



Strengthening arts, culture,  
and creative expression as the  
tools to cultivate a better  
California for all.

Gavin Newsom, **Governor**  
Jonathan Moscone, **Executive Director**  
2750 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 300, Sacramento CA 95833  
(916) 322-6555 | [www.arts.ca.gov](http://www.arts.ca.gov)

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING**  
Wednesday, August 30, 2023  
10 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Kings Art Center  
605 North Douty Street  
Hanford, CA 93230

The members of the California Arts Council convened in Hanford and via web conference to discuss and vote on various items as listed in the minutes below. The full audio and video of the meeting can be accessed [here](#).

**PRESENT:**

Council Members

Consuelo (Chelo) Montoya, Chair  
Vicki Estrada, Vice-Chair  
Gerald Clarke  
Caleb Duarte  
Ellen Gavin  
Leah Goodwin  
Roxanne Messina Captor  
Olivia Raynor

Arts Council Staff

Jonathan Moscone, Executive Director  
Kayla Ungar, Chief Deputy Director  
Ayanna Kiburi, Deputy Director  
Kristin Margolis, Director of Programs Services  
Artemio Armenta, Director of Public Affairs  
Kimberly Brown, Public Affairs Specialist  
Qiana Moore, Outreach and Events Coordinator  
Wes Breazell, Graphic Designer  
Zachary Hill, IT Associate  
Jonathan Estrada, Arts in Corrections Program Analyst  
Amy Garrett, Arts Programs Manager

Leslie Giovannini, Arts Program Specialist  
Elisa Gollub, Programs Manager  
Kala Kowtha, IT Specialist  
Josy Miller, Arts Program Specialist  
Megan Morgan, Race Equity Manager  
Charles O'Malley, Literary Arts Specialist  
Natalie Peeples, Arts Program Specialist  
Arielle Rubin, Arts Program Specialist  
Yaquelin Ruiz, Arts Program Analyst  
Julee Starkey, Arts Program Specialist  
Marianne Strickland, Office Technician  
Emily Taggart, Arts Program Specialist

**[Note: Agenda Item 12 was taken out of order. These minutes reflect the agenda item as listed on the agenda and not as taken in chronological order.]**

## **1. Call to Order**

Acting Chair Estrada opened the meeting at 10:02 a.m. An acknowledgement was made thanking the Kings Art Center for hosting the meeting. Ways to participate in the meeting were mentioned.

Director of Public Affairs Armenta conducted a roll call.

**PRESENT:** Chair Consuelo Montoya (joined after the lunch break), Vice Chair Viki Estrada, Gerald Clarke, Caleb Duarte, Ellen Gavin, Leah Goodwin, Roxanne Messina Captor, and Olivia Raynor.

A quorum was established.

Executive Director Moscone presented a brief overview of the agenda, which included procedures for attendees as well as participation guidelines.

## **2. Land and Peoples Acknowledgement**

Acting Chair Estrada read the following into the record: The California Arts Council acknowledges the original inhabitants of the land now called California and that California continues to be home to many indigenous communities. Generations of tribal communities developed their understanding of the land and continue longstanding relationships with the land, water, air, plant and animal beings through ceremony culture and stewardship. These communities are not only an important part of all our history as contemporary Californians, they are also an important part in our understanding of this place. In acknowledging the violent history of founding of the state of California, its support of state-sponsored genocide, the misrepresentation of indigenous peoples and their culture and the erasure of their contributions, we at the California Arts Council

recognize our responsibility to these indigenous communities and we are compelled to support tribal organizations and related organizations including arts organizations in our effort to uplift indigenous people and their communities.

Now I would like to welcome Celestino Rayos to share more about the land and people here. Celestino is a poet and storyteller born in Texas and raised in Shafter, California. His mother's parents are Apache and Cherokee. His father's parents are Yaqui and Irish, I am part Yaqui as well.

Celestino Rayos performed a traditional welcome, blessing and ceremonial song and dance.

### **3. Welcome from the Kings Arts Center**

Stephanie Magnia welcomed participants: I am the Executive Director at Kings Arts Center. I have over 20 years of experience in the arts field. My goal is to increase the visibility and accessibility in our communities to make sure we have a good representation of ages and cultures in our area.

We have six shows a year and utilize this facility as well. We are trying to build this center to be available to everyone and to make this sustainable. Finances are always a challenge, and we try to optimize what we have. Thank you for coming here and we are excited to have you.

### **4. [Executive Director's Report](#) and Community Agreements**

I want to thank our generous hosting organization, the Kings Art Center, Executive Director Stephanie Magnia and all of the staff here in Hanford. I first came to Hanford in early spring before I visited Corcoran State Prison to experience arts programming in confinement.

The warmth and openness of everyone here at KAC and throughout Hanford is the best part of this job. Meeting the cultural workers, artistic and administrative as well as the culture bearers, has been a good experience. We need to be generous at a time when our field struggles.

Whether rural and remote or urban and densely populated, every community in our state counts. And each community deserves access and engagement with beautiful artistic and cultural experiences to better help all.

When I came to the job one year ago, I set myself to focus on increasing our accountability. This means looking into all aspects of policies and procedures to ensure they reflect best practices to serve our field because that is who we are accountable to.

We are doing this in many, many ways. We are analyzing our application questions. We are assessing our Arts in Corrections Program and there are so many other areas throughout the Agency that are endeavoring to improve.

Today's Council Book which an epic tome, is a reflection of our growing commitment to looking at everything. In the Book you see budgets, calendars, program descriptions and recommendations from our Allocations Committee with more budgets, narratives and alternative scenarios among other topics.

All of this is in service of providing the Council and our communities with as much information as possible as we strive to make strategic decisions and equitable investments through our 2023 Grant programs.

We will also talk about the range of policy possibilities around indirect costs and what is the true cost of making the work happen. What does it take to do this. This conversation will serve the Council in developing a thoughtful and responsive policy in our 2023 programs.

There is a lot of work ahead of us today. Over several meetings and many hours of work the Allocation Committee members supported by Agency staff developed recommended and other funding scenarios based on strategic thinking and equitable distribution of grants and responsiveness to the real time members of applications with received in 2023 which clocked in at over 1800.

With a finite set of dollars recommendations were difficult as well as the Council's decisions today were not easy. Everyone at the Agency and in the Council is aware of the fact that not everybody is funded in any cycle at any time.

But that consciousness does not result in a prioritization of one program over another. For we are a Council to every community member who is being served by our programs. Each and every one of our 2023 programs, and indeed, all of our programs are designed to impact communities.

I have developed first-hand knowledge of many of Council partner agencies and I see a wide range of services that correspond to the specific needs and nature of each part of our state; direct granting, advocacy, leveraging of county dollars, coalition building, artists directories and direct programming to communities. I see it in our entire state.

We have four more counties to go before every county is served by state and local partners and change that they want.

I see what it is like without a county arts agency, and I know how essential it is. State and regional members do the same as to give administering organizations that directly support the bearers of traditional arts and direct funding to organizations and artists via general operations and impacts are all about the community. This is what everyone in our field, no matter what, no matter where, no matter who is focused on.

So, as the tough decisions get made, we all must remember this – we are here for our communities and together through generosity of spirit can we continue to make it possible for everyone regardless of circumstance or background to live an artful life.

Let us debate, discuss and consider with grace and thoughtfulness and care for all of our programs, all of our field and all of our communities because we owe them no less.

I will now go through our community agreements:

- Always assume good intentions.
- Respect other's personal and professional experiences.
- Seek space and definitely give space.
- Ask questions and learn why.
- One microphone, one diva.
- Correct gently if there are any errors.
- Be respectful of each other and be nice.
- Never engage in personal attacks.
- Never fail to listen to what others are saying.
- Never jump to conclusions.
- Never resist being gently corrected.
- Never interrupt.
- Never pontificate.
- Never judge other's opinions and always practice with grace.

Executive Director Moscone mentioned that underneath all of this strategic focus is a focus on equity which the Agency has been a pioneer in throughout the state government and among other arts agencies throughout the country.

Working from the foundation of racial equity, we are building our competency and commitment to building enthusiasm and access and beyond that we continue to examine the geographic fact that this is so important to ensure that we meet everyone where they are at. Equity does not happen overnight nor does it happen in a vacuum. It is intersectional. It is everywhere and there is no end to the journey.

This is the journey, and a creative sector can work towards an equitable California and better than anyone because our sector is just that. I wonder if any members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Disability Inclusion and Access would want to add anything to my thoughts on equity. I offer this to Olivia or Ellen.

Council Member Raynor spoke: I am very pleased that the Council has decided to advance an Ad Hoc Committee on this topic. Our intent is to further the Council's work on addressing equity and to ensure that work becomes a part of all equity conversations, policies, and guidelines.

Some of our activities will include looking at needs of parties with disabilities, working to increase the acceptability of all Council activities, and work in deep collaboration with

the disability community to examine equity and opportunities for all Californians with disabilities.

Council Member Gavin added that it would be wonderful to have some feedback and interactions with disabled artists. We will be dedicating some time to this at Council meetings.

Also, we all need training in that regard. It would be wonderful to have experts in the areas inform us.

## **5. Council/Committee Meeting Calendar & Creative Economy Workgroup Discussion**

Executive Director Moscone continued: We are going to talk about the calendar that was in the Council Book.

We have learned a lot about not being able to have conversations early enough among Committees that are supported by the Bagley-Keene Act. This has been a struggle for us. On the screen you see highlights of things that will help us deal with these restrictions.

Executive Director Moscone covered events and/or anticipated activities pertaining to the Council Calendar.

## **6. Voting Item: Minutes from Previous Council Meetings**

Acting Chair Estrada mentioned that wherever in the minutes that the word “Chelo” was written that it be changed to “Consuelo”. This was noted on the record.

**MOTION:** Council Member Duarte moved approval of the April 28, 2023 (Stockton) CAC Meeting Minutes; seconded by Council Member Messina Captor.

**VOTE:** Yes: Vice Chair Estrada, Council Members Clarke, Duarte, Goodwin, and Messina Captor.

No: None.

Abstain: Council Member Gavin and Council Member Raynor.

The April 28, 2023 (Stockton) CAC Meeting Minutes were approved.

**MOTION:** Council Member Gavin moved approval of the June 14, 2023 (Los Angeles) Open Executive Committee Meeting Minutes; seconded by Council Member Goodwin.

**VOTE:** Yes: Vice Chair Estrada, Council Members Clarke, Duarte, Gavin, Goodwin, Messina Captor, Raynor.

No: None.

Abstain: None.

The June 14, 2023 (Los Angeles) Open Executive Committee Meeting Minutes were approved.

**MOTION:** Council Member Goodwin moved approval of the July 31, 2023 (Virtual) Open Strategic Framework Committee Meeting Minutes; seconded by Council Member Raynor.

**VOTE:** Yes: Vice Chair Estrada, Council Members Clarke, Duarte, Goodwin, and Raynor.

No: None.

Abstain: Council Members Gavin and Messina Captor.

The July 31, 2023 (Virtual) Open Strategic Framework Committee Meeting Minutes were approved.

## **7. General Public Comment**

Acting Chair Estrada explained the procedure, the purpose and prohibitions for making Public Comment at CAC meetings. Artemio Armenta explained the process and provided specific instructions.

### **Live public comment:**

Julie Baker commented: I am the CEO for Californians for the Arts or CFTA. CFTA just completed a series of four convenings around the state entitled, Adapting in Crisis Toward a Resilient Performing Art Sector.

We recognize that the non-profit performing arts is not rebounding to pre-pandemic numbers, and this should be a deep concern for every community in California as live arts drive local economies, create jobs and bring meaning and joy.

We just summarized what we have heard and learned with an eye towards public policy solutions. One of those is the California Non-Profit Performing Arts Paymaster, a program of Californians for the arts with paymaster services provided by Austin Creative Alliance. This activity is supported, in part, by a grant from the California Arts Council.

Finally, for those that are disappointed that your grant did not score high enough to receive funding, note that this is due to the increased demand for funding without an increase to the agency's budget appropriation.

Marie Acosta addressed the Council: I have noticed that 30 minutes have been allocated for Public Comment for general CAC comments. I would like to suggest that if you do not have any more comments that time be moved to comments on voting items where there may be greater interest.

Amy Kitchener gave public comment: I am Amy Kitchener, Executive Director of the Alliance for California Traditional Arts and a folklorist. We are a statewide organization serving culture bearers to communities.

I would like to thank the Council for their historic allocations of one million dollars for the Folk and Traditional Arts programs.

We are the inaugural AO for this area. Next week the Board will approve the recommended 98 grants totaling \$850,000. We have received 343 applications from a broad geography. We have a total of over three million dollars in requests.

We have grants to a wide variety of cultural groups and artists in the community of Kings County. We are only able to fund 28 percent of the applicants this time, which we consider quite low. Over 80 percent of our proposals were suitable for funding.

We urge you to continue to grow the pool of funding for the folk and traditional arts. We are humbled to take these grants from the CAC.

Lilia Gonzales-Chavez addressed the Council: It is so nice to have you here in the Central Valley. I am the Deputy Director of the Fresno Arts Council and we are your state and local partner.

We do not get lots of grants in this area. This is not because we do not have talented artists but because the competition is great across the state. I am here to say that we need to look at providing services to our communities.

When we lost our Arts in Corrections grants, 20 artists who relied on these monies for their livelihoods lost those resources. When our teaching artists cannot compete with credentialed artists we ask you to work with us so that we can get waivers so that teaching artists can work as professional artists and not as instructional aides.

**Written public comment submissions:**

- Anonymous, Orange County  
RE: Agenda Item 9. VOTING ITEM: 2023 Grants

I would like to address two items related to California Arts Council grant opportunities.



First, I wanted to draw to the Council's attention that the new requirement for CAC grantees to obtain a UEI number has disproportionately disadvantaged small arts organizations that do not have physical office space. Many small arts organizations have volunteer or paid staff that work from homes. A UEI requires a physical business address that is not a P.O. Box and not a virtual/co-working office. For safety reasons, we do not have our staff list personal home addresses since we specifically address social injustices as part of our work which, sadly, attracts hateful rhetoric and even death threats. I urge the CAC to immediately remove this requirement, especially as the Council votes to determine grant recipients—some of whom are entirely unable to obtain a UEI unless they formally and publicly register their home address. It is dangerous and only advantages multimillion dollar arts orgs who can afford physical office space.

Second, I urge the CAC to approve the staff's Recommended Scenario for Arts & Cultural Organizations General Operating Support (GEN) 2023 to allow as many small nonprofits—many of whom are still extremely vulnerable in a post-COVID world--some financial support. The Alternative Scenarios impact small nonprofits most severely when they are in need of the most support.

Thank you for your consideration. The work you do and the decision you make truly impacts lives.

- Jeffrey Derus (He/Him/His), Choral Arts Initiative, Orange County  
RE: Agenda Item 9. VOTING ITEM: 2023 Grants

As Board Chair of Choral Arts Initiative, I have seen the amazing work accomplished by this (Tier I) organization. I urge you to heed the CAC's request to provide more funding to the most vulnerable non-profits. We need the support to keep on making great strides in our community of artists. Thank you for your time and consideration.

- Anonymous (She/Her/Hers), Orange County  
RE: Agenda Item 9. VOTING ITEM: 2023 Grants

I am submitting a public comment to the CAC council urging them to heed the CAC staff's advice by approving the Arts & Cultural Organizations General Operating Support (GEN) 2023 Recommended Scenario to help the most vulnerable nonprofit arts orgs in our state and NOT approve the Alternate Scenario 1 (which favors Tier 2 orgs) or Alternate Scenario 2 (which favors the wealthiest Tier 3 orgs).

- Genie Hossain (She/Her/Hers), Choral Arts Initiative, Orange County  
RE: Agenda Item 9. VOTING ITEM: 2023 Grants

On behalf of my friends and colleagues of Choral Arts Initiative, I urge the council to heed the advice of the Arts & Cultural Organizations General Operating Support (GEN) 2023 Recommended Scenario to help the most vulnerable nonprofit arts orgs in our state and NOT approve the Alternate Scenario 1 or Alternate Scenario 2.

I humbly ask that you revise the allocation to prioritize more funding to Tier 1 organizations.

- Bonnie Pridonoff (She/Her/Hers), Choral Arts Initiative, Orange County  
RE: Agenda Item 9. VOTING ITEM: 2023 Grants

Please approve the CAC Arts and Cultural Organizations General Operating Support GEN 2023 Recommended Scenario to help the most vulnerable organizations. Thank you for your consideration.

- Anonymous  
RE: Agenda Item 9. VOTING ITEM: 2023 Grants

I urge the CAC council to please heed the CAC staff's recommendation to approve the Arts & Cultural Organizations General Operating Support 2023 recommended scenario. Tier 1 organizations desperately need the assistance to survive during this period of rising costs. Thank you.

- Lorraine Welling (She/Her/Hers), Choral Arts Initiative, Orange County  
RE: Agenda Item 9. VOTING ITEM: 2023 Grants

Please heed the advice and recommendations of the CAC council staff and approve 2023 recommended scenario for the Arts and Cultural Organizations General Operating Support to help the most vulnerable non-profit arts organizations in our state (Tier 1). Please do NOT approve Alternate Scenario 1 that favors Tier 2 organizations or Alternate Scenario 2 that favors the wealthiest Tier 3 organizations. Grant the money to those who need it the most. Thank you.

- Katue Lorge Murawka (She/Her/Hers), The Clare Rose Foundation Center for Creative Youth Development, San Diego County  
RE: Agenda Item 9. VOTING ITEM: 2023 Grants

This comment expresses disappointment in the panel recommendation that the San Diego Creative Youth Development Network (SDCYDN) receive no funding through the 2023 SRN program. I'm concerned that after 3 years of sustained, and annually increased, funding from the SRN program, the SDCYDN has abruptly received a low panel score resulting in a total revocation of funding. In my mind, this drastic change points to an uncommunicated shift in process or priorities at the CAC that was not clear to applicants. The SDCYDN has been a recipient of SRN funding every year this grant has been available, and is a true representation of the CAC's definition of a Network: an association with common interests, visions or organizational missions that work together to strengthen the collective group. The SDCYDN relies on SRN funding, because as a close partner to San Diego-based CYD organizations, the Network has committed to not pursue funding from sources that they are eligible to apply for. The introduction of the SRN grant made new funding for SDCYDN's work available and has provided critical

capacity that has allowed the Network to expand its support for the field of CYD in San Diego and deepen our collective impact. With ongoing support from the CAC, the Network has been able to hire its first Director, and reach the precipice of building the full capacity needed to serve our Network. With SRN funding abruptly taken away, the capacity we've worked together to build is now in jeopardy.

- Merryl Goldberg (She/Her/Hers), California State University San Marcos, San Diego County  
RE: Agenda Item 9. VOTING ITEM: 2023 Grants

For several years prior to this year, California State University San Marcos (CSUSM) was the fiscal agent for the San Diego Creative Youth Development Network in its application for CAC funds for Network/Regional grants. I have been the supporting Professor and PI from the University. The SDCYDN is an essential and vibrant coalition in San Diego, and CSUSM has been committed to supporting its work.

SRN grant funds have contributed to overall capacity for the Network by supporting new leadership opportunities, supporting the Network. After 3 years of sustained, and annually increased, funding from the SRN program, the SDCYDN has abruptly received a low panel score resulting in a total revocation of funding. The SDCYDN has been a recipient of SRN funding every year this grant has been available. The SDCYDN relies on SRN funding, because as a close partner to San Diego-based CYD organizations, the Network has committed to not pursue funding from sources that they are eligible to apply for that network organizations may access. With ongoing support from the CAC, the Network has been able to hire its first Director, and reach the precipice of building the full capacity needed to serve our Network. With SRN funding abruptly taken away, the capacity we've worked together to build is now in jeopardy. I sincerely hope for our region, that the CAC revisit this rating and decision.

- Kenny Key (He/Him/His), San Diego Creative Youth Network, San Diego County

Hello, my name is Kenny Key and I would first like to express my deepest regret that the San Diego Creative Youth Network will not be receiving the much needed funds to continue doing good work in the community. It is a very unfortunate and discouraging matter when funding is pulled or not renewed for organizations like this. They are making such a Big Impact on our community supporting and building up marginalized and underserved Non-Profits like the High Steppers Drill Team Inc., Game Face Video SD, Royal Push...

We would like to take this opportunity to Advocate the reconsideration of the denial to fund the San Diego Creative Youth Network? Please take the time to re-evaluate the low score given. In my opinion, it makes no sense?? They have received funds for 3 straight years for a reason??-----They're doing the work and need more help to continue that good work??

The CAC grant has literally kept the doors open for organizations like this through COVID all the way up to today!

Again, we need the support and the existence of this organization in our community. We are asking that you support them to be a healthy tree in our CYD forest? Thank you and God Bless!

Sincerely,  
Kenny Key  
(Founder/Dir Game Face Video SD)  
(Steering Committee Member SDCYN)  
[www.GameFaceServices.com](http://www.GameFaceServices.com)

- Catherine Corral (She/Her/Hers), transcDANCE Youth Arts Project, San Diego County

I have learned that the San Diego Creative Youth Development Network has not been funded this round, as they have for the last several previous years. This is hugely disappointing to find out and will negatively impact our collective work to continue to build toward our field goals. I have been involved in the SDCYD Network since its inception and it has been instrumental to my role as a leader (Executive Director), our CYD organization, and our field locally. It has been a source of connection to other leaders and practitioners, provided professional development to me and our team members, supported our collective advocacy efforts. Our momentum is just peaking with an updated strategic plan and critical plans in place for the upcoming year. Please reconsider this funding ranking and decision. The San Diego CYD field relies on the Network and the loss of funds will be incredibly damaging to all involved.

- Shayla James (She/Her/Hers), San Diego Creative Youth Development Network, San Diego County  
RE: Agenda Item 9. VOTING ITEM: 2023 Grants

I am the Director of the San Diego Creative Youth Development Network (SDCYDN). I am disappointed to see that SDCYDN was not recommended for funding through the SRN grant for 2023 due to our panel score being outside of the funding range. We have received the grant 3 years in a row with higher scores and funding each time. We know that doesn't mean we will automatically receive funding. However, our scores have historically been high, so we were surprised that our score was ranked so low this year. SDCYDN has been a consistent advocate and convener for the CYD field for over 5 years. SDCYDN has a variety of members who are in the CYD field, arts and culture sector, and cross-sector areas—mental health, higher education, government, and more. I was excited to see that the CAC launched the SRN grant because SDCYDN has made a commitment to its members not to go after funding that would be in direct competition with CYD organizations. This narrows the funding opportunities available to SDCYDN, so we have applied for the SRN grant because it is the only grant from the CAC that is Network specific. Receiving the SRN grant has meant that we are able to

build leadership capacity and offer more opportunities to members. Without this funding, my position as Director and other leadership roles are at stake. I am seeking to better understand how funding decisions were made in the grant review and recommendation process and if the CAC's goals for the SRN have shifted.

- Patricia Wells (She/Her/Hers), El Teatro de la Tierra, Fresno County

KDA Corps sent out an RFP. They provided Zoom workshops to explain their process. In the Zooms I kept asking how much funding can we ask for? 1/2 of last year's budget? 1/4? In a Zoom with Director Andrea Hansen I asked her again what a small organization such as ours, should feel 'safe' in requesting. I asked if \$50,000 would be acceptable (almost reaching our yearly budget). She encouraged me to ask for \$80,000. I was happy to hear her say that, so I applied for more than our yearly budget. Weeks later I received an email stating the director of KDA would be announcing the 'winners' and later that day we could Zoom in to watch. I immediately called them and the answering machine directed callers to email them instead, so I did, asking them if we had been funded. KDA answered back that no, we were not funded. I wrote back to see if there was an appeals process and what criteria did panelists fulfill to adjudicate the proposals. They answered that they are not required to provide that information. There were no panel comments or reasons why the proposal did not qualify for funding, at all. If I had not emailed them I would not have known because they do not answer the phone. We have received funding from the CAC, ACTA, Cal Endow, Fresno Arts Council, for over 40 years, and most recently our Director Agustín Lira was a Legacy Recipient; yet we qualified for zero funds.

- Denise Montgomery (She/Her/Hers), CultureThrive, San Diego County  
RE: Agenda Item 9. VOTING ITEM: 2023 Grants

I am writing to express support for funding the San Diego CYD Network, which has been recommended for zero funding. CAC has funded the San Diego CYD Network for the past 3 years.

The regional networks grant program of CAC is an important source of funding and also imprimatur for networks. The San Diego CYD Network provides important and unduplicated infrastructure for San Diego creative youth development organizations.

At the exact moment when federal pandemic relief funds are going away and when youth are experiencing an ongoing mental health crisis, investment in support FOR creative youth development organizations is essential. We know that practitioners and direct service providers cannot do their work if they do not have the support they need, such as high-quality professional development, a sustained peer network of support, and connection to one another and to applied research and other resources.

I encourage you to revisit funding for the San Diego CYD Network. Additionally, it would be helpful to have information about the rationale for the low panel score for the San Diego CYD Network. Thank you.

- John Highkin (He/Him/His), Fern Street Community, San Diego County  
RE: Agenda Item 8. Programs Staff Presentations, 9. VOTING ITEM: 2023 Grants

I am again disappointed by the continued limitations on funding for mid-sized organizations in General Support grant. I recommend funding as many organizations as possible - this connects with the long, artist-friendly model agency that the CAC was for much of its history. Please fund Scenario 2.

- Michael Remson (He/Him/His), San Diego Youth Symphony, San Diego County

As a member of the San Diego Creative Youth Development Network Steering Committee, it was disappointing to learn that after three years of successful grant applications, the network's application did not receive the a score that put it in the range for funding for the upcoming grant period. The Network is one of the few vehicles in the border region that is providing valuable professional development for CYD groups and is serving as a critical hub of information, advocacy, and alignment for CYD work in the region. The loss of this funding, which is matched and provides funding for leadership salaries and youth stipends, will be keenly felt and will force the network to seek funding through other sources, putting it in direct competition with CYD organizations in the area, something it has worked hard not to do. The Network provides important associations for a diverse group of organizations that can come together and achieve far more collectively than they can individually. CAC's support for the last three years has allowed it to hire its first Director, build its internal capacity to serve the Network, and crucially, rebuild the network post-pandemic. Please consider revisiting the panel review process to allow for broader support.

- Leticia Gomez Franco (She/Her/Hers), Balboa Art Conservation Center, San Diego County  
RE: Agenda Item 9. VOTING ITEM: 2023 Grants

Hello, my name is Leticia Gomez Franco and I am the Executive Director of the Balboa Art Conservation Center, or BACC. We are headquartered in San Diego, on Kumeyaay land, and are the ONLY publicly accessible art conservation nonprofit organization in the entire state.

California is home to nearly 4,000 nonprofit and public-facing collecting institutions. These include museums, historical societies, tribal cultural centers, libraries, and community-held collections. Spread throughout the state's 58 counties, their holdings are as diverse as the state's population. Despite this abundance of collecting institutions, and cultural material, BACC is the state's only nonprofit regional conservation center.

BACC counts on programs designed specifically to fund this regional work by nonprofits focused on providing services to the institutions that serve our state's residents and

visitors, programs like the State and Regional Network grant category at CAC. Without this support, we are unable to provide emergency preparedness workshops for collections, workforce development and capacity building programs to our state's collections caretakers in the midst of once in a century hurricane threats, wildfires, and mudslides.

I reiterate my colleagues' frustration at the inequitable distribution process for these funds. The work that our region's nonprofits do on behalf of the state is important and requires the state's financial support. Please reconsider your funding process.

- Maeva (My-EEE-vuh) (She/Her/Hers), Artistically Elevated Design, Los Angeles County

Hello Everyone!

I unintentionally missed this meeting as I was working on something to contribute to the community quilt dedicated to Gloria Molina, which is on display at La Plaza de Cultura y Artes; however, two things:

1. It was so awesome to briefly meet Chelo in person at the ArtsMatter Symposium hosted by LA Promise Fund! Although I don't think she recognized my name when I introduced myself to her, I appreciated her joy when meeting me and I appreciated her being in attendance at the symposium. (Hi Chelo! \*insert highly melanated waving hand emoji\*)

2. This is moreso a public acknowledgement of a shared sentiment: It is becoming increasingly difficult to advocate for a community that doesn't properly support (or respect) your heart, art, wellbeing and/or existence.

- Jennifer Oliver (She/Her/Hers), A Step Beyond, San Diego County

I am writing to express support for funding the San Diego CYD Network, which has been recommended for zero funding.

The regional networks grant program of CAC is an important source of funding for the network for the past three years. The San Diego CYD Network provides important and unduplicated infrastructure for San Diego creative youth development organizations.

As a creative youth development organization, A Step Beyond, we depend on the CYD network for high-quality professional development, a sustained peer network of support, and to connections to applied research and other resources.

I encourage you to revisit funding for the San Diego CYD Network. Additionally, it would be helpful to have information about the rationale for the low panel score for the San Diego CYD Network. Thank you.

## **8. Voting Item: 2023 Grants**

Acting Chair Estrada moved to Item 8 on the agenda. First, I will ask Executive Director Moscone to talk a little bit about the process.

Executive Director Moscone presented the following: We started to have some deep dives into what Robert's Rules of Order mean to us, especially in the voting section. A presentation of procedures and practices adhering to Robert's Rules of Order was discussed among the Council Members.

A question was asked - if the recommended motion needed to be voted on first before a new motion is made?

Executive Director Moscone answered: No, not at all. We will get to that, but – no.

Once a motion is on the table, another member can make another motion and that motion is an amendment. It just means another motion.

You always must have a second in order for the motion to become a discussion item.

Calling for, "the previous question" means it is time to take a vote.

The first half an hour will be a presentation by the Allocations Committee and will also include some information on our 2023 Budget from Ayana Kiburi.

This portion of the conversation is about clarifying questions and we are not debating. Whenever we go to a specific program, if one of the Council Members has a conflict of interest, they must recuse themselves.

After our discussions we will then go to public comment. After public comment we are in the motions section.

Acting Chair Estrada stated that we have six programs that we are looking at.

Council Member Raynor stated that we are going to start by asking Ayana to give us an overview of the landscape of our budget.

Deputy Director Kiburi addressed the Council: I will discuss what our budget looks like. We project our budgets and then we project our allocations and then the budget comes to pass and then we define our way forward with our budget after it is finalized.

Deputy Director Kiburi went over the 2023 Allocations via a slide presentation.

Volatile funds are what we could get but we have no guarantee of receiving them.



Council Member Messina Captor stated that I just want to clarify that it is five million dollars for the administrative, operating of the California Arts Council per year.

Deputy Director Kiburi stated that this is about baseline funding and it might change a little bit from year to year.

Council Member Messina Captor stated that we need a real budget because this is nice but it is not a real budget. It is not detailed. I would like to see a real budget that allocates where all the administrative monies are going. I am still very confused and I feel like I am operating in a vacuum.

Council Member Raynor stated that today's discussion is focused on one piece of this totality of the budget which is the monies which are available with the grants programs. I hear you that at some point the Council would like to see the operating budget of the Council.

Executive Director Moscone stated that at some point we will make that happen.

Council Member Raynor stated that we anticipate that today some of the challenges and gaps in our approach to our panels will surface and where we need to improve and suggestions for adjustments. These will be discussed at subsequent Committee and Council meetings as we make decisions and policies related to future allocations.

Chair Montoya joined the meeting and stated and thanked Vice Chair Estrada for conducting the meeting in her absence. I am proud to be here and this is my hometown area.

Vice Chair Estrada stated that Impact Projects entails collaboration between local arts organizations and community members to develop projects that a community might need. These communities are historically under resourced communities in California.

We received a total of 553 eligible applications. Applicants applied for up to \$25,000. Our Committee recommends that the Council vote to approve funding in the amount of \$8,213,895.00.

Applications ranked 6.0 and above to be funded at 100 percent of the requested amount. There were 59 applications in this category.

Applications ranked from 5.0 to 6.0 received 85 percent of the requested amount. There were 322 applications in this category.

There was a total of 381 grants funded.

Council Member Gavin wanted to know if there was a breakdown geographically of the grants.

Council Member Raynor replied that this is one of the challenges we face.

Vice Chair Estrada added that clearly, we need more of a presence in geographical areas and this is one of our challenges. Geography may come into play when considering the rankings.

Vice Chair Estrada moved on to State-Local Partner Mentorship (SLP-M). This program is intended to support the establishment of a county-designated, local, arts agency in the four counties of Alpine, Glenn, Kings and San Joaquin.

We received two applications, both ranking 6.0. We recommend that the Council vote to award 100 percent of the requested amount, which is \$50,000 to both applicants. These funds will provide support mentorship for these counties.

Executive Director Moscone stated that when Allocations voted in 2023, did it vote for \$100,000 or \$200,000? At the time of voting the ideal would have been to have four. What is the recommendation of the Council about the other \$100,000? What are you recommending about the \$100,000 that is not being used?

Council Member Goodwin stated that it is in the Book that we, the suggestion is to move any excess funds to Folk and Traditional Arts.

Vice Chair Estrada moved on to Statewide and Regional Networks. These are grant programs to provide operations for grantees. This is to provide services that respond to the needs of culturally-specific and geographically-diverse communities.

We received a total of 81 eligible applications. They can apply for up to \$50,000.

So, the recommendation is that the Council vote to award \$1,853,625 for the SRN Program. Applications that are ranked 5.4 to 5.8 are to receive 100 percent of the requested amount. There were 10 applications in this category.

Applicants that are ranked from 4.8 to 5.33 were a total of 33 applications. We recommend that they receive 85 percent of the requested amount.

Council Member Raynor spoke about the item, State-Local Partners. This program calls for cultural development on a local level through a partnership between state and counties in California.

The CAC received the 52 expected applications from the state and local partners (SLPs). SLPs could apply for up to \$75,000 for funding.

The Committee considered two funding scenarios. Both scenarios include \$5,000 for Poetry Out Loud.

The recommended scenario is, the Committee recommends that the amount of \$3,567,599 awarding 94 percent to local funding at 94 percent which would be \$70,800 per county of the requested amount to the SLP applications ranked 6.0. There were nine applications and the 88 percent was at \$66,600 per county of the requested funding to applications ranked 5.0 of which there were 43 applications.

The slightly lower allocation to applications ranked 6.0 will allow for a more even distribution of the available funding across partner organizations.

Alternatively, the Council could vote allocations of \$3,512,999 to the program awarding 100 percent of the requested amount to the SLP applications ranked 6.0 and 85 percent of the requested funding to applicants who are ranked 5.0 which would be 43 applications.

This scenario is consistent with the recommendations that across programs that we more commonly fund, full funding to those applicants that ranked 6.0 and a lower amount to those ranked 5.0. This scenario comes in at \$54,541 under the total allocation amount.

Deputy Director Kiburi chimed in: The amount of money available, \$22,834, 997 is appropriated. That was a mistake on my part. The numbers are correct in the chart.

Overall, our allocations, the amount of money that we have for locals is reduced by 12 percent.

Next we are going to talk about Folk and Traditional Arts Programs. These programs direct resources at the local level by funding one or more events to organizations who have demonstrated a need.

The recommended scenario: we received two eligible Folk and Traditional Arts applications both of which were ranked 5.2 by the panel. While we expected to fund one organization, our grant guidelines stated that the CAC is proposing to serve one AO for this program. However, if it is determined that multiple applicants will meet the requirements of implementing statewide and engagement strategies to priority communities and trusted cultural bearers, the CAC will consider distributing awards to multiple AOs.

We recommend that the Council vote to award \$903,751 for the FTA Program and split the funding equally between the two organizations that scored the same. They will be awarded \$440,437 grants for a two-year program with a similar amount next year pending budget availability.

We also recommend that any of the leftover funds from the 2023 Budget be absorbed by the FTA and distributed evenly between the two applicants.

Council Member Gavin stated that I understood it would be one organization. Was that not clear in the application?

Council Member Raynor replied that I quoted from the guidelines. It was a direct quote from the guidelines. Let me reread: the CAC is proposing to serve one AO for this program. However, if it is determined that multiple applicants will meet the requirements of implementing statewide and engagement strategies to priority communities and trusted cultural bearers, the CAC will consider distributing awards to multiple AOs.

And the only information that we, the Allocation Committee, can go by are the panel's score. The score is 5.2 for both applicants.

The last program that we will review is the Arts & Cultural Organizations General Operating Support. This grant program provides direct funding to arts and cultural organizations in support of their ongoing operations.

We suggest that you keep in mind the grant tiered approach as in the guidelines, the number of applicants per year, the quality of proposals as scored by the panels and how to maximize grant funding to the greatest number in the state.

The Council indicated that we had a three-tier process that I will review. I am also going to make reference that these were considered foundational levels but not necessarily the exact levels.

This is the first year we were opening this up to additional tiers. The grant guidelines stated: Tier 1 organizations with a total revenue are anticipated to receive 55 percent of the funding with 173 possible awards. And those were organizations whose total revenues were less than \$250,000. Tier 2 organizations with a total revenue of \$250,000 to \$1,000,000 were anticipated to receive 25 percent with 79 anticipated awards. And Tier 3 with a total revenue of \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000 were anticipated to receive 20 percent of the award for a total of 63 organizations.

We received 1,116 eligible applications to this program with 720, 65 percent of Tier 1 organizations, 331 or 30 percent from Tier 2 organizations and 65 or 5 percent from Tier 3 organizations.

The three tier organizations based on total revenue size were adjudicated separately so that the applications were compared to those with similar total revenues. Decimal points were considered rather than rounded, whole numbers. This was done with the intent to fund as many organizations as possible.

The Committee considered three scenarios:

The recommended scenario is: We are recommending the funding of \$8,236,130 to a total of 358 organizations.

Tier 1 organizations ranked 4.8 to 6.0 and that represents 291 organizations. Tier 2 organizations ranked 5.33 to 6.0 representing 57 organizations or 16 percent of the programs allocation. And Tier 3 organizations ranked 5.33 to 6.0 are 10 organizations or 3 percent of the program.

So, the next scenario that we considered focused on trying to evenly support the three tiers based on a percentage of those who applied and taking into consideration the guidelines.

In this scenario, Tier 1 organizations ranked 5.2 to 6.0, 183 to be funded which would be 52 percent of the program allocations. Tier 2 organizations ranked 4.8 to 6.0, 153 organizations representing 43 percent of the program allocations and Tier 3 organizations ranked 5.2 to 6.0, 65 organizations or 5 percent of the program allocations. This scenario focused on trying to more evenly distribute the three tiers based on percentages of those who applied.

In Alternate Scenario 2 we are recommending funding at \$8, 232,550 to a total of 320 organizations broken down as follows: Tier 1 organizations ranked 5.2 to 6.0 would receive 57 percent of the program allocations, Tier 2 organizations ranked 5.2 to 6.0 would receive 26 percent of the program allocations, and Tier 3 organizations ranked 4.2 to 6.0 would receive 17 percent of the program allocations.

Tier 1 organizations consisted of 183 grantees, Tier 2 organizations consisted of 83 grantees, and Tier 3 organizations consisted of 54 grantees for a total of 320 organizations.

This scenario most closely approximates the percent of funding to be allocated to each tier of applicants as initially proposed in our grant guidelines. This award would fund 83 percent of those who applied to Tier 3 and 25 percent of those applied to Tier1 and Tier 2.

This is now a two-year program with grantees receiving the same amount of funding as in year one pending budget availability.

This concludes our presentation of the funding allocations. We can discuss clarifying questions now. The Council discussed a number of clarifying issues leading up to Public Comment.

## **Public Comment**

Sara Doter addressed the Council: I am a member of the Leadership Team for the Coalition of County Arts Councils, and I am speaking on behalf of the many SLPs who are not able to be here today.

County arts agencies appreciate the CAC's ongoing support of the state and local partnerships grant programs found in the voting items today. Our conversations with the

coalition members support the Allocations Committee first recommendation of a more equitable funding scenario.

We would like to thank Executive Director Moscone for the extensive travel throughout the state to meet and become familiar with the many and diverse arts communities throughout the state of California.

Lilia Gonsales-Chavez gave public comment: The funds being put forward today by the CAC are greatly appreciated, however, funding does create challenges for smaller organizations.

If the mentorship funds are going away, then at what point will those funds be available once again? We desperately need a state and local partner.

Mercy Herrera spoke: I am the president of a small arts organization in California. I appreciate the discussion on the three different scenarios. And the one recommended is more favorable to organizations that make under \$250,000.

In Tulare and Kings County we do not have as much funding as others. We would like you to consider the First Scenario. Thank you.

Trevor Davis was recognized: I am representing REACH for Community which is a non-profit organization that is dedicated to the mission to articulate and advance the field of arts-based social work to create healthy and empowered thriving communities nationwide.

I want to thank the CAC for recommending REACH for funding to support professional development and online networking opportunities for emerging artists and arts administrators throughout California.

It is essential that this sort of funding exists to be able to help our field to thrive, especially given the recent years.

If awarded, this will be REACH's first CAC grant. We appreciate your support, and this funding will also help to give us the resources to further develop REACH's Board so we can build the infrastructure necessary to grow the company and be an impact in these coming years.

David Mack commented: I am speaking to you from Oakland, California. I am the Executive Director of Artist Magnet Justice Alliance, a nonprofit based here in the Bay Area that serves emerging artists and arts administrators throughout the state, advocacy and financial support.

I want to thank the panelists and the Allocations Committee for recommending our organization for funding this cycle. The project that is being funded will support L.A.

U.S.D. School, Audubon Middle School in South Los Angeles. We are networking with teaching artists to bring dance to in-school and after-school programming.

One reflection on the application process is that there were a lot of equity questions this year that were very similar to each other. It was very time consuming and we recommend that for the next application cycle all those questions could be consolidated into one equity question or better yet, equity could be integrated throughout the application so that it is not seen as an add-on but really integral to the values of you as the funder and also us as the grantees as part of the competitive process.

Marie Acosta addressed the Council: I have been in the field for 40 years as an artist administrator and I am a member of the Tongva Tribe of Native Americans and a legacy artist.

I want to remind the Council that in the April, 2023 meeting the Council passed a proposal to fund general operating grants with percentages that are no longer reflected in today's staff recommended proposal.

Our work participation in the field has been ignored. How does this happen? I and others have the distinct impression that the CAC lacks consistency and cannot be trusted to listen and act on hundreds of voices in the field including votes taken and then challenged.

We as arts producing organizations want to work with you to improve access and increase artistic work in California but after we spent hours of volunteer time providing input, we are ignored.

The CAC's reputation is barely climbing out of a deficit in trust among the artists of California. I personally feel disrespected and in an unsafe space by this agency after I and others spent weeks, indeed months, encouraging organizations to apply to general operating with the changes that were made in April.

These organizations are reflective of our diverse communities, most of who have been historically under resourced and represent organizations that the CAC in the 90s committed to support and grow.

If you renege on this previous vote it further erodes trust in the agency. I ask that you consider the many ripples that you will create negative to the agency. I urge you to follow the spirit with which the previous vote was taken and passed by the majority of Council Members.

Strengthen and support creativity among organizations that have historically made California a vital art creating state.

Shayla James spoke: I am calling from San Diego. I am the Director of the San Diego Creative Youths Development Network or the Network. I am disappointed to see that

the Network is not recommended for funding through the statewide and regional networks grant for 2023 due to our panel's score being outside of the funding range.

We have received the grant three years in a row with higher scores in funding each time. Our scores have historically been high so were surprised that our score ranked so low this year.

The Network has been a consistent advocate and convener for the CYD field for over five years. The Network has a variety of members who are in the CYD field, arts and culture sector, and who are in cross sector areas such as mental health, higher education, and government.

I was excited to see that the CAC launched the SRN grant because it was Network specific. Our Network has made a commitment to its members not to go after funding that would be in direct competition with CYD organizations.

We applied to this SRN grant because it is the only grant from the CAC that focuses on networks. Receiving the SRN grant means that we are able to build leadership capacity and offer more opportunities for our members. Without this funding my position as Director and other leadership roles are at stake.

Additionally, I am on the board for the San Diego Regional Arts and Culture Coalition, another San Diego-based network. I am even more disappointed to see that they have not been recommended for funding as well.

I am seeking to better understand how funding decisions were made in the grant review and recommendation process if the CAC's goals for the SRN grant have shifted.

Felicia Shaw commented: I am the Executive Director of the San Diego Regional Arts and Culture Coalition also known as SDRACC. Established in 1989, SDRACC has a long history of serving San Diego's creative community as the region's primary advocate for the arts.

So when the CAC established the state and regional network grant category, we were thrilled that arts services organizations like ours finally had a dedicated funding source to support our unique work.

SDRACC applications received high ranks and consistent funding enabling us to grow and serve more artists throughout our region.

We are disappointed that SDRACC will not be a partner this year and only one San Diego organization was recommended for funding in the SRN category.

So, I leave you with four recommendations. First, prioritize organizations for funding whose missions and fulltime work align with SRN goals over those who primarily work in other spaces. Two, enable panelists to convene and gain perspectives of each other



before submitting final ranks. Also, recruit panelists with specific arts service experience. Increase overall funding for the SRN category so that everyone can receive some support. And finally, grant SRN funding throughout the state more equitably so all regions can benefit.

Katie Lorge Murawka spoke: I am based in San Diego. I am the Director of the Clare Rose Foundation Center for Creative Youth Development which serves as the backbone organization and fiscal sponsor for the San Diego Creative Youth Development Network.

I join with my colleague Shayla in disappointment in the panel recommendations for the Statewide and Regional Networks Program, particularly the recommendation that the San Diego CYD Network receive no funding through the 2023 SRN Program.

I am honestly shocked that after three years of sustained and annually increasing funding from the SRN Program, the San Diego CYD Network has abruptly received a low panel score resulting in a total revocation of our funding.

While I know that funding is never guaranteed, in my mind this drastic change points to an uncommunicated shift in process or priorities at the CAC that was not clear to applicants.

And given the earlier questions and discussions from Council membership and staff about the percentage of established versus new networks applying for and receiving SRN funding, I would encourage the Council to reconsider how the SRN grants have been allocated for this cycle.

The San Diego CYD Network is a quintessential and true representation of the CAC's definition of a network which is a group or organizations with common interests, visions or organizational missions that work together to strengthen the collective group.

When the SRN Program was introduced three years ago it was a game changer for coalitions whose primary mission in organizing and activating networks. And in reviewing the panel recommendations for the 2023 cycle, I fear that the CAC's dedicated funding for this type of work is in jeopardy.

David Hunt-Prescott was recognized: I am with the Prescott Circus Theater calling in from Oakland. I want to thank the CAC for all of your work.

We serve over 400 low-income children and communities through engaged community and school-based circus and theater arts education programs. We have been receiving support from the California Arts Council for many years and this made it possible for us to grow over the years.

I am calling to advocate to fund as many programs as you possibly can. We have been on the receiving end of high scores as well as low scores over the years.

And this is an unprecedented opportunity to help fortify so many arts organizations around the state at a time when we have seen post-covid funding drying up slowly. Corporations are funding less and less.

Prescott Circus was forced to choose between a reduction of services, push overly taxed employees, holding artists in a status of struggle with the funding and pay scales or decide that this work, especially for midsized, right in between small and large – is simply not viable anymore in this economy.

This two-year funding will really make a difference for so many. I always advocate to spread it out as much as possible. It is not only the reputation of getting CAC funding support for all of us, it is a stamp of support, but every little bit helps.

Chair Montoya stated that we are looking to voting on each item. Before each item we will call for a conflict of interest.

Executive Director Moscone interjected: I think we talked it through before you came. I think what you do is you call for the motion, and then conflict of interest and then discussion in which amendments can be made and an amendment to an amendment.

Chair Montoya continued: Okay then, I am going to open up Impact Projects. Do I have a motion from the Council on the recommendation for Impact Projects?

Do any Council Members want to say if they have a conflict of interest with any grantees in the Impact Projects? (No Council Members had a conflict of interest)

## **Discussion**

Chair Montoya shared some comments from applicants that were directed at the guidelines for consideration. We developed the guidelines to allow as many people as possible to be considered. It appears that some of the language may have excluded people or organizations due to what can be considered minor or major formalities, depending on how you look at it.

Our words matter as policy makers, so we need to keep that in mind going forward.

Executive Director Moscone added: Can I just confirm that what you mean is eligibility but not applications. It is about being considered, so eligible.

Director of Public Affairs Armenta read the motion into the record: The motion is to approve awards for the 2023 Impact Projects Grant Program applicants put forth by the Allocation Committee as outlined in the Allocations memo specifically funded in the amount of \$8,213,895 awarding 100 percent of the requested amount to Impact applications ranked 6.0, 59 applications, and 85 percent of the requested funding amount to applications ranked 5.0, 322 applications.

**MOTION:** To approve awards for the 2023 Impact Projects grant program applicants put forth by the Allocations Committee as outlined in the Allocations memo Recommended Scenario, specifically: funding in the amount of \$8,213,895, awarding 100% of the requested amount to Impact applications ranked 6 (59 applications), and 85% of the requested funding amount to applications ranked 5 (322 applications).

Council Member Raynor moved; seconded by Vice Chair Estrada.

**VOTE:** Yes: Chair Montoya, Vice Chair Estrada, Council Members Clarke, Duarte, Gavin, Goodwin, Messina Captor, and Raynor.

No: None.

Abstain: None

Council Member Raynor read the following into the record: The Committee recommends that Council vote to approve funding in the amount of \$8,213,875 with applications ranked 6.0 be funded at 100 percent of the requested amount and applications ranked 5.0 at 85 percent of the requested amount for a total of 381 grants funded.

Chair Montoya continued: The next item we are voting on is the State and Local Partner Mentorship Program.

Vice Chair Estrada stated: The recommendation is to approve the recommendation of the Committee. That Council vote to award 100 percent of the requested amount, \$50,000 to both applications using the \$100,000 allocated to the program.

These funds will provide mentorship in the San Joaquin County and continue the SLP mentorship in Alpine County. So that is the motion.

After some discussions among Council Members, Vice Chair Estrada stated: I will modify the motion to add that the remaining funds would be allocated to Folk and Traditional Arts, what's leftover.

Chair Montoya interjected: Let me just ask for motion. The question of conflict of interest was posed to Council Members. (No conflict of interest was voiced)

Discussion

Council Member Goodwin shared that right here we had a small organization working very hard who had a flood and could not submit an application. Is there something we can do at this point?

Chair Montoya answered that this is a question that should probably be directed to staff.

This grant program originated with the intention to cover California's 58 counties of which four have not had a representative of state and local partner designated. And we established the Mentorship Program to cover these gaps. There are two counties that are still not covered.

Council Member Goodwin restated: Today we learned that because of the flood and the small organization and the transition in the executive director; all of things that are critical to our local partners they did not submit an application. My question is, is there something we can do to support the people who have a valid reason for not being able to move forward, that's all. So, is there any allocated money somewhere else that we can consider?

Council Member Raynor replied that this is all about finding out if we have those parameters. I will turn to Ayana on that of angling if we have additional funds potentially available that we might consider as voting to reopening that particular grant program.

Executive Director Moscone: Just quickly, I am not aware of those parameters. I will pass that baton over to Kristen. There are \$200,000 that have been allocated. So, it is not like we have to find the money from somewhere else. It is there. It is just where that money goes.

Josey Miller, Program Specialist chimed in: The way we structured the guidelines for this program is that it is not the counties that don't have SLPs that are the applicants. They are the mentee counties. So, currently the way the guidelines read, a current state local partner is able to put in applications to mentor a county.

And though we received two eligible applications, one to mentor in San Joaquin County and one to mentor for Alpine County. We did not receive applications to mentor either Kings County or Glenn County. So, that is the way the program is structured right now.

In terms of furthering, so that's what we think we have to vote on this what has been adjudicated in those two applications.

Chair Montoya added that the Council has ideas and a strategy. One could be, can we extend the deadline and make another call within this grant cycle. Is there a timeline by which that would be possible? Are there other strategies that we have seen in the history of the CAC to utilize money on the table?

Josey Miller added: One thing I did want to offer the Council for your consideration is did hear feedback from a number of state local partners that were thinking of putting in an application that the requirement of getting a letter of commitment from the County Administrator's Office was somewhere between a hurdle and a barrier to receive enough applications. So, should Council decide to reopen the program at a later date we may want to consider whether or not to continue to put that as a requirement.

Chair Montoya chimed in: Again, is it possible to extend the deadline to utilize the money that has been allocated for the Mentorship Program at which point when we have the opportunity we may make refinements? Is that possible within the calendar year?

It was added that right now there are two applications on the table to fund.

Executive Director Moscone clarified: I would recommend that we push the hardest voting to the end because if there is a conversation about money would go after that. So we can put all that into a conversation at the end. That is a separate item from the first item which is what is on the table.

Chair Montoya asked: Does anyone want to make an amendment to the motion which is on the table which includes the suggestion to yield the additional resources to Folk and Traditional Arts?

Council Member Raynor stated: I move that we amend the motion and fund the two counties and vote to award 100 percent of the requested amount to those applications with \$100,000 allocated to the program.

Executive Director Moscone stated: I am wondering why we need to make an amendment.

Chair Montoya requested: Okay, so, could you make that amendment once again? You are going to keep a certain paragraph but possibly adjust the second paragraph?

Council Member Raynor replied: The amendment is we award \$50,000 dollars to each of the applicants and for a total of \$100,000 allocated to the program and these funds will provide mentorship to San Joaquin County and Alpine County.

It was added that we took out what happens with the remaining funds.

Executive Director Moscone added: We can discuss that later.

Chair Montoya asked: Okay, is there further discussion on the motion or the amendment to the motion? (No further discussion was voiced). Okay, hearing none, let's call for the vote on the amendment first.

Director of Public Affairs Armenta read the following into the record: So, the motion is to approve the awards for the 2023 State-Local Partner Mentorship Grant Program applicants put forth by the Allocations Committee as outlined in the Allocations Memo recommended scenario specifically funding the amount of \$100,000 award with 100 percent of the requested amount of \$50,000 to both SLP-Ms application ranked 6.

**MOTION:** To approve awards for the 2023 State-Local Partner Mentorship grant program applicants put forth by the Allocations Committee as outlined in the

Allocations memo Recommended Scenario, specifically: funding in the amount of \$100,000, awarding 100% of the requested amount of \$50,000 to both SLP-M applications ranked 6.

Council Member Raynor moved; seconded by Vice Chair Estrada.

**VOTE:** Yes: Chair Montoya, Vice Chair Estrada, Council Members Clarke, Duarte, Gavin, Goodwin, Messina Captor, and Raynor.

No: None.

Abstain: None.

Chair Montoya moved to the next item, Statewide and Regional Networks. May I have a motion for this item?

Vice Chair Estrada moved the following: I will make the motion that the Council recommend or vote in favor of the Committee Recommendation to award \$1,853,624 to the State and Regional Networks Program with the following breakdown, applications ranked 5.4 to 5.8, receive 100 percent of the requested amount and applications ranked 4.8 to 5.33 at 85 percent of the requested amount.

Executive Director Moscone was recognized: As Council discusses and votes on this, I was reminded that in the Federal Regs of February 24, 2023 vote of allocations for this cycle, 2023, the Council voted to reduce the number, the dollars from \$3,000,000 to \$2,000,000. So, what you are seeing today is actually a manifestation of that vote.

And of course, there is the 12 percent that got cut. That is not to sway or anything. That is just information that that vote had happened.

Chair Montoya opened discussion on this item. Hearing none, we will call for the question.

Council Member Clarke noted: I need to recommend that someone there needs to watch the screen so that one of us on Zoom has a question – I have had my hand up several times and it has been missed.

The second thing is, you are having a lively discussion there at the live meeting and I am catching about 30 percent of it because more than one person is talking at a time which is making it very difficult to follow and to participate in the discussions.

Council Member Messina Captor added: I second that.

Chair Montoya replied: So, I will pay more attention to the virtual as well and I will ask staff to back me up. With that, if there are no further comments on this item from anyone online or in-person, I call for the question again.

Director of Public Affairs Armenta read the following into the record: The motion is to approve the award for the 2023 Statewide and Regional Networks Grant Program applicants put forth by the Allocations Committee, as outlined in the allocations from the recommended scenario specifically funding in the amount of \$1,853,625 awarding 100 percent of the requested amount to SRN applications ranked 5.4 and above and applications get 85 percent of the requested funding amount to applications ranked 4.8 to 5.33 get 33 applications. We will now call for a vote.

**MOTION:** To approve awards for the 2023 Statewide and Regional Networks grant program applicants put forth by the Allocations Committee as outlined in the Allocations memo Recommended Scenario, specifically: funding in the amount of \$1,853,625, awarding 100% of the requested amount to SRN applications ranked 5.4 and above (10 applications), and 85% of the requested funding amount to applications ranked 4.8 to 5.33 (33 applications). Vice Chair Estrada moved; seconded by Council Member Raynor.

**VOTE:** Yes: Chair Montoya, Vice Chair Estrada, Council Members Clarke, Duarte, Gavin, Goodwin, Messina Captor, and Raynor.

No: None.

Abstain: None

Chair Montoya announced: We are now moving on to Folks and Traditional Arts (Administering Organization). May I have a motion?

Executive Director Moscone chimed in: I recommend that we put that to the end.

Vice Chair Estrada stated: Oh, we did move it, didn't we?

Executive Director Moscone affirmed: Yes.

Chair Montoya acknowledged and moved on: Okay, let me move on to the State and Local Partners vote. We have a motion to open up discussion?

Council Member Raynor started reading the following: So, the Committee recommends funding in the amount of –

Executive Director Moscone interjected: Sorry, I hate being the stickler, I make a motion to –

Council Member Raynor replied: Oh, I apologize, okay. I make a motion that \$3,567,599 be awarded to this program with 94 percent of the requested amount to the SLP applications, we give to applicants SLPs that ranked 6.0, and 88 percent of the requested funding of applications ranked 5.0.

Chair Montoya acknowledged: Okay, and now let's then call for any conflict of interest. Anyone online?

Executive Director Moscone asked: Who seconded?

Chair Montoya replied: So, Council Member Raynor made the motion, and Vice Chair Estrada seconded. Any conflict of interest in-person?

Council Member Goodwin chimed in: Yeah, I have a question.

Chair Montoya replied: Okay, and then, Gerald, do you have a conflict of interest?

Council Member Clarke responded: No, I have a comment. Should the motion also include the \$5,000 for Poetry Out Loud?

Council Member Raynor answered: No, it's... can I answer?

Chair Montoya continued: We are now in discussion.

Council Member Raynor stated: So, all awardees are inclusive of the \$5,000 for Poetry Out Loud. The funding is inclusive of that money.

Chair Montoya acknowledged: Thank you. Any other discussion on this?

Council Member Goodwin was recognized: So, my question is, we are working in an equitable process. It is amazing, you know, the ranking system. But us splitting, you know, to 88 percent because we are actually hurting a lot of our small people by doing that.

So, what is being more equitable for us to consider like \$68,600 for all of our State and Local Partners. Splitting up the money equally among all of our 50 requests. That would make it \$68,600 each instead of \$70,000 for five of them, \$70,000 for six and then \$66,000 for the rest.

Executive Director Moscone suggested: So, I would recommend you say, I would like to amend this motion by –

Council Member Goodwin replied: Well I would like us to consider amending the motion by equitably distributing the SLP funds among all of our 51 partners raising that total to \$68,606 for everybody.

Chair Montoya acknowledged: Okay, may I have a second to that motion?

Council Member Gavin chimed in: May I ask a question?



Chair Montoya replied: Not yet, we need a second. Anybody online? Okay, seeing none, we will go back to the first original motion. We will open discussions and at this point anybody can make a new amendment.

But to your point, I just want to recap. We already had a reduction of funds because of the 12 percent, correct. And we also had because of the rankings certain SLPs are getting even less than what was allocated.

We know that SLPs are a unique category of grants. They are a, what's the word, consortium? Coalitions? And so, what direction should we go on this particular opportunity?

Council Member Gavin spoke: I remember in our discussions about the SLPs, we really wanted to have accountability to how they were doing with their diversity? We wanted to have accountability to how they were reaching out to smaller groups. We wanted to have a gradation rather than giving everybody the same amount of money.

it's two things at once. We've said, we want them to be more accountable. We want them to really reach out to the small parts of the state and then on the other hand, we said, we want to have every county to be represented.

So, if there are smaller counties that are ranking lower, then that is contradictory. So, did you notice that?

Council Member Goodwin spoke: Will it's tricky because we actually have, you know, to me when I am looking at this, there were about four of them that looked like smaller counties that ranked with a 6.0. And also including where we are right now.

So, I don't want to hurt anybody. I do think at some point we do need to look holistically at what they're saying. I hope we could get past this in our policies as how are we supporting the really small people where we really matter, we are their existence and balance that out for the people that we help that we don't make as much impact for, say, we have state and local partners that have more money than we do that we grant.

So, how do we balance? How do we really know, listen to, and support the state?

An attendee spoke: I would like to share within the guidelines, and so, for the California Art Council decision making, the final authority for grant awards is the appointed council. After receiving and reviewing recommendations from Council Committees the Council will vote on the final funding awards at a public meeting. Awards may differ from requested amounts based on panel rank, available funding, and passage of the state budget.

So, there is some room in there. Usually, just to respect the panel's process, I would recommend that this would be something you will discuss for the next cycle. But, that is what it says in the guidelines.

Council Member Gavin stated: I like the idea of having it be qualitative analysis rather than, here's all the same amount of money. So, I would ask you guys the difference between the 100 percent going to the top tier and then, the first was, 94, But, when you are talking of that, what would be considerations there?

Council Member Raynor answered: In terms of information that we have, we only go by, I mean, how to we decide 88 percent that is. It is a really a matter of –

Council Member Gavin interjected: But you are right. It is also a scenario where it's 100 percent to the top ranked.

Council Member Raynor replied: Correct.

Chair Montoya intervened: One person at a time, to make sure we get everyone.

Council Member Raynor continued: It is a historic recognition that those that ranked 6.0 we tried to give 100 percent or as close to 100 percent as possible. So, that has been a practice and not part of our formal policy, an informal way that the allocations process historically operated.

Chair Montoya chimed in: Okay, so I am going to –

Council Member Gavin interjected: So, was there one less person funded, one less group funded, they got the \$34,000 extra? There wasn't anybody cut out?

Council Member Raynor replied: No.

Chair Montoya chimed in: Okay, so I am going to ask, a point of order real quick. I believe Jonathan stated earlier some of the ground rules for discussion. We want to make sure we encourage one full comment and then we can equally distribute and not go back and forth. And I now want to give Roxanne an opportunity to speak.

Council Member Messina Captor commented: I think we are getting off topic. I hope what we are were trying to do here is vote what the Committee's recommendation is. I think we had the discussion about are the panels the most effective way to look at the grants, the people who apply for grants and is this the most effective way to then have the Committee decide who should be getting these grants.

I think what the public said today was something we need to listen to. I really think that whole process needs to be reevaluated. But we are not going to reevaluate it right his minute. What we need to do now is vote on the recommendation.

Also, I don't think we should be putting in, saying, oh well we are going to open it up for other groups that didn't get into this. This is the close. It has been done. It is closed. They are going to have to apply for another year.

And if we want to make changes to what those grants look like, we will do that for the next grantee cycle. But now we have a set thing. We can't just keep saying, oh because we like this one – no, we can't do that. It is closed. We vote and we move on.

And we can make changes for the future. So, I would like to vote on this whether we are going to accept what the Committee said. And Committee, you did a fabulous job. Thank you.

Chair Montoya asked: Is there anyone else who has not had a moment, an opportunity to comment?

Council Member Goodwin chimed in: Is this the only area where the Allocations Committee did not give 100 percent to a 6.0? I realize we gave 100 percent of the funding request elsewhere.

An attendee answered: Yes, FTA.

Chair Montoya added: Folks and Traditional Art and also getting less than 100 percent because it was split. But in this case, the less than 100 percent has to do with the 12 percent reduction of our funds.

I know this is not a perfect scenario and I have not heard any additional amendments on this item. Any additional points to be made or questions to be asked?

My question is, is this how we have done it in the past in terms of the tiered – please remind me - the percentages, the ranking and reduction of the full grants?

Executive Director Moscone answered: Yes.

Chair Montoya acknowledged: So, this is the traditional. And has every single SLP applied and they're in the pool? So, we now have – okay, so let's proceed with calling for the question on the original motion.

Director of Public Affairs Armenta read the following into the record: So, the recommended scenario or motion is to approve awards from the 2023 State and Local Partners Grant Program applicants that were awarded by the Allocations Committee as outlined in the Allocations Panel recommended scenario specifically funding in the amount of \$3,567,599 awarding 94 percent of the requested amount and SLP applications ranked 6.0 at 88 percent of the requested funding, funding two applications ranked 5.0.

**MOTION:** To approve awards for the 2023 State-Local Partners grant program applicants put forth by the Allocations Committee as outlined in the Allocations memo Recommended Scenario, specifically: funding in the amount of \$3,567,599, awarding 94% (\$70,800 per county) of the requested amount to SLP

applications ranked 6 (nine applications), and 88% (\$66,600 per county) of the requested funding to applications ranked 5 (43 applications).  
Council Member Raynor moved; seconded by Vice Chair Estrada.

**VOTE:** Yes: Chair Montoya, Vice Chair Estrada, Council Members Clarke, Duarte, Gavin, Goodwin, Messina Captor, Raynor.

No: None.

Abstain: None.

Chair Montoya moved to the next item: We will move on to the next item, Gen Ops. And I will ask if my Council a motion for this item.

Executive Director Moscone chimed in: My recommendation is to bring the language up because it is so complicated.

Council Member Raynor asked: Which language are you referring to?

Executive Director Moscone answered: Oh, the recommended, what the scenario looks like because it is a lot of numbers.

Council Member Raynor stated: I make a motion to provide \$8,236,150 for the General Operations Program to a total of 358 organizations broken down as follows, Tier 1 organizations to receive 81 percent of the program allocations, Tier 2 organizations to receive 16 percent of the program allocations and Tier 3 organizations to receive 3 percent of the program allocations. Estrada seconded.

Chair Montoya acknowledged and continued: Thank you. I will ask for any conflict of interest with any of the grantees or perceived conflict of interest. I am going to recuse myself with a perceived conflict of interest, the board that I serve on the Foundation of is in each of the three scenarios to be considered for a grant. I am going to yield my gavel to our Vice Chair Estrada for this very lively discussion, thank you very much. I am going to be outside. (Chair Montoya exited the room)

Discussion

Acting Chair Estrada asked: Is there any discussion on the motion in front of us?

Council Member Gavin was recognized: I have a lot to say about this. The worst thing that we can do is pit small and medium and large organizations against each other. The worst thing we can do is accept the fact that we are number 39 in state funding of the arts. Accept the fact that 66 cents on the dollar for each citizen of California.

So, we get into this fighting with each other or competing with each other for resources. And as a Council Member I want to commit so that all these needs that we have been

hearing we really try to serve. I feel like when small organizations get up and say and say, we need it more than you do. And when we say large, it's not really large.

So, as someone who started an organization of volunteers and who grew it for 25 years so that it is an anchor institution; I know what capital right now is a midsize organization that are larger and/or organizations of color within LGBTQ, disabled, youth – they are dying.

The performance arts organizations are suffering so much, their venues are suffering so much, they are not bringing the artists back. So we decide, at some point we chose now just the smaller organizations for organizational support. And we reject and throw away and ruin 30, 40 years of support in the larger organizations.

Leah and I worked for probably six months on this. And we came up with something that was based on compromise. I wanted to go to 2,000,000 because I look around and and I see way less at a \$2,000,000 organization. I see some of the most Latino theatre center downtown, a \$2,000,000 organization. Each play is \$2,000,000. They are institutions that take so long to build.

And let me tell you, when you get to 10, 20, 30 years, the air is very thin for most cultural organizations. It is hard to survive. And so, when you look and you listen, you say, there are so many more small organizations, small organizations that don't have budget staff, small organizations that are just beginning. It doesn't mean that we should give the majority of support to them. We should be supporting every tier, every level for what they need because a healthy arts organization has bushes and trees and Sequoias and has a forest so that we can learn from each other. My commitment here is going to come back here and talk about, oh it's not quite rural versus cities. Let's not fight north versus south. Let's bring California culture when it was beautiful, vibrant cultures in the world together so that we are cross pollinating.

And I know as having grown an organization from zero to what is now worth probably \$10,000,000 in the Mission District that I learned from my peers. I learned from the next people ahead of me, and the next people ahead of me, and the next people ahead of them. And we have to have that attitude.

I heard last night people talking about the programs entry level, we don't even need a non-profit status to get in. Multicultural advancement, we made it to 10 or 20 years and we helped people keep the building open.

Artists in the communities we had a three-year commitment to do something and in the community and you are not going to have it pulled out from under you and it is a living wage.

Sure, these are things that we have in the past so I am coming from 35 years experience with the CAC and this proposal did not listen to what we said. We were basically promising the field that was in the guidelines. We would give somewhere

around 173 grants to the Tier 1, 79 to Tier 2, and 6 to Tier 3, the larger organizations and we added 30 percent to small organizations. That is crazy.

Large organizations, 63 of them – we are going to get 10. So, I am with Scenario 2. I feel very excited about this. The field that was told, these were the percentages that you are going to be looking at if you take the time and the labor and the energy to apply. We had 200 comments, in-person and written – 200 comments saying expand it out. Why are you cutting off the middle and the slightly larger organizations, why is that happening?

So, once we get into this game of pitting people against each other, we are going to lose. We need to be out there fighting for our \$100,000,000 for the California Arts Council not committing to do nothing.

So, to respect the work that Leah and I did, the listening that we did, the compromising that we did – we need to land right around where we started and that would be Scenario Number 2.

Executive Director Moscone chimed in: So, just in terms of that, if I could. Just in terms of the motion procedure, would you like to make an amendment which would then be named, the –

Council Member Gavin interjected: I would like to amend –

Executive Director Moscone continued: - the scenario that each –  
Council Member Gavin continued speaking: - I would like to amend –

Executive Director Moscone continued: - and then break out –

Council Member Gavin continued concomitantly: - amend the vote for –

Executive Director Moscone continued: - Scenario 2, is everyone –

Council Member Gavin continued stating: - Scenario 2 –

Executive Director Moscone asked: Could you just read that scenario again, so that people can hear it for the record?

Council Member Gavin replied: Okay, so funding 8.23 to 5.50 for a total of 320 organizations broken down as follows, Tier 1, 57 percent of the program allocations, Tier 2, 20 percent of the program allocations, Tier 3, 17 percent of the program allocations.

Acting Chair Estrada acknowledged and asked: Okay, is there a second to the amendment?

Council Member Goodwin chimed in: I second it.

Executive Director Moscone continued: So, Gerald, now this the conversation.

Council Member Clarke stated: I just want to say that I support the recommended scenario and I also want to state that I did not approve of this tiered system anyway. I think if we look at the data from past years compared to today, what is being proposed today, I think a lot of the burden is falling on these small organizations who I believe feel the financial distress of the economy today more so than these larger organizations.

I don't support Alternative Scenario 1 or 2.

Executive Director Moscone chimed and asked: Acting Chair, may I have a point of order?

Acting Chair Estrada replied: You may have a point of order.

Executive Director Moscone stated: The discussion is about the amendment which Gerald did, but just make sure we are talking about whether you support the amendment not whether you want to support the new motion. That makes sense.

Then there can be discussion and a vote on that and that takes us to the main motion. There is also a point of order from Kristen.

Director of Programs Services Margolis commented: So, the amendment can only be made if it is not exclusive of the original motion.

Council Member Gavin asked: They have to be compatible?

Director of Programs Services Margolis replied: Yes.

Executive Director Moscone added: You can change the –

Director of Programs Services Margolis interjected: And that, it can't be a completely different motion I think.

Executive Director Moscone chimed in: Okay, thank you, thank you. Thank you for the gentle correcting, I want to be respectful of that. If I heard what you said, is this correct? That we would then vote on the motion.

Director of Legislative Affairs Margolis agreed: That is correct.

Executive Director Moscone continued: And then if it fails, we go to the Scenario 2. Okay, I apologize. I am really sorry, that was a learning for me. I am looking at Robert's Rules of Order which, regardless –

Executive Director Moscone continued: nodding, I'm behind. So I apologize, we're learning about this process, so I would request that we go back to the main motion, have a discussion, and vote on that and then move on.

Acting Chair Estrada added: And if it fails, then we go on to Alternative 2.

Executive Director Moscone agreed: Yes.

Acting Chair Estrada continued: So, any continuing discussion? On either motion, right?

Executive Director Moscone replied: Well no, we are sticking for now just on the main motion.

Acting Chair Estrada acknowledged: We are back to the main motion.

Executive Director Moscone added: And we have heard from Ellen. And we have heard from Gerald.

Acting Chair Estrada reiterated: We are going back to our main motion, the recommended scenario 1.

Executive Director Moscone chimed in: I think what Gerald is asking is, we vote from the guidelines. And if you look at the guidelines as presented to the field which is what I am looking at; the guidelines specify it focuses on percentages not the numbers because the numbers are vastly different than – 55 percent, 25 percent, and 20 percent, Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3.

In the vote there was an at least attachment, at least 55 percent, approximately the other two. So, they were foundational and approximate. But, let me be clear because I'd be happy to be straightforward about this to Caleb's point to Ellen Gavin's point is, the guidelines to the field have a very clear table. It had a very clear table and it did not have any of that other language.

So, I just want to be mindful of that differential there. Because one is what we discussed and voted for, we still have a council member and I apologize, grants versus what was said to the field. So, I just want to again, name that as a basis for your discussion.

Council Member Gavin chimed in: And just as a point of information, the vote of 10 to 1 in favor of this. That was the vote that was taken in favor of our Program Policy Committee recommendation.

Acting Chair Estrada acknowledged: Okay, so to keep with the protocol let's, if we can go around for any sort of comments, anybody who has not said anything do you have anything to say?



Council Member Duarte commented: What I think, you know, there are many big arts organizations that have social capital, have private funding, have other great resources than small ones. Really have a lifeline of the state and I think that the goal of the state within capitalist systems is to really look out for those with less money, so, I think we understand what the state's program is and what the private sector's role is and we can look at it.

But I don't think we are ready to, I am ready to vote on the recommendation by the Committee.

Acting Chair Estrada continued: If there is no further discussion then –

Executive Director Moscone chimed in: Hold on a second, please. Point of order.

Council Member Raynor chimed in: I want to make sure you are referencing, do we have two motions up or just one?

Executive Director Moscone stated: No, if you declare, I made a mistake by thinking that the second motion that Ellen brought up was an amendment. It is not. It is a separate motion. So, what we have to do is go with the main motion and vote it up or down. If it votes down, then we go to this motion. Does that make sense?

Okay, with whatever motion Ellen wants to bring up. I just think that is the procedural difference and I, again, apologize for my newness in that regard.

Council Member Goodwin chimed in: You have, again, a clarifying question on the Alternative Scenario 2, on Tier 3 it goes down to 4.2 percent. We are talking about this whole thing.

Council Member Raynor stated: You can talk about the whole thing.

Council Member Goodwin continued: Okay, so on the whole thing I am just curious as to why we went down to people that rank at 4.2 in Tier 3 only in this scenario? So, everyone else is at 5.2 in the other tiers.

Acting Chair Estrada responded: To be able to fund more organizations.

Council Member Raynor interjected: No, no.

Executive Director Moscone chimed in: They know it is actually, it is actually percentages. It is the one that most closely matches the percentage breakdown from the guidelines. That is the reason why the adjustment in the scoring happens in order to hit the percentage numbers as stated in the guidelines. So that is the clarity there.

So, the rank out is less important than the percentage number, correct? Did I get that right?

Council Member Goodwin added: It is just that I was going for consistency, like, it was saying that people kind of basically in our, you know, at 4.8 is kind of things like the line item for the rankings to get funding for all of our programs. So, this is just kind of, a different, you know.

Acting Chair Estrada acknowledged: Yes, got it. So, we are –

Council Member Raynor interjected: Wait, I want Leah to finish her thought. What did you mean there?.

Council Member Goodwin answered: I am just wondering why you went for a lower percentage in Tier 3 as a fund for funding recommendations?

Council Member Raynor replied: Again, we have done across the board. So, one of the scenarios was to make the gallant effort to more closely mirror what the guidelines stated. So, it is actually is Scenario 2 that is closest to what we had published.

I do want to also make one other comment that is related to that. In a way I think that the issue that we are having today was foreshadowed in our March meeting where we discussed this and I want to say I understand and respect the amount of time that you all spent trying to come up with the tiers. But at that meeting to quote myself, I actually was not clear on how we are ultimately going to get successfully determining these tiers.

And, you know, as we said, we anticipated at least 55 percent. So, that is a low bar. I think ultimately it may make the allocations of awards a little more complicated because we need to make sure that we are clear that these are not fixed bars.

So, and that's sort where we are which is trying to determine really exclusive, you know, the majority of our grant program are determined on ranks or on decimals, and so there is sort of two issues here. One is, to be respectful of the percentages that we established as a Council. And the second is, to say be respectful of the adjudication process and the panel's process in terms of their thinking, they are then thinking about the rankings of the applicants.

Council Member Gavin commented: One thing that disturbed me is I feel like I was right about two million. and I think one thing is we have not as many applicants at the highest level because the word has spread out, people have been shut off by this operational climate. And I think that's why in fact, you didn't- in your scenario you went down to 4.8 for the smaller group, almost doubled the recommended numbers and not to over 300,778.

In a perfect situation you would have everybody, okay, everybody with a 5.0 was funded, is what we wanted. But, you know, if you, in other words, that factor to bring in is, were the larger groups in general scored in a more difficult way, or a more strenuous way, or a more rigorous way, right, because the fact that we have different panels is also affecting the size, each size has a different panel, right. So, basic complications and I do feel like the simplest thing would be to and also the interaction between the Policy Committee and the Allocations Committee we don't have these conversations. And so, we end up we can create one thing and then they can create something else. At this point, they are at odds.

I think we are doing the best we can. Now what we need to do is refine it and really think about this in a more holistic way. But would still honestly like to see the stats. I don't know the statistics for how many in this cycle organizations are there of color, diverse? How many are there in the state? How are they doing? These are all things that inform what- I am just going by my own personal contacts with a lot of people and what I hear from the field.

Executive Director Moscone chimed in: We don't disagree. I just want to- Ellen, you're almost done and Kristen, she is ready to talk.

Director of Legislative Affairs Margolis commented: No, I just wanted to address one comment you said, just to clarify that each tier was adjudicated separately. Each tier was adjudicated separately just to be clear.

Council Member Raynor chimed in: No, each tier was –

Director of Legislative Affairs Margolis interjected: Yes.

Acting Chair Estrada chimed in: Okay, well at this point, it's clear we need to to work with the original motion on the table for the recommended scenario. So, would you call the vote please.

Executive Director Moscone read the following into the record: We are voting on the recommended motion to approve the awards for the 2023 Arts and Cultural Organizations, General Operating Support of grant applications. Applicants put forth by the Allocations Committee as outlined in the Allocations Memo recommended scenario specifically funding in the amount \$8,236,130 to a full 358 organizations broken down as follows, Tier 1 organizations ranked 4.8 to 6.0, 81 percent of the program allocation, Tier 2 organizations ranked 5.33 to 6.0, 16 percent of the program allocation, and Tier 3 organizations ranked 5.33 to 6.0, 3 percent of the program allocation.

**MOTION:** To approve awards for the 2023 Arts and Cultural Organizations General Operating Support grant program applicants put forth by the Allocations Committee as outlined in the Allocations memo Recommended Scenario, specifically: Funding in the amount of \$8,236,130 to a total of 358 organizations broken down as follows:

- Tier 1 organizations ranked 4.8 – 6 (81% of the program allocation)
- Tier 2 organizations ranked 5.33 – 6 (16% of the program allocation)
- Tier 3 organizations 5.33 – 6 (3% of the program allocation)

Council Member Raynor moved; seconded by Vice Chair Estrada.

**VOTE:** Yes: Acting Chair Estrada, Council Members Clarke, Messina Captor, and Raynor.

No: Council Members Duarte, Gavin, and Goodwin.

Abstain/Recuse: Chair Montoya.

The motion passed with a vote of 4 “Yes” votes and 3 “No” votes.

In response to an inquiry from Council Member Goodwin, Executive Director Moscone responded that there are only seven voting members. So, the majority of the voting members which is seven, voted “Yes.”

Executive Director Moscone suggests that Council discuss the final vote for this Agenda Item after lunch at 2 p.m.

## **9. Art Experience and Lunch**

A lunch break was taken and Chair Montoya joined the meeting.

Chair Montoya continued the meeting: I believe we are on Item 8 still. This is the last vote of the grant opportunities, Folk and Traditional Arts (Administering Organizations). We have to get a point of clarification from staff in terms of the resources available which may impact the numbers that are reflected in the motion.

Let’s now proceed with the voting item. Staff, may I have an update on the numbers for Folk and Traditional Arts?

Staff provided a verbal update to the Council.

Chair Montoya chimed in: Let me formalize the meeting by the establishment of a quorum.

Director of Public Affairs Armenta called the roll and determined that a quorum was present.

Chair Montoya acknowledged: Okay. The staff noted that the remaining amount is \$803,751 if the \$100,000 is removed from the State and Local Partners Mentorship Program.

May I have a motion for the Folk and Traditional Arts Program?

Council Member Raynor stated: I make a motion to take the remaining \$100,000 and place it within the Folk and Traditional Arts allocation. Is that correct?

Chair Montoya replied: That's the allocation for –

Executive Director Moscone chimed in: If we voted on, we voted on the SLP Mentorship at two, right. And then this was a separate issue. So, we start with one motion, right.

Chair Montoya stated: Okay, so we start with this motion. So, may I have a second?

Vice Chair Estrada chimed in: I'll second her.

Executive Director Moscone chimed in: Hold on a second.

An attendee stated: I am wondering if it might be valuable for the Council to see the allocations spreadsheet on the screen again; seeing the right numbers.

Chair Montoya asked: Did we capture the motion?

Director of Public Affairs Armenta stated: Vice Chair Estrada seconded the motion.

Natalie Peeples was recognized: So, from my understanding of what we voted on was to approve the two applicants for SLP-M so the question still remains on the other \$100,000. So, right now as it stands the numbers onscreen are correct- for FTA we have \$903,751, is the question.

Executive Director Moscone added: Which includes \$100,000 –

Natalie Peeples agreed: Yes, correct.

Executive Director Moscone continued: - left over from, not assigned to SLMP –

Natalie Peeples interjected: Right, and –

Executive Director Moscone continued: - because that is what is on the table right there. We are talking about FTA's money.

Natalie Peeples continued: - they fund that triple asterisk at the bottom.

Executive Director Moscone added: So, what I understand then, I'm sorry Chair Montoya but that is right. That's the motion because that includes that money. And then we can discuss an amendment to that motion in relationship.

Chair Montoya replied: She made a different motion. So, we will probably need to vote the motion down because it was seconded. In order to re-explain the motion. So, we are

now open for discussion on this current motion. Is there any discussion? By Council online? Gerald is –

Council Member Raynor interjected: I think I need the motions that we are voting on right now. I thought we already voted on the Folk and Traditional Arts.

Several Council members can be heard shaking their heads and commenting.

Chair Montoya stated: This is what we are doing. So, you did the motion and to Olivia's point, that we repeat the motion.

Executive Director Moscone replied: What we just said.

Chair Montoya clarified: Your motion is what the motion is.

Council Member Raynor repeated: The motion was to award the remaining dollars.

Chair Montoya acknowledged: Okay, and so we are going to have discussion on the motion that you gave. And then we are going to vote to see it passes. If it doesn't, then we will reopen a new motion to correct what we should be voting on.

And I have Gerald who is online, Gerald.

Council Member Clarke spoke: I support moving the \$100,000 from the SLP Mentoring Program over to Folk and Traditional Arts but only if we cannot leave that in the SLP Mentoring Program to kind of re-advertise it to see if we can get those two counties covered.

If we cannot do that, then I support moving it to the Folk and Traditional Arts. But I want to know whether that is possible, to reopen the Mentoring Program.

Chair Montoya acknowledged: Thank you, Gerald. I also echo that.

Director of Legislative Affairs Margolis was recognized: I think staff would need some time to present how that would look like in terms of the timing and how that would be reopened. So, we can present it at the next Council Meeting.

So, if Council decided to leave those funds on the table, that is what I propose. I just want a clarify on the numbers.

An attendee commented: Yes, I just wanted everyone is on the same page with what you are looking at on the screen. This is based on the conditions that Ayanna gave on the budget update for 2023. The yellow column, those are the revised allocations amounts based on what you all approved in your initial allocations.

The second line, State and Local Partner Mentoring, you initially approved \$200,000. That was reduced by 50 percent because we only received the two applications. Every other program, as you see in the header, was reduced by 12 percent across the board. So, an equal reduction across the board for every program based on the initial approved allocations by the Council.

And that gets us to our \$22,875,000. So, that is already taking into account only allocating \$100,000 to State and Local Partners Mentorships. So, when you are looking at this green column to the right, the recommended scenarios which you have approved all of those except for the final one which is FTA; those are based on only allocating \$100,000 to that grant.

Executive Director Moscone was recognized: Just a point of clarification –

Council Member Goodwin chimed in: I have a point of clarification also. Does that mean we don't have money laying around, We do not have money, there is no-

Executive Director Moscone stated: It's in there. It's in this number. It's in the \$903,751. It's already in there.

Council Member Goodwin continued: So, it is already being used.

Executive Director Moscone replied: Well, it hasn't been voted on yet. So, it's not there yet.

An attendee commented: May I come in? The only other adjustment, again between the yellow column and the green column, is when adjusted everything down by 12 percent except for SLPM which is down by 50 percent because we only got two applications, you'll see the only significant disparity in the yellow column and the green column is in Folk and Traditional Arts because there were about \$22,000 left over, just the way the number shook out.

So, the recommendation from the Committee was to put that \$22,000 into what the on the bottom, the triple asterisk, recommended any leftover funds be absorbed in FTA. That is the difference between \$880,000 and \$903,000, is the \$22,000.

Council Member Goodwin stated: And you put that \$22,000 into which?

Executive Director Moscone chimed in: Just one clarification. Just want to keep this, keep us aware that the Folk and Traditional Arts is the rare program, an anomalous program in that two organizations are getting the same amount.

So, it is very different than a bunch of organizations or one organization. So, they have already been, it is already kind of split in half. So, that is something to keep in mind as you consider that.

Chair Montoya continued: Okay, so we have a motion on the table and we need to decide if we want to move it forward. Is there any further discussion? If it does not pass then we will reopen a new motion and perhaps consider are they correct numbers and then we do it all in that motion.

An attendee chimed in: Chair, I'm sorry, my understanding of the motion that has been made, as was made by Olivia is, not the recommended scenario, the recommended scenarios less \$100,000, correct?

Chair Montoya replied: It is to, her motion –

An attendee interjected: I believe that's all that –

Chair Montoya continued: - addresses what to do with the \$100,000 but she wasn't aware that we have not voted on the original allocation first. So, when and if –

An attendee suggested: So, maybe we want to rescind it and resubmit.

Executive Director Moscone added: We can rescind a motion.

Chair Montoya acknowledged: Thank you, point of order. Olivia, do you rescind the motion?

Council Member Raynor replied: I will rescind the motion.

Chair Montoya acknowledged: Okay. The motion is rescinded.

Executive Director Moscone stated: So, we don't have to call.

Chair Montoya responded: We don't have to call for the vote, okay. We called it, bear with us. Allocations is complicated. Every time we move anything it affects everything. May I have a motion on the Folk and Traditional Arts? I need a motion.

Council Member Messina Captor stated: I move that we accept the recommendation of the Committee for the Folk and Traditional Arts and allocate the amount listed here on the graph.

Chair Montoya acknowledged: Okay, so we now have a raised motion. Can we have a second?

Council Member Duarte chimed in: I will second.

Chair Montoya acknowledged: Caleb Duarte. So, Roxanne Messina Captor and Caleb Duarte seconds. And now we are open for discussion.



Executive Director Moscone requested: Can we just ensure that the number was said clearly for the FTA numbers, dollar amount?

Council Member Messina Captor replied: Yes, to \$903,751.

Executive Director Moscone continued: So, we are going to state the motion with that number.

Council Member Messina Captor answered: I will state the same motion but allocate the number being \$903,751.

Chair Montoya chimed in: Okay, continue with discussions.

Council Member Duarte asked: May I, our commitment to the mentorship program is strong, but it is going to be another year or so for the next cycle. So, where we ask for the legality of it, and it's totally possible to open it up for a short period of time like an emergency or something like that?

Kristen, if we get two more strong applicants.

Chair Montoya answered: And we are going to see what is possible with that, yes. And we will find out about that at a later time officially. But we have voted to hold that the allocation that was set for that program.

And the other thing is, we hear you on funding from SLPs and the two- Kings County and Glen, there isn't a guarantee that that would happen for both. We don't know that. So, we would have to be coming with some kind of contingency plan and from that would look like. And I would urge you all to do so now based on the volatility of funds.

Chair Montoya chimed in: I was also going to ask that. I am still formulating how to say that.

Council Member Goodwin stated: I think we need to just say what we are talking about straight up, which is to agree to fund these two organizations. I think because we are already funding the allocation we should also just because we said there is leftover money to put it in the FTA and then let staff work with our state and local partners to see where they can because they may not be able to get put their proposal together that can still be approved by that in a timely manner.

The total would be 903,000, okay, so we're back to \$903,000. But just, I guess for me, my bigger question and bigger concern because you know I'm about sustainability, is here we have an AO who actually spoke with us today who's managing the million who has had more grants than she can already take care of. So, what does that do to all the hard work that happens to them say, okay, great well somebody else ranked us as high as you and now we are going to get half the money and we have already done all this work to grant a million.

So, I really want us to consider the sustainability of another AO that doesn't have all this hard work count for anything. So, in my book it counts for something.

Chair Montoya added: And in our public process they did go through a formal procedure and there is now competition, and it is now completely even. So, it's a total conundrum and on the Policy Committee the guidelines, you know, the language is what we need to refine in order to avoid this in the future.

But at this moment there's not much we can do besides in allocations like is there an ethical way to make that decision. So, how can we say, they were the same all even though our public process. So, it doesn't seem to be an option right now. They went through an equitable process. And that's a conundrum.

Director of Legislative Affairs Margolis stated: I appreciate your comments and we need to respect that. funding the 88 percent and that is significant and it's same thing not being able to often get funds out mainly where we want to to support Kings and Glen there is no easy decision because they are very limited funds. So, this Committee, this Council, is trying to make a very difficult decision.

Executive Director Moscone chimed in: I have a question for the Council. Because of the two-year commitment is there opportunity for Council to have a conversation over the next couple of months to amend something in the second year? Does it have to stay at the same –

An attendee interjected: It has to stay at the same amount.

An attendee added: It would have to stay as a two-year grants so they would get an identical amount. I mean, so that doesn't mean that going forward in 2024 discussions you couldn't decide how to allocate more at a separate rate.

Executive Director Moscone acknowledged: Yes, so like a separate allocation. So, this grant wouldn't change.

An attendee agreed: Correct.

Executive Director Moscone continued: This would still be a split down the middle but then you'd get another thing.

An attendee answered: Right.

Executive Director Moscone asked: Is that what I am hearing?

An attendee replied: Yes.

An attendee commented: The only contingency to be awkward for grantees that were awarded this grant, is that you would get the same amount of money, whatever that was, this next year depending on the budget, not another policy decision.

Executive Director Moscone agreed: Yes, but that is a December conversation.

An attendee added: The council can also just allocate money next year, fiscal year 2024-25.

An attendee chimed in: This is true for SLPs; it gets back to these very difficult decisions. And the other is to point back to the meeting in San Diego, you all had discussed really, really looking at SLPs in general and the amount we are awarding them. So, that is something that I can guess is going to happen starting this policy discussion.

Chair Montoya acknowledged and continued: Okay, so, I am seeing no comments and I want to just ask that we restate the motion just to make sure everyone is on the same page.

Director of Public Affairs Armenta read the following into the record: The motion is to approve awards for the 2023 Folk and Traditional Arts administering organizations Grant Program applicants put forth by the Allocations Committee as outlined in the Allocations Memo recommended scenario specifically funding in the amount of \$903,751 awarding equal funds in the amount of \$451,876 to both eligible applicants ranked at 5.2.

Chair Montoya acknowledged: Okay, and that motion includes the \$100,000 for the SLP Mentorship Program.

Executive Director Moscone clarified: And that is actually – no. That is spread out throughout the agency. It is just spread out throughout all the grants. The only thing it includes is \$22,000, correct?

An attendee agreed: Yes.

Executive Director Moscone added: We just call it, remaining money after everything was set and done. It's kind of a change.

Chair Montoya continued: I would like to make an amendment to the motion to allow any active funds that become available for any tasks, to be allocated to this program.

We are hoping for \$900,000 from the grants of License Plates that we can use in '24-'25. But that will probably happen the next fiscal year. It is not going to happen this fiscal year.

I will ask if there is a second to that motion. Is there a second to the motion?

Executive Director Moscone added: Chair, you proposed an amendment to the motion to allow for excess funds that will become available to be allocated to the Folk and Traditional Arts Program can be used.

Chair Montoya asked: Can we repeat the motion? Okay, well let's move on to the suggestion. Okay, seeing none, it is then back to the original.

We currently have a motion on the table. I am looking for hands online and in-person and I see none. So, I am going to call the question.

Director of Public Affairs Armenta asked: Call for the motion?

Chair Montoya answered: Yes.

**MOTION:** To approve awards for the 2023 Folk and Traditional Arts Administering Organization grant program applicants put forth by the Allocations Committee as outlined in the Allocations memo Recommended Scenario, specifically: funding in the amount of \$903,751, awarding equal funds in the amount of \$451,876 to both eligible applicants ranked at 5.2.  
Council Member Messina Captor moved; seconded by Council Member Duarte.

**VOTE:** Yes: Vice Chair Estrada, Council Members Clarke, Messina Captor, and Raynor.

No: Chair Montoya and Council Member Goodwin.

Abstain: Council Member Duarte.

Director of Public Affairs Armenta announced: We have four votes; the motion passes.

Chair Montoya stated: This is an important discussion and I appreciate everyone's points that were made. We also are mindful of the gaps that exist historically, and we are doing as best as we can. So, thank you.

With that, I will move to the next item which is my report.

## **10. Chair's Report**

Chair Montoya explained: I want to first welcome the California Arts Council back to the Central Valley, our nation's breadbasket. I also want to thank the staff for hosting a listening session last night in Fresno at [Arte Américas](#) where a beautiful exhibition of my late father-in-law Jose Montoya work is on view. The gallery was filled with community members from Mariposa County to Lindsay.

We did our best to align this meeting with the most excruciatingly hottest moment of the summer to really give our council the Central Valley experience. Of course the weather is in our favor today and you are spared triple digits.

I took the train up from Los Angeles to ground myself in the communities along the way that I am here to represent.

From Bakersfield to Fresno I will name a few: Wasco, Allensworth, Famoso, McFarland, Vinland, Delano, Earlimart, Pixley, Tipton, Tulare, Goshen, Traver, Laton, Kingsberg, Wineland, Selma, Fowler, Clovis, Fresno

These are just a few of the communities along the path of major thoroughfares like the HW99. There are countless others across the valley that are harder to see but filled with potential.

It gives me great pleasure to bring my role on the California Arts Council home. I grew up just 8 miles from Hanford in an unincorporated rural community called LATON which is actually based in Fresno County.

As a creative, I always knew that art was the path for me but for some reason I did not find a lot of mentors or outlets in my vicinity. I sought opportunities outside of my community and was determined to bring it back.

I studied art in my undergraduate degree aspiring to be a muralist and dedicated my masters program to Cultivating the Arts in Rural communities which was the focus of my thesis.

In my first professional job as an arts administrator and professor at Otis College of Art and Design, I was able to bring a 180k Ford funded project to my hometown. They wanted to explore how institutions could engage rural under-resourced communities and I just happened to know one very well.

It was not until I was appointed to the California Arts Council that my understanding of the resources for the arts across the state became clear.

I learned about the State Local Partnership program and how each county is intended to have a county arts agency to share opportunities with the local communities and advocate on their behalf. I realized that four of our 58 counties across the state, four did not have representation, and that I came from one of those areas.

While I was based in Fresno County, my community had little formal infrastructure connecting it to its resources. Kings County was much closer in proximity, it was where we got our gas. It dawned on me that I was part of the gap.

This gap still exists today but we are working hard to close it through our State Local Partner mentorship program which is an initiative I am proud of being a part of creating.

We intentionally chose to meet in Stockton earlier this year which is in San Joaquin County and Kings County today because we want these communities who do not yet have a designated State Local Partner to know that we are here for you and will do what is necessary to get you covered.

I am proud to take one step forward in this direction by being present today and that my role on the council has this purpose.

And now for some business.

This meeting represents a full cycle for our council where we get to adjudicate the resources we steward.

I want to thank each and every member of the council, staff and public who have contributed to this process:

Those of you who spent tireless hours writing these grants that are extensive and often cumbersome. I know some of your efforts will not yield an opportunity this time but we hope you will take this experience forward and apply in the future. And congratulations to those who were successful in receiving a grant.

Thank you to the panelists for pouring over the thoughtful applications and deliberating with our guidelines and values in mind.

Thank you to our dream team staff. Your jobs are not easy and I know feedback to you is often critical but in this moment I want to spotlight the hard work it is to manage the volume and complexity of our field and your caring efforts to do the very best for it.

Thank you to our council members for keeping your ears available to the public while doing the diligent work of research and discussion to shape these opportunities equitably. It is a privilege to work alongside you.

I want to thank Johnathan Kayla and Ayana. It takes leadership to move this forward and coral us cats. We appreciate your true dedication and vision as well as your can-do attitude.

I want to thank the public, artists, organization leaders and everyday people who are connected by these resources. Thank you for continuing to give us feedback and sometimes a little grace.

Policy making takes time, it takes negotiating possibilities and we do our best to do this work with no harm to individuals or the field. We appreciate you listening and coming along throughout the process.

On a personal note, I want to thank my parents, family, husband and children.

This year I term out of my role on the California Arts Council after four years of service.

I am extremely proud to have been appointed by the speaker emeritus Anthony Rendon, who I will acknowledge later under my legislative memo. It does take sacrifice to do this work as you can see from the 300 page book we use to prepare for these meetings and my family has been supportive of my determination to serve on behalf of communities like the one I grew up in.

It is with great gratitude that I do this work and fulfill my promise to give back to my community.

Thank you all and that is my report.

### **11. Voting Item: Fiscal Sponsor Change Request**

Chair Montoya announced: We are Voting Item 11. And this is the Fiscal Sponsor Change Request.

Council Member Goodwin presented the following: In our policy meetings we talked about vetting organizations. We have two organizations who would like to consider and approve a change request in their fiscal sponsorship organizations.

Chair Montoya continued: Is there any public comment on this item?

Director of Public Affairs Armenta announced: We are now opening public comment for this specific agenda item.

Chair Montoya noted: I do not see any hands raised in the audience. I do not see anybody online as well. I will ask the Council to make a motion on this item.

Council Member Goodwin stated: I make a motion for the Council to approve the fiscal sponsor change for the two organizations requesting such change.

Chair Montoya acknowledged: Okay, may I have a second?

Vice Chair Estrada chimed in: I second.

Chair Montoya acknowledged and stated: We are open for discussion now. Seeing none, I call for the vote.

Director of Public Affairs Armenta read the following into the record: This is the motion for a fiscal sponsor change.

**MOTION:** Council Member Goodwin moved to approve the fiscal sponsor change request recommendations put forth in the Allocations Committee memo; seconded by Vice Chair Estrada.

**VOTE:** Yes: Chair Montoya, Vice Chair Estrada, Council Members Clarke, Duarte, Goodwin, Messina Captor, Raynor.

No: None.

Abstain: None.

Council Member Goodwin commented: This is really something we can trust our staff to do. Our staff can meet with these organizations, look at the memos, make sure that their request makes sense. At this point, what we would like the Council to consider is that we just vote to update our current fiscal sponsor policies.

So, the purpose of this memo is to provide recommendations so that when there is a fiscal sponsor policy that has the authority and ability to make those changes without having to wait a month and bring them to us.

Sometimes waiting a month in that situation can actually hurt an art organization. So, for your consideration I would like us to change the current policy to be updated to reflect that a change will not be made for an awardee based solely on the desire to change to a different fiscal sponsor. Changes will only be made by official written requests to and approved by CAC staff.

The big change is that this doesn't need to be approved by the Council. We know our staff can do this. That would be the motion – the recommendation to change our current fiscal program policy, our fiscal sponsor policy, so that requests can be approved by staff.

Chair Montoya acknowledged: Thank you. Because this is a separate item I am just going to call for the vote.

Director of Public Affairs Armenta announced: I will now call for public comment on this motion. Is there anyone here in the audience for public comment? I see no one raising their hand. I see on Zoom no hands raised.

Chair Montoya stated: I need to ask, grant a motion to open up this item?

Council Member Goodwin responded: So, I would like to make the motion to update the fiscal sponsor policies so that when the CAC grantees need to make any change, they can provide an official written request to, and be approved by, the CAC staff.

Chair Montoya asked: May I have a second?



Executive Director Moscone stated: Olivia.

Chair Montoya noted: I think Caleb had his hand up. We have a second by Caleb Duarte. Now we are open for discussion on the item. Hearing none, we will call for the question.

**MOTION:** Council Member Goodwin moved to change current fiscal policy to allow California Arts Council staff to process fiscal sponsor changes without a Council vote, seconded by Council Member Duarte.

**VOTE:** Yes: Chair Montoya, Vice Chair Estrada, Council Members Clarke, Duarte, Goodwin, and Raynor.

No: Council Member Messina Captor.

Abstain: None.

Chair Montoya continued: I will now go to Item 13 the discussion item on True Costs with the Hewlett Foundation.

## **12. Committee Reports**

(Taken out of order, after Agenda Item 13)

I would like to offer an opportunity to speak on the Committee reports that are provided in the memo which pertains to Agenda Item 12.

So, the Equity Committee.

Council Member Duarte reported: The four points that we have been working on are there. We are trying to open learning about the Land Acknowledgement.

The Programs Committee.

Council Member Goodwin reported: We are getting ready to ramp up and have a long-term discussion about what happens now that we have some time to plan our programs. We have building sustainability committed funds already. So, we are looking holistically for a timetable of the work ahead.

The Legislative Committee.

Chair Montoya reported: I wanted to thank the staff for compiling together the legislative process to look at the next cycle. I wanted to acknowledge Speaker Emeritus Anthony Rendon, the 70<sup>th</sup> Speaker of the California State Assembly from 2016 to 2023. He is very passionate about climate and water and art.

They just announced that they are hosting an informal hearing on Thursday, August 31 from 1:30 to 3:30. I am so proud to serve under his leadership. I worked in his district on a festival where artists are creating their own festival in their community.

Strategic Framework Committee.

Council Member Raynor reported: We are going to be looking at how to develop goals and objectives that will fall in alignment with the priorities that are being set by the Council.

Allocations Committee.

Vice Chair Estrada reported: But before we start, we're so tight in our agenda. We can't do things without the opinion of the other. That is something that we have found that we are so, so tied together and we really can't make decisions in a vacuum or in a silo or whatever you want to call it.

Council Member Raynor chimed in: Today we discussed a lot of challenges that we have in the allocations process. We identified four areas for discussion at the Council – transparency regarding the overall allocations process, decision-making in the context of the reduction of CAC funding in conjunction with the Program Policy Committee discussion, panel members, geographic data.

Director of Legislative Affairs Margolis was recognized: If you all are interested in the staff prior to the September meeting programming some background materials for you to look at prior to September looking at ways we could possibly change program support and traditional support for SLP, SLPs, looking at staff programs and those that we are funding in FTA so that could support you all in speaking of whether or not we want to give additional funds in 2023-24.

And if there is anything else that you want to be looking into prior to that September meeting that would be great to include.

Council Member Raynor stated: I think there is interest in looking at the geographic distribution of those that we've awarded.

Executive Director Moscone chimed in: Am I just hearing that you asked a question just now, would you like that?

Director of Legislative Affairs Margolis answered: Yes, if we did this...

Council Member Raynor added: May I have one more? Okay, we amend the fellowship programs to augment the original programs.

Deputy Director Kiburi chimed in: I'm sorry Olivia, we can't –

Council Member Raynor replied: I'm sorry, I'm losing my voice. We augmented the individual fellowships and I'm wondering if we have any info of where we are with that cycle and if we have any information on the extent to which they were successful with their outreach.

Director of Legislative Affairs Margolis answered: So, we have three initial organizations that were awarded to serve Los Angeles County, Southern California, and the Central Central Region have all finished the adjudication process.

Our Northern California AO's applications are open right now and closing September 30. So, that will be a little bit behind, but I can say certainly prior to September I can get this done.

Chair Montoya continued: Okay, I am going to go into Agenda Item 14, Budget Update but I think we did that.

Executive Director Moscone noted: No, she did 2023 but now she is going to do 2024.

### **13. Discussion Item: True Costs with the Hewlett Foundation**

Executive Director Moscone spoke: I want to introduce Jessica Mele who is the Principal of Jessica Mele Creative and Jennifer Wei who is the Hewlett Foundation's Organizational Effectiveness Program Officer and Marcus McGrew, Hewlett's Director of Grantmaking, learning and Operations. They will engage us in discussions around true costs to inform the Council on 2024 Program Guidelines.

Jessica Mele addressed the Council: We want to make sure we have a lot of time for Q&A. I will hand it over to Jennifer because she is very knowledgeable about this topic.

Jennifer Wei spoke: Jennifer presented a number of pertinent items related to the notion of true costs to the Council via a PowerPoint presentation.

Jessica then spoke about her observations when she was involved with the Performing Arts Program at Hewlett. She mentioned that for eight years she was the Program Officer in the Performing Arts Program at the Hewlett Foundation. Prior to that she was the Executive Director of the Performing Arts Workshop which is an arts education organization in San Francisco and also a grantee of Hewlett and a past grantee of the California Arts Council. She discussed many aspects of the idea pertaining to true costs.

Council Member Raynor had questions: I have questions and one is indirect costs- could you give a brief overview of how you are defining indirect costs? There is some confusion between indirect costs and administrative costs. We have regranteeing organizations with different levels of indirect costs.

My first question is about what are you inclusive of when you are talking about indirect costs? And the second question has to do with how does that vary with the core functions or activities of that organization?

Jennifer Wei replied: Indirect rate costs was used more broadly in our collaborative to encompass administrative costs, fundraising costs, anything that would not be funded by programs.

For some government contractors they don't think about fundraising but we did try to address that in the BDO Non-Profit Indirect Rates Guide. You can see a pretty detailed description of how to calculate indirect costs.

Fundraising is also an indirect cost because funders aren't necessarily paying for it. I think it really varies depending on the funder and depending on the sector. We have been using those terms somewhat interchangeably.

The whole purpose of doing this Indirect Costs Rate Guide by BDO was to standardize because there is a lot of variability in how different funders are approaching how to calculate indirect costs rates.

This guide is just trying to standardize it so there is more consistency.

Council Member Messina Captor was recognized: This was a very clear and concise presentation. I was the executive director of a non-profit in San Francisco and the main thing that always kept coming up was no grant organization wanted to see a large operating cost.

So, if a lot of that money was going to operating, they weren't even going to look at your grant application. I think how you explained that this can be within your budget but still have the grant person not go crazy because they think you are using all the money for operating not for programming.

And we are giving money for operating which is a good thing because somebody has to make it work. We always have to be careful as a funding organization how much we are allocating to operating.

Jennifer replied: Thank you. The important thing that I mentioned earlier was non-profits need a certain amount of operations and investment in their staff to really be successful and sustainable. And it can vary as we showed in the data.

We need to have the funder mindset. This is part of the True Cost Project as well. We were trying to change the narrative in the field of philanthropy that a low indirect rate was not a bad thing. It is actually a good thing for the non-profits.

An impact that it has had when we are thinking about grantmaking decisions is that when you decide to give a larger portion of the budget to operating, then that reflects

the programming. That means maybe adjusting what you expect of the goals for the grant.

Executive Director Moscone asked: Are there other municipal or state agencies or county agencies that adhere to a true cost policy?

I am only aware of the private foundations because that is the collaborative that we work in. I do not know about agencies. This BDO Report talks about how government grants because it is usually cash reimbursement because they have strict and direct rate policies, and these are very detrimental to non-profits.

I think there needs to be some change on the end. I am not familiar with what is going on there.

Vice Chair Estrada was recognized: Could you elaborate a little bit more, you said that pretty much across the board that smaller organizations have higher operating costs than large ones because of inefficiencies and so forth, they are smaller.

Is that the only reason? Are there other reasons, does it depend on that type of organization whether it is a teaching organization or an organization that actually builds things? Or is that pretty much, you have found that across the board that the smaller they are, the higher the operating costs.

Jennifer replied that: It is a percentage. It is a percentage of their direct costs. For smaller organizations that is higher because their budgets tend to be smaller. Around a 2.5 to 3.0 million dollar budget may be where an organization can afford to bring a development staff or a team or have a COO or something like that. But below that, they really don't have those resources until their operating very much on a thin margin, but they still have the needs to do an audit, those needs are still the same but they may not be able to be equipped.

So, I think there is this inequity in those smaller organizations having the access to more flexible funding. They are not necessarily connected with high network individuals. They probably don't get a lot of operating support.

Jennifer added: And also a lot of smaller, non-profit organizations probably don't even know their real indirect costs rate and are telling the funder a lower rate. They are probably telling you 10 or 15 percent but what it really takes is going to be higher most likely.

Jessica chime in: Jenn, your answer made me think of it in a way, just because an organization is so small that they don't have a development director doesn't mean that they are doing fundraising. So, they may not have that obvious line item that they would have to make a decision about to where it goes in the budget; it is embedded in the work of the executive director or the program director or other positions in the organization.

It is more difficult to pick out percentages of a person's time if their whole job is not dedicated to something that is to a funder recognizable as indirect costs.

Marcus McGrew spoke: I have a question for the Council. In what way is Council encouraging grantee partners to share their true costs as a way to inform what grantee partners are actually dealing with? Even if you are unable to fund those true costs and think about how you might leverage that knowledge to inform next steps with Council as you plan future years.

Executive Director Moscone stated: I do know that last year the Programs Policy Committee did meet with one of our administering organizations to understand the range of costs that it takes to do this work.

We know that a previous grantee was also faced with this issue with the California Arts Council. The person involved helped us identify a higher level to begin to figure this out.

Kristen, the question is, have we done any kind of learnings from grantees about what their true costs are so we can get a sense of what the real issues are out there?

Director of Legislative Affairs Margolis replied: No, not that I know of outside of what you shared.

Josy Miller added: One thing the Council is wrestling with is our definitional language because we actually don't use the term, "indirect costs". We use the term, "cost allowed for design and implementation". And those costs are only capped in project-based programs. For example, with our administering organizations that do regranteeing, we typically allow for 20 percent for design and implementation of that program.

But again, the idea there is that it is specifically related to the work of the grant. We are really gaining a lot from understanding how you all are languaging true costs which maybe does live somewhere in the middle of indirect, what is direct, what is indirect in terms of getting the actual work done.

Director of Legislative Affairs Margolis chimed in: Absolutely, because even if in that example with our Creative Core Program, they can use up to 20 percent. They are not necessarily doing that. And there is a lot more work that we can be doing in evaluating what their direct costs are.

Chair Montoya continued: So, we can keep the conversation going if there are any other questions. I will ask my own question. I think this is a whole new concept than what we are used to dealing with at the Council.

We have a lot of variety of programs and most of our Council have been members for one year and so we have a new Council. In my history on the Council it has been very nuanced. There are some opportunities that are less complex or nuanced and very

straightforward at which point we give the administrative fee that is very low. And then there are some that are very nuanced.

So, we try, and we have pushed that higher and we are still talking about administrative costs not the consequence that you are referring to. So, this is, you know, not straightforward and many more discussions will be had.

Council Member Goodwin was recognized: I am on the Policy Committee. One of the reasons that we do try to give as much unrestricted funds to the field is because we know that a lot of our funds are going to staff.

I believe that when we are talking to our AOs is it 15 percent we could say because they're a regranting org, and we really granted more around 30.

Chair Montoya continued: Our field looks closely at that number because they also think about how much are you planning on administration versus how much is actually going to the artists, right. So, there is that side of the coin.

Jennifer chimed in: I think there is a fallacy that a low indirect rate makes a more efficient or better organization and that is so not true at all. And that is kind of the myth that we want to be breaking or dismantling.

There are so many funder-powered dynamics here at play. We really have to trust our non-profits that they can do the work that we want them to do and we fund them properly to do it but also note that we are in a position where we have the money. And so, sometimes they are not always forthcoming about what their true needs are when it comes to their operating costs.

Chair Montoya continued: I want to say thank you again. This is a very difficult conversation, and we need to continue it.

#### **14. [2024 Budget Update](#)**

Deputy Director Kiburi presented the following: So this is the moment where we are sharing with you what could happen in Fiscal Year 2024 and 2025. And it is really based on the baseline budget that we received this year. But it is not taking into consideration any provisions that could be in our budget next year.

We are working on another strategy to track all of our expenses throughout the year and to ensure that there is nothing left behind or if there is something that happens with our budget, the Department of Finances will find a way to communicate that earlier in the process or assuming we possibly can.

So, I wanted to start with that promise. This slide shows the Local Assistance Funding money that we can assume we will have in 2024-25.

Deputy Director Kiburi discussed the categories and numbers on the slide.

A slide showing budget considerations for the CAC was discussed.

A slide covering Operations Funding and Volatile Funds was also discussed.

Vice Chair Estrada chimed in: Can we not meet with our local elected officials and just show them how important arts are to people's communities and that it helps change lives without asking a single thing? That is not happening so much but I think it should.

Chair Montoya explained: As far as the Leg Committee, we have been trying to make sure that we engage staff in that effort. During the pandemic things were quite suppressed but since then we have participated in the Arts Summit in California and they had an advocacy day at which point the field advocated.

As Council Members we cannot lobby or advocate. We can educate and inform our legislatures.

Director of Legislative Affairs Margolis added: We might try convening a meeting in Sacramento around January and we would set up meetings with the legislature and it's exactly what Olivia is describing, it's about educating and sharing what's happening and what we're funding in their districts.

Executive Director Moscone stated: The whole speech that I delivered to the legislature committee in Sacramento was information. I told them every single thing we did with every single dollar and the impacts.

I didn't lobby or advocate for anything. And the response was, oh my God, that is great. So, in a way we are at that point where we are just telling the story of what we do. And this invariably will result in something.

## **15. In Memoriam**

Vice-Chair Estrada presented the following:

- Keith Waldrop won the National Book Award for poetry in 2009.
- Minnie Bruce Pratt was a celebrated poet of lesbian life.
- Al Young was a California poet laureate, novelist, singer and lecturer.
- George Winston played the piano and affected me a lot.
- Bob Barker, so well known for The Price is Right.
- David Jacobs was a writer and produced a lot of TV shows.
- Ron Cephas Jones was a state and screen actor.
- Chris Peluso, a Broadway star in Mama Mia and Wicked.
- Magoo was a rapper that died at 50.
- Robbie Robertson played in one of my favorite groups, The Band.
- Sixto Rodriguez was incredibly popular in South Africa.



- William Friedkin, a director of the French Connection and The Exorcist.
- Clifton Oliver was a Broadway actor and died at 47.
- Paul Reubens, Ole Pee Wee was well loved.
- Sinead O’Conner had an incredible voice and died at 56.
- Tony Bennett, one of the most loved singers in America.
- Alan Arkin was in so many movies that I saw in my younger days.
- Laura Ann Carleton down in L.A. was murdered for hanging a pride flag outside her office.
- Tina Turner, Proud Mary – who doesn’t remember this star.
- Barbara Bryne was veteran theater actress.
- Gordon Lightfoot was somewhat of a poet as well as a songwriter.
- David LaFlamme was the founder of the S.F. band, It’s a Beautiful Day.

## **16. Adjournment**

Chair Montoya adjourned the meeting at 4:21 p.m.