



Spaced ... Out?

A Study of Facility Needs of Small and Mid-Sized Performing & Visual Arts Organizations in Ontario

Commissioned by: Association of Artist Run Centres & Collectives of Ontario
Dance Umbrella of Ontario
Ontario Association of Art Galleries
Orchestras Canada
Professional Association of Canadian Theatres
Theatre Ontario
Toronto Theatre Alliance

September, 2001

by Sandra Tulloch and Catherine Smalley

The Steering Committee for this Study – Gary Hall (Artists Run Centres and Collectives of Ontario - ARCCO), Myles Warren (Dance Umbrella of Ontario - DUO), Cheryl Smith (Ontario Association of Art Galleries - OAAG), Betty Webster and Ann Brokelman (Orchestras Canada), Pat Bradley and Lucy White (Professional Association of Canadian Theatres - PACT), Jane Gardner (Theatre Ontario) and Jessica Fraser (Toronto Theatre Alliance) gratefully acknowledge the support of the Department of Canadian Heritage, the Music and Visual Arts Sections of the Canada Council for the Arts, and the Canada Council for the Arts Flying Squad Programs in the Dance and Theatre Sections for this project.

The consultants appreciate the assistance provided by Anne Kolisnyk, Jan McIntyre and John Watson, thank sincerely the Project Steering Committee and the many individuals across Ontario and in the United States who generously gave their time to be interviewed and consulted for the study, and the community consultation organizers: Patti Cannon (Hamilton and Region Arts Council), Peter Honeywell (Council for the Arts in Ottawa), Bill Huffman (Art Gallery of Sudbury), Bill Kimball (Peterborough New Dance), Mark Lefebvre and Laurie Smith (Arts Council – Windsor and Region). This report was informed by the input of over 200 individuals, as listed in Appendix C.



THE CANADA COUNCIL | LE CONSEIL DES ARTS
FOR THE ARTS | DU CANADA
SINCE 1957 | DEPUIS 1957



Canadian Patrimoine
Heritage canadien



Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Preface..... | 5 |
| Methodology..... | 8 |
| Part I – What Was – Some History on Previous Capital Support Programs.. | 10 |
| Federal | 10 |
| Provincial..... | 11 |
| Municipal | 12 |
| Part II – Small and Mid-Sized Arts’ Facility Needs – Today | 13 |
| What Challenges are Ontario’s Arts Organizations Facing?..... | 13 |
| Challenges To Be Met in Facility Projects..... | 15 |
| Financial Challenges | |
| Artistic or Programming Compromises | |
| Short-Term & Long-Term Institutional Stress | |
| What Are The Origins of Facility-Related Problems?..... | 17 |
| Lack of Appropriate Technical Assistance | |
| Inadequate Technical Assistance | |
| Insufficient Uses of Resources | |
| The Funding Process Magnifies These Problems | |
| Lack of Early Money | |
| Fragmented Resources | |
| Inaccessibility of Debt Financing | |
| Planning Your Successful Facility Project | 19 |
| Broad-Based Planning is Essential | |
| An Emphasis on Rapid Growth | |
| Believing in Angels May Be Dangerous to Your Health | |
| Take a Good Look at the Facility Situation in Your Community | |
| What Steps Are Essential for Facility Planning & Development?..... | 20 |
| The Needs – A Scan of Facility Needs Across Ontario for..... | 22 |
| Dance, Music, Theatre and the Visual Arts | |
| Dance..... | 24 |
| Music..... | 27 |
| Theatre..... | 31 |
| Visual Arts..... | 34 |
| Part III – Current or Upcoming Capital Funding Opportunities for the..... | 38 |
| Culture Sector | |
| Federal – Cultural Spaces Canada Program..... | 38 |
| Canada-Ontario Infrastructure Program | 39 |
| Federal – Human Resources Development Canada | 39 |
| Federal – Official Languages..... | 39 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Federal – FedNor | 39 |
| Federal – Community Futures Program | 39 |
| Federal – Historic Places Conservation Initiative..... | 40 |
| Provincial – SuperBuild Sports, Culture & Tourism Partnerships ... | 40 |
| Fund | |
| Provincial – Ontario Trillium Foundation Programs | 41 |
| Provincial – Ontario Heritage Challenge Fund..... | 41 |
| Provincial – Northern Ontario Heritage Fund..... | 42 |
| Provincial – The Fair Municipal Finance Act..... | 42 |
| Municipal Supports..... | 42 |
| Don't Forget Private Fundraising | 44 |
| | |
| Part IV – The Case for Public Support of the Capital Needs of..... | 45 |
| Ontario's Small and Mid-sized Performing and Visual Arts | |
| Organizations | |
| Public Investment Leverages Private Support..... | 46 |
| A Smart Investment in Artists, Organizations & Audiences | 46 |
| Acknowledges the Artistic and Societal Impact | 47 |
| Invests in Diversified Economic Development..... | 48 |
| Enhances Our Quality of Life and Image | 48 |
| Increases Cultural Tourism Potential..... | 49 |
| | |
| Part V - Alternative Models for Capital Investment..... | 50 |
| The British National Lottery..... | 51 |
| The American Nonprofit Finance Fund..... | 52 |
| Cultural Districts..... | 53 |
| Other Municipal Tools..... | 54 |
| | |
| Part VI – Strategic Recommendations | 56 |
| General Recommendations | 56 |
| Recommendations for Arts Funding Agencies..... | 57 |
| Recommendations for Governments | 57 |
| Recommendations for Arts Organizations | 59 |
| Recommendations for Service Organizations..... | 61 |
| | |
| Appendix A - Websites and Other Resources..... | 63 |
| | |
| Appendix B - Study Survey Forms..... | 65 |
| | |
| Appendix C – Community Consultations Listing..... | 69 |

A SURVEY OF FACILITY NEEDS OF SMALL AND MID-SIZED PERFORMING AND VISUAL ARTS ORGANIZATIONS IN ONTARIO

PREFACE

Several factors are driving this report:

- the mounting concern of Ontario's artists and small and mid-sized arts organizations over capital and facility needs, needs which are changing from those of a decade or two ago;
- the recent announcements of new provincial and federal infrastructure programs which will include the cultural sector – the first such opportunity in several years; and
- the recognition that several Ontario municipalities have or are about to undertake the development of Cultural Plans, which will include cultural facilities plans or policies.

OUR GOAL: to offer a bold and creative solution to the chronic facility funding needs of small and mid-sized performing and visual arts organizations in Ontario and to present this plan to all levels of government and other potential investors; a plan which will include technical support, financing and grants support, tax incentives and credit programs; a plan which encourages Ontario's performing and visual arts community to undertake realistic, well-prepared facilities processes: projects that are financially sound, invest in stability and advance the organizations' artistic programs on a long-term basis.

In other words, we wish to avoid press like the following – four of many British and US items which appeared on this subject in March of 2001 – with which we acknowledge a corresponding Canadian reality:

“Many, if not most of our theatre buildings are like theme parks, (Britain's) National Theatre's former boss, Richard Eyre, has stated. To visit the National Theatre is to visit the 1960's.” (The Telegraph, www.telegraph.co.uk).

More than half of the capital investment in museums (£500 million from British Arts Lottery money) was spent on expansion or on new museum facilities, rather than deferred maintenance or upgrading existing facilities. As a result, “these organizations could face increased annual operating costs of nearly £29 million.” (The Guardian).

“The Toledo Repertoire Theatre, Toledo's oldest theatre group, has decided against returning to the Valentine Theatre next season, saying that the cost of staging shows there is too expensive. Once expected to be the Valentine's biggest user, the Rep will stage its productions elsewhere. The Rep's move keeps alive questions as to whether the Valentine's high usage fees can be realistically met by Toledo's many local arts groups.” (Toledoblade).

“After a decade of constructing giant, 2,000-seat lottery financed shrines to culture, the emphasis has completely switched direction to uniting artists with audiences, abolishing the gulfs between them.” “The current reshaping of facilities like The Royal Shakespeare Theatre at Stratford-on-Avon and the National Theatre in Britain are the most dramatic symptoms so far of a growing recognition that traditional theatres no longer meet the demands of today's drama or attract new, younger audiences.” “There's a surge of young people within this building who want to reinvent the theatre for their generation,” says the National Theatre.”(The Telegraph).

This report is a summary of needs expressed through the project steering committee, surveys of their memberships and consultations in key communities of differing population bases across the province of Ontario.

Ultimately this report directs the arts sector to immediately activate its constituency, its regions, its audiences, its public and private funders and the public to establish constructive, integrated facilities policies, funding partnership strategies and resource materials that safeguard the past and strengthen the future.

“Small” and “mid-sized” are defined as organizations with annual operating budgets of less than \$3 million that own or operate/manage facilities of less than 500 seats, and includes the needs of thousands of freelance artists who work independently or as collectives from time to time. Not included are the needs of teachers and students who create, perform, produce and exhibit within the formal education system of Ontario, through commercial studios or through municipal recreation programs.

For the purposes of this project we are not considering the construction of new facilities. This action plan is about sustaining, upgrading and renovating existing small and mid-sized arts facilities OR converting non-traditional spaces for arts programming, presentation and exhibition because of the pent-up demand for such spaces. We do so because:

- Ontario is the largest and most diverse centre for arts production in the country, hence it is essential to protect and enhance the physical embodiment of this cultural heritage;
- Many small and mid-sized arts organizations or collectives have begun capital projects or are seriously considering doing so;
- There is an urgent need to build strategies and raise awareness of arts facility needs and issues with all levels of government including municipal governments. Municipal approval and project support is key to accessing new federal and provincial infrastructure programs. Small and mid-sized arts organizations face enormous and immediate competition from larger cultural, recreation or sports institutions in accessing the province’s new SuperBuild Sports, Culture and Tourism Partnerships Fund and the recently announced federal infrastructure program, Cultural Spaces Canada.

Ultimately the facilities issue begs a combined and multidisciplinary approach by all potential partners in facility support policies and programs, be they public or private.

For several years Ontario’s arts sector has cited its facility needs and the need for the reinstatement of capital funding programs by all levels of government. For too long it has been a case of make do because there simply are insufficient financial resources to address facility needs across Ontario.

Sadly, many of the organizations consulted say that their facility plans are just dreams for now or compromises on their real needs or they are “making do” because they feel the competition for the infrastructure funding support recently announced in new federal and provincial programs is too fierce or inaccessible for smaller organizations and collectives. Because of this perception, several have not approached any funders about facility projects, although the new Cultural Spaces Canada Program may smoke them out to at least put their needs on the table and be counted. As well, many are reluctant to address their facility needs because of fears of how such projects will impact on operations in a time of significant competitive and fundraising challenges.

A case in point is the fact that visitors from across the country and abroad have expressed surprise, indeed dismay, at the physical state of several of our theatres particularly in comparison to sister theatres in Montréal and Québec. In the mid nineties Québec arts organizations, with the active encouragement and support of the Québec government, were particularly successful in accessing federal capital funding through the then federal-provincial Economic Regional Development Assistance program, which was discontinued in 1998. It is high time for Ontario arts organizations to emulate Québec's success of the '90s.

This facilities action plan is crucial as a first step in what should become a multi-phase initiative to seize the opportunities offered by the new funding programs, the current awareness by governments of the extent of the need for facility development in the province, and a recognition by the arts community at least, that new approaches to the issue are essential. The report outlines past and present funding programs, the funding trends, the capital needs, the case for support, the strategies and potential models required to address the facilities issue along with recommendations for arts organizations and the Project Steering Committee as to next steps.

Ultimately the goal is to work with the public and private sector to put a creatively exciting, technologically modern, safe and accessible face to the physical environment that contains our artists, designers, technicians and audiences; an environment that reflects and responds to the work the company or artists(s) produces; that is welcoming, safe and comfortable for artists and audiences alike; and augments the company's ability to build capacity and increase earned revenue.

THIS REPORT IS WRITTEN IN THE SPIRIT THAT ARTS FACILITIES FOR SMALL AND MID-SIZED PERFORMING AND VISUAL ARTS ORGANIZATIONS ARE A MEANS TO AN END: THE ADVANCEMENT OF AN ARTS ORGANIZATION'S OR COLLECTIVE'S ARTISTIC MISSION.

We hear politicians and community leaders referring to the arts as the soul of our cities and towns. If this is so, can we not say the spaces in which art is created, rehearsed, exhibited or performed are the body of our arts infrastructure? Many of these "bodies" are crumbling – or non-existent. To quote Tim Jones, Executive Director of Toronto's Artscape, "as in life, without a body the soul tends to escape."

METHODOLOGY

This report provides an historical context, a general overview of facility needs and challenges, a summary of existing mechanisms for cultural capital development, and some alternative models for consideration.

Information for the report was gathered in several ways. The consultants reviewed existing reports and studies, and monitored news items and many national and international websites relevant to arts facility issues.

Documents reviewed for this project include:

Questionnaire (re capital study, Ontario Ministry of Culture and Recreation), May, 1979

Places to Grow – 1975-79 (Ontario Ministry of Culture and Recreation), April, 1980

Encore: Recycling Public Buildings for the Arts (Secretary of State, Canada) 1980

No Vacancy - A Cultural Facilities Policy for the City of Toronto (Toronto Arts Council), 1988

A Roof Over the Arts (Metro Toronto Culture Office, Judy Stephen-Wells), December, 1991

National Cultural Facilities Study (US Non Profit Facilities Fund), New York, March, 1994

The Role of Culture in the GTA (Toronto Arts Council submission to the Greater Toronto Services Board), 1997

Sustaining Our Facilities Infrastructure (Ontario Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation), 1998

Toronto Competes - An Assessment of Toronto's Global Competitiveness

A Sense of Place - A Sense of Being (Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage) 1998

Beginning the Conversation (the Ontario Arts Report), April, 1999

Overview of Cultural Tourism in Ontario, Ontario Ministry of Tourism, October, 1999

A Study of Large Theatres in the City of Toronto (City of Toronto Culture Division, Net Gain Partners), October, 1999

The Future of the Arts in Toronto- a report on community consultations (Toronto Arts Council), December, 1999

Facility Workshop Materials (Massachusetts Cultural Facilities Project) 1999

The Report of the Arts in Communities Task Force (Ontario Arts Council) 2000

Exploring New Models for Capital Development: The Dream Team (Catherine Smalley), July, 2000

A Study of Facility Needs of Small and Mid-Sized Professional Theatres In the City of Toronto (Sandra Tulloch, commissioned by Theatre Ontario, Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, Toronto Theatre Alliance) July, 2000

Infrastructure Analysis, The Citadel Theatre, 2000-2030 (Raymond Chandler, Citadel Theatre), October, 2000

Culture Districts and Urban Development (Brooks, Kushner) Winter, 2001

Arts Stabilization: Update from England (David Pratley, Management Matters) 2001

The Performing Arts in a New Era (US – Rand Enterprises Analysis for Pew Charitable Trusts) 2001

Surveys were distributed to the dance, music, theatre and visual arts communities through the Steering Committee and made available on the PACT website.

Presentations and discussions occurred at meetings of the Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, Ontario Association of Art Galleries, the Artist Run Centres and Collectives of Ontario, Community Arts Ontario, the Association of Summer Theatres 'Round Ontario, and the Canadian Association of Professional Dance Organizations.

Information was also gathered through consultations with:

- the Facilities Project Steering Committee: Artist Run Centres and Collectives of Ontario, Dance Umbrella of Ontario, Ontario Association of Art Galleries, Orchestras Canada, arts consultant Jane Marsland, the Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, Theatre Ontario and the Toronto Theatre Alliance, who commissioned this study;
- the Canadian Theatre Facilities Strategy Committee, including committee members from the Canada Council for the Arts, the Department of Canadian Heritage, the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation, the Ontario Trillium Foundation, the Culture Division of the City of Toronto, the Toronto Arts Council;
- representatives of the arts community and municipal governments in Belleville, Hamilton, Kingston, Kitchener, Ottawa, Peterborough, Thunder Bay, Toronto, Windsor;
- staff from the federal Department of Canadian Heritage, Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities;
- specialized consultants, and those involved with similar work in Toronto, Chicago, New York and Boston, and members of the League of Historic American Theatres.

PART I

WHAT WAS - SOME HISTORY ON PREVIOUS CAPITAL SUPPORT PROGRAMS & GENERAL GOVERNMENT POLICIES ON FACILITIES SUPPORT

Many of our Ontario arts facilities were planned, designed and built as Centennial projects circa 1967. Throughout the 1970's and '80's the supply of facilities continued to expand as many communities built their first theatre, art gallery or recital hall. Most were built as single purpose venues and financed through public partnerships between federal, provincial and municipal governments using a one-third, one-third, one-third funding formula.

Capital funding programs have been sporadic and driven by such a wide range of imperatives that it is difficult to trace significant trends which have led to their development other than to say that they are manifestations of community pride and more latterly addressed the "business" imperatives of the particular level of government driving the program – not necessarily the real needs of the art forms affected.

Members of the Canadian Theatre Facility Strategy Committee, made up of funders from the municipal, provincial and federal levels of government, have been meeting for three years to exchange information on capital projects proposed by Ontario theatre companies and providing advice and support to such projects. This Committee has expressed dismay at the state of venues throughout the province. Many of these venues are older buildings (many are heritage designated) and were converted in the late '60s and early '70s during the Centennial explosion of national and community pride.

Historically –

at the federal level:

- 1960s, early '70s - **Centennial capital projects**
- 1972 – 1990 – **The Museums Assistance Program (MAP)** established in 1972 with an initial budget of \$8.5 million that grew to \$14.8 million at its high water mark in 1992-93. MAP was instrumental in raising the standard for heritage facilities across Ontario and Canada and provided assistance to art galleries (referred to as art museums) and heritage museums in Canada through ten program components which included some assistance for facilities.

1990 – The Canadian Museum Policy was announced and it clarified the spheres of operation of MAP and CIP (Cultural Initiatives Program) for the provision of services towards museum capital funding. There had been a blurring and duplication of assistance since CIP had been initiated in 1979. From 1990, MAP would fund upgrades for existing museum facilities including long-range planning and facility development studies, purchase and upgrading of collection preservation related equipment within existing museum facilities, security, fire and protection systems, storage, mechanical and lighting systems, handicapped access, loading docks and freight elevators.

1996 – 1999 - MAP funding reduced to \$7.2 million and very limited monies available for facilities.

- 1986-1992 - **Economic Regional Development Assistance**, a \$50 million program under the Canada-Ontario Cultural Development Subsidy Agreement. One of the four grant

programs under this Agreement supported the construction and/or acquisition of new facilities, additions, renovations, alterations and restorations of existing facilities and conservation of heritage facilities or sites in the cultural sector. This Agreement supported cultural facility projects in Ontario totaling more than \$220 million dollars, projects such as the Elgin Winter Garden Heritage Theatre Complex in Toronto, Sault Ste Marie's White Pines Auditorium, Imperial Oil Performing Arts Centre in Sarnia and Ottawa's Arts Court. As well, some capital funding was provided through the Cultural Initiatives Program during this period.

- 1995 – Department of Canadian Heritage placed a moratorium on capital funding through the Capital Initiatives Program which continues (officially) to this day.
- 1994-1998 – **Canada/Ontario Infrastructure Works Program**, a \$6 billion dollar program, with costs shared equally by federal, provincial and municipal governments, designed to allow municipalities and the provinces to reflect their own priorities with private sector investment encouraged. One component of this federal provincial program were grants to upgrade the quality of Canada's physical infrastructure in local communities, with some cultural facility projects approved, including Dundas Little Theatre, Mississauga's Living Arts Centre, and Showplace Peterborough.
- 1998-2000 – **Canadian Millennium 2000 Partnership Fund** (the Millennium Bureau of Canada) – this Fund supported several facilities projects in Ontario, converting or restoring historic buildings into arts or museum facilities, including the Quinte Cultural Centre. The last deadline for this Fund has passed and organizations that received funding from this program were under the gun to complete the stage of the project being funded by the Millennium Fund grant before the March 31, 2001 deadline, which was proving to be unrealistic because of hold-ups in other funding, or other problems related to construction.

at the provincial level:

- 1985-1992 - **Community Facilities Improvement Program** – CFIP supported
 - ◆ up to one third of the eligible costs of the construction of new facilities undertaken to meet justifiable needs for new or improved cultural, multicultural or citizenship programs/services; OR
 - ◆ the acquisition, alteration or renovation of existing facilities to improve current services or programs; and
 - ◆ up to one half of eligible costs for heritage conservation, feasibility studies, life safety or retrofit, special amenities for disabled persons, energy conservation projects.
- 1993-1995 – **Jobs Ontario Community Action** – JOCA's Community Capital program component provided support for the construction, rebuilding or renovation of community facilities or infrastructure identified as a community priority and contributing to the economic growth of the community. Support was available for up to one-third to a provincial maximum of \$3 million of the project cost.
- 1988 – **Northern Ontario Heritage Fund** – grants have been made to northern Ontario cultural organizations from this Fund originally set up in 1988 by the Ontario government. Magnus Theatre in Thunder Bay received \$2.5 million towards the restoration and renovation of a heritage building into a theatre complex.

- 1997 – **The Fair Municipal Finance Act** – this act eliminated the Business Occupancy Tax and exempted small and mid-sized theatre facilities - facilities of fewer than 1000 seats - from property taxes.

At the municipal level:

Municipal grants for facilities usually come from an extraordinary contribution from the municipality after a successful extensive lobby by an arts organization or community.

- City of Toronto Culture Office has a capital budget which covers routine building maintenance and repairs for city owned facilities. From time to time in the late '80s and early '90s, the former Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto received grant requests on an exceptional basis and did fund some major arts institutions deemed to have a unique reach, i.e. no other such facility existed, including the Art Gallery of Ontario and Roy Thomson Hall. The recession of the early '90s and the city's welfare crunch ended this opportunity, continuing to this day.
- 1989 –1998 – Toronto Arts Council's **Cultural Facilities Support Program** (a matching grant program) had a \$1 million budget in 1989, was down to \$100,000 by 1998 as the austerities of the 1990s kicked in. By 1999 there was a moratorium on Toronto Arts Council Facilities Program which continues to this day, as support for operations was deemed more pressing due to impact of operating cuts from the Ontario Arts Council.
- In **Ottawa**, the **Cultural Capital Fund** – was discontinued due to provincial cuts and downloading to municipalities by province with resultant decision that cultural funding focus on operating and project grants as a priority. However it has recently been re-instituted.
- In **Thunder Bay**, the Thunder Bay Capital Fund, a general fund, with grants from \$7000 to \$250,000 for capital maintenance and upgrades. Four cultural organizations are included in this grant program: the Thunder Bay Museum, the Thunder Bay Community Auditorium, the Thunder Bay Art Gallery and the Sports Hall of Fame. Recent major arts facility projects in the city are prompting a hope that this program can be broadened.

In the past, some municipalities have supported facility development through non-grant contributions – including bridge financing - such as:

- In **Kitchener**, the city made an empty municipal office building available at no cost to The Registry Theatre Company.
- In **Thunder Bay**, the city donated free landscaping as a contribution to the Magnus Theatre renovation project.
- In **Windsor**, the multi-million Art Gallery of Windsor facility project was paid for from rents received from the Windsor Casino which rented the former gallery facility while the new casino was being built.

PART II SMALL AND MID-SIZED ARTS FACILITY NEEDS IN ONTARIO TODAY

WHAT CHALLENGES ARE ONTARIO'S ARTS ORGANIZATIONS FACING IN SUSTAINING OR DEVELOPING THEIR FACILITIES?

With the austerity and moratoriums of the 1990's at all levels of government, particularly the impact of the devastating cuts to the Ontario Arts Council which lost 40% of its funding by 1996, Ontario's arts' community, and the public and private investors who support them, are faced with very real challenges:

- A huge pent-up need for facilities development has built up in Ontario due to the absence of facility support programs during the past decade and many small companies and artists have given up hope, seeing their needs as just "dreams";
- Ontario's new SuperBuild Sports, Culture and Tourism Partnership Fund and the federal component of that Fund do not begin to address the needs across the province and the criteria for applicants have effectively shut out the bulk of small and mid-sized arts organizations from the first Investment Round;
- Raising funds for capital projects has always been about leveraging – no one, particularly private sector partners, wants to be the sole player, and private funding partners usually look for the public commitment before committing themselves;
- Many companies are scrambling to preserve programming and staff;
- Basic maintenance is a low priority;
- Deferred maintenance is not a saving – short-term gain for long-term gain;
- Health and safety issues like overloaded circuits or compromised structures are hazardous;
- There is a lack of attention to physical barriers to public access to arts facilities because of budget constraints;
- The cultural sector has been the fastest growing sector of the Canadian labor force over the past decade and facility development is not keeping up with this growth;
- The past large (over 500 seats) municipal theatre/arts centre concept of the 60's, 70's, and early 80's, supported by local arts organizations' usage, is proving to be economically challenging in city after city. Most local arts organizations can no longer afford the rental and/or union rates for these facilities;
- A very thorny dilemma is developing, one that challenges the setting of priorities for facility maintenance and development over the next decade and beyond. The dilemma is between the obvious need to upgrade, renovate and repair existing arts facilities and today's reality that many artists and small organizations and collectives need more and different types of spaces; spaces which accommodate both the growth in the arts labor force and their "product" in most Ontario municipalities and changing artforms, programming and staging techniques;
- Last, but not least, booming real estate markets in many municipalities have led to a crisis in availability and affordability for many arts organizations. In a major city like Toronto, support for downtown intensification will push property values even higher.

In contrast to the many variables in facility development, including the all important political variables from government to government, arts programming development in Ontario has been fuelled by a sustained public partnership between the Canada Council for the Arts, the Ontario Arts Council and in some communities directly by the City or as in Toronto, by the Toronto Arts Council.

With the exception of the Toronto Arts Council's former facility support program, these arts councils do not support capital costs and there is a tendency to punish organizations whose overhead expenses seem higher than average, i.e. companies that operate facilities. Performing and Visual Arts organizations and their service organizations must impress upon arts council staff the realities of operating facilities along with the responsibility of managing the "extra" or "back" spaces upon which small arts organizations and collectives depend for presenting/exhibiting their work, in addition to their artistic programming. The arts councils must step up and champion the need for public support programs for cultural facility development at all levels of government and provide the appropriate operating support as well.

Municipal governments are in the front-line of many contemporary issues, cultural ones included. Ontario cities are struggling with the downloading of responsibilities from the province, and with dramatically changing economies and demographics.

Amalgamations such as those in Hamilton, Kingston, Ottawa and Toronto have caused additional confusion and uncertainty. Prior to amalgamation, a smaller city may have had an arts capital plan, such as Nepean did. This plan has been lost in the process of creating the council and budget for the new amalgamated city of Ottawa.

In the case of Toronto, which has a concentration of organizations and facilities in the downtown core, cultural budgets must now be equally accessible to other suburban communities – except that cultural budgets have not increased.

In Hamilton, the arts advisory committee was disbanded at the time of amalgamation, along with all standing committees of the old city. At the time of our Hamilton consultation neither committees or budgets had yet been finalized for the new city.

Many Ontario cities are actively considering the role of arts and culture in their communities, and after years of concentrating on recreational facilities, are considering capital projects designed to improve their cultural assets. It is important that such planning be part of the city's overall plan, addressing anticipated population growth and change, reflecting needs of the local arts community, and exploring the regional audience demand. Assessing a city's needs and establishing municipal policy with regard to cultural assets is complex, specialized work. Cities can benefit greatly from the contribution of knowledgeable consultants and the experience of other municipalities.

CHALLENGES TO BE MET IN FACILITY PROJECTS

We were not surprised to discover a similar review of facility needs in the United States in 1992-93 (Nonprofit Finance Fund's National Cultural Facilities Study) and the following section echoes their findings which certainly mirror the challenges for facility planning in Ontario to-day.

A WORD TO THE WISE - POTENTIAL FACILITY-RELATED PROBLEMS

The arts sector addresses facility needs under difficult circumstances and operates in a complex environment. As well, they do so with a fraction of the staff and resources that many private sector entities apply to facility concerns. Given these challenges, they have managed remarkably well. However, their efforts are often fragmented and difficult to sustain. They struggle within the conflicts inherent in a dual artistic and operating management structure, and they serve multiple publics – their artists, the audience for the artistic program, and the public and private sector which invests in them. This inherent operational complexity is further complicated by the advent of a facility project and the array of additional factors that such an endeavour precipitates.

Research indicates some arts organizations complete their projects with reasonable success and manageable problems. More, however, have some level of difficulty and incur evident setbacks with some ending up with serious long-term problems as a result of their facility projects. The following observations are offered to assist with planning capital campaigns, not as deterrents but as areas requiring advance planning and contingencies.

SUCCESSFUL FACILITY PROJECTS REQUIRE REALISTIC, HONEST APPRAISALS & PRE-PLANNING, TIME, PATIENCE AND PERSISTENCE

ALWAYS REMEMBERING THAT ARTS FACILITIES SHOULD ADVANCE AN ARTS ORGANIZATION'S ARTISTIC MISSION AND ENRICH THE AUDIENCE'S ARTS EXPERIENCE, IGNORE AT YOUR PERIL:

Financial Challenges

Among the factors that lead to future financial difficulties are: unrealistic capital campaign budgets; unrealistic fundraising campaigns and targets; insufficient planning and time; excessive debt burdens; the unexpected increases in annual operating costs of a new or expanded facility; unrealistic cash flow projections; or loss of earned income during renovations or because a building wasn't designed correctly or doesn't function properly. As one example, a lack of financing compromises the building of dressing rooms, so the theatre cannot serve the market they were supposed to be building for, and rentals and rental income suffer.

Artistic or Programming Compromises

Programming can be affected negatively by facility projects. Programming may be reduced over the long-term because of financial instability, or curtailed or artistically compromised in the short term because staff is distracted by the burdens of a project. Sometimes programming is impaired because of the inadequacy of an improperly constructed or designed facility. Skimping on project management can translate into leaky roofs, which cancels classes or rehearsals. Too much debt can affect choices. Artistic directors may be forced to devote excessive time to fundraising rather than artistic pursuits.

Short-Term and Long-Term Institutional Stress

Cultural facilities usually exceed the financial and management capacities of arts organizations whatever their size. They can take two to ten years to complete and are costly and technically complex. Projects exact a toll on organizations in that management, development and artistic staff may spend upwards of 50% of their time on a project.

Facility projects that are transformational (reconfiguring or expanding a company's scale and staff structure) can create major change in programs and alter the economic structure. Projects such as these can place impossible expectations on the organization, placed there by unrealistic Boards of Directors or the local community, who see the organization in a different light as a result of the newly transformed facility. Few organizations are prepared for such challenges. More than one facility project has resulted in major staff and board turnover.

WHAT ARE THE ORIGINS OF FACILITY-RELATED PROBLEMS?

The origins of problems with arts facility projects are found in the very nature of the project development process, as well as in the culture of arts organizations. Often a shortage of money is not the primary cause of problems, although it is most frequently cited as the culprit when things go wrong. In fact, the problem is more likely to be cash flow - funds are mismatched to need or ill-timed, or are difficult to draw on. This, combined with several larger areas of concern, creates an environment that can hamper sound facility projects. These areas of concern include:

Lack of Appropriate Technical Assistance

Most arts organizations serve as developer of their own projects, but most staff do not have access to the information needed to feel confident in their undertakings. Their concerns are about the facility as a whole or about critical areas of planning, financing or project management. Most arts managers could use an information and resource centre to go for help and are not interested in becoming real estate developers at the expense of their theatres.

Inadequate Technical Assistance

Facility projects demand highly specialized skills, but many arts organizations feel they cannot afford to purchase project services. Arts organizations seek as much of their technical assistance as possible from pro-bono providers. This assistance can be beneficial, but limited. Professional liability stops architects, engineers and designers short of implementation. Volunteers are rarely able to commit full time. The real estate, legal and financial professionals who serve on the boards of arts organizations are a good source of guidance and often give helpful advice. But through no fault of their own, many do not understand the difference between commercial real estate and the unique limits and needs of not-for-profit arts organizations, particularly the nature of their growth and market.

Most technical assistance used by arts organizations for facility projects focuses on the facility itself or on fundraising. Whether professional or pro-bono, the assistance is highly specialized, addressing a narrow aspect of a complex process. Many organizations therefore undertake projects without fully considering organizational development and market issues, nor do they use project planning, project packaging or project management services when these are needed.

Too often, strategic planning for organizational development has not been a fundamental step in facility projects, on either a formal or informal basis. Few seem to include an assessment of the market for their services as part of the project. Feasibility studies must be used in any campaign and must provide an opportunity for broad assessment of organizational capacity, along with fundraising capacity and project cost. Feasibility studies must address the issue of whether the project makes sense for the organization.

Insufficient Use of Resources

Costs of facility projects are often higher than intended caused by inadequate planning or shortcomings in project management services. Some are not prepared to use debt financing when necessary to bridge funding gaps. Often costs increase because of the stop-start nature of the process.

Using volunteers as project managers is risky, as they often cannot stay on top of things and companies can end up in court with the contractors. Even if they win, the project funds may be

spent and the project is only half finished. Financing can take many months of negotiations. Loan guarantees can incur legal fees, so contractors are on hold or working in bits and pieces and costs rise. Have a decent contingency in your project budget.

The Funding Processes Magnify These Problems

The way in which funding for arts organizations is delivered is frequently incompatible with the facility project development process.

Lack of Early Money

This situation has actually improved in Ontario and grants are available for feasibility studies that support project planning and pre-development which can avoid costly problems later in the process.

Fragmented Resources

Project support must be assembled from a variety of unrelated sources. Public funders should appreciate more fully the process, and design capital support programs that can be more responsive to the realities of capital projects. Too often funders do not approve and deliver support until the project is underway. The unpredictability of debt financing also adds to uncertainty.

Inaccessibility of Debt Financing

Few banks provide financing for the arts on a regular basis. Loans are usually the result of a very carefully nurtured relationship with a bank or credit union by an individual arts organization. Most banks seem to feel arts organizations are not well managed – a false perception, which needs to be debunked – and they are leery of loans or even lines of credit. Some negative credit experiences with arts organizations also make it harder for arts organizations to borrow. However, an essential element of a successful capital campaign is developing a good relationship with a financial institution. It may be needed!

PLANNING FOR YOUR SUCCESSFUL FACILITY PROJECT ... THE MOST SUCCESSFUL FACILITY PROJECTS ARE DRIVEN BY THE RESIDENT ORGANIZATION(S)' STRONG SENSE OF THEIR ARTISTIC MISSION, THEIR INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY AND THEIR KNOWLEDGE OF THEIR MARKET.

Broad - Based Planning Is Essential

For success, a facility must be framed in light of the organization's artistic mission, the market for its program and its management capacity. However, participants in facility projects, arts organizations and funders alike almost always focus their attention and energy on how much can be raised. Architects, consultants or board members often focus too narrowly – on the building or space itself – not on the artistic mission, the institutional capacity or the market. Furthermore, they concentrate on what must be raised thinking of the project as a one-time fundraising event NOT the organization's ability to support the facility over time. This focus makes it hard to plan well for facilities, and lack of planning can lead to problems later.

An Emphasis on Rapid Growth - Time and Sophistication are Essential

Operating in a risk-oriented culture, arts organizations are not rewarded for practicing incremental growth. Many do not use managed growth as a guiding principal for their programs or their facility projects. Thus we see organizations of all sizes undertaking projects that are quite large in scale compared to the human and financial capacities of the organization. You are in a situation where you must raise funds several times your annual revenues while at the same time you must undertake your annual operating fundraising. **Be prepared for a multi-year fundraising process.**

If undertaking a major facility project, **plan for the acceleration of change within your organization.** Major projects add levels of complexity to your operation and may alter the public's perception, even your Board's, of what and who you are.

Believing in the Angels May be Dangerous to Your Health

"Gifts", in-kind or not, can be unkind. Arts organizations may seek (or be offered and then must respond to) tremendous "one-time-opportunities". A magnanimous donor offers a building or an astounding financial contribution, or a building becomes available that would be "ideal" as a theatre complex. This can create difficulties in maintaining a sense of proportion and organizations can find themselves undertaking ambitious, risky projects involving large amounts of grants and insupportable levels of debt. Caution and research is essential in such cases.

Again, phased-in planning stages appropriate for the arts organizations concerned is everything.

Take a Good Look at the Facility Situation & Resources in Your Community

Too often, large facility projects are undertaken by staff and board members acting in isolation. The guidance of experienced peers is often not sought or perhaps available, there is no counsel to question and evaluate assumptions, no way to challenge the myths or share information gathered from other sources. As well, arts organizations keep their facility projects to themselves only to find others in the community are also considering such projects, which can be counter-productive and competitive, sometimes destructive as more than one Ontario community can attest.

WHAT STEPS ARE ESSENTIAL FOR FACILITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT?

NOTE: The excellent Massachusetts Cultural Facility Project has successfully recommended and/or incorporated the following steps in pre facility project planning. Some can be undertaken internally, but many should be led by facility planning experts in the various areas.

1. A Conceptual Overview, which includes:

- organizational change, facilities and program choices
- questions to be asked about your programming
- common facility project justifications
- your project's size
- mistakes made with large projects
- assessing your financial readiness
- costs to be included in your capital campaign
- what every successful capital campaign needs
- feasibility studies

2. Organizational Assessment, which covers

- demand assessment
- organizational capacity readiness – human resources capacity & readiness: staff/boards/volunteers
- program feasibility study
- readiness indicators

3. Financial Assessment, which covers

- financial warning signs
- financial feasibility study
- administrative costs of growth
- project budget sheet
- revenue sheet
- cash flow sheets

4. Selecting the Appropriate Facility Option, which covers

- assessing options
- incremental growth
- characteristics of your option, are you renovating or building?
- analyzing your space needs
- facility requirements checklist
- building program
- site and project feasibility study

5. Selecting the Appropriate Facility Project Cost, which covers

- how much will it cost
- project costs
- cost rules of thumb
- hard and soft costs
- rent vs. buy
- project cash flows and worksheets

6. **Project Fundraising**, which includes
- what you may not know about capital campaigns
 - keys to capital campaign readiness
 - stages of a capital campaign
 - distribution of grant resources
 - gifts
 - donor prospect evaluation and rating
 - government support programs
 - hiring a fundraising consultant
 - project and capital campaign budget updates

7. **Project Payment and Financing**, to cover
- borrowing money is not fundraising
 - types of debt
 - approaching a lender
 - debt service calculating
 - sources of debt

8. **Implementing the Project**, including
- implementing time lines
 - maintaining control of the project
 - request for proposals
 - selecting an architect, contractor
 - can you manage construction risks, are resources on hand locally?

THE NEEDS - A SCAN OF FACILITY NEEDS ACROSS ONTARIO FOR DANCE, MUSIC, THEATRE AND THE VISUAL ARTS

OBSERVATIONS FROM INPUT FROM COMMUNITY CONSULTATIONS, INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS AND SURVEY RESPONSES FROM DANCE, MUSIC, THEATRE AND VISUAL ARTS ORGANIZATIONS:

There was a tremendous degree of consistency within disciplines across the province, and there were also striking similarities between disciplines and communities.

While it is possible to put a price tag on facility needs for theatre and the visual arts (see theatre and visual arts facility needs sections) because these disciplines have many facilities or seem more readily attuned to facility development possibilities, it is impossible to put a price tag on the needs for dance and music. These disciplines have many issues and needs, but to date primarily use facilities owned and/or operated by other organizations or institutions. Dance in particular, and to some extent certain sections of the music community, seem to lack the resources to provide the leadership required in facility development.

Our findings present the community and policy makers with a dilemma. How can the need to repair, renovate and upgrade existing arts facilities after years of neglect be balanced with the need to develop other additional non-conforming spaces to address growth in the arts labour force in every community in Ontario, increased production, and changing artforms and programming needs in the 21st century.

The “Build It and They Will Come” syndrome which seemed to reflect the arts facility philosophy of the 60’s and 70’s is being challenged – needs are more individualistic and audience oriented now. Facilities must accommodate the large number of artists who work independently or in ever changing collective configurations. Facility policies must accommodate the growing cultural labour force and the changing programming and art forms of today and the future.

Facility needs fall into three categories:

- Upgrades, renovations and repairs are required by just about every existing small and mid-sized facility in Ontario;
- New and emerging organizations, collectives and artists are looking to renovate non-conforming spaces to create a range multi-purpose venues, arts incubators, studios, some for creation, some for presentation, exhibition and sales and administration (e.g. Guelph, Peterborough, North Bay, Thunder Bay, Hamilton);
- A few communities or companies are embarking on or considering major new facility projects (e.g. Collingwood, Barrie, Ottawa).

Cities, particularly recently amalgamated cities like Hamilton, Kingston, Ottawa and Toronto, are coping with a balancing act with regard to facility projects. Priorities have shifted as a result of amalgamation and most municipalities are looking at under-served areas of their new geographies.

A considerable number of organizations are currently housed in empty mall spaces in many communities across the province. The plus side of this is that the rents are minimal, the minus is that tenure is very shaky with the eviction axe poised to fall as soon as traditional commercial tenants need space. Organizations do not invest in and spend minimally on such space

therefore do not attract much custom and are constantly de-stabilized as they wait for yet another move.

Rising rents in bigger cities are driving artists and companies away from the downtown cores. This potentially poses a dilemma for city planners because it is widely acknowledged that vibrant arts activity in downtown cores keeps cities alive, safe and attractive to citizens in their leisure hours and for visitors into the small hours of the night.

Rising rents or eviction notices are increasing in larger centres because of the booming real estate market. This creates workspace-related challenges and loss of productivity for many artists and organizations. They are faced with shutting down their operations, loss of incomes as they re-locate, sometimes staff layoffs. Lack of affordable workspace has many artists and organizations looking with envy at Toronto's 401 Richmond Street complex. Many community consultations cited the need for a 401 Richmond model on a smaller scale and Toronto itself could accommodate several such facilities and others like those operated by Toronto's Artscape.

FACILITY NEEDS FOR SMALL AND MID-SIZED DANCE IN ONTARIO

Dance in Ontario comprises dance professionals and organizations working in the full range of classical, contemporary, and culturally specific dance forms. Increasingly, the work of contemporary dance artists is cross-disciplinary; innovative fusions of dance, theatre, music, and media arts.

Almost every Ontario community has a dance school, many of them thriving operations which introduce hundreds of children and their parents to dance every year, at a community or pre-professional level. These schools play an important role, but they are beyond the scope of this report, which focuses on facilities for professional dance.

Ottawa is home to one mid-sized dance organization, the nation's largest dance presenter (the National Arts Centre) and a vibrant community of independent dance artists. Professional dance is also expanding in cities like Guelph, Waterloo, and Peterborough. But the vast majority of professional dance activity occurs in the Greater Toronto Area.

Toronto's dance community is a complex network of more than 500 individual dance professionals, small and mid-sized dance companies, and two very large institutions: The National Ballet School, and the National Ballet of Canada.

Dance practitioners have special facility needs dictated by the physicality of their art form. There is the obvious need for rehearsal and performance space. But dancers must also train and practice daily. Access to studio space for class is vital, and for many dancers not affiliated with a company, it is difficult to find. Any dance company that wants to survive, never mind thrive, must find an answer to this dual space problem.

An ideal venue suitable for dance class and rehearsal needs:

- a wood sprung floor
- transferable linoleum surfacing
- 20' ceilings
- a large clear span (40' x 40')
- good air circulation and quality
- decent acoustics for piano or recorded music
- barres and mirrors, and
- showers and dressing rooms.

For performances, dancers also need

- a warm-up studio with sprung floor
- a large stage area (40' x 40', 22' ceiling)
- significant wing space
- room for live musicians, and
- superior technical capabilities for recorded music/sound and lighting.

The purpose-built dance venue is a very rare item, indeed. The Premiere Dance Theatre at Harbourfront is one such space. Universities with dance programs, such as York, have facilities. The studios at the National Ballet of Canada and the facilities at The National Ballet School (including the Betty Oliphant Theatre) are also excellent. Occasionally a theatre will be renovated with dance in mind, such as Buddies in Bad Times Theatre in Toronto. But these spaces are almost fully used by those organizations themselves.

The adaptation of an existing building for dance purposes can be daunting, because of these special needs which must be taken into account. In Ontario, very few small and mid-sized dance companies, or independent choreographers, have been able to find an appropriate and secure facility for their work. Those that have found a home are lucky. Nevertheless, they face the challenges of renovated arts buildings everywhere:

- less than ideal conditions
- a constant need for maintenance and upkeep
- escalating utility costs
- additional effort and expense to make the space available to other users
- heritage restrictions in buildings so designated, and
- no capital reserves with which to work.

Many dancers wish to tour in Ontario. Many local presenters also want to bring dance to their communities. One limiting factor is the difficulty of finding community venues which are physically appropriate for dance. Another is the fact that most dance producers cannot use civic-owned facilities - even though they are likely the best equipped spaces - because they are burdened with costly unionized technical and front of house staff, and high rents. And, finally, the scale is often not appropriate, with venues either too large or too small to make economic sense. For most dance producers, 150-250 seats would be ideal.

Even in Toronto, access to good-quality, dance-friendly space is difficult. Among the mid-sized companies, Toronto Dance Theatre is a tenant in a renovated church, which is also the used-to-capacity home of the School of Toronto Dance Theatre. Canadian Children's Dance Theatre owns an old CBC radio studio, which is also used by Danny Grossman's company. Dancemakers rents above an auto repair shop, and hopes to move to a new facility altogether. These companies undertook to renovate these facilities in the last 20 years.

In 2001 it is not a surprise that they all report a major need for capital improvements in their venues:

- exterior repairs
- dressing rooms
- washrooms
- technical and equipment upgrades
- heating and air-conditioning
- health and safety concerns
- signage, and
- accessibility
- video recording capacity in performance spaces

These venues are all heavily used by other dance artists on a rental basis, so their continued well-being is essential for the whole community.

Among smaller companies, ownership is out of the question. Rehearsal, production, storage, and administration are often in different locales (and the latter two often in someone's home). Frequent displacement is a major problem, driven by Toronto's booming real estate market. One example of this is Princess Productions, which was recently evicted from the space it shared with The Music Gallery. They have just opened a newly renovated 2nd floor studio in the city's west end, which it shares with two other companies to make the rent manageable. Companies like the Toronto Tabla, Collective of Black Artists/COBA, Ensemble/M-Do, Esmeralda Enriqu  Spanish Dance Company, and OMO Dance are all renting small

warehouse-type spaces, and hoping that sympathetic landlords will allow them a measure of security.

While certainly not ideal for dancers, or even for audiences, these studio spaces are sometimes used for performances. When requirements are more complex, the companies have to rent better equipped spaces operated by other companies: Toronto Dance Theatre's Winchester Street Theatre, Artword Theatre, Buddies in Bad Times Theatre, Dancemakers, or Premiere Dance Theatre.

Rising rental costs, and limited availability, are chronic problems for the occasional user in these venues. This is especially frustrating with Premiere Dance Theatre, a venue built in 1984 for dance at Harbourfront Centre, with high community expectations, but now also used extensively for other non-dance purposes. Harbourfront programs its own international dance series there, and it is also used for other theatre and music performances, including the bi-annual World Stage Festival and, in recent years, the summer season of Souleppper Theatre. What was hoped to be a long awaited performance home base for Toronto's dance community is now frustratingly inaccessible to them – a phenomenon sadly repeated in other disciplines and cities in Ontario.

Though they all indicate a desperate need for secure, suitable space, most companies feel that the solutions to their facility needs are just dreams at this point. They "make-do" with severe compromises for their art, their comfort, and even their safety. None of these small companies has the operating base to permit them to embark on the purchase, renovation and management of a venue. With no hope of assistance, and strapped for operating resources, they have not even begun the long and complex task of exploring options and establishing costs.

Nor have the leadership or resources emerged – at least not yet – that would be necessary to forge a cooperative solution on behalf of a group of small companies or independent choreographers, or, as in the "One Roof" project in Peterborough, a collective of small organizations from various disciplines. Perhaps through the feasibility component of the new Cultural Spaces Canada Program, some of this process can begin.

FACILITY NEEDS FOR SMALL AND MID-SIZED MUSIC IN ONTARIO

Perhaps no other artistic discipline provides such a range of form and content in Ontario, or involves so many professional and amateurs artists, as music. The following synopsis of selected music activity in Ontario makes this abundantly clear.

Since the facility needs for music vary as much as the possible range of artistic expression, it is impossible to generalize about music venues. This report concentrates on the needs of small to mid-sized music organizations: orchestras and small ensembles, professional opera /music theatre organizations, and classical/contemporary new music organizations.

Ontario has many outstanding orchestras, such as the National Arts Centre Orchestra, the Kitchener-Waterloo Symphony, and the Toronto Symphony. At the same time, dozens of the other communities right across the province are home to smaller symphony orchestras. Almost 50 of these community-based orchestras are members of Orchestras Canada. They play several important roles in their communities. Often they are the only performers of orchestral repertoire in a region of the province, ensuring community access to that music. They also provide excellent training and playing opportunities for professional and amateur musicians across the province, with each one using the talents of 40 to 50 local musicians.

Experienced players who may or may not belong to a symphony orchestra – or new music graduates who have never played with an orchestra - relish the intimacy of the chamber music repertoire. Orchestras Canada reports almost 40 of these small ensembles in Ontario.

The province is also blessed with an incredibly active choral community. Choirs Ontario has almost 400 members, including church and school choirs, performing the complete range of choral repertoire. Though only a very few choirs are strictly professional, in the sense that the singers are paid to perform, the Ontario Arts Council supports 20 independent choirs with budgets of more than \$100,000. They expect to be assisting another 30 - 50 smaller choirs through their newly reinstated community choral program. Like their orchestral counterparts, choirs bring amateur and professional musicians together, and many choirs are active in the commissioning and performing of new music.

Ontario is home to The Canadian Opera Company (whose ongoing facility saga is beyond the scope of this report). But the province also has several smaller opera companies: Opera Ontario, Opera Atelier, Ottawa's Opera Lyra, and several unique organizations devoted to the creation of new works of opera and music theatre, such as Tapestry New Opera Works, Queen of Puddings, and Autumn Leaf.

A burgeoning new music community exists in Toronto. The Music Gallery and ARRAYMUSIC have studio spaces which are widely used by other members of the new music community, both groups and individual musicians. In the case of ARRAYMUSIC, there were more than 40 different users in 2000/2001. Their studio is also becoming a centre for improvised music, averaging four or five loft concerts each month. Interest in new music is growing in other communities, too, such as Kitchener/Waterloo, home to the Open Ears Festival.

From individual artists and composers, to small ensembles like ARRAYMUSIC, to even larger ones like the Esprit Orchestra, new music is an exploration with broad parameters. Technology and related equipment can play an important part, and unusual instrumentation, complex

arrangements, and partnerships with other artistic disciplines such as dance, theatre, and visual arts affect the venue needs of new music.

This kind of cross-disciplinary collaboration is increasingly evident even in traditional music forms.

The American Federation of Musicians has a membership of approximately 12,000 individual artists in Ontario, who pursue work in all aspects of the discipline. As well as performing in ensembles, many musicians actively pursue solo careers, or provide music for all kinds of recordings, films, television, and radio. About 100 Toronto-area musicians play full-time in the orchestras for commercial musicals. All over Ontario, musicians are teachers in schools or private practice.

Music festivals are a way of life in Ontario. There are dozens of them, many of them in small communities: from the Festival of the Sound in Parry Sound, the Elora Festival, Stratford Summer Music, Rhythms of the World at Harbourfront Centre, to multiple jazz and folk festivals across the province. Festivals need a concentration of venues, and a variety of venues, in order to reach a critical mass of performances to draw audiences and artists. For example, one of the largest festivals of chamber music in the world is held in Ottawa. The biennial Strings of the Future brings 200 musicians from around the world, and uses more than a dozen venues in the city, including various churches, the University of Ottawa, the Glebe Community Centre, and the grounds of Rideau Hall.

Acoustics are a major concern in a music performance venue, and different uses (for example, vocal as opposed to orchestral) require different acoustics. That it can be complex and costly to achieve a good acoustical result is borne out by the renovations recently announced for Roy Thomson Hall - a contemporary venue built as a home for the Toronto Symphony, which has complained about the acoustics consistently since the hall opened. Most music organizations simply try to manage with what they have, even if the venue sounds, as one group reported, as if they are "playing inside a marshmallow". The Niagara Symphony rents an acoustical shell to use in the hall at Brock University. It is a partial solution at best, and even the shell is in need of replacement.

Aside from acoustics, other facility issues are identified by music organizations:

- how big is the performance space? The space needs of a small ensemble are one thing. The stage-size needed for a symphony performing with full choir is something else entirely;
- are there adequate dressing rooms, and warm-up areas for musicians and choir?
- is the seating capacity appropriate to the performance from an artistic and economic point of view? Many municipalities have school auditoriums or large performing arts venues. These might be good for orchestras, but they are not very appropriate for small musical presentations by ensembles and collectives. These groups need flexible multi-use spaces, with 150 - 250 seats;
- does the venue have reasonable heating and air-conditioning?
- how are lobby and concession spaces? Can an organization offer a good public experience and meet the needs of patrons and sponsors?
- is it affordable? This is always an issue, especially with unionized civic venues where charges for set-up and costly overtime fees are the norm;
- is it available? Scheduling is also a major concern for all non-resident users. The owners or major tenants in a space take priority, and, in the case of a school or university, they dictate not only the days, but even the times of day that venues can be used;

- is it possible to record in the venue? Recording is an important activity for many music groups, whether they are producing CDs for commercial sale, for promotion or showcase purposes, or making an archival recording. Not very many spaces are created with this in mind, as was the CBC's Glenn Gould Studio. But many groups want or need to record scheduled performances, rather than book expensive studio time in a separate location;
- rehearsal space is necessary - and this may need to be a large space, used on a flexible schedule, over a long period of time;
- storage and security for instruments, stands, music, and sound equipment - especially for the technological demands of some new music - is also a problem. For many small groups the administration, music library, and instrument storage are in three separate locations, often in private homes, and rehearsals take place in another venue altogether.

Not surprisingly, with the huge variety of music performance in the province, there is a need for tremendous range and flexibility in venues. It is impossible for a music venue to be "all things to all people". Many music organizations perform different kinds of work in a season, which may need different kinds of spaces. As a result, music is regularly performed in all kinds of venues.

Churches are particularly connected with music performance across the province. The ambiance and improved acoustics in churches can be a trade-off for other challenges, though: limited lobby and washroom facilities, no dressing rooms, and less-than-effective heating or air-conditioning. Music organizations also use theatres, concert halls, community halls, school auditoriums, civic auditoriums, multi-use lecture halls in universities, people's homes, small studios, bars and clubs, parks, and bandshells.

Where a university has a music program with good facilities, or there is a specialized music building like the Royal Conservatory in Toronto, their studios and halls are also used by independent music organizations - provided they are not in use by their owners.

Most small and mid-sized music ensembles are project-driven, and they rent the best available performance space on a project by project basis. The nomadic life suits many small groups, who want maximum flexibility, and are simply not interested in taking on the operation of a facility - as long as they can find appropriate space when they need to.

Occasionally an organization, like Tafelmusik, will have a long-standing and happy relationship with a venue. In their case it is a church, in which they perform and also have their offices. Some groups with venues, like the Music Gallery in Toronto, play an important role as presenters and readily make their studio space available for performances by others. Recently evicted, the Music Gallery has just relocated in a church. Whether they can continue to provide this service to so many other users is yet to be determined. Much more typical is the Timmins Symphony Orchestra, which rents a school auditorium to perform, rehearses under a leaky roof in the upper floor of a lumber company, and has an office in a third location.

Larger and more established groups, who are regular tenants in a performing space, tend to be more specific in the changes and improvements they would like to see in the venues they use. But they themselves cannot implement renovation plans, even if they had the resources to do so. To get a true picture of the costs of restoring and renovating music venues, one would have to have the full cooperation of municipalities, educational institutions, churches, theatre companies, and others who are the owners of venues used by music organizations.

As long as an organization is a renter, it has no responsibility for - but also no control over - the maintenance and upkeep of the facilities. The owner's priorities and budgets take precedence.

This can be frustrating for music organizations trying to maximize earned revenue and keep expenses down, because performance venues play such a critical part in whether or not they will succeed in those goals. Orchestras, which need large spaces and therefore have very little choice in venues, can be particularly affected. In London the orchestra has been lobbying for 20 years for improvements to Centennial Hall, without success. In Hamilton Place, Symphony Hamilton must use the hall's front of house staff, even if they think they could do a more efficient job. This can have expensive repercussions. For example, for a school performance, a delay of even 10 minutes in seating the children runs them into very expensive overtime costs which they cannot recoup.

In Toronto, a group of new music organizations has begun to meet on a regular basis to discuss issues of mutual concern. A sub-committee of this group, led by New Music Concerts, is exploring the idea of a new venue, a centre for experimental arts. This venue would be modeled on similar ones in New York, Paris and Amsterdam. There would be a cafe, a gallery space, studios, recording facilities, and performance space(s) suitable for use by performing artists in any discipline - or several disciplines together - creating new work. It would be a destination venue for audiences of experimental arts. This is an unusual initiative in terms of music organizations, and much more work needs to be done before a cost estimate for such a venue could be completed.

In any city, meeting the facility needs of music organizations means they must be part of a community's overall planning for cultural infrastructure. They need to be an active part of the process, consulted about both the creation, and the continued operation, of venues that are intended for music use.

FACILITY NEEDS FOR SMALL AND MID-SIZED THEATRES IN ONTARIO

NOTE: *The Study of Facility Needs of Small and Mid-sized Professional Theatres in the City of Toronto*, published in July, 2000 by Theatre Ontario, PACT and the Toronto Theatre Alliance, provides anecdotal information of the issue within Toronto and also several other Ontario communities.

Before we talk facility needs, let's look at what constitutes small and mid-sized theatre in Ontario. An incredible amount of theatre is produced in Ontario throughout the year by an incredible number of artists and theatre companies with annual operating budgets of under \$3 million. In approximate numbers we are looking at:

- 150 professional and semi-professional companies
- 30 summer theatre companies
- 300 community theatres including francophone and culturally diverse groups
- 1000's of actors, directors, playwrights, designers, technicians, administrators

who produce in just about every town or city in the province from populations of 2.5 million to 1500, who produce work which ranges from the classics in the Canadian and international repertoire to new works in the genres of alternate, feminist, musical, cross cultural, theatre for young audiences, movement, performance art, popular theatre, to name a few.

An important component in the growth of the Ontario theatre sector over the past decade comes from the abundance of work produced by artists and companies representing the wide range of cultural diversity across the province, but primarily producing in larger urban centres like Toronto, Hamilton and Ottawa. They are professionally trained artists from their country of origin, or graduates from Canada's post-secondary training programs or community-trained and producing primarily as non-professionals.

These artists and companies enjoyed a surge of support and encouragement in the early '90's but like everyone else were hit by the severe cutbacks of the mid-nineties. The cuts were particularly destructive because as an emerging community of theatre practice these artists and companies relied on project funding and were just beginning to build a sound track record to attract both private and public investment in their work.

Even more discouraging is the sense that issues of diversity have fallen off the cultural map in Ontario. While some companies have succeeded in establishing themselves many artists who aspired to inclusion in the continuum of theatre practice in Ontario have discarded such aspirations and are doing their work as best they can, wherever they can, with few resources and far removed from the "mainstream".

In the main, the culturally diverse community works with their networks and in the particular venues or spaces that have been available, and with which some groups are now "identified" – community halls, churches, school auditoriums, clubs, bars – whether they are appropriate for their work or not.

To date, diversity funding has been programming support. There are now voices being heard that this sector wants facility support – support to address the under-served: **culturally diverse needs, physically challenged artists needs, barrier-free facilities**. A major challenge for this community appears to be the absence of experienced individuals to act as leaders and catalysts to put an arts facility project together.

Ideally, a smaller (100 – 200 seats) multi-task venue(s) would serve cross cultural needs well, particularly if situated in areas that are accessible to the audiences for the work.

WHAT DOES THEATRE NEED?

Including the facility needs outlined in the July, 2000 report, “A Study of Facility Needs of Small and Mid-Sized Professional Theatres in the City of Toronto”, the **price tag for current or planned facility projects for Ontario’s small and mid-sized theatres is approximately \$100 million.**

Stagnating operating grants and little public investment in arts facilities over the past ten years have left few resources in the hands of companies for maintenance, capital upgrades and renovation costs. Today many are in a state of decrepitude. All require immediate improvements, including barrier-free access to facilities.

The need to address efficiency, comfort and safety concerns of theatres across Ontario goes beyond the theatres that own or operate their theatre facilities of course. Just look at the numbers and they speak for themselves. Across Ontario, there are approximately 130 theatre facilities of less than 500 seats available for small and mid-sized companies (professional, semi-professional, summer and community theatre), and there are approximately 325 small and mid-sized theatre companies competing for these spaces along with rehearsal, administration and storage space. The competition is even tighter because 94 of these 130 facilities have resident users for most of the traditional theatre season.

Consequently, in addition to renovations and retrofits for existing operating theatre facilities, smaller companies are seeking non-traditional spaces to convert for production purposes because of the lack of space: spaces in churches, warehouses, pubs, hotels, libraries, schools, old movie theatres. The current development boom in larger urban centres is driving up rents and many companies are being forced to reconsider their facility options.

As well, the lack of access to small and mid-sized theatre spaces for persons with disabilities cannot be understated. A mere twenty-five to thirty provide any suitable access at all. It is not that the theatres are disinterested in the access issue, they simply require financial assistance for such facility upgrades.

At least seventy-two theatre companies are assessing needs with a view to increasing capacity, retrofitting, renovating existing or non-traditional spaces to meet needs and increase artistic and financial growth. Projects range from \$40,000 to \$6,000,000 with several looking into the feasibility of new 300 to 500-seat theatres.

Rising rental costs in larger urban centres have compelled several small producers to look beyond the city core, where there are few if any small, flexible, theatrically equipped spaces.

Putting aside the obvious necessity of addressing the needs of existing theatre spaces across the province, the trend is away from the large theatre facility of former years certainly in communities that have one or more of them. Ottawa’s La Nouvelle Scène and Toronto’s Artword Theatre are two facilities that receive much interest and recommendations as models for new facility development for small groups, artists and collectives.

La Nouvelle Scène, the former Atelier, acts as the owner/operator of the facility with four small francophone theatres as resident companies. It is well equipped technically, barrier free, has

rehearsal and office space, and a multi-purpose lobby area which can accommodate a small bistro/art gallery, performance space and receptions.

Artword Theatre is a 150 seat black box space with a sprung floor, technically well equipped, wheelchair accessible, has decent dressing rooms, a backspace ideal for small workshops and rehearsals, and a spacious L-shaped lobby which can serve as an art gallery while accommodating cabarets, readings and receptions. In the 2001 PACT Theatre listing, Artword defines its space as “a performance space where new work can emerge and artists of different disciplines discover and work with each other.”

Current or planned/dreamed facility projects in Ontario’s small and mid-sized theatre community requiring public and private financial support include:

- feasibility studies and engineering and architects reports
- sustaining/stabilizing historic properties
- retrofits and access needs
- health & safety – code compliance updates
- improved dressing room facilities
- contemporary technical upgrades
- replacing aging equipment
- health and safety needs
- major repairs (basements, brickwork, roofs)
- heating and air conditioning
- expansion and upgrades for lobby, box office, public washrooms, bar/concession areas
- signage and general aesthetics upgrading
- renovation of non-traditional spaces or buildings into operating theatre facilities.

Sadly, many of the companies consulted say that their facility plans are just dreams for now or compromises on their real needs or they are “making do” because they feel the competition for the infrastructure funding support recently announced in new federal and provincial programs is too fierce or inaccessible for smaller organizations and collectives. Because of this perception, several have not approached any funders about facility projects, although the new Cultural Spaces Canada Program may smoke them out to at least put their needs on the table and be counted. As well, many are reluctant to address their facility needs because of fears of how such projects will impact on operations in a time of significant competitive and fundraising challenges.

FACILITY NEEDS FOR SMALL AND MID-SIZED VISUAL ARTS ORGANIZATIONS IN ONTARIO

For the purposes of this report, we have looked at the needs small and mid-sized art galleries and artist run centres (arcs) and the needs of artists generally as reflected by input from galleries and arcs.

The Visual Arts landscape in Ontario is vast and diverse. Within this landscape are situated in approximate numbers:

- 100 small and mid-sized galleries
- 33 artist run centres
- many thousands of citizens make art but only several thousands present their work in a consistent manner and spend at least one-third of their working life creating, exhibiting promoting and selling their work.

Let's take a moment to differentiate between art galleries and artist run centres. Typically, public art galleries are initiated by civic minded citizens, are supported by a membership and are governed by Boards of Directors drawn from the local community and reflect community interests. Generally, galleries have a broad mandate to present art to the public and their structure and programming follows a similar pattern: exhibitions, collection, education and the programming is driven by a professional staff of one or more.

Artist run centres (arcs) have all been initiated by groups of artists to address specific needs within the art community, principally to multiply exhibition opportunities. Their exhibition focus is often more specific than art galleries'- i.e. Toronto Photographers' Workshop is devoted exclusively to photo-based art. Many artist run centres provide facilities or equipment to artists for production or distribution - ranging from printmaking, photography darkrooms, video production to new computer based technologies. Generally artist run centres provide more direct support to artists and have more flexibility in working with artists than do public galleries, and their boards are controlled by artists who are often involved directly in the selection and generation of programming.

Most public galleries have secured a suitable building and central location often owned by the municipality or located in a local heritage building. Many galleries undertook major upgrades and renovations during the provincial and federal infrastructure funding programs of the 70's and '80s, capital campaigns led by influential local citizens, and from the assistance provided through the federal Museums' Assistance Program (MAP). Most public galleries have collections which require secure exhibition and storage space that is environmentally controlled and most comply with local building and safety codes.

Artist run centres are smaller and much fewer in number but work with an astonishing number of artists many of whom work and network nationally and internationally. The centres are located in old warehouses and office buildings, empty stores in and outside malls, often in locations which are not centrally located. The spaces are rented, not owned, and provide exhibition space primarily, with some cramped inadequate administration space and perhaps programming or studio space. Few artist run centres have collections. Those that do probably do not meet minimal standards for housing their collections.

Obviously visual arts facility needs – for creation, exhibition, programming and studio/classes - loom large in the visual arts community. Stagnating operating grants and little public investment in arts facilities over the past ten years have left few resources in the hands of galleries and artist run centres for maintenance, capital upgrades and renovation costs. Today many are in a state of disrepair or require expansion to meet the volume of work being produced locally, nationally and internationally as well as the needs of the increasing artist labour force.

Facility funding from the Ontario Trillium Foundation has been very helpful for small facility projects in the visual arts community and elsewhere over the past two years. Interestingly, however, organizations and some municipalities are beginning to voice some concerns about a mounting, unrealistic, reliance upon Trillium money, which is finite, while not-for-profits require a degree of ongoing public support.

What do Art Galleries, Artist Run Centres & Collectives and Visual Artists Need?

Our research indicates that the **price tag for current or planned facility projects for Ontario's small and mid-sized visual arts sector is approximately \$30 million**. This figure reflects planned or projected projects by established galleries and artist run centres, only. It does not address the large number of "hopes and dreams" expressed by collectives and local artists across the province who desperately require spaces for their special needs.

As in other arts disciplines, today's dilemma and challenge in arts facility development and policies is to meet the facility needs of existing visual arts facilities while addressing the needs of new generations of artists and audiences. Facility needs fall into 3 sub-groups:

- **New Site Projects.** These often involve major restorations, renovations and/or enlargements to an existing building, often one designated as an historic building (McLaren Arts Centre project in Barrie, Belleville's Quinte Cultural Centre);

- **Renovations of Existing Gallery Facilities.** These include some or all of:
 - Retrofit
 - Expansion
 - Repair
 - Technical/equipment upgrades
 - Heating/air conditioning
 - Health and safety
 - Accessibility improvements
 - Flooring
 - Humidity Control
 - Lighting
 - Security System
 - Public Lobby/Washroom spaces
 - Exhibition area
 - Collection/Storage area
 - Programming space
 - Signage and or other aesthetic improvements

Galleries are voicing a particular need for programming and studio space or the expansion of same. Such spaces are essential in today's galleries as key to gallery health. They provide opportunities for community outreach and public awareness by educating, changing attitudes and enriching the arts experience, as well as building capacity by increasing earned revenue sources from classes and rentals.

- Retrofits – Generally undertaken by artist run centres. The spacial environment of artist run centres is often not a pretty one. And it is an issue which has been studied previously. All aspects of their facilities are inadequate to deal with current needs in the communities they serve. - Specifically, every study ever done has indicated most artist run centres require:
 - 50% to 100% more space for exhibition/presentation, programming and administration;
 - general aesthetic improvements;
 - lighting – lighting in most artist run centres is not designed specifically for multiple use - difficult to deal with multitude of mediums and technologies used by contemporary visual artists, performance artists, video and computer artists;
 - storage, preparation space;
 - accessibility improvements;
 - climate controls - many spaces have no air circulation or temperature control and many suspect possible chemical fumes etc. from other businesses in buildings such as photo labs or printing shops. Complaints about heat and air quality too frequent from working artists and visitors.

Artists and artist run centres need public visibility of location and ownership in their communities. They operate with constant moves from location to location, chasing cheap rents and in the process, de-stabilizing their organizations and work.

The prevailing need, voiced throughout the province is for shared space that allows for new uses such as some version of Toronto's 401 Richmond's complex with its mix of commercial and not-for profit, or proposed projects like Guelph's Visual Arts Community Centre or Peterborough's multi-use "One Roof".

The Guelph proposal is specifically dedicated to the visual arts in the community and would be a renovation of an existing building to incorporate some or all of: meeting room(s) and kitchen, a large meeting hall, dedicated rooms for arts groups and guilds, shared accommodation for arts groups and guilds, teaching space for adult classes and programs for young people, darkroom facilities, kiln, Guelph Artisans' Store, community art gallery, individual artists studios.

Peterborough's "One Roof" is also the renovation of an existing building, in the downtown core, and is an inter-disciplinary concept with at least four partners with a shared commitment to the development of a vibrant cultural scene in an environment enriched by audience sharing and collaborative energy. It would include gallery space, a small 50 seat performance space, office and programming space.

The visual arts sector points to successful facility projects in Quebec, the United States and Europe and is pushing for more small multi-task facilities and arts incubators such as Toronto's Gibraltar Point Centre for the Arts which offers residencies for artists from other parts of Canada or international exchanges. There is interest in cohabiting with performing arts organizations or community based organizations in community centres and libraries, a funky arts mix which can draw audiences and enhance fundraising potential.

While the art gallery world is somewhat hopeful that it will receive some share of the new multi-year provincial and/or federal infrastructure funding, it will not begin to meet the

pent-up needs and a dismaying number of visual arts practitioners see little hope in accessing these programs given their criteria and the fierce competition for this support from larger and more sophisticated applicants.

PART III CURRENT OR UPCOMING CAPITAL FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE CULTURE SECTOR

All capital fundraising, whether from public or private sources, is extremely competitive across the province and requires perseverance and patience. Facility projects require a comprehensive and realistic case for support, including a realistic fundraising strategy and evidence of the organization's capacity to operate the renovated or new facility.

Political support from all levels of government is essential and for the newly announced programs at the provincial and federal level, MUNICIPAL APPROVAL IS KEY.

To succeed in any government program, support of a project by the local MP, MPP and others is crucial. Interested parties should keep in constant touch with constituency staff as well as Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation field offices and Department of Canadian Heritage regional offices. Note: The website addresses for the following funding programs which provide full details on the programs are included in Appendix A.

FEDERAL :

Cultural Initiatives Program (CIP)

For many years there was no facilities program within the CIP envelope. From time to time funding was "found" at the Department of Canadian Heritage for a facility project and funneled to the recipient through the Cultural Initiatives Program. Such recipients had well developed facility campaigns in place and on file at the Department, just in case; had politically well-connected boards or champions; and had been lobbying for support at all levels of government, with both political and public service staff.

May 2001 - the government announced a major funding package for the cultural sector. Part of this package is for **Cultural Spaces Canada**, a national \$80 million fund to be allocated over three years. This is in addition to the national infrastructure program previously announced (see below). The program goal is to improve the cultural infrastructure, and public access to performing arts, visual arts, media arts, and museum and heritage displays. A particular focus will be the repair and upgrading of arts and heritage facilities.

This funding is greatly needed, and very welcome. It is particularly helpful in light of how small and mid-sized organizations were virtually shut out of the Canada-Ontario infrastructure program. However, it will not go very far toward meeting the cultural facility needs of the entire cultural sector, across the whole country. It will be very competitive. The best scenario would be if the government is willing and able to maintain this level of support beyond the current three year span, which would enable the department - if they are willing to do so - to explore some different ways of structuring the program.

Applications can be submitted anytime, however those received after October 31st may not be considered for funding until 2002/2003. The Department will contribute 33% of eligible costs for construction and renovation, and for transforming buildings not previously used for cultural purposes. For specialized equipment purchases and feasibility studies, the Department will contribute 50% of eligible costs.

The assessment criteria are described on the website. They include questions about how a project will benefit other cultural organizations locally, regionally, provincially or nationally; and how it will contribute to, or complement, existing networks or inventories of cultural spaces. The better an organization can make a case for doing so, the better its chances. This may be a barrier for smaller, locally-based organizations which may not be able to argue broad geographic impact, but may still be critical to their communities.

Federal Infrastructure Program:

The last Speech from the Throne and the 2000 federal budget announced a \$2.7 billion five-year modern physical infrastructure program for Canada, including projects in tourism, telecommunications and culture. The federal government negotiated agreements with provincial and municipal partners to describe how this program would be implemented in each province. The program will contribute \$680 million in Ontario, in collaboration with Ontario's SuperBuild program. The federal priority is green municipal infrastructure, which will receive 40% of the funding in Ontario. Secondary priorities include culture, recreation, and tourism initiatives. Municipal governments play an important role in the federal program, and special allowances can be made for projects of a regional nature, involving more than one municipality. In Ontario the province has effectively become the gatekeeper to the federal funding, through SuperBuild.

Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC):

Job creation grants are available through HRDC for applicants who can illustrate significant employment opportunities during facility construction and afterwards. Such grants are obviously determined by the size of the project. Working with local politicians and their staffs, particularly federal MPs, is essential for any success through this program.

Official Languages Act:

Support may be available for francophone theatres through this program. Call the Department of Canadian Heritage if you think your company is eligible. Ottawa's La Nouvelle Scène received substantial support from this federal program.

FedNor:

This is short for Federal Economic Development Initiative in Northern Ontario, an Industry Canada initiative. FedNor's priorities include improving telecommunications infrastructure, supporting other infrastructures which are linked to economic performance, and emphasizing the quality of life in Northern Ontario, particularly through tourism development.

Grants of up to \$100,000 are available for not-for-profit organizations in northern communities. Thunder Bay's Magnus Theatre was a successful grant recipient through FedNor's Northern Ontario Economic Development Fund. The funding covered professional fees for the project's architecture firm. This fund covers costs for wages and benefits, special services, liability insurance, etc. A new capital program under this fund will grant up to \$200,000 for capital costs and materials for eligible projects.

Community Futures Program:

This is a community partnership initiative of Industry Canada for rural communities. Economic, social, cultural and environmental factors important to the community are considered. This program provides resources for building capacity to adapt and manage economic change including an effective development process and development of people, organizations and infrastructure.

Other

Last year Federal Heritage Minister, Sheila Copps, announced plans for a tax-crediting system to encourage the preservation of heritage buildings. Now called the **Historic Places Conservation Initiative**, this program is still in development. The Department is currently working to complete a register of historic places, and standards and guidelines for conservation. Organizations should keep in touch with regional DOCH offices or their website for future announcements.

PROVINCIAL:

SuperBuild Sports Culture and Tourism Partnerships Fund

Announced in the May 2000 Ontario budget, SuperBuild Sports, Culture and Tourism Partnerships is a \$300 million program to be delivered over five years, with \$60 million available in 2000-2001. More than 450 applications with funding requests totaling more than \$1 billion were received for Round I of the Fund. Of these, the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Recreation, Tim Hudak, reports only thirteen applications were from arts institutions. The Stratford Festival has been approved already as an eligible project at \$2 million, and several other cultural facility projects which were submitted to the Ministry prior to the Fund's announcement are also anticipating approval.

The criteria for Round 1 of SuperBuild were released in December 2000, with letters of intent due in February 2001. Selected applicants were invited to proceed with a rigorous application in April. Decisions will be made by the Cabinet, with recommendations first coming forward from the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation to the SuperBuild Secretariat. This certainly suggests that, as in all government programs, political interests will be at play. As mentioned at the beginning of this section, hard and ongoing advocacy work, at all levels, is the order of the day.

The SuperBuild program structure made it almost impossible for small and mid-sized organizations to apply. There were two streams. In the **Municipal stream**, each municipality, regardless of size, was permitted to select and submit only one project as its highest priority in sports, culture or tourism. (To be eligible, municipalities must first be in compliance with the province's new Clean Water guidelines.) In the **Provincial stream**, organizations were able to come forward without municipal sanction, provided they could make a case for significant tourism or regional economic impact. This is of benefit to large groups like The Shaw Festival or Roy Thomson Hall, major community projects well into the development and fundraising cycle, like the Art Gallery of Hamilton or Belleville's Quinte Cultural Centre or provincial agencies like the Ontario Science Centre.

The concept of public-private partnership is integral to SuperBuild. Applicants needed to be able to go forward with confirmed cash contributions from the private sector. Only those who were well-advanced in their capital projects will likely have much to report in the way of confirmed partnership contributions.

In a significant departure from previous federal/provincial capital programs, the province receives all applications through SuperBuild, and will choose which projects it will forward to its federal infrastructure counterparts for consideration under the Canada-Ontario agreement. This means that small and mid-sized organizations are not only limited at the provincial level, but their access to federal infrastructure funds is also severely curtailed.

The province was inundated with requests, and despite the province's best intentions for rapid turnaround, no results are expected until the fall of 2001. This means the timing of Round 2 is up in the air. Nor have the priorities for Round 2 been announced, and they could change dramatically from Round 1. This may be an opportunity for the cultural sector, as it might be possible to influence the terms of Round 2 in an advantageous way. Perhaps. A cautionary note, however. Although SuperBuild was announced as a five-year program, at this point no nominal allocations have been made beyond the anticipated but unconfirmed second round.

Ontario Trillium Foundation Programs

The Ontario Trillium Foundation has been the sole provincial source for capital support for the cultural sector through its Community and Province-Wide grant programs since 1999. Close to 300 capital grants of up to \$75,000 have been made through these programs, including Georgian Bay Folk Society, Gibraltar Point Centre for the Arts on Toronto Island, Chatham Capital Theatre, Goderich Little Theatre, Guelph Youth Music Centre, London's Palace Theatre, North Bay's White Water Gallery, Ottawa Valley Artists' Association, Toronto's Opera Atelier, Sault Theatre Workshop, Regent Theatre In Picton, Stirling Festival Theatre, Tillsonburg District Craft Council, Visual Arts Centre of Clarington and Waterloo Community Arts Centre. After years of no capital support programs, the Trillium support has been very valuable for smaller capital projects.

Ontario Trillium Foundation grants are made with reference to eight goals, including making better use of existing community facilities, land, and other tangible resources; supporting economic opportunity; and improved access and participation in all aspects of community life. Capital grants for up to \$75,000 can be for renovation and repairs, or for equipment purchase and Internet access.

Applicants should talk to a Program Officer about local priorities in the 16 catchment areas of the province, but strategies that increase use of under-used assets or which encourage shared or multiple use are encouraged. The process for funding decisions can be lengthy - up to four to six months for larger grants.

Trillium support programs have become extremely competitive. Other sectors have become as proactive with applications for support as the arts and culture sector was in the past year, and more arts organizations are applying. Some arts organizations are becoming concerned that Trillium is setting expectations in the community which may not be fulfilled, if the government decides to end the program, or change the program focus. The new Minister, Tim Hudak, was quoted in the June issue of Arts Advocate to the effect that "what the Premier wanted to see from Trillium was more direct support of general government initiatives."

Ontario Heritage Challenge Fund

This is the newest provincial program to support the creation of endowments and cultural projects in the cultural sector. The Heritage Challenge Fund Community program provides not-for-profit organizations, First Nations Councils, municipalities or local service boards and conservation authorities with matching funds for:

- capital projects to conserve and restore eligible heritage properties, and related feasibility studies, architectural plans and conservation master plans
- or
- endowments created specifically to provide income for the ongoing capital costs of conserving eligible heritage properties.

NOTE: Applicants can apply for capital project assistance or endowment funds, but not both. Applications for funding will be accepted until March 31, 2002. It is on the web at: www.gov.on.ca/mczcr. This program is delivered in cooperation with the Ontario Heritage Foundation, which you can find on the Ministry's website under Agencies, Boards and Commissions.

Northern Ontario Heritage Fund

The May 2, 2000 budget renewed and improved this fund to \$60 million annually. The Northern Ontario Heritage Fund Corporation (NOHFC) currently reviewing its programs and developing new guidelines and funding criteria.

The Fair Municipal Finance Act – this 1997 act eliminated the Business Occupancy Tax and exempted small and mid-sized theatre facilities - facilities of fewer than 1000 seats - from property taxes.

NOTE: As occurs federally, funding is occasionally “found” within Ministry budgets, usually nearing the end of the fiscal year, and a few facility projects have received special grants from the Minister. Obviously, these projects have already been on file at the Ministry and have been lobbied for by the company in question. There is a trend federally, and certainly in Ontario, to support capital projects that assist tourism and regional development.

MUNICIPAL:

Many Ontario cities are actively considering the role of arts and culture in their communities, and after years of concentrating on recreational facilities, are considering capital projects designed to improve their cultural assets. Arts organizations can capitalize on this growing interest at the municipal level.

It is important that such planning be part of a municipality's overall plan, addressing anticipated population growth and change, reflecting needs of the local arts community, and exploring the regional audience demand. Assessing a municipality's needs and establishing municipal policy with regard to cultural assets is complex, specialized work. Municipalities can benefit greatly from the contribution of knowledgeable consultants and the experience of other municipalities.

Two distinct examples are Barrie and Oshawa. Barrie is the fastest growing city in the province, and known for its recreational infrastructure. It has a new library and a visual arts centre. However, its performing arts infrastructure is poor. With encouragement from the local Arts Council, the city recently commissioned a status report on two existing venues (neither of them city-owned) and a community needs assessment. As a result it is now planning for the construction of a large new venue, while also acknowledging a demand for a much smaller multi-purpose performing arts venue.

In Oshawa, another rapidly expanding region of the province, the city's initiative was driven by the sudden opportunity to purchase and restore the old Regent movie theatre, located in a disadvantaged part of the downtown core. The Regent project will most likely result in a multi-purpose venue for local dance, theatre and music organizations.

In both these cities - in all cities undertaking capital planning - the process of understanding the most appropriate use of an existing building, and how it could meet (or fail to meet) the community's dreams and aspirations is crucial. Is the building part of an overall plan for a neighbourhood or the city? Who will own and operate such a building? Why, and for whom?

In Barrie and Oshawa - and most Ontario cities - funds for cultural capital projects must come from the city's general capital budgets. Some cities, however, have separate budgets.

In its general capital fund, Thunder Bay provides support for maintenance and upgrades of the four major cultural organizations in the City: the museum, art gallery, community auditorium, and sports hall of fame. Grants range from \$7,000 to \$250,000.

The city of Ottawa has recently reinstated its capital grants budget, for studies and minor capital projects. It provides partial funding, with maximum grants of \$7,500. The city is trying to reinstate its fund for major capital projects. In the past these programs have assisted Great Canadian Theatre Company, La Nouvelle Scène (both in converted garages), the Orpheus Society, and Ottawa Ballet. The city of Ottawa has two suburban municipal facilities, Centrepointe Theatre and Cumberland Town Hall Theatre, and one downtown venue, Arts Court. Over the past 12 years Ottawa has spent about \$10 million on this heritage building (a former courthouse) which houses several arts organizations, a gallery space, and a small performing venue.

In contrast, the City of Toronto owns 78 cultural facilities (including heritage sites), 44 of which it also operates. It is estimated that the Culture Division needs to spend about \$7 million annually in maintenance and upkeep, roughly double its current state-of-good-repair budget. Toronto does not have a capital budget to meet the needs of cultural facilities it does not own. However, it supports the operations of most of those organizations through the Toronto Arts Council. It has a vested interest in the health and vitality of the entire sector, and the Culture Division recognizes that most small and mid-sized organizations have critical capital needs that must be addressed. Toronto has created a Cultural Facilities Reference Group as part of its current cultural policy review process.

Not many communities can make an Olympic Games bid such as undertaken recently by Toronto, but from time to time cities bid for other large events, such as international sports championships. Bid organizers are interested in lasting legacies, and upgrading cultural infrastructure may fall in with their plans.

While capital support programs are virtually non-existent at the municipal level, today, there are other ways municipalities can, and do, assist with the development of cultural facilities. Organizations need to be creative about approaching city governments, determined, persistent, and patient to make these things possible. They will not happen without support and good will from staff and politicians at the local level.

Loans (Kitchener's loan/grant of \$94,000 to The Registry Theatre) and lines of credit, access to vacant public buildings (Kitchener's offer of former Waterloo County Registry Office building to The Registry Theatre), rent or tax exemptions, capital grants through economic or neighbourhood development programs, donations of land or equipment, heritage building designations, and density transfers have all been used in Ontario to help arts organizations realize a facility dream – on a project by project basis, not as regular programs.

While capital support programs are virtually non-existent at the municipal level today, municipalities can also assist capital campaigns in significant non-monetary ways, some of which are listed in the "Alternative Models" and "Recommendations for Governments" sections of this report.

DON'T FORGET PRIVATE FUNDRAISING:

Current capital support programs at any level of government now require matching or significant private investment in the project. Before a final decision is taken to undertake a facility project of any substance, organizations should conduct a fundraising review to determine their ability to conduct a fundraising campaign of sufficient size.

Once committed to a facility project of any size, organizations should begin immediately to research locally and nationally those corporations, foundations or individuals that may be interested in investing, in a variety of ways. Include naming possibilities in your plan, which have been key components of successful facility campaigns. An influential local leader, widely respected within a community, can be very helpful to champion your project.

Occasionally private funders or donors, who do not normally support capital projects, are willing to provide bridge financing or loans to organizations. When this happens it is nearly always because the donor/funder has already had a long-term or special relationship with the organization. For instance, the Laidlaw Foundation has held a first mortgage on Theatre Passe Muraille since 1983, and in 1999 made a \$200,000 loan to Factory Theatre which is guaranteed by the City of Toronto. If you have corporate and private partners, who have a vested interest in the future of your organization, talk to them about your capital project. A special request might be considered.

Community foundations can be important partners. Local lottery funds also contribute to many capital projects.

Capital and endowment fundraising are particularly challenging for small and mid-sized organizations. But a facility is a long-term initiative, with ongoing operating costs. The ideal plan, if at all possible, is to raise enough funding over and above your capital goal to create an endowment which will provide annual contributions toward upkeep and maintenance.

On an ongoing basis, many organizations institute a special surcharge on the sale of each ticket, which is allocated specifically to capital maintenance and repairs.

PART IV THE CASE FOR PUBLIC SUPPORT OF THE CAPITAL NEEDS OF ONTARIO'S SMALL AND MID-SIZED PERFORMING & VISUAL ARTS ORGANIZATIONS

“The cultural industries don’t have easily measured output, such as assembled cars, steel ingots, litres of wine or shipped personal computers, as the manufacturing industries have. But when we look to future sources of wealth as well as quality of life, it should be clear that the cultural sector is one of the most important assets a community can have.” David Crane, economics editor, Toronto Star, July, 2001.

AND THOSE ASSETS NEED HOMES.

To give some context to the facility needs of the small and mid-sized performing and visual arts organizations in Ontario, it is estimated, conservatively, that in the province of Ontario **known** projects in the cultural and heritage sectors, including large arts organizations and museums (a very few underway, most in the planning and fundraising stages) approaches \$1 billion with requests for provincial and federal government support in the area of at least half that amount.

These figures do not take into account projects that companies have put on the back burner because of the poor funding environment, and, of course, the cultural sector is competing with other pressing infrastructure needs in the country.

While there is much to celebrate artistically and culturally in Ontario, in our larger urban centres, particularly, there is a rising tide of adverse comment surfacing from the media, citizens and visitors alike that our safe, clean, friendly metropolises are fraying at the seams, are adrift without a focused vision and increasingly culturally stagnant. As we trumpeted our quality of life in comparison to similar sized cities in the United States over the past decade, we became complacent.

This complacency has dimmed awareness of what is really happening to some of our cities. In the case of Toronto, it now ranks lower in cultural spending – including cultural infrastructure spending – than cities like Cleveland or Pittsburgh in the United States, cities which just a short time ago were in major decay. It is past time to take a hard look at how shoddy Toronto’s and many of Ontario’s existing small and mid-sized arts facilities look, at what audiences and artists are expected to cope with.

While the societal push of the past decade in Canada has been to make the arts justify themselves economically, other cities of the world have taken the leap to embrace the arts as a vital urban good and are investing accordingly. A combination of municipal, state and federal infrastructure programs in the United States, along with concerted efforts at the municipal level to market these cities as cultural destinations, has turned these cities around.

Like American cities, Ontario municipalities must recognize the catalytic role the arts can play in urban revitalization. Investments in arts infrastructure assist with the stimulation of neighbourhood economic development.

In the particular case of Toronto, Canada itself and Ontario in particular have not been inclined to acknowledge the importance of Toronto as its major metropolis and to develop urban policies and support systems to develop and enhance this position, as is done in other countries.

Remaking cities requires enormous investment and leadership and citizens must stop considering the investment as debt. Canada and Ontario are experiencing an era of unprecedented economic growth and health. Citizens, corporate and business leaders, governments of all stripes must grow up, shrug off their timidity and throw off the shackles of a colonial past – which we thought we were doing in the '60s and '70s – and seriously focus the many disparate but vital pockets of creativity in the province into a groundswell of power and action.

FACILITIES ACTIVITY IS BOTH CONTINUAL AND CYCLICAL. There are ongoing maintenance, code requirements and management of repairs complicated by sophisticated equipment, public assembly and structural aspects that are special to performing and visual arts facilities. They all add complexity to the responsibilities inherent in facility operations. Some facility activity is incorporated into operating budgets. From time to time extraordinary repairs or code requirements necessitate additional outside support.

Along with the continual activity, investment is required for the larger scale activity that usually occurs every six to ten years, activity like a major renovation or relocation. Major facility projects are usually activated by growth-related needs, a changing real estate market, such as exists in Ontario's larger urban centres today, or deferred maintenance (deferring the burden of major maintenance because of budget constraints until it becomes a major renovation project).

The case for support for the community's pent-up need for infrastructure support follows.

SUSTAINING OUR FACILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE WITH PUBLIC INVESTMENT LEVERAGES PRIVATE SUPPORT FOR FACILITY PROJECTS

Public funding is crucial as leverage for fundraising support from the private sector. Arts organizations are focused on increasing private sector support for their operations in the wake of the enormous cuts in provincial support to the Ontario Arts Council. They need all the help they can get when faced with the additional challenge of capital fundraising campaigns. Public funding support and the leverage it brings to securing business and corporate support cannot be understated.

SUSTAINING OUR FACILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE IS A SMART INVESTMENT IN ARTISTS, ARTS ORGANIZATIONS AND AUDIENCES ALIKE

Public and private support for arts facilities builds capacity for increasing earned revenue through expanded box office, concession, revenues, and rentals. Facilities are imperative to the performing and visual arts, not a luxury. They advance an arts organization's artistic mission, enrich the audience's arts experience, and are essential to an organization's efforts to develop audiences and predict their finances.

While facilities contribute to the overall financial health, inadequate facilities can lead to debilitating management problems, financial instability and artistic compromises. The impact of facility problems is magnified by a financial climate where arts organizations operate on very narrow financial margins. Investing in facilities in areas like shared administration, teaching and

rehearsal spaces can enhance their respective financial health and end exhausting counter-productive states of transience.

Ontario's small and mid-sized performing and visual arts sector is Canada's largest such community in all its scope and exciting diversity. As key investors in its growth and development, the Province of Ontario and the Government of Canada and many municipal governments have understood their place in the dynamic continuum of our country's cultural development.

A healthy economy now presents optimum conditions for both the public and private sector to invest in sustaining and upgrading the physical properties of our arts facilities as sparkling jewels reflective of the art they produce, comfortable, safe and welcoming to the artists they engage and the audiences they serve. It is our arts facilities and their artists, designers, technicians and administrators who engage in the innovation and new work development, who produce it, provide the work opportunities, mentor the artists and cultural workers, many of whom do cross-over work in other arts disciplines and the cultural industries.

Major not-for-profit and commercial producers including David Mirvish, have consistently recognized the importance of Toronto's and Ontario's small and mid-sized arts community in feeding into their work. New public investment will banish the depressing comparisons with other regions of the country, but particularly the province of Québec and the City of Montréal. In the mid-1990's Québec championed and invested in facility development in Montréal and Québec, as did the federal government.

**USING ONTARIO'S LARGEST CITY, TORONTO, AS AN EXAMPLE,
SUSTAINING OUR FACILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE ACKNOWLEDGES THE ARTISTIC AND
SOCIETAL IMPACT OF THE ARTS ON A COMMUNITY.
JUST IMAGINE THE CITY WITHOUT ITS GALLERIES, THEATRES, STUDIOS, CONCERT HALLS....**

The diversity, innovation and multiplicity of production drives Toronto's dynamic arts culture. It provides the opportunities for artists to hone their craft, enlarge their repertoire, stretch their boundaries in ever-changing art forms and innovation, thus enhancing Toronto's recognized position in developing Canadian work and artists.

This dynamic arts culture is responsible for the increase in the number of tickets sold to people living outside the Greater Toronto Area in the past year, with every indication that this activity will increase, a benefit to citizen and artist alike. It is this critical mass and diversity of work and innovation that routinely attracts professionals from across North America and beyond to Toronto's arts scene.

And they all need a home...

If only the physical state of our arts venues lived up to the work. Think how investment in facilities will add the technological and design sophistication capacity which modern audiences now expect. Demographic forecasters predict that the aging Baby Boomer population will expand demand for arts events and programming, and Baby Boomers, whether attending events in small or large venues demand comfort and efficiency. Imagine how many more patrons would be attracted – increasing crucial earned revenue potential - with wheelchair access, renovated lobby areas, expanded washroom capacity, expanded bar and refreshment

areas, increased and improved seating or viewing comfort for audiences, and improved programming, studio, storage, wardrobe or dressing room areas for artists, technicians, ensembles, crews and administrators.

SUSTAINING AND NOURISHING OUR FACILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE IS AN INVESTMENT IN ONTARIO'S DIVERSIFIED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH

The Ontario not-for-profit arts and culture community collectively generates an economic impact exceeding \$8 billion according to a 1996 Toronto Arts Council report, and in the Greater Toronto Area the total impact in the city of the arts and cultural industries is about \$2 billion annually and in Toronto about \$1 billion annually.

Tourism Toronto estimates that cultural tourism is a \$1 billion industry in the region. For example, an estimated six million people attend theatre in Toronto each year, half of whom are visitors to the city.

According to Statistics Canada, arts and culture jobs represent about 10% of the region's employment, a good half of whom are self-employed. This figure does not include employment that is generated in other industries as a result of the economic activity of the arts and culture sector.

Ontario's small and mid-sized performing and visual arts sector are no small players or contributors in this economic impact. And it is shortsighted to ignore the impact of suitable space for artists and audiences on the success of artistic ventures. Well-designed, affordable space is an essential ingredient in the ability of Ontario's arts community to contribute economically as well as artistically in the future.

SUSTAINING ONTARIO'S ARTS FACILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE ENHANCES ONTARIO'S QUALITY OF LIFE AND ITS IMAGE NATIONALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY

In the fall of 1999, federal Finance Minister Paul Martin met with the editorial board of the *Toronto Star* in a wide-ranging conversation on the rosy state of Canada's economy and its implications for the country's future. In the course of the conversation, Mr. Martin "blue-skied" about Canada's cities and their potential in the 21st century: Thunder Bay as the Edinburgh of Ontario, Ottawa as the Amsterdam of Canada and Toronto as the Paris of North American. Lofty ambitions, but why not?

Paris is Europe's cultural mecca for many reasons, one of which is France's enormous ongoing investment in its arts infrastructure, not just in entertainment and mega-projects. Such renewal is possible for Toronto, Ottawa, Thunder Bay and any other city in Ontario and the significant public investment in the arts facilities that make our cities unique – their most dynamic and lively arts organizations – will certainly take them some way along the path to meeting Mr. Martin's challenge! To do so we must re-invigorate our governments' appetites for public partnerships.

There is simply no contest in comparing the cultural impact of a Great Canadian Theatre Company in Ottawa or Toronto's Tarragon Theatre with the Ford Centre for the Performing Arts (now the Toronto Centre for the Arts) or a White Water Gallery in North Bay or Kingston's Agnes Etherington Art Centre with the Art Gallery of Ontario. Citizens and governments alike must

recognize the significance of Ontario's small and mid-sized performing and visual arts sector – and their artists and technicians and administrators – to the cultural fabric of the country. We must invest in our arts and heritage treasures by addressing:

- our limited technological resources, including new media capacity;
- our limited capacity to serve the safety and comfort of audiences within our theatres;
- our limited capacity to respond to new generations of artists and culturally diverse artists.

SUSTAINING OUR FACILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE INCREASES ONTARIO'S CULTURAL TOURISM POTENTIAL

- Cultural tourists of the 21st century expect to enjoy the arts in accessible, comfortable, aesthetically pleasing, technologically modern facilities.
- In Ontario, 3.8 million attended a cultural performance while on a trip away from home;
- Over 25% of Ontarians attend at least 1 cultural activity annually;
- Tourism Consultant Judy Rodgers' research indicates that 29% of all visitors to Toronto participate in a cultural activity during their stay;
- Cultural tourists include visits to not-for-profit cultural productions and events on their itineraries, as well commercial products;
- Cultural tourists contribute to more intensive utilization of the tourism infrastructure in traditional low seasons, since cultural activities are not as reliant on good weather as many other types of tourism;
- Cultural tourists bring new spending to the country, province and city, helping Canada's balance of trade;
- Cultural tourists are major contributors to the tourism economic engine in Ontario because they rely heavily on Ontario's hotels, motels, cultural establishments and shops.

In the end, the arts sector must stand together to articulate and champion facility needs to all levels of government as a priority within their disciplines.

PART V - ALTERNATIVE MODELS FOR CAPITAL INVESTMENT

In Canada governments have created many tools to support and encourage the development of a vibrant arts community. Arm's length funding agencies are just one very good example. These tools were usually designed to focus on a particular element of "the big picture" and taken together - provided an adequate level of support was maintained - had an impact that far exceeded the sum of the parts.

However, both the arts community and the environment in which it exists, have changed very significantly. Adequate levels of support have not been maintained. "Tools" are devised and implemented on an ad hoc or temporary basis. And certain important tools are missing from the tool-kit. These things, combined, threaten to undo much of what has been accomplished.

One missing but increasingly important tool is a mechanism to help small and mid-sized organizations cope with facility challenges. The overall goal of this project was to offer a bold and creative solution to the chronic facility problems that plague small and mid-sized performing and visual arts organizations.

Form Follows Function.

Whatever the specific mechanisms might be, the results of this research project suggest that the following outcomes are essential if significant progress is to be made in the facility area for small to mid-sized arts organizations:

- current building assessments for all existing venues which will identify, and create budgets for, deferred maintenance and health and safety items;
- proper life-cycle planning for the ongoing maintenance and upgrading of these facilities, including the development of capital reserves;
- access to qualified expertise to help organizations complete these assessments and life-cycle plans;
- immediate and ongoing public investment, on a cost-sharing basis, for the implementation of deferred maintenance ;
- a central repository of facility-related information and resources which can be readily shared across disciplines, and across the province;
- liaison with local and regional agencies to search for, and share, examples of effective local mechanisms for cultural facility development and support;
- access to a flexible mix of pre-planning and feasibility studies, loans, bridge financing, and grants;
- technical assistance workshops and materials for the Ontario arts community, such as those developed by the Massachusetts Cultural Facilities Program;
- incentives to encourage private sector participation in the development and maintenance of cultural assets;
- a high degree of cooperation between all funders, so that capital program(s) are part of the overall picture of arts support strategies, and are not isolated from operating grants, endowment funds, working capital reserves and other initiatives.

There are many ways that the arts community, governments, and the private sector could begin to work toward these goals. Governments usually think in occasional and temporary terms, such as the infrastructure programs described in Parts I and III of this report. The following examples show that much more appropriate kinds of mechanisms are already being used by the federal and Ontario governments for other purposes. These mechanisms could begin to address the

cyclical and ongoing nature of facility needs for small and mid-sized arts organizations. Some even exist in the cultural tool kit already, but they are being used in the service of other priorities.

IMAGINE HOW SUCCESSFUL WE COULD BE IF THESE KINDS OF MECHANISMS COULD ALSO BE PUT TO WORK TO ADDRESS ARTS FACILITY ISSUES:

- The federal government has recently invested \$100 million to create a separate, grant-giving foundation. This foundation will work in partnership with academia and the private sector to encourage the development of sustainable development technology;
- The Ontario government created an independent, not-for-profit corporation which manages a \$20 million loan fund. The Cultural Attractions Fund acts as a source of loans and grants for marketing purposes;
- In the mid-80s Human Resources Development, Indian and Northern Affairs, and Industry Canada came together to create Aboriginal Capital Corporations. There are more than 30 ACCS across Canada which provide access to financing and management support for emerging aboriginal businesses - in recognition of the special challenges faced by First Nations entrepreneurs in gaining access to loans and credit arrangements;
- The province also invested \$50 million in a multi-year program which provides matching grants as rewards for more successful fundraising, and incentives for increased private sector contributions - the Arts Endowment Program.

Two special national initiatives from the United Kingdom and the United States deserve mention:

The British National Lottery

The Ontario government receives vast sums of money from its lottery programs, and it puts these profits into general revenues. In the U.K. they took a different approach. The arts are one of five “good causes” which benefit from proceeds of the National Lottery. Over 10 million pounds have been donated to these causes since 1993.

Four national Arts Councils distribute this money in the arts sector. Arts Lottery money is being spent on a wide range of capital projects, including new construction, renovation, and re-equipping arts venues. It is a substantial and long overdue investment in the cultural infrastructure of the United Kingdom. For projects seeking more than £100,000, the Arts Capital Programme has £176 million to spend by 2005. For smaller projects, the regional Arts Lottery Program includes a capital stream.

This has not been without problems, however. David Pratley, in a 2001 report on the British arts stabilization program, notes that among the 30 organizations involved in the recovery program are “some buildings created by capital funds from the Lottery where trading experience did not match the expectations of business plans.” The BBC reports that the Department for Culture, Media and Sport decreased its spending on the arts by 20% between 1986-96. “This appears to break government pledges that Lottery cash would be extra spending rather than a substitute for public funding. But DCMS says that since then its contribution has increased – with a major influx of funding recently announced – and would continue to do so.”

In March of 2001, an article in the Guardian claimed that more than half of the capital investment in museums (£500 million) was spent on expansion or on new museum facilities, rather than deferred maintenance or upgrading of existing ones. As a result, these organizations could face increased annual operating costs of nearly £29 million. More coherent funding decisions could have been taken, the author argued, had there been a museums policy in place, instead of a history of ad hoc interventions by government.

An article in the Telegraph at the same time described the renovations planned to make the Royal Shakespeare Theatre in Stratford more intimate, and to abolish the gulf between the stage and the audience. At the National Theatre, similar plans are driven by a surge of young people who want to re-invent the theatre for their generation. So, after a decade of constructing 2,000 seat Lottery-financed shrines to culture, the emphasis has completely switched direction. Many smaller facility initiatives are now seen as priority projects for capital funding from the National Lottery.

The American Nonprofit Finance Fund (NFF)

In the late 1970s a number of US foundations were faced with a growing realization. After years of supporting the programs of organizations like Boys and Girls Clubs, it had become clear that program excellence requires safe, appropriate, and accessible facilities. While sources of support for program funds were in place, there was no comparable source for facility issues: repairs, maintenance, renovation, restoration, energy conservation, accessibility, or new construction.

In 1980 they created a \$300,000 loan fund to help New York non-profits with energy conservation projects. This initial experiment rapidly expanded to include support for all kinds of non-profit capital projects. Today the NFF has \$34 million in assets, and six offices across the US serving eight geographic markets.

NFF programs include planning grants, loans, asset building services, credit enhancement, advisory services, and workshops and materials for management assistance.

Two decades of experience with more than 7,000 non-profits has taught the NFF several important things:

- that non-profits require access to different financing systems if they are to grow, take risks, and be competitive without compromising core principles and values;
- that long term improvement requires the collaboration of many partners, including funders, governments, banks, and specialist consultants;
- that financing is helpful, but better long-term sustainable gains can be made if financing is combined with management assistance: funded advice, and advised funding;
- that neither operations nor facilities can be addressed in isolation, or without regard to an organization's "big picture";
- that debt financing can be useful, but also has limits in a sector so seriously under-capitalized.

Until recently the organization was called the Nonprofit Facilities Finance Fund, which reflected its emphasis on capital elements. So seriously does it take the last two lessons, that it has

recently dropped “facilities” from its name. It now works as a community development financial institution, and uses its \$20 million loan fund for facilities, working capital, and venture capital.

The NFF’s programs attempt to improve three key things: the system whereby non-profits are capitalized, the quality of the financial knowledge in the field, and the amount and structure of capital available.

“We are moving to counteract [historical] patterns of disinvestment [and] to implement a holistic approach to financing the increasing complex and interdependent capitalization and management needs of non-profits. We call this Comprehensive Capitalization.”

In 1994 NFF completed a national Cultural Facilities Study. Its findings confirm that facilities are central to the arts, and that arts organizations face many challenges in successfully completing and maintaining a facility. The findings are entirely consistent with the experience of Canadian arts organizations (see Part II of this report). The study informed the creation of the NFF’s Cultural Facilities Fund program for nonprofit arts and heritage organizations.

One example of the NFF’s presence in other markets is the implementation of the **Cultural Facilities Fund (CFF)** in Massachusetts. The Massachusetts Cultural Facilities Project was established in 1995 as a collaboration between the NFF, the state funding body The Massachusetts Cultural Council, and the New England Foundation for the Arts. The Massachusetts Cultural Facilities Project offers workshops, grants, and low-interest loans to cultural organizations with capital projects. Since 1996 they have awarded sixty-eight planning grants (\$517,000 US) and sixteen loans (\$3,773,000 US). Loans provide start-up, liquidity and bridge financing.

In keeping with the NFF’s philosophy, organizations are required to have attended readiness and pre-planning workshops before they can apply for financial assistance on a facility project. Workshop topics include Facility Project Readiness, Project Planning, Project Feasibility, Funding Your Facility Project, and Managing Your Facility Team. The materials are detailed and comprehensive, and an excellent resource for arts organizations.

The Massachusetts Cultural Council continues to be very involved with the CFF program. It recognizes that facilities and programming are completely related, and funding decisions must be informed by the entire picture of an organization’s artistic and operational strengths, its facility needs, and the health of its balance sheet.

The long experience of NFF is worth serious consideration as we move toward a much improved method of sustaining the development and maintenance of cultural capital for small and mid-sized arts organizations in Ontario.

Cultural Districts

A cultural district is a well-recognized, labeled, mix-use area of a city in which a high concentration of cultural facilities serves as the anchor of attraction. Interest in the establishment of such districts has been growing steadily as communities strive to diversify their economies, revitalize urban areas, and take part in the lucrative but competitive tourism market. In the US, ninety American cities now have in place, or are planning, some kind of formal cultural district.

These vary tremendously in size, complexity, how they are structured, and how (and by whom) they are managed. Successful districts all have effective public and private sector leadership, diverse funding sources, and clear objectives. Municipal leadership generally begins with the planning and designation of the area, and cities also offer advantageous zoning, land, relocation, and tax incentives to encourage the development of cultural infrastructure. Planning strategies for the integration of existing streets, renovation of existing buildings, creation of pedestrian or open spaces, live/work spaces, and the development of new venues are also vehicles governments use to make an effective cultural district.

In San Jose the Arts and Entertainment District was created in 1990 as a loosely aligned group of arts establishments, and its creation was driven largely by the business community. In other cities, such as Toronto, districts have been announced by simply creating new street signs to label an area which had, whether planned or not, become home to a number of arts organizations.

In contrast, Pittsburgh's cultural district is one of the largest and most comprehensive. It was established in 1982 with \$50 million of government funds and strong private sector support from the Heinz family. It now contains 14 cultural facilities of different size and scope, and covers 14 square blocks. It is overseen by The Pittsburgh Cultural Trust, which renovates and operates venues, runs community outreach and educational programs, and is involved in overall planning, programming, and fundraising for the district. In 1998 the Trust reported that less than \$300,000 of sales tax subsidies translates into \$24 million in amusement and sales tax revenues per year.

In its 2001 proposed budget, New York City Council plans to create five culture zones, one in each of the city's five boroughs. It plans to spend \$2 million in 2002, increasing to \$6 million in 2005, to help small arts groups with moving, renovation, and operational costs. A sponsoring organization, such as a local development corporation, will design each zone's plan, attract arts organizations to the district, and coordinate development efforts. NY State will be asked to provide certain tax benefits to businesses and activities in these zones.

Pawtucket, a small industrial city outside of Boston, created its 60-block district in 1999. The city will help artists find and renovate space, and artists can waive sales tax on the work they sell there. Those who live and work in the district are also eligible for a state income-tax exclusion on any money their art generates.

Recent studies indicate an unintended down-side to the resurgence of an area due to cultural investment: gentrification and displacement. These are real problems in both Toronto and San Francisco, for example, where real estate values have soared as the area becomes vibrant, forcing many artists and arts organizations out of the districts they helped to transform in the first place. If what is left is only high-priced, homogeneous, or tourist-driven, then the long-term efficacy of the cultural district strategy is in doubt. The risk of such a result is particularly high when short-term economic goals assume a higher priority than a long-term vision of improving the vitality and diversity of the cultural life of the city.

Other municipal tools

Municipal funding is often key to the success of a cultural facility project, not least because it is critical to leveraging support from other levels of government and the private sector. In addition

to grants programs for arts facilities, municipalities can also offer other means of support to arts organizations, where its jurisdiction allows:

- revolving loan funds or loan guarantees to help organizations secure credit;
- tax increment financing, the issuance of bonds or debentures;
- implementation of special targeted taxes, such as a hotel or visitor's tax, or lotteries;
- advice and consultation on city processes, such as appealing property tax assessments;
- property tax exemptions, credits, rebates or remissions, and/or the prohibition of reassessment for properties improved for cultural purposes;
- access to surplus or under-used city properties;
- facilitating public-private partnerships;
- supporting approaches by arts organizations to other levels of government;
- maintaining a current inventory of existing facilities, and facility needs;
- flexible and enabling zoning bylaws, density transfers, and density bonuses to encourage private sector participation in cultural asset development;
- implementing development criteria and guidelines (for example, Boston's new waterfront plan requires that 25% of ground-floor space in all new construction be designated for cultural or civic purposes);
- sharing internal expertise in capital maintenance and management.

AND THIS JUST IN - The U.S. Department of the Interior will soon publish a book celebrating the 25-year history of the Tax Act. The Department has just selected the Ritz Theatre in Tiffin, Ohio, as an exemplary use of the tax incentives program, and will include that case in the book.

This program provides a financial reward in the form of tax credits to non-profits for careful and appropriate historical restoration of landmarked buildings. The better the quality of the restoration, the larger the tax credit. This tax credit can then be sold to one or more for-profit companies. In this case, the Ritz received \$720,000 US from selling its tax credits to two banks – the second largest gift of their capital campaign. Non-profits who can take advantage of this program involve historical restoration experts very early in the planning stages. These consultants can inform them of the value of the architectural restoration decisions they are making, and point out where different decisions can maximize the value of tax credits.

IMAGINE HOW SUCCESSFUL WE COULD BE IF....

PART VI STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Infrastructure programs are political by nature. Arts organizations undertaking facility projects must be prepared to undertake advocacy and awareness campaigns in support of their projects with community leaders, public servants and politicians at all levels of government. Successful facility projects require time, perseverance and patience. Build these into your strategies.

While it is very encouraging to see new infrastructure support for the cultural community for the first time in several years, pent-up needs and demand will not be met by these new programs, even through public/private partnerships.

To deal constructively with the cyclical nature of cultural facility needs, it is recommended that:

- **In the short term**, Ontario's arts service organizations and arts community use this report to develop strategies to raise policy makers' awareness of the urgent and unique facility needs of Ontario's small and mid-sized performing and visual arts organizations; AND
- Initiate a policy makers' forum on new models for arts infrastructure development for Ontario.
- **For the longer term**, two ideas be considered for the purposes of stabilizing Ontario's arts facility environment:
 - (a) the cultural community undertake a strategic process to engage the province in establishing an Ontario Facilities Fund for Culture, Recreation and Sports. Such a fund could be built over three to five years with significant annual allocations from Ontario's substantial lottery profits during the run of the current of the SuperBuild Sports, Culture and Tourism Partnership Program. Aim for a permanent billion dollar fund, a lasting legacy of the Minister and the Government of Ontario;or
 - (b) an application on behalf of Ontario's small and mid-sized performing and visual arts organizations be presented to the SuperBuild Sports, Culture and Tourism Partnership Fund and the federal infrastructure fund, each in the amount of \$60 million. These applications would be one-time only for the purposes of building a permanent Ontario Arts Facilities Finance Fund for small and mid-sized arts facilities in Ontario;
- The Canadian Theatre Facilities Strategy Committee become multi-disciplinary and work closely with the Ontario arts community to ensure that the facilities issue remains active and responsive to real needs;
- A cohesive, inclusive approach to cultural facilities development and sustenance be initiated with key stakeholders.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ARTS FUNDING AGENCIES

(Toronto Arts Council, Ontario Arts Council, The Canada Council for the Arts)

- Funders must be at the table as facility support programs are developed. They must be part of the solution because facility upgrades impact on operations;
- Funders must recognize that the period during capital projects is one of increased anxiety for theatre staff and boards, and must provide stable, ongoing operating support during facility projects and be responsive to the inevitable changes to the company's cost and revenue structure that facility projects induce;
- There must be a respect for the fact that operating and capital funding should respond to life-cycle needs and the physical and administrative costs of existing and new facilities;
- Granting programs should reflect the special needs of theatre companies operating facilities, acknowledging their contributions to the theatre community.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FEDERAL, PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS

- that the three levels of government acknowledge the cultural facility crisis in Ontario and begin to work with Ontario's arts sector on solutions, including consideration of a permanent fund for facilities development in Ontario communities;
- that the three levels of government work together on facility issues, policies and support programs, not in isolation, and formulate plans for cultural facilities that complement each other and respect the ongoing and cyclical nature of cultural facility needs in Ontario;
- that the Canadian Banking Act be changed to set targets for commercial banks to reinvest in communities;
- that a permanent, multidisciplinary mechanism modeled on the Canadian Theatre Facilities Strategy Committee with stable membership be set up to monitor facility issues and development;
- that municipalities develop cultural facility plans which address undersupply of facilities together with the projected growth of cities over the next two decades, and which recognize the critical role of municipal funding/support in demonstrating the commitment required for companies to obtain capital and operating funding from other levels of government. *It is important that such planning be part of the city's overall plan, addressing anticipated population growth and change, reflecting needs of the local arts community, and exploring the regional audience demand. Assessing a city's needs and establishing municipal policy with regard to cultural assets is complex, specialized work. Cities can benefit greatly from the contribution of knowledgeable consultants and the experience of other municipalities;*

That Ontario municipalities (as appropriate) consider, in addition to actual grants programs for arts facilities, other non-monetary support including:

- revolving loan funds or loan guarantees to help organizations secure credit;
- tax increment financing, the issuance of bonds or debentures;
- implementation of special targeted taxes, such as a hotel or other visitor's tax, or lotteries;
- advice and consultation on city processes, such as appealing property tax assessments;
- property tax exemptions, credits, rebates or remissions, and/or the prohibition of reassessment of properties improved for cultural purposes;
- access to surplus or underutilized city properties, including long-term, zero sum leases to develop arts centres in surplus municipal buildings;
- facilitating public-private partnerships;
- supporting approaches by arts organizations to other levels of government;
- maintaining a current inventory of existing facilities and facility needs;
- flexible and enabling zoning bylaws, density transfers and density bonuses to encourage private sector participation in cultural asset development;
- negotiating volume discounts on insurance and utilities rates for cultural facilities;
- implementing development criteria and guidelines which include cultural facility development (for example, Boston's new water development plan requires that 25% of ground-floor space in all new construction be designated for cultural or civic purposes);
- sharing any internal expertise in capital maintenance and management.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ARTS ORGANIZATIONS

If a capital funding project is in your near or distant future plans:

- ensure that your Board of Directors is firmly behind the project and committed to assuming leadership throughout its various stages;
- undertake a visioning and planning process to clearly identify your organization's mission and/or focus, community outreach and awareness, artists and audience needs;
- keep abreast of all potential facility support opportunities through continual surveillance of programs at all levels of government, as well as private sources;
- undertake a fundraising review to assess your company's fundraising capacity and opportunities before proceeding with a feasibility study;
- determine the impact of any interim facility closing on your operations and bottom line;
- begin early on comprehensive community outreach to develop enthusiasts and champions of your work. Such outreach should include other organizations or activities that contribute to the community's quality of life, the Mayor and City Council, your MP and MPP and their staffs, your bank. They should receive routine bulletins on your work generally, and during facility projects they should receive updates on the progress;
- ensure that broad based community and grassroots support is heard by corporate and governments sectors;
- begin early to develop a volunteer base in advance of any small-budget facility project, a base that can donate invaluable volunteer time for specific components of a facility project which does not require professional expertise – schedule project work during any regular closing period, to minimize any financial loss during construction.
- court banks and credit unions as they can be very helpful and supportive at crucial points during a facility project. Better yet have a bank manager on your board or fundraising committee. If you are working closely with a bank, alert them immediately if there are financial difficulties with the project;
- begin immediately to shape your campaign and alert funders at all levels of government as to the scope of the project and its budget requirements. Funders must be aware of your plans even if they are in the future. Your updates help keep the facility issue on the agenda;
- begin building the support of your city council, MP and MPP – and their staffs – for your project. This support is crucial for current public programs;
- begin the capital fundraising campaign NOW and designate a paid individual to direct the activity and ensure its drive and focus. The more private support you can bring to the table, the stronger your application to public funding programs. New infrastructure programs require significant private support;

- arts managers should share their facility experiences and know-how by mentoring companies considering launching projects. Too often arts managers work in isolation.
- arts organizations with facility needs should consider organizing locally from time to time, perhaps through local arts councils, to brainstorm, share ideas, and initiate collective efforts as appropriate for capital projects;
- seek out creative arrangements with corporations that may have appropriate space in their buildings. There may be opportunities for free space and money for renovations if the not-for-profit company can pass along property tax or zoning breaks to the corporation in question. BUT, consider such opportunities carefully;
- break down civic barriers. Identify civic leadership/champions for the project and include them as appropriate in major strategy sessions and definitely in presentations to politicians;
- enlist support and advice from your arts service organization(s) for the project. Théâtre Action was invaluable in the early development of Ottawa's la Nouvelle Scène (the renovation of the former National Arts Centre Atelier), and actually did the feasibility study for the facility for the four theatres involved;
- be prepared to gamble – to some extent – or you can falter and lose the project. Major facility projects are not for the faint of heart;
- factor into your project budgets and projections escalating labour and materials costs, particularly in multi-year planning and implementation. Many projects can take several years from genesis to completion and costs can double in that period.
- be prepared for the impact that hold-ups with building permits, zoning problems, the possibility of labour strikes, work to rule stoppages and materials shortages may have on your project and company operations. They can affect the completion timetable and the bottom line. Beware sub-contractors who low ball bids and costs or materials.

Specific to visual arts projects:

- allow sufficient lead time and factor in the personnel required if the project involves moving out a collection. It can be an enormous challenge for small staffs to sort, date, catalogue and pack, sometimes collection by collection, to determine the packing order, and then find an appropriate storage site. The Agnes Etherington Art Centre ended up storing its collections in Hull, Quebec during renovations;
- allow time, after a project which includes environmental controls, to balance relative humidity and temperature before re-introducing artwork into the space. Adjustments will be required;
- partnerships often essential with school boards and post secondary institutions in developing your projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ARTS SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

- participate actively in the organization of a forum in September, 2001, for policy makers on new models for arts infrastructure development, and any post forum activity which follows;
- maintain this study's momentum and, specifically, lobby for its general recommendations with politicians, bureaucrats and the arts community across Ontario – as champions for small and mid-sized arts organizations;
- continue to collect arts facility data: needs, issues, ideas and establish a central clearing house for same;
- designate a point person immediately as liaison to carry forward the recommendations herein;
- set up a multidisciplinary strategic planning group to liaise with the Canadian Theatre Facilities Strategy Committee to focus Ontario's arts community and the three levels of government on facilities issues for small and mid-sized arts organizations, develop a lever into the design process of any future capital funding programs;
- engage immediately in general advocacy and awareness building of facilities issues on behalf of members;
- approach a high profile, respected leader and champion within the cultural sector to partner in strategic approaches to government and the private sector;
- produce a comprehensive resource manual on facility project planning and development similar to that produced by the Massachusetts Non Profit Finance Fund; and educate members through regional workshops, websites, pamphlets on the "how to's" of capital projects through the stages of strategic planning, feasibility studies, lobbying, engineering/architectural reports, project funding and fundraising, to construction and coping operationally with same;
- request members with facilities or facility issues to put their needs with priorities and costs on paper – approximate if not actual – and send immediately to their municipality, Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation and Department of Canadian Heritage regional office. This builds the critical mass required to push the issue forward;
- urge municipalities to produce economic impact studies for the arts which can be key to influencing local politicians and communities to support arts facility development;
- include the arts facility issue in special membership meetings or workshops, annual meetings and conferences to strategize on raising the issue's profile with both the public and private sector;
- work with the community foundations network, in collaboration with local arts councils and communities, to educate and raise their awareness of facility issues. Is there a role for community foundations to broker arts and business partnerships, or assist with feasibility studies?

- approach the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to educate them and their members about arts facilities issues and to enlist their active support in developing strategies to build capacity and competitiveness for municipal arts organizations;
- encourage municipalities to adopt new culturally progressive regulations, e.g. that all new structures incorporate a small arts space, that housing over a certain size incorporate low rental units for artists in the community, etc.;
- develop a list of qualified, experienced cultural facility consultants, including their field of expertise;
- encourage mentoring opportunities to develop and train expertise in technical planning for facility projects;
- pursue provincial and federal tourism strategies recently, or about to be announced.

APPENDIX A

WEBSITES AND OTHER RESOURCES - CURRENT CAPITAL FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES AND RELATED DOCUMENTS

Canada – Ontario Infrastructure Program

www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/ino-bni/main/projects/on_e.asp

Website for Government of Canada/Ontario new physical infrastructure programs.

Cultural Spaces Canada Program

www.pch.gc.ca/arts/arts_pol/cultspaces_e.htm

FedNor

www.fednor.ic.gc.ca

Information on Federal Economic Development Initiative in Northern Ontario and Community Economic Development Unit.

Industry Canada

www.ic.gc.ca

Community partnership initiative for rural communities funded by the Government of Canada.

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation

www.tourism.gov.on.ca/english

Heritage Challenge Fund Community Program – matching funds for capital projects and endowments for ongoing capital costs of heritage properties.

Ontario Ministry of Northern Development and Mines

www.mndm.gov.on.ca

News releases and information about the Northern Ontario Heritage Fund program guidelines.

Ontario Trillium Foundation

www.trilliumfoundation.org

Information on community grants and access program funds for capital projects.

Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

www.mah.gov.on.ca

The Citizen's Guide to the Land Use Planning System in Ontario. A series of ten publications, including Zoning Bylaws, Building Permits, Land Severances, etc.

The Nonprofit Finance Fund (U.S.)

www.nonprofitfinancefund.org

The British Lottery Program

www.culture.gov.uk/lottery

The Massachusetts Cultural Facilities Project

www.massculturalcouncil.org/grants/for_organizations/mcfp

Association of Artist Run Centres and Collectives

416-504-4242

Dance Umbrella
www.danceumbrella.net

Ontario Association of Art Galleries
www.aaag.org

Orchestras Canada
www.oc.ca

Professional Association of Canadian Theatres
www.pact.ca

Theatre Ontario
www.theatreontario.org

Toronto Theatre Alliance
www.theatreintoronto.com

In addition to the papers described in the Methodology section of this report, readers may find the following of interest.

The Theater Checklist: a guide to the planning and construction of proscenium and open style theatres. The American Theater Planning Board, 1969

Theatres and Auditoriums (Burriss-Meyer, Cole) Robert E. Krieger Publishing Co. 1975

Will It Make A Theatre: a guide to finding, renovating, financing, and bringing up-to-code, the non-traditional performance space. (Elder) The Off Off Broadway Alliance, 1979

Olympus on Main Street: a process for planning a community arts facility (Golden), Syracuse University Press, 1980

A Review of Art Gallery Building Facilities (Brian Arnott Associates, Baird/Sampson Associates) Ontario Association of Art Galleries, 1982

Space for Dance: an architectural design guide. (Armstrong, Morgan) National Endowment for the Arts, 1984

Building for the Arts: a guidebook for the planning and design of cultural facilities. (Brown, Fleissig, Morrish) Western States Arts Federation, 1989

Developing Urban Entertainment Centers. (Beyland, Braun, McLaughlin, Phillips, Rubin) Robert E. Krieger Publishing Co. 1998

APPENDIX B - STUDY SURVEY FORMS

SURVEY OF FACILITY NEEDS FOR SMALL & MID-SIZED VISUAL ARTS ORGANIZATIONS IN ONTARIO

1. Do you own your own facility?
2. If not, do you rent a facility?
3. Are you the primary tenant in this facility?
4. Who is responsible for capital maintenance and upgrades for this facility?
5. Is your facility a purpose - built gallery? Or was it designed and built for other purposes originally?
6. Is it an historic building?
7. Do you house your preparatory and collection storage facilities in this building?

If not, do you rent or own a separate space?

8. Is your gallery planning to undertake a capital improvement or expansion in the next three years?
9. Is this with regard to your exhibition venue?
Or to a separate preparatory space?
Or to a separate collection/storage space?
Or to a separate administration area?
Or to programming/studio space?

10. Which of the following components apply to your project?

- Renovation
- Retrofit
- Restoration
- Expansion
- Repair
- Technical/Equipment upgrades
- Heating/Air Conditioning
- Health & Safety
- Accessibility improvements
- Flooring
- Humidity Control
- Lighting
- Security System
- Public Lobby/Washroom spaces
- Exhibition area
- Collection/Storage area
- Signage and/or other aesthetic improvements

11. How far are you in the planning and development process for this project?
Has your Board formally committed to the project?

Do you have conceptual or architectural drawings or plans?

Do you have a budget for your project?

Have you undertaken a feasibility study, including fundraising and financing options?

Do you have a fundraising strategy in place? What is the goal in dollars?

What percentage of your total do you expect to raise from:

Government?

Corporations?

Foundations?

Individuals?

Tax breaks, land swaps or any other innovative sources or mechanisms?

Have you started your fundraising campaign?

When do you plan to have it completed?

How much have you raised to date?

Will you be applying to the province's newly announced SuperBuild Fund?

Will you be applying to the federal infrastructure program?

Have you approached your local government, MP and/or MPP for their support?

Have you hired an Architect?

Project Manger?

Consulting Engineer?

Do you have a date to begin construction? When?

To complete construction? When?

12. Do you have any comments, insights, advice or other information for the consultants about your facility project OR facility projects generally?

13. Do you know of any other visual or performing arts capital projects being considered in your community or region?

SURVEY OF FACILITY NEEDS FOR SMALL & MID-SIZED PERFORMING ARTS ORGANIZATIONS IN ONTARIO

1. Do you own your own facility?
2. If not, do you rent a facility?
3. Are you the primary tenant in this facility?
4. Who is responsible for capital maintenance and upgrades for this facility?
5. Is your facility a purpose -built theatre/recital hall? Or was it designed and built for other purposes originally?
6. Is it an historic building?
7. Do you rehearse in your performance venue? If not, do you own or rent a separate space?
8. Do you house your production/shops/storage facilities in this venue? If not, do you own or rent a separate space?
9. Is your company planning to undertake a capital improvement or expansion in the next three years?
10. Is this with regard to your performance venue? Or to a separate rehearsal space? Or to a separate production/shops facility?
11. Which of the following components apply to your project?
 - ... Renovation
 - ... Retrofit
 - ... Restoration
 - ... Expansion
 - ... Repair
 - ... Technical/Equipment upgrades
 - ... Heating/Air Conditioning
 - ... Health & Safety
 - ... Accessibility improvements
 - ... Public Lobby/Washroom spaces
 - ... The House/Auditorium
 - ... Acoustics
 - ... Stage & Wing areas
 - ... Production areas (set, costume)
 - ... Dressing rooms/green rooms
 - ... Rehearsal space
 - ... Signage and/or other aesthetic improvements
12. How far are you in the planning and development process for this project?
 - ... Has your Board formally committed to the project?
 - ... Do you have conceptual or architectural drawings or plans?
 - ... Do you have a budget for your project?

... Have you undertaken a feasibility study, including fundraising and financing options?

... Do you have a fundraising strategy in place? What is the goal in dollars?

... What percentage of your total do you expect to raise from:

ý Government?

ý Corporations?

ý Foundations?

ý Individuals?

ý Tax breaks, land swaps or any other innovative sources or mechanisms?

... Have you started your fundraising campaign?

... When do you plan to have it completed?

... How much have you raised to date?

... Will you be applying to the province's newly announced SuperBuild Fund?

... Will you be applying to the federal infrastructure program?

... Have you approached your local government, MP and/or MPP for their support?

... Have you hired an Architect?

... Project Manager?

... Consulting Engineer?

... Do you have a date to begin construction? When?

... To complete construction? When?

12. Do you have any comments, insights, advice or other information for the consultants about your facility project OR facility projects generally?

13. Do you know of any other visual or performing arts capital project being considered in your community or region?

APPENDIX C - COMMUNITY CONSULTATIONS' LISTING

Through community and individual consultations, the following people were interviewed:

Adrian, Dee, Capital Centre, North Bay
Agnew, Jane, White Water Gallery, North Bay
Anderson, Ellen, Creative Spirit Art Centre, Toronto
Aoki, Barbara, Gryphon Theatre, Barrie
Ardaugh, Christine, American Federation of Musicians, Toronto
Augspols, Astrid, Orchestras Canada, Toronto
Baile, David, Opera Atelier, Toronto
Baird, Roger, Department of Canadian Heritage, Ottawa
Bairstow, Ted, Department of Canadian Heritage, Ottawa
Barlow, Janis, Janis Barlow & Associates, Toronto & St. Catharines
Barry, Marg, Sudbury Symphony Orchestra, Sudbury
Bartleman, Gwen, Buddies in Bad Times Theatre, Toronto
Beatty, Erika, Niagara Symphony, Toronto
Beck, Mimi, DanceWorks & Dance Ontario
Benjamin, Erin, Music & Film in Motion, Sudbury
Bertrand, Denis, Théâtre Action, Ottawa
Blackstock, Pam, Department of Canadian Heritage, Toronto
Blake, Colleen, Shaw Festival, Niagara-on-the-Lake
Bono, Franco, Summerworks, Toronto
Bradley, Pat, Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, Toronto
Brodeur, Ghislaine, Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation, Windsor
Brophy, Maureen, City of Thunder Bay
Bulte, Sarmite, MP, Toronto
Campbell, Steven, Ontario Arts Council, Toronto
Cameron, Carolyn, Port Stanley Festival Theatre, Port Stanley
Cann, Rebecca, City of St. Catharines
Cannon, Patti, Hamilton and Region Arts Council, Hamilton
Carley, Rod, Nipissing Stage Company, North Bay
Carlin, Ross, Gravenhurst Opera House, Gravenhurst
Castonguay, Teresa, Celebrate Canada in the Kawarthas, Peterborough
Clarkson, Austin, New Music Concerts, Toronto
Condon, Jane, Department of Canadian Heritage, Ottawa
Corbeil, Liz, Timmins Symphony, Timmins
Costa, Terry, UNI Theatre, Mississauga
Courchesne, André, Theatre Section, Canada Council for the Arts, Ottawa
Cousins-Matthewson, Sophie, Peterborough Symphony, Peterborough
Darroch, Rick, Canadian Museum Association, Ottawa
D'Avella, Lilliana, Arts York, Toronto
Davidson, Adrienne, Burlington Art Centre, Burlington
Davies, Rita, Culture Division, City of Toronto
DeConnick Smith, Michael, Canadian Children's Dance Theatre, Toronto
Doherty, Ken, City of Peterborough
Eaton, Karin, Scarborough Arts Council, Toronto
Eck, Paul, Showplace Peterborough
Elliot, Mark, Sudbury Multicultural Folk Arts, Sudbury
Elvidge, John, City of Toronto
Emmerton, Andrea, Theatre Ontario, Toronto
Feldman, Barbara, CentrepoinTE Theatre, Ottawa
Fink, Terry, Ontario Ministry of Tourism Culture and Recreation, Windsor
Finlay, Anne, Sudbury Symphony Orchestra, Sudbury
Fortin, Terry, FedNor, Industry Canada, Sudbury

Fraser, Jessica, Toronto Theatre Alliance, Toronto
Gagnon, Paulette, La Nouvelle Scène, Ottawa
Gardner, Jane, Theatre Ontario, Toronto
Garrard, Jim, Toronto Arts Council, Toronto
Gauvin, Mélany, Réseau Ontario, Ottawa
Gibson, Jane, Gibson Studio, Toronto
Ginder, Jennifer, arts consultant, Toronto
Goddard, John, Young People's Theatre, Toronto
Grabke, Simon, Canadian Music Centre, Ontario Region, Toronto
Greenall, Denis, Department of Canadian Heritage, Ontario Region
Greco, Cristina, Cinefest Sudbury
Gorbasew, Sasha, Orchestra London
Grossman-Ianni, Mina, Windsor Symphony, Windsor
Hall, Gary, Toronto Photographers' Workshop, Toronto
Harper, Carol, Massachusetts Non Profit Finance Fund, Boston
Harvey, Deborah, The Grand Theatre, London
Harvey, Jocelyn, arts consultant, Ottawa
Haywood, Barry, Rails' End Gallery, Haliburton
Heaman, Ken, Whitehern Museum, City of Hamilton
Herling, Adina, Genovese, Vanderhoof & Associates, Toronto
Hill, Debby, City of Ottawa
Holland, Camilla, Toronto Arts Council, Toronto
Honeywell, Peter, Council for the Arts in Ottawa
Howell, Julia, Ontario Trillium Foundation, Toronto
Huffman, Bill, Art Gallery of Sudbury, Sudbury
Hurst, Mark, Orillia Opera House, Orillia
Irwin, Jan, freelance theatre artist & producer, Ottawa
Jackson, Doug, Chatham Capital Theatre, Chatham
Jacobson, Rose, Toronto Theatre Alliance, Toronto
Jones, Michael, ARRAYMUSIC, Toronto
Johnson, Marie, St. Lawrence Stage Company, Brockville
Jones, Tim, Artspace, Toronto
Jurakic, Ivan, Hamilton Artists Inc., Hamilton
Kahro, Peter, Oakville Symphony, Oakville
Kaye, Jennifer, Textile Museum, Toronto
Kelly, Keith, Canada Council for the Arts, Ottawa
Kelly, Roseanne, Upper Canada Playhouse, Morrisburg
Kimball, Bill, Peterborough New Dance/Theatre Users Group, Peterborough
Lamoureux, Wyatt, First Night Peterborough, Peterborough
LaRiviere, David, Artspace, Peterborough
Lawrence, Julie, Windsor Woodcarving Museum, Windsor
Lefebvre, Mark, Windsor and Region Arts Council, Windsor
Lemay, Michel, Department of Canadian Heritage, Ottawa
Lundholm, Michael, architect, Toronto
Lussier, Hubert, Department of Canadian Heritage, Ottawa
MacDonald, Elizabeth Gaye, Windsor Printmakers' Forum, Windsor
Marshall, Ray, Academy Theatre, Kawartha Lakes Summer Festival, Lindsay
Marsland, Jane, arts consultant, Toronto
Martin, Lori, Culture Division, City of Toronto
Maude, Sharon, Latcham Gallery, Stouffville
McAvity, John, Canadian Museums Association, Ottawa
McConnan, Nola, Arts East, Toronto
McDermott, Charles, Massachusetts Cultural Council, Boston
McEwan, Chuck, Toronto Fringe Theatre Festival, Toronto
McKee, Carolyn, Toronto Sinfonietta, Toronto
McTavish, David, Agnes Etherington Art Centre, Kingston

Merritt, Elaine, Theatre On The Grand, Fergus
Meyer, Uwe, Port Hope Festival Theatre, Port Hope
Miller, Clara, Non Profit Finance Fund, New York
Mombourquette, Mary Pat, Theatre & Company, Kitchener
Moore, Steven, Factory Theatre, Toronto
Mustakas, Alex, Drayton Entertainment, Drayton
Nagy, Nataley, Art Gallery of Windsor, Windsor
Naubert, Colette, Ontario Trillium Foundation, Toronto
Nelson, Susan, Technical Development Corporation, Boston
Nestor, Helene, Orchestra Toronto
Nicholson, Terry, Culture Division, City of Toronto
Oakley, Nancy, Great Canadian Theatre Company, Ottawa
O'Connell, Beverly, Department of Canadian Heritage, Toronto
Parras, Zis, Theatre Direct, Toronto
Parsons, David, Ontario Arts Council, Toronto
Patterson, Anne, Danny Grossman Dance Company, Toronto
Pauk, Alex, Esprit Orchestra, Toronto
Perkins, David and Sue, Palace Theatre, London
Peters, Richard, Guild Renaissance Group, Toronto
Plaus, Michael, Mississauga Symphony, Mississauga
Poliakova, Rabka, Nightwood Theatre, Toronto
Pollari, Debra, Hamilton Philharmonic Orchestra, Hamilton
Powers, Claire, White Water Gallery, North Bay
Quinn, Diane, Soulpepper Theatre, Toronto
Raths, Taylor, Theatre Passe Muraille, Toronto
Ramzy, Yasmina, Arabesque Dance Company, Toronto
Rankin, Jay, Toronto Dance Theatre, Toronto
Reid, Cathy, Theatre Orangeville
Reitzel, Julie, Canadia dell'Arte, Toronto
Recollet, Nancy, Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation, Sudbury
Robertson, David, Peterborough Arts Umbrella, Peterborough
Roch, Lucille, Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation, Toronto
Rodgers, Margaret, Visual Arts Centre of Clarington, Clarington
Rodriguez, Rommy, Ontario Crafts Council, Toronto
Rosati, Chris, Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation, Toronto
Rosnick, Jeff, Hamilton and Region Arts Council, Hamilton
Ross, Ian, Burlington Arts Centre, Burlington
Ryan, Lorna, Ontario Trillium Foundation, North Bay
Sandberg, Brenda, Symphony Hamilton
Scully Mosna, Merry Ellen, MacKenzie Hall, City of Windsor
Sharpe, Kathleen, Ontario Cultural Attractions Fund, Toronto
Shepertyki, Cathy, City of Ottawa
Sherman, Rick, The Theatre Centre, Toronto
Sirman, Bob, National Ballet School, Toronto
Smith, Caroline, Stirling Festival Theatre, Stirling
Smith, Cheryl, Ontario Association of Arts Galleries, Toronto
Smith, Gail, Oakville Galleries, Oakville
Smith, Laurie, Windsor and Region Arts Council, Windsor
Smith, Terry, Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation, Toronto
St. Onge, Frederic, Good Sound Audio, Sudbury
Stacy, Sarah, Station Gallery, Whitby
Stevenson, Alida, Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation, Toronto
Stevenson, Murray, Action 2000, Hamilton
Stewart, Karen, Blyth Festival, Blyth
Stewart, Laura, Northern Lights Festival Boréal, Sudbury
Stolk, Jini, arts consultant, Toronto

Suzuki, Ann, Art Gallery of Sudbury/Sudbury Craft and Arts Foundation, Sudbury
Thomas, Steven, Theatre Collingwood
Tiffin, Barb, Nepean Visual Arts Centre, Nepean
Timko, Irene, Multicultural Council of Windsor and Essex, Windsor
Todd, Rebecca, Dovercourt House Dance Centre, Toronto
Tracy, Christopher, Theatre Aquarius, Hamilton
Tremblay, Christine, Gloucester Arts Council, Gloucester
Trenaman, Brad, Native Earth Performing Arts, Northern Lights Dance Theatre Foundation
Uhlyanik, Georgina, Nancy Hushion & Associates, Toronto
Vagianos, Andrea, Dancemakers, Toronto
Wagner, Helen, Lighthouse Festival Theatre, Port Dover
Walker, Debra, Victoria Playhouse, Petrolia
Walshon, Greg, Alchemist Theatre, Hamilton
Wanless, Greg, Thousand Islands Playhouse, Gananoque
Warren, Myles, Dance Umbrella of Ontario, Toronto
Webster, Betty, Orchestras Canada, Toronto
Webster, Nancy, Ontario Trillium Foundation, Toronto
Werger, Charlie, Market Hall Performing Arts Centre, Peterborough
White, Lucy, Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, Toronto
Wilkinson, Lorraine, Sudbury Theatre Centre, Sudbury
Williams, Megan, Canadian Conference of the Arts, Ottawa
Wismer, Sally, Guelph Arts Council, Guelph
Willrich, Wendy, City of Boston
Wright, Susan, Toronto Arts Council, Toronto
Zehr, Alison, Nonprofit Finance Fund, Chicago
Zuger, Nicole, City of Ottawa

The July, 2000, Phase I Report on Facility Needs of Professional Theatres in Toronto informed this study and included the following Interviews:

Baile, David, Factory Theatre
Barlow, Janis, Planning and Project Management
Bartleman, Gwen, Buddies in Bad Times Theatre
Bradley, Pat, Professional Association of Canadian Theatres
Chan, Marlene, Department of Canadian Heritage - Ontario Region
Chown, Bruce, Centre for Indigenous Theatre
Coy, Nancy, Young Peoples Theatre
Davies, Rita, City of Toronto Cultural Division
Duclos, David, The Theatre Centre
Eaton, Karin, Scarborough Arts Council
Elvidge, John, City of Toronto, Office of Chief Administrative Officer
Fraser, Jessica, Toronto Theatre Alliance
Gallagher, Bob, Toronto, City Councillor Olivia Chow's Office
Gardner, Jane, Theatre Ontario
Gilbert, Mallory, Tarragon Theatre
Ginder, Jennifer, Canadian Opera Company
Hamilton, Lyn, Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation
Holland, Camilla, Toronto Arts Council
Howell, Julia, Ontario Trillium Foundation
Jones, Tim, Toronto Artscape, Canada Council for the Arts
Moynihan, Christine, Equity Showcase Theatre
Muszysnska, Maria, Department of Canadian Heritage - Ontario Region
Nicholson, Terry, City of Toronto Culture Division
Raths, Taylor, Theatre Passe Muraille
Rosati, Christopher, Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation
Sherman, Rick, The Theatre Centre

Smalley, Catherine, Dream Team Project
Smith, Gerald, Lakeshore Assembly Hall
Stolk, Jini, Toronto Dance Theatre
Taylor, Carolyn, Toronto 2008 Olympic Bid
Webster, Nancy, Ontario Trillium Foundation
Wright, Susan, Toronto Arts Council

Ottawa Interviews:

Balduzzi, Linda, Arts Court
Borgal, Phillipa, Canadian Conference of the Arts
DeFalco, Maria, Community Arts Ontario
Doucet, Clive, writer and Ottawa Regional Councillor
Feldman, Barbara, Centrepointe Theatre, Nepean
Gagnon, Paulette, La Nouvelle Scène
Honeywell, Peter, Council for the Arts in Ottawa
Irwin, Janet, freelance theatre artist
McPhaden, Stephanie, Federation of Canadian Municipalities
Oakley, Nancy, Great Canadian Theatre Company
Stern, Natalie, Ottawa School of Speech and Drama
Ward, Ron, Opera Lyra
Wilson, Neil, Ottawa International Writers Festival

Thunder Bay, Kitchener & Belleville Interviews:

Crudo, Mario, Magnus Theatre, Thunder Bay
Douthwright, Robert, Magnus Theatre, Thunder Bay
Scadron-Wattles, Stuart, Theatre & Company, Kitchener
Stevenson, Susan, Quinte Cultural Centre, Belleville