

**Wyoming Cultural Trust Fund  
Conference Call  
December 13, 2010, 10 a.m.**

**Board Present on Call:** David Reetz, Chair; Sara Needles; Mike Shonsey; Barbara Smith; and Nancy Schiffer

**Staff Present on Call:** Renée Bovée

**Guests:** Milward Simpson

Chair Reetz called the meeting to order at 10 a.m.

**Agenda**

Agenda approved by consensus.

**Minutes**

Mike Shonsey moved to approve the minutes of June 11-12, 2010 as written. Seconded by Nancy Schiffer. Motion passed unanimously.

**Governor's Budget Recommendation**

Governor Freudenthal has recommended an increase of \$1 million to the corpus of the Cultural Trust Fund in the supplemental budget for the next legislative session. Milward Simpson spoke on this additional increase and the support we have received over the years from Governor Freudenthal. If approved by legislature, this would increase the corpus of the Trust to \$14.4 million. Renee Bovee noted that for each million dollar increase in the corpus, interest earning generate between \$50,000 to \$80,000, in additional funding available for grants. Chair Reetz expressed his appreciation of Governor Freudenthal's heritage and the support we have received from Legislature has made a great partnership which has makes something really happen for Wyoming through this fund.

Simpson also noted that he anticipates this upcoming legislative session to be fiscally conservative. The current revenue estimates indicate there will be a surplus of revenue for the State of Wyoming, however that will be eaten up by the increases in Medicaid which are anticipated. Chair Reetz noted that will the high match which our constituents bring to these projects, the impact of these additional grant dollars will be significant to Wyoming. Simpson suggested that it would be valuable for the Trust Fund Chair or board talk with Governor-elect Matt Mead early in his administration about the Trust Fund and the legacy of the fund and the impact the fund has had. It is important to garner his support in carrying the budget forward through the Legislative process.

**WCTF Board Replacements**

Bovée reported that at the end of February, 2011, Board members Mike Shonsey and Barbara Smith's terms will expire, and they are not seeking reappointment. Thus both the State Parks and Cultural Resources Commission and the Wyoming Arts Council Board went through processes to propose a nomination to the Governor's office for replacement board members. The nominations which have gone forward are: State Parks and Cultural Resources nominated Dave Kathka of Rock Springs, and the Wyoming Arts Council Board nominated Susan Stubson of Casper. That information has been provided to the Governor's office and to the transition team of the Governor-elect. No challenges are anticipated but there is the process of the transition of administration to go through and the board appointments

do require Senate approval. Chair Reetz remarked on Dave Kathka's exceptionally fine skills and background he will bring to the Trust Fund Board. Kathka is quite the "pillar" to Wyoming's culture.

Nancy Schiffer remarked on Susan Stubson's background as a pianist and a lawyer, and her valuable service to the Arts Council board. She is very thoughtful in all her comments and never says anything without impact...along with being witty and fun. Simpson noted that Stubson is also the spouse of Representative Tim Stubson, who is a "rising star" in Wyoming Legislature.

Bovee noted that there is once possible "hiccup" in that Susan Stubson's nomination would require an over-lap of board service as her term with the Wyoming Arts Council board does not expire until June 30, 2011. (The Arts Council board terms are in transition as they are phasing in the term expiration dates from June 30 to February 28.) Stubson has definitely expressed the interest in serving and making this work out although she will have to do some balancing between the two boards.

Chair Reetz noted that these appear to be excellent additions to the Cultural Trust Fund Board...although they will have to fill in some very big shoes which Mike Shonsey and Barbara Smith will leave.

### **Review of WCTF Grant Changes**

Bovée had sent everyone a copy of the complete application packet with the proposed revisions included. The significant changes occur on pages 4, 5-7, and 13. All board members confirmed they had the material. Bovée moved the Historic Preservation General Rehabilitation Guidelines and the proposed new Cultural Heritage Tourism Guidelines to the front of the packet, so as not to interfere with the actual forms to be completed by an applicant. The Historic Preservation guidelines existed before, they are just being relocated.

Sara Needles reviewed the proposed changes for the Cultural Heritage Tourism Guidelines. The section begins with a Definition and Purpose, followed by Goals, Categories for Consideration, Other Considerations, Criteria and Additional Applicant Resources. Needles hopes this new information reflects what was mentioned in the October board retreat, of assisting possible Heritage Tourism grant applicants understand what exactly the Board is looking for in these grants. Needles asked for any comments from the Board.

Barbara Smith had several observations. She tried to take on the role of a possible applicant, and she thought it would be very helpful to the ordinary person applying to re-order some of the six Goals, five Categories for Consideration, four Other Considerations, and five Criteria into comparable order. As these involve the same types of issues or topics, each section should be re-ordered to logically follow the previous sections. For example, if Partnerships or Quality are a primary consideration, as explained in the Goals section, then the Categories for Consideration should not begin with marketing which is an end product. The Criteria should also follow in the same style, with the first criteria being Partnerships and Coordination. Then the actual questions on page 13 will follow the same reasonable thought process. It should be organized in a way that logically follows the development process of a project: the planning first, the assurance of quality, the execution of the project.

Smith also noted that Other Consideration seems to be redundant because those "Other Considerations" appear to be the actual questions later on. Everything really appears to be very good and addressing what we want to accomplish, they just need to be in a different order.

Needles concurred and suggested that we could just delete the “Other Considerations” section, as it is re-stated as the questions on Page 13. Needles noted that the Categories for Consideration is just a set of examples of projects which people can do in this category. Smith noted that if you set up Goals and Criteria in the same priority order, then the categories can be placed in a process order. The Board concurred that deletion of “Other Considerations” would be appropriate and supported the concept of re-arranging the Goals, Categories for Consideration and Criteria section. Needles also suggested that it would be appropriate to set-up the section to include Definition and Purpose, followed by Goals, then have the Criteria section, then conclude with the Categories for Consideration. The Board concurred.

Mike Shonsey noted that the section title “Categories for Consideration” seems to actually be examples, but the title seems confusing. Perhaps it needs to be re-titled to something like Examples of Categories for Consideration. Needles, agreed, that section could be retitled to be more reflective of this being a series of example projects. Shonsey noted that the formatting of these pages also seems to be different than the others—it appears the font is smaller. Bovée acknowledged that it is one-point smaller as she was trying to keep it to three pages versus four. If she is able to drop the “Other Considerations” section that will solve that font problem and make the entire section stylistically the same.

Smith inquired about the term “product” which is used a couple of times throughout the section. Is this an appropriate term? Or are these projects? Is this a marketing concept term? Will it be understood by applicants? Specifically the last sentence of the second paragraph in “Definition and Purpose”, highlights the term with the phrase “Wyoming’s Culture and Heritage Product.” Simpson noted that this is a term which is in use and within the Department overall there are often discussions about our “heritage tourism product” in relation to our historic sites. A general discussion was held on the appropriateness of this term and of the repetition of the phrase in several locations within this section. The consensus of the Board was to drop the line “This program is designed to encourage the development and promotion of Wyoming’s Culture and Heritage Product” to de-emphasize the terminology and to reduce some of the redundancy in the following paragraphs.

Smith raised the question as to whether the check boxes on the actual application need to include the category “Cultural Heritage Tourism”, since we now have these additional questions to be answered. A general discussion was held, noting that the intent behind the check boxes has been assigning applications to our review agencies. For example, if an application comes in which is predominately focused on arts program, the Arts Council gets the application for review. The review agencies have provided not only the technical expertise, but have also helped define quality within the proposals. It was noted that a check box such as “Cultural Heritage Tourism” would be so overly broad it would not carry any meaning as to which agency would act as reviewer. Simpson noted that there is no agency or panel which would be able to evaluate this category. He did note that there are current discussions within the Department about creating a Cultural Coalition, comprised of individuals around the state, who have an interest in supporting culture and willing to deal with overarching advocacy issues, etc. But until that Coalition is formed, the Cultural Trust Fund Board itself needs to be the arbitrator of this category. It was suggested by Bovée that these checkboxes be removed entirely from the application, thus eliminating the confusion, and she would then assign the applications (as she sometimes does anyway) to the appropriate review agency. If a Cultural Heritage Tourism application comes in that is not discipline specific (i.e. deals with a planning project, or a marketing project), then that application would not be reviewed by our review agencies but would come directly to the board. As the board must read all applications anyway, it would mean only a small handful would come without the supporting reviewer comments or rankings. The board concurred that removing the boxes may be the simplest solution.

Needles inquired of the board whether they needed to consider the idea that there may be applicants which come in which are obviously requesting support in a Cultural Heritage Tourism category, and yet did not see their application in that light and did not complete that series of questions – and should that board weigh those applications differently? It was acknowledged by the board that given this is a new category, obviously the board will need to look at each application individually and that no application will be penalized for not completing these additional questions. Simpson noted that this is a new category and people will not yet have the familiarity and there will need to be an education process with applicants. Shonsey noted that the danger is probably going to come from the other side, not that people haven't submitted Cultural Heritage Tourism questions, but that too many do thinking that everything we support is Cultural Heritage Tourism.

Smith moved to accept the revisions and changes to the WCTF grant application as discussed during this conference call and to direct Bovée to create a final document incorporating all changes. Schiffer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

### **Board Grant Review Sheet Changes**

Bovée reminded the Board, that in their review of WCTF grant applications, they use a three-page review sheet. The first page of that review sheet provides the “overview” or “birds eye view” evaluation based on the WCTF enabling legislation and carries a page total of 100 points. The second and third pages of the evaluation form are the same for both the Board and the review agencies, and acts as a double-check for the board as they may individually note a strength or weakness that the review agencies do not catch, or vice versa. It has come up several times that this first page has a lot of redundancy in it. It was originally created off of two separate sections in our rules and regulations, which do contain duplications. Shonsey volunteered at the October retreat to tackle the challenge of eliminating some of the “department of redundancy department” wording on this page.

Shonsey reduced several of the redundancies, but it is still in two sections. Bovée reviewed an alternative version she and Shonsey had created that further reduces the page to one section. The one section version combines several items, continues to reduce the duplication and hopefully, still addresses those over-arching issues the board should address when reviewing applications. As not every board member had received the single-section version, Bovée read through the document. Bovée noted that she still advocated for that single-section version carrying the weight of 100 points as that “birds eye view” evaluation would allow the board's oversight of the entire state and issues to supersede the basic qualitative review of the application. For example, there are times when the merit of the proposal outweighs the technical aspects of preparing a good application. In reading through the shortened version, Bovée acknowledged there were still some grammatical changes which will need to be made to make it compatible throughout.

Smith noted that these changes to a single section version makes a lot of sense and she agrees that the 100 point value would make it very simple for use. Chair Reetz noted that these changes seem very appropriate and simplification is usually generally good.

Shonsey moved to accept the changes to the Board Grant Review Sheet has proposed and reviewed during this conference call and to direct Bovée to create the final document incorporating all changes. Smith seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The revised WCTF grant application form will be made available via the WCTF webpage as of January 1, 2011. Multiple press releases will be sent out noting the availability of the form, with follow-up releases reminding applicants of the upcoming deadline for application. The deadline this year is a postmark deadline date of May 2, 2011, as May 1 is on a Sunday.

#### **Other Business**

No other business was brought forward.

#### **Next Meeting**

The next board meeting will be Friday, February 11, 2011 in Cheyenne at Little America. The agenda has not yet been completed, but will once again include presentations for grant recipients and will most likely occur from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. Following the board meeting, the Board will be invited to the Governor's Arts Award events. The Board will also be invited to join the other statewide boards for a gathering the evening of Thursday, February 10. The Board had expressed the desire to have more of an "educational" focus for the Thursday gather at the October retreat. Bovée noted that they have not yet been able to get the educational programming sorted out, but that will be a series of e-mail conversations that will occur in early January. Simpson noted that we are planning on having the joint event at the Suite 1901 restaurant in Cheyenne, but perhaps have it more informal than a sit-down dinner and incorporate the educational component within the framework of the evening. Simpson also remarked that the State Parks and Cultural Resources Commission would like to take this opportunity to join each of the respective board meetings briefly, to observe how each board works.

Smith inquired if the new nominees to the board will be invited to the February meeting. Bovée replied yes, and that Kathka is already committed to attending, and Stubson will try to work it around her Arts Council Board Meeting.

Shonsey moved to adjourn, seconded by Needles. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.