acosta and Jeff Jones, reviews the City's allocations of public money for art and culture. We hope the study's findings will launch a dialogue about cultural equity and inclusion.

Rebecca Nevarez  
Director, Latino Arts Network of California  
October 2013

---

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Finance January 2013

<sup>2</sup> <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06067.html>

## Context of Report

In the mid 1980s, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) established programs to foster the development of multicultural nonprofit arts institutions. In 1986, the California Arts Council (CAC) stated “**Multicultural arts institutions must take their place alongside the established arts institutions, if we are to recognize the realities of a diverse California.**”<sup>3</sup> In that same year, the Sacramento Metropolitan Arts Commission’s five-year plan advised the City Council to fund arts organizations that represent communities of color. But, twenty-five years later, nothing has really changed in Sacramento. **(Addendum 1)**

**In FY2012-2013, the City of Sacramento allocated \$2,403,406\* to the arts. Art organizations that reflect communities of color received \$53,130 of that total\*\***

<b>Asian American organizations</b>	<b>\$19,823 or 0.82%</b>
<b>Latino organizations</b>	<b>\$24,859 or 1.03%</b>
<b>African American organizations</b>	<b>\$8,448 or 0.35%</b>
<b>Native American organizations</b>	<b>\$0 or 0.00%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$53,130 or 2.21%</b>

*\*FY2012-2013 City of Sacramento, Approved Budget*

*\*\*City of Sacramento, City Council, 12/4/2012, Report Type: Consent—Cultural Arts Awards (CAA) Funding for Calendar Year 2013*

---

<sup>3</sup> 1986, California Arts Council Multicultural Advancement Program, Statement of Purpose

## Summary of Our Findings

Our research, which takes a frank look at how the City of Sacramento has funded the arts from 1986 to 2013, asks three important questions:

- 1) Should the City repeatedly invest its cultural resources in organizations that require constant taxpayer-supported bailouts?
- 2) What are the city's art agencies doing to plan for the pluralistic city Sacramento is demographically destined to become?
- 3) What funding policies should the City's elected officials adopt to provide all Sacramento residents equal access to the arts?

Our findings reveal the City of Sacramento's startling history of making very large expenditures to just a handful of Eurocentric art organizations and awarding very small allocations to art organizations whose work reflects the lives and experiences of people of color. From 1986 to 2013, the City of Sacramento has consistently provided the Opera, the Ballet, a Symphony and a large museum with taxpayer-funded grants, loans, lines of credit, forgiven loans, and capital improvement funds without making similar funding opportunities available to arts organizations rooted in communities of color.

Additionally, LAN research documents the City's history of allocating public resources to Eurocentric organizations that subsequently went bankrupt, failed to repay their loans and did not fulfill the conditions of their grant awards.<sup>4</sup> With the exception of grants awarded by the Sacramento Metropolitan Arts Commission, the City's allocations to nonprofit art organizations reflect a lack of coherent cultural policies, a failure to develop plans that take into account the residents' changing demographics, and an elitist cultural investment strategy that makes no economic sense.

Over the past 30 years, taxpayer dollars have financially supported the Sacramento Opera, the Sacramento Symphony, the Sacramento Ballet and the Crocker Art Museum. Additional municipal expenditures have underwritten staff salaries, consultant fees, building repairs and maintenance, parking, technical support and equipment. In addition, the City's annual budget supports "nonprofit partnerships" with The Discovery Museum/Powerhouse Science Center, the Sacramento History Museum and the Crocker Art Museum. (Note: The Crocker Art Museum receives two annual allocations: the first a direct line-item allocation; the second is a grant from the Sacramento Metropolitan Arts Commission. The City has made similar exclusionary allocations of public funds to the Music Circus and the B Street Theatre.)

On the other hand, City support for nonprofit arts organizations of color is minuscule: even though these communities comprise a majority of the City's population, they receive less than three percent of the City dollars invested in arts and cultural services. **(Addendum #2)** Documentation was compiled from the City of Sacramento's operating budgets, capital improvement project budgets, City Council resolutions and published news articles.

---

<sup>4</sup> Addendum 1 pgs 6-9, 1998 MEMO from the Sacramento Metropolitan Arts Commission to the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Sacramento and Council SUBJECT: Agreement for Short-Term Funding Stabilization for the Sacramento Ballet, Sacramento Opera and Sacramento Theatre Company

## WHERE DOES THE MONEY COME FROM?

The majority of Sacramento's municipal arts and cultural funding comes from the Transit and Occupancy Tax (TOT) and the City's general operating budget. The Sacramento Department of Conventions, Culture and Leisure distributes these funds. Additional public dollars have been allocated to the arts by the former Sacramento Redevelopment Agency, the Capitol Area Development Authority, the Community Reinvestment Capital Improvement Program, the former Sacramento Metropolitan Cable Television Commission and, in 2013, the California Environmental Protection Agency. The Department of Conventions, Culture and Leisure can also allocate discretionary funding. For example, in April 2013, the Department awarded \$42,000 to the Sacramento Opera/Sacramento Philharmonic to plan its merger.<sup>5</sup> Grants of less than \$50,000 do not require City Council approval.

---

<sup>5</sup> Addendum 2 Merger — Funding Agreement Department: Convention, Culture & Leisure, Division: Sacramento Metropolitan Arts Commission April 30, 2013

## A HISTORY OF EXCLUSION, A STRING OF FAILED INVESTMENTS

### The Symphony

In April 1990, the City cosigned and cosecured a \$700,000 line of credit for the Sacramento Symphony. On May 1, 1990, the City Council reauthorized the same \$700,000 line of credit for a longer period of time and again served as the co-signer. On June 26, 1990, City Council Resolution 90 — 521 approved a three-year \$200,000 annual contribution to the Sacramento Symphony. An April 28, 1992 staff report stated, *“Although the Symphony’s revenues have improved slightly, their financial condition continues to present serious concerns.”* The report continued, *“In the event of a financial default under the line of credit, the City, not the Symphony is liable to the bank for the balance of the line of credit plus interest on unpaid balance.”*

On December 11, 1990, in Resolution 90—998, the City Council approved a three-year reoccurring \$200,000 grant to the Symphony. On June 30, 1992, Resolution 92—476 extended for the third time the original \$700,000 line of credit to the Symphony (the previous note was due in June 1992). On December 10, 1992, three days after receiving its final \$200,000 grant allocation, the Sacramento Symphony filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection.<sup>6</sup> On November 21, 1995, City Council approved a \$50,000 grant to the Symphony and a week later awarded the Symphony \$50,000 more. The Sacramento Symphony went bankrupt and closed in 1996. In 2012, a Sacramento Bee article reported, *“That bankruptcy left 5,000 subscribers without recourse for refunds, and taxpayers got stuck paying an unpaid \$300,000 loan,”* and the Sacramento Symphony, now reborn as the Sacramento Philharmonic Orchestra *“will close if it can’t raise \$150,000 in the next month.”*<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, the City continues funding the Symphony.

### The Opera

On February 18, 1992 the City Council approved a \$65,000 line of credit to the Sacramento Opera. By 1994, the Opera’s debt to the City had increased to \$76,781. In 1995, the City augmented the original \$65,000 loan by \$19,000. By 2000, the Opera owed the City a total of \$101,419. Nevertheless, in 2000, both the Sacramento City Council and the County Board of Supervisors adopted resolutions that awarded the Opera a total of \$150,000, noting the \$150,000 was *“a grant and not subject to repayment if the Sacramento Opera works with the Metropolitan Arts Commission and National Arts Stabilization Inc. to identify critical financial issues and complete a long-term stabilization plan.”* In other words, the City and the County of Sacramento awarded \$150,000 to the Opera, an organization that already owed the City \$101, 419.<sup>8</sup> In February 2000, the City approved a \$15,200 bridge loan to the Opera, using the Opera’s anticipated FY2000-2001 Cultural Awards Grant to guarantee the loan. Apparently, the Sacramento Metropolitan Arts Commission approved a bridge loan to the Sacramento Opera, then *gave* the Opera the money to *pay it back*.

According to City staff, the justification for the Opera’s recurring loans and grants were: *“severe financial and organizational instability in recent years that threatens its continued viability”*

---

<sup>6</sup> Jan 8, 1993, Report to City Council by Divisions: Accounting, Budget, Revenue, Risk Management SUBJECT: Impact of Sacramento Symphony Association Bankruptcy filing on the City of Sacramento

<sup>7</sup> *Sacramento Philharmonic’s future rides on donations now, officials say* eortiz@sacbee.com, Thursday, April 12, 2012, The Sacramento Bee

<sup>8</sup> Agreement for funding the Sacramento Opera Association, April 26, 2000, Approved May 2, 2000)

including: ***“(1) use of deferred revenue, (2) borrowing from boards and endowments, (3) high accumulated debt, (4) no cash reserves or method to deal with annual cash flow shortages, and (5) no financial planning or plan to invest in its infrastructure.”***

While it is important to note that many of these problems are endemic to the nonprofit arts world, whenever arts organizations of color face similar problems, they are rarely provided taxpayer subsidies to survive.

## **The Ballet**

In 1991, when the Capitol City Ballet dissolved, it owed the City of Sacramento \$11,020; the remaining principal on an interest-free loan. In 1995, Sacramento County granted the reconstituted Sacramento Ballet a 12-month loan subject to, among other conditions, the consolidation of the Ballet and Opera’s administrative functions<sup>9</sup> and a \$75,000 match from the City, which was approved on April 11, 1995.<sup>10</sup> In 2004, when the Sacramento Ballet owed the City \$362,000, a loan repayment plan was signed in February 2004.

## **The Crocker Art Museum**

The Crocker Art Museum was part of an 1885 gift to the City of Sacramento. The deed states, in part, that the City of Sacramento shall “hold and keep property both real and personal forever, to care for and maintain.” However, while the deed language is subject to interpretation, it appears that the City has assumed responsibility to sustain the Crocker Art Museum, and now awards the Crocker more than \$1,700,000 annually as well as an annual grant from the Sacramento Metropolitan Arts Commission that ranges from \$25,000 to \$35,000. In 2010, a review of the City of Sacramento’s finances and operations conducted by Management Partners (an independent consulting firm based in Cincinnati, Ohio) **recommended eliminating subsidies to fee-based nonprofit agencies.** The recommendation cited the Crocker Art Museum, the Sacramento Zoo, the Discovery Museum, the Center for Sacramento History, and the Sacramento History Museum.<sup>11</sup>

Like the Ballet, Opera and Symphony, the Crocker Art Museum has also experienced significant financial difficulties. In 2012, the Sacramento Bee reported, ***“The Crocker, which has an overall budget of \$7.2 million, had expected to bring in \$375,000 in corporate funds by the end of February — about two-thirds of the way through its fiscal year — but had received just \$200,000 by that date.”*** Lial Jones, director of the Crocker Art Museum, was quoted saying, ***“The Crocker has never made corporate support a cornerstone of its revenue stream. For its recent expansion, the museum relied on large individual contributions and City funding.”***

In May 2013, the Sacramento City Council voted to forgive a \$7.5 million loan to the Crocker, despite the fact that the museum has estate gift pledges totaling at least \$10 million.<sup>12</sup> As director Jones stated on May 10, 2013, “We do not know when the estate gifts will be fulfilled.”<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> County of Sacramento, inter-office office Memorandum, March 14, 1995

<sup>10</sup> Resolution 95 — 156

<sup>11</sup> City of Sacramento, Citywide Financial and Operational Review April 2010 pg. 90

<sup>12</sup> Ryan Lillis, The Sacramento Bee, May 13, 2013, <http://www.sacbee.com/2013/05/13/5415151/amid-kings-actions-sacramento.html> Page 1A

<sup>13</sup> May 10, 2013 <http://sacramento.cbslocal.com/2013/05/10/crocker--catch--22--museum--needs--donors--to--die--to--pay--the--bills/>

## FUNDING PRIORITIES: A PUBLIC POLICY DISCONNECT

As early as 1986, when the nascent Sacramento Metropolitan Arts Commission developed its first five-year plan, the Commission advised the Sacramento City Council and staff to fund arts organizations that represent communities of color. The plan stated that ***“Special effort should be extended to involve and include traditionally underserved constituents.”***<sup>14</sup>

Subsequently, Dr. Thomas Wolf, in his 1992 report entitled “Strategies for Sacramento’s Cultural Master Plan” wrote:

***“The allocation systems for the distribution of City and County money are not endorsed by most constituencies in the arts community.... Race and ethnicity provide richness for the arts in Sacramento. But race in particular has been the cause of great public divisiveness in the arts community. Several concerns have been expressed by members of the Black community: that the composition of the Metropolitan Arts Commission and the Arts Division staff are not reflective of the community, that the distribution of public funding does not address the needs of multicultural groups, that artists of color are inadequately represented in the Art in Public Places program, and that there is very little public recognition of art forms that are not based on European modes. If there is a forceful public policy on these issues, it is not being heard.”*** He continued: ***“There is also great concern that some organizations bypass regular grant procedures and make their cases directly to the City Council or County thus further undermining the fairness of the system itself.”***<sup>15</sup>

### Technical Assistance

In 1999, the City paid \$350,000 to the National Arts Stabilization Initiative for an organizational capacity building program for the Sacramento Opera, Ballet and Theater Company. In 2000, the Sacramento City Council approved a \$75,000 grant to financially stabilize the Sacramento Opera Association and awarded the Opera an additional \$150,000 to work ***“with the Metropolitan Arts Commission and National Arts Stabilization Inc. to identify critical financial issues and complete a long-term stabilization plan.”***

The Sacramento Regional Performing Arts Alliance, the newly created (2013) "umbrella" corporation for both the Sacramento Philharmonic and the Sacramento Opera<sup>16</sup> is currently located in rent-free, City-owned office space. Except for the two percent of the awarded grants allocated in FY2012-2013, Sacramento has not provided subsidized staff, free space, loans or other kinds of support to any art organization rooted in a community of color.

---

<sup>14</sup> August 11, 1986, Transportation and Community Development Committee, Sacramento, California SUBJECT: "1986 Sacramento Arts Plan" pg. 4

<sup>15</sup> 1992, pg. 6-7 “Strategies for Sacramento’s Cultural Master Plan”, Dr. Thomas Wolf

<sup>16</sup> <http://2intune.org/2013--14--season--announcement/>



When members of Sacramento's Latino arts community have sought financial support, both City Council members and City staff have told them:

- *"There's no money,"*
- *"We can't support all these nonprofits,"*
- *"What happened to all the support we gave you in the past?"*
- *"Go to SMAC. That's where we fund you."*

## Public Access to Subsidized Facilities

Finally, Sacramento's multicultural organizations are denied equitable access to the City's subsidized or municipally-owned arts facilities. For example, in 2012, a Sacramento *ballet folklórico* organization sought to rent the Community Center Theater. They were told that the calendar dates they desired were not available because the Opera, Symphony and Ballet get first choice of dates, and whatever dates remain are then available to other performing groups.

In 2011, a Latino visual arts organization approached the Crocker Art Museum and asked if they would like to partner with them to present a lecture by a renowned Native American visual artist. The museum declined, but stated that the organization could rent their theater at market rate.

In 2013, the Sacramento Opera and Symphony moved into a City-owned, rent free location with several hundred square feet of carpeted, heated and air-conditioned space. In that same year, the City leased the Fremont Adult School facility to the Sacramento Ballet at the token amount of \$1 per year. In 2011, La Raza Galeria Posada was offered what one County Supervisor calls "The Shed" in an unused portion of a park maintenance facility with no heat or air-conditioning for \$380 per month rent.

## A TALE OF TWO CITIES

*Promoting excellence in arts programming;  
Enhancing stability and development of Sacramento's arts organizations;  
Enhancing the role of the arts in economic development.*  
- Art policy of Sacramento<sup>17</sup>

### **The Sacramento Metropolitan Arts Commission: \$350,000 for 55 organizations**

Sacramento's Department of Convention, Culture and Leisure allocates the majority of the City's funding for art and culture through the Sacramento Metropolitan Arts Commission (SMAC). Since 2005, SMAC's major grant-making program — the Cultural Arts Awards — has had a transparent grant application process and has made all decisions in public meetings. On average, the Cultural Arts Awards program distributes \$350,000 annually to approximately 55 small and large nonprofit arts organizations. SMAC is the only municipal funding source that accepts requests from nonprofit art organizations whose work is rooted in and reflective of communities of color.

Despite the prevailing belief that SMAC is the only municipal resource for nonprofit arts organizations, in reality, the City distributes the largest share of its financial investments in art and culture without an application process, and, to date, only to Eurocentric arts groups.

---

<sup>17</sup> Sacramento City Council, Sacramento April 26, 2000

## CONCLUSION

Despite changing demographics and the dwindling audiences for Eurocentric art forms, governmental arts funding agencies tend to invest a large percentage of their cultural resources in symphonies, ballets, operas and large museums. In particular, local governments tend to bail out large-budget arts groups, even when they act in financially irresponsible ways or are no longer sustainable. The City's failure to analyze the financial impact of the arts on the City's economy, its failure to base its cultural investments on measurable outcomes, and its elitist conception of art and culture are disservices to the City's taxpayers and to the City's nonprofit arts community.

How Sacramento will sustain its nonprofit arts organizations in the future remains an unanswered question. On a national level, it is debatable whether ballet companies, operas and symphony orchestras located in the nation's mid-sized cities will be financially sustainable 25 years from now. Sacramento's propensity to invest only in Western European arts organizations that serve almost all-white audiences, fails to recognize that like the population as a whole, their audiences are both growing older and shrinking. But to be clear, this is no an either/or proposition: without devaluing Sacramento's Eurocentric arts organizations, the City can diversify its cultural funding so the many communities residing here can fully participate in the City's cultural life.

The authors of this report believe that when Sacramento's elected and appoint officials establish policies and procedures that mandate an equitable distribution of, and access to, the City's funding and spacial resources, Sacramento's creative class will become a true economic engine and the City's arts economy will thrive.

## Recommendations

- 1) To distribute arts and cultural funds in a fair, equitable and transparent process, the City Council should place all monies dedicated to art and culture in one fund and should contract with an independent source to develop policies and procedures that will promote equitable allocations.
- 2) Sacramento should immediately allocate significant resources to promote the development of culturally-diverse small- to mid-sized arts organizations.
- 3) The City should make a good faith effort to more closely align its grant allocations to the Census Bureau's projections of demographic change.
- 4) The City should adopt and enforce a policy guaranteeing that all nonprofit arts organizations have equitable access to the City's owned and subsidized arts facilities.
- 5) To ensure that Sacramento's arts landscape represents the variety of cultural traditions already present here, the City should follow San Francisco's lead and create a Cultural Equity Grants Program that supports culturally diverse arts organizations and individual artists working in culturally-specific and historically underserved communities.

© 2013

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**Marie Acosta** is a board member of the Latino Arts Network of California. She is the current Executive Director of La Raza Galería Posada in Sacramento. In 1986, the California Arts Council contracted with Acosta to plan and implement the nation's first publicly funded arts program committed to promoting the development of multicultural organizations. Acosta matched the state's Latino, African American, Asian American and Native American arts organizations with technical assistance providers in a wide variety of areas, most importantly in strategic planning and grantwriting. These programs launched a historical process—the use of public tax dollars to promote cultural diversity—that the academic establishment subsequently labeled “Multiculturalism.” She was formerly an actress and Business Manager of the San Francisco Mime Troupe and the Executive Director of the Mexican Museum in San Francisco. Ms. Acosta has served on grant making panels for the National Endowment for the Arts, the California Arts Council, and the Rockefeller Foundation to name a few. For ten years, she sat on the community Advisory Board Grants for the Arts, San Francisco. She was appointed to the Board of the California State CCHE, and San Francisco's War Memorial Board. She is a founding member of “El Centro/The Center” a new merger of three Sacramento Latino cultural organizations. She is the recipient of numerous awards including the California Arts Council Director Award, 2005. She recently joined the board of directors of Californians for the Arts.

**Jeff Jones** is a free-lance fundraising and long-range planning consultant who has been working in the San Francisco arts community for 35 years. Prior to moving to the Bay Area, he taught at the University of Texas-Austin for 10 years. He has authored over 3500 successful grant proposals for nonprofit arts organizations and has assisted arts groups to access foundation and public funding sources, including the San Francisco Ethnic Dance Festival, the San Francisco Mime Troupe, the Lorraine Hansberry Theater, Galería de la Raza, the Queer Cultural Center, Abhinaya Dance Company of San Jose, Highways Performance Space, the Queer Women of Color Media Arts Project, the Jewish Film Festival Fresh meat Productions and numerous others. He also authored two late 1980s reports that launched a public debate on the inequitable distribution of public arts funding.

The authors wish to thank the many people who assisted in the preparation of this report, especially the following:

John Hamilton  
Rebecca Nevarez  
Irene Lugo  
George Raya  
Christopher Rodriguez  
Debra Padilla  
Beth Pickens

## ADDENDA

### Addendum #1

### Partial History of Public Funding from City of Sacramento to Ballet, Opera, Symphony 1989-2013

ORGANIZATION	DATE	AMOUNT	PURPOSE
Ballet	1/24/89	\$30,000	to fund art activities
Ballet	7/26/89	\$30,000	grant
Ballet	May 1990	\$20,000	loan
Ballet	10/15/91	\$20,000	balance of loan forgiven
Ballet			loan forgiveness
Ballet	4/13/93	\$350,000	loan
Ballet	7/21/93	\$164,000	loan-capital improvements
Ballet	3/14/95	\$75,000	loan
Ballet	11/6/96	\$189,000	loan
Ballet	3/3/00		3 year deferment of loan payments
Ballet	4/18/02	\$361,563	loan
Ballet	2/10/04	\$362,000	*dollar match loan forgiveness resolution
<b>TOTAL BALLET</b>		<b>\$1,601,563</b>	
Symphony	3/1/90	\$700,000	Line of credit
Symphony	7/1/90	\$200,000	grant
Symphony	6/14/91	\$1,200,000	\$400,000 City/County grant annually for 5 years, stopped after three years
Symphony			interest waived on loan for 1 year
Symphony	6/18/05	\$80,000	3 year \$80,000 per year grant matched by Brd of Sups for 3 years
<b>TOTAL SYMPHONY</b>		<b>\$2,180,000</b>	
Opera	2/18/92	\$65,000	Line of credit
Opera	5/20/93	\$65,000	loan

ORGANIZATION	DATE	AMOUNT	PURPOSE
Opera	6/22/95	\$15,200	guaranteed from SMAC
Opera	6/23/95	\$15,200	guaranteed from SMAC
Opera	11/15/95	\$19,000	addition to 65,000 loan
Opera	2/1/00	\$15,200	bridge loan
Opera	2/1/00	\$3,000	grant
Opera	3/3/00		3 year deferment of loan payments
Opera	5/2/00	\$101,419	previous loan and unpaid bills to Community Center Theater
MUS	5/2/00	\$150,000	City/County grant
Opera	6/23/05	\$30,400	Guaranteed SMAC grant
Opera	6/23/05	\$30,400	Guaranteed SMAC grant
Opera	4/18/02	\$76,781	loan status
Opera	1/2/01	\$15,000	to complete NAS stabilization program
<b>TOTAL OPERA</b>		<b>\$601,600</b>	
Crocker	1990-1991	\$962,000	
Crocker	1991-1992	\$966,000	
Crocker	1992-1993	\$944,909	
Crocker	1993-1994	\$889,915	
Crocker	1994-1995	\$721,000	
Crocker	1995-1996	\$741,000	
Crocker	1997-1998	\$756,664	
Crocker	1998-1999	\$762,234	
Crocker	1999-2000	\$769,339	
Crocker	2001-2002	\$814,665	
Crocker	2002-2003	\$918,043	
Crocker	2003-2004	\$926,746	public subsidy
Crocker	2004-2005	\$985,654	
Crocker	2005-2006	\$1,121,183	

ORGANIZATION	DATE	AMOUNT	PURPOSE
Crocker	2006-2007	\$1,067,250	
Crocker	2007-2008	\$1,160,450	
Crocker	2008-2009	\$1,163,489	
Crocker	2009-2010	\$1,093,211	
Crocker	2010-2011	\$1,041,633	Mid-year amendment to \$1,427,910
Crocker	2011-2012	\$1,850,714	Mid-year amendment to \$1,841,577
Crocker	2012-2013	\$1,777,260	
Crocker	2013-2014	\$1,783,296	
<b>TOTAL CROCKER</b>		<b>\$22,459,991</b>	
<b>ITEMS BELOW ARE TO TWO OR MORE ORGANIZATIONS</b>			
Opera and Symphony	6/30/92		60 day extension of \$700,000 line of credit
research grants to ballet 1995-1996			
Ballet, Opera, Sac Theater Company	8/25/98	\$335,000	General Fund and Redevelopment Agency
Ballet, Opera			City
Ballet, Opera	6/21/05		loan payments deferred for three years
Ballet, Opera, Symphony	6/1/13	\$5M facility renovation	
<p>*BALLET-2004 resolution            \$119,000 County Principal only (\$991.67/month, \$11,900/year)            \$58,000 City Principal only (\$483.33/month, \$5,800/year)            \$185,000 SHRA Principal only (\$1,541.67/month, \$18,500/year)            \$36,200/year \$3,016.67/mo for 10 yrs.            OR            Repay entire loan amount \$362,000 over 10 years and qualify for incentive (50% ) credit</p>			

## Addendum #2

### Public Policies, Art Organizations from Communities of Color

In the mid 1980s, The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the California Arts Council (CAC) established programs to foster the development of multicultural nonprofit arts institutions. In 1986, when the CAC established its Multicultural Advancement Program, the program's statement of purpose accurately described the challenges for public funders:

*"For most [California multicultural arts organizations] major funding support from private and public*

*sources has been extremely rare. This can be explained through a combination of factors: limited connections to foundation and corporation funders; the inability to hire appropriate personnel for such activities as board development, capital campaigns, long-range planning, marketing and public relations; a lack of training and career development opportunities; an absence of adequate facilities; and a commitment to their own artistic expressions which lie outside the scope of traditional Western European art forms and thus outside of major funding.”*

From The California Arts Council's 1986 guidelines establishing the Multicultural Advancement Program: *“The California Arts Council recognizes that efforts must be made to weave the life of such organizations into the fabric of the larger community. Multicultural arts institutions must take their place along side the established arts institutions, if we are to recognize the realities of a diverse California.”*