

STRATEGY SAMPLER

State Cultural District Programs

Key Issues, Strategies and Management Practices

Increasingly, state arts agencies are pursuing place-based creative economic development strategies in the form of cultural district policies. NASAA has documented this trend in our [State Cultural Districts Policy Brief](#). That brief provides an overview of policy rationales, intended outcomes and the roles that state arts agencies typically play in leading efforts to establish statewide creative district certification programs.

Such policies have proliferated broadly across the nation. Thirteen states now have established statewide cultural district programs, two states (Arkansas and California) have legislatively enacted cultural district policies but have yet to launch programs, and legislation for new programs is under consideration in several other states. Some of the newer programs have experimented with different structures, and some of the older programs have reached a second or third stage of evolution.

This makes it a fruitful time to conduct a comparative analysis and to draw out lessons learned. With that goal in mind, this Strategy Sampler explores key implementation issues associated with managing cultural district programs at the state level. For this research, NASAA interviewed the cultural district managers at 10 state arts agencies and reviewed program materials from all 13 states with formalized cultural district programs. NASAA also completed a scan of new or pending legislation and applicable literature and research.

CULTURAL DISTRICTS AND CREATIVE PLACE-MAKING OUTCOMES

All state arts agencies conduct work that promotes the economic benefits of the arts. Cultural districts are one strategy used by state arts agencies to develop economic outcomes through arts activities. Cultural districts are also highly relevant to the concept of creative place making: arts and culture can play a central role in shaping the social and physical character of a neighborhood. A number of state arts agency programs and services, such as arts based community development grants, have aimed at creative place-making concepts for some time, though

Table of Contents

- [Cultural Districts and Creative Place-Making](#)
- [The Value of State Certification: Local Districts](#)
- [The Value of State Certification: States](#)
- [Tax Incentives](#)
- [Funding and Sustainability](#)
- [Certification Practices and Issues](#)
- [Technical Assistance Approaches](#)
- [Partnerships](#)
- [Evaluation](#)
- [Appendix A: Program Profile Matrix](#)
- [Appendix B: Technical Assistance Matrix](#)
- [Appendix C: Key Certification Elements](#)

State Creative Place-Making Report Examples

Massachusetts: [MassINC/ArtPlace report](#) on creative place-making strategies for Massachusetts Gateway Cities

North Carolina: [SmART Initiative Task Force report](#) paved the way for creative district pilot grants

the role of state arts agencies in the larger conversation around creative place making is less often cited.

Place-based/arts-based development strategies such as cultural districts that are employed by state arts agencies are a particularly ripe area for examining the economic and social benefits of the arts. Formalized state level cultural district policies can provide well-defined goals against which to measure outcomes.

In the creative place-making schema, multiple players from the public, private and nonprofit sectors act cooperatively to create positive social and economic outcomes. State cultural district policies offer state assistance (in multiple forms) to pursue these positive outcomes in conjunction with—and at the will of—local communities and stakeholders.

States can offer a strategic helping hand to communities that are interested in integrating the arts into their economic development strategies. By allowing for statewide collaboration and learning, leveraging investments from other sources, and actively managing programs, state agencies can positively influence outcomes and collect the necessary information to articulate benefits.

Resources for Further Investigation into Place-Making Outcomes

- National Endowment for the Arts [creative place-making](#) initiatives, including the [Our Town](#) program
- [ArtPlace](#) grants and indicators
- [Leveraging Investments in Creativity](#)
- University of Pennsylvania [Social Impact of the Arts Project](#)

THE VALUE OF STATE CERTIFICATION: BENEFITS TO LOCAL DISTRICTS

One of the primary questions NASAA asked state program managers during interviews was: What do local districts value about being certified through your state program?

From this question, a number of benefits were identified as important to local districts, though no clear trend emerged. Several interviewees expressed that "it varies from district to district." Local circumstances—such as the age of a district, its staffing circumstances, its ability to tap tax incentives (if available) and levels of involvement of local partners—all can affect the real and perceived benefits of state certification. This lack of a trend points to an important finding: the ability to flexibly deliver the right type of assistance to the right place at the right time is an appropriate "superpower" for state cultural district managers. Despite variations, a number of concrete values of state certification were articulated:

Recognition: State certification lends impetus and credibility to a local district, and in some circumstances has become a key part of a local community's strategy to market itself as an arts and culture destination.

Focus: Seeking state certification has helped to catalyze and focus collaborative efforts at the local level.

Incentives: Although many state programs do not include them, incentives are often cited as a significant benefit when present and accessible to local districts.

Examples of State Certification Value

While many factors contribute to the achievements of a district, state certification can certainly leverage a community's success. For instance:

Kentucky: State certification was part of what helped one district get recognized as one of the "Best Small Towns in America."

Maryland: Several districts have used their designation to leverage significant grant investments from ArtPlace and the National Endowment for the Arts Our Town program.

Technical assistance: Interviewees frequently mentioned various types of technical assistance offered by states, an issue explored in depth later in this document.

Convening: State efforts to convene district managers are highly valued. The learning experience that transpires during a convening helps direct future program offerings; gives state administrators the necessary feedback to continue serving districts in meaningful ways; and allows local district managers to share issues, challenges and best practices.

Funding leverage: The ability to leverage resources following state certification is seen as a major value to state certified districts, although the data available to enumerate what is leveraged remains thin. Further information, such as data on how districts are able to leverage funds from multiple sources, including federal, municipal, private and other state funds, would be valuable in explaining this important benefit of state certification. NASAA's research showed that these data are not often collected as a portion of annual reports required by state certified programs.

THE VALUE OF STATE CERTIFICATION: BENEFITS TO STATES

While many benefits of state certification accrue to local districts, states, too, gain value from these programs. Those values include:

Economic benefits: Although documentation of the economic outcomes is a work in progress, many states have received reports indicating that designated districts have attained positive economic outcomes relating to employment, capital investment, visitor traffic and other factors.

Data: When data on districts is collected and aggregated, this information can provide an extremely useful tool for states. This value is less clear at the district level, where data collection and rigorous application processes can be seen as burdensome. However, given sustained program demand in most states, the extra documentation associated with state certification does not seem to be deterring local participation in certification programs.

Visibility: State cultural district program managers report accolades from policymakers at the local and state levels, evidenced by letters of support and mentions in political speeches as catalysts for community revitalization. One influencing factor for this support is the place-based nature of cultural districts. Legislators, council members and mayors hear about the value of districts from their constituents and experience the work that is being conducted within their jurisdictions. This localized visibility can have political value for a state arts agency.

Partnerships: Cultural district programs have expanded the constituency of state arts agencies given the cross-pollination of this work with real estate development, sustainability, urban planning, and new models of arts participation, economic development and tourism. While political successes associated with cultural districts have not yet directly translated into increased funding for the programs, this type of outreach has the potential to benefit long-term advocacy efforts for the work of state arts agencies.

Examples of Economic Benefits

Louisiana Cultural Districts support:

- 2,794 cultural events with 3.3 million people in attendance
- 820 new businesses
- decreased commercial vacancy rates

Maryland Arts and Entertainment Districts support:

- 4,188 jobs
- \$128.1 million in total wages
- \$379 million in state GDP
- total tax revenues of \$29 million

TAX INCENTIVES

A major point of discussion regarding the benefits that a cultural districts program can either offer localities or derive from the state involves the availability of state tax incentives. While more states have been implementing cultural district policies and legislation, the ability to pass tax incentive legislation as a program benefit has been problematic due to fiscal conditions within state governments.

Among the four states interviewed that offer tax incentives in cultural districts, program managers described their positive use as well as complicating factors regarding incentive implementation. This duality is most poignantly examined in the conversation related to sales tax credits. Anecdotally, these credits have provided a useful marketing tool for businesses such as galleries that are involved in the retail sales of original art. Sales tax credit incentives are perceived by managers to have helped the intended outcome of creating agglomerations of arts related businesses within districts. These credits have also created additional administrative work for state arts agency cultural district managers. Certification of tax-exempt businesses, data collection regarding sales tax exemptions and definitions of original artwork are all important considerations for states exploring a sales tax exemption.

Admission and amusement tax exemptions have seen varying degrees of utility. At issue is the tax-exempt status of nonprofit venues. It can be difficult for nonprofits to utilize this type of tax incentive. Commercial venues, however, have been able to use these credits effectively as an incentive to locate within cultural districts.

District managers reported that other incentives, such as property tax credits, historic preservation tax credits and income tax credits, also have varying degrees of usefulness. In many cases, developers consider these types of credits as part of a multilayered, highly complex tax environment when making investment decisions.

Among states that lack incentives, all managers interviewed expressed at least some desire to have the ability to use tax incentives in cultural districts when the timing for legislation becomes appropriate. For these states, tax incentives are seen as an additional tool that can help with efforts toward community revitalization. District managers see the value in having tax incentives, however the administrative complexities of tax incentives are acknowledged, and many states operate effective programs without tax incentives.

States with tax incentives attached to cultural districts have tended to release public reports on such districts' economic and fiscal impact or other indicators. These reports help to illustrate the economic value of the state investment in cultural district tax incentives.

State Arts Agency Grants for Cultural Districts

Colorado: Districts and aspiring districts receive direct grants in various amounts depending on their work plan. Additional funds for districts are available through a relationship with a private foundation. Loans and loan guarantees are also available for commercial, mixed-use, infrastructure and other types of development projects.

Maryland: [Technical assistance grants](#) are targeted to cultural districts and can be used for marketing and capacity building activities.

Massachusetts: Designated cultural districts are eligible to apply for direct grants that may be used for activities and services that support district goals. Funds may not cover capital improvement or non-arts projects.

Texas: [Arts Respond grants](#) can be used by districts for events, signage, marketing and similar purposes. Eligible grant categories include economic development, education, public safety and criminal justice, and natural resources and agriculture.

FUNDING AND SUSTAINABILITY

Sustaining funding and staff capacity for program implementation is an ongoing challenge for all state agencies. State cultural district legislation has not often come with additional resources, and all states are forced to stretch budgets and staff time to implement programs effectively. In almost every case, state cultural district program managers have secondary and tertiary responsibilities—or managing the cultural district is their secondary or tertiary responsibility. This finding is consistent with overall state arts agency staffing trends over the past several years as job responsibilities at agencies have continued to compound.

Funding challenges have played a role in shaping the nature of state cultural district programs. Resource limitations have challenged states to find new partnerships and implement low-cost/high-impact efforts. This is apparent in efforts at administering technical assistance, where expertise is often provided through partnerships with state and local agencies, as well as the efforts of state district managers to connect areas with the local resources they need.

State funding challenges also have limited the direct grants available to state certified cultural districts. Only four states have designated special grant programs to support cultural districts. (One of these states also can make loans to cultural-district development projects.) All state arts agencies, however, do allow constituents within cultural districts to receive funding from the agency's grant programs. Organizations and artists operating within designated districts are eligible to apply for a wide variety of project support grants, and nonprofit cultural institutions are eligible to apply for operating support funds.

CERTIFICATION PRACTICES AND ISSUES

Program Demand

As state cultural district programs continue to evolve, issues relating to program momentum and demand deserve consideration. No state program manager interviewed by NASAA reported a lack of demand or interest in district designation. In fact, some reported the opposite. The number of applications for district certification tells the story. Indiana, New Mexico, Colorado and Texas all receive more applications than they approve. Some states track not only the number of applications filed but also the number of program information requests or letters of intent received, which shines a light on how interest in certification leads to district designation.

There are strategic reasons to limit the number cultural districts, however. Quality control is one: setting certification criteria is a major role played by state arts agencies. Being selective in designations awarded is another strategic management approach, allowing cultural district programs to grow without becoming saturated or stagnant.

District Size

There is no standard geographic size for cultural districts. Each state has its own process for determining the boundaries of districts, though there are common parameters for establishing them. Here are the most prevalent rules for establishing district size:

- District centers and boundaries should be well defined.
- Districts should have high concentration of cultural facilities, activities and/or entrepreneurs.
- Districts should have amenities that facilitate cultural tourism.
- Districts should be walkable and be accessible to people with disabilities (some states even set the maximum district radius).
- Districts should have walking routes and transportation plans.

- Districts should be a manageable size, small enough for local managers to run them effectively.

Application and Certification

There is no standard application process for cultural district certification. Every state arts agency establishes its own procedures according to the program's authorizing legislation, the state arts agency's capacities, state regulations and other contextual considerations.

Depending on the state, applications for certification are accepted cyclically, constantly or at other intervals. Some states with new programs have yet to determine the best application cycle, so do not have a firm process. States with cyclical application timelines organize deadlines on a rolling, biannual, annual or biennial basis. Application timing in those states, however, can be flexible. At least one state interrupted its annual application cycle to devote time to program evaluation.

In addition to the initial application process, state arts agencies must consider whether and how to recertify and decertify cultural districts. While many cultural district policies have a provision for recertification, not all states have yet established a recertification process. Similarly, only two of the four states with decertification provisions have established procedures. Neither state with a formalized decertification process, however, has decertified a district, and the states with decertification authority but no process have yet to encounter the necessity to establish one. Overall, cultural district program managers reported that a recertification process is valuable for ensuring that districts meet their goals and build in mechanisms for sustainability. This can be especially important when public officials and administrators at the state and local level are term-limited and new leadership is elected.

Application Assistance

Indiana provides technical assistance to communities seeking certification and colloquia for communities interested in cultural planning.

Maryland screens applications before they are filed and would provide assistance for reapplications.

Colorado offers multiple ways for new or emerging districts to gain the necessary tools for a successful application, as emerging districts are integrated into overall program offerings.

Recertification and Decertification

State	Recertification Cycle	Decertification Policy
CO	5 years	n/a
IA	10 years	n/a
IN	n/a	Yes (process pending)
KY	1 year (based on annual public value report)	Yes
LA	n/a	Yes (process pending)
MA	5 years	No
MD	10 years	No policy, but via recertification
NM	5 years	Yes
OK	3 years	n/a
RI	n/a	No formal process
SC	5 years	No
TX	10 years (process pending)	No policy, but via recertification
WV	n/a	Yes

Ongoing Maintenance

Cultural district certification is a process that doesn't end with official district designation. In fact, maintenance of cultural districts is an important investment, according to several of the cultural district program managers interviewed. One state, for example, planned to stop assisting cultural districts after two years, but later realized that districts need ongoing support to realize their goals. Stewardship of cultural districts is necessary; it is a matter of recognizing what districts need, what communities want and what resources state arts agencies can offer and broker.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE APPROACHES

Types of Technical Assistance State arts agencies offer many types of technical assistance in support of cultural districts. The technical assistance available depends on agency resources as well as the needs of cultural districts and their communities. While technical assistance options vary widely, opportunities tend to fall under (but are not limited to) one or more of the following categories:

- access to knowledge
- consulting
- networking
- leadership and governance
- program design and planning
- marketing
- evaluation
- fund raising
- guidance to noncertified communities.

Two types of technical assistance for cultural districts most frequently deployed by state arts agencies are marketing assistance and networking assistance. **Marketing assistance** takes several forms. In some states, arts agencies create a statewide cultural district brand and nourish it through a campaign. Such branding, program managers say, is an effective tool for drawing tourists to and encouraging community involvement in cultural districts. In other states, agency staff work directly with local leaders to develop specific marketing tools for individual cultural districts. **Networking assistance** includes any opportunity for local leaders and other stakeholders of cultural districts to engage with their peers. Some states hold annual cultural district colloquia or dedicate sessions to the creative economy at their annual meeting. Other popular and less resource-intensive networking tools include webinars, listservs and newsletters.

Technical Assistance Examples

Access to Knowledge

- information on and help with tax benefits
- free publications
- free access to data
- free access to mapping software

Consulting

- staff consultations
- assistance from other state agencies
- connections to third-party consultants
- grants to pay for third-party consultants

Networking

- convening of local leaders and stakeholders
- state arts agency meetings and colloquia
- peer-to-peer communication
- webinars

Leadership and Governance

- training sessions (in-person or on-line)
- access to free publications
- webinars

Program Design and Planning

- cultural planning
- strategic planning

Marketing

- state cultural district branding
- professional marketing resources

Evaluation

- expertise varies

Fund Raising

- help with federal, foundation and other state grants

Guidance to Noncertified Communities

- application assistance
- debriefing of failed applications

Technical Assistance Practices

How technical assistance is delivered depends on the type of assistance, the budget and capacity for it, and the cultural district receiving it. In general, state arts agencies provide assistance to cultural districts in four ways. The first and most common practice is to provide technical assistance through staff time and other agency resources. The second is to engage third-party consultants to help manage and implement aspects of the state program. Third is to share technical assistance responsibilities through established volunteer partnerships with other state agencies or nongovernmental groups. The final practice is to award grants to cultural districts. With the exceptions of grants in Colorado, Maryland, Massachusetts and Oklahoma, this funding is not specifically for cultural districts, but can be used by the districts to pay for consultants, signage, marketing, networking, event preparation and other technical assistance.

PARTNERSHIPS

Partnerships, both formal and informal, are common and very important to most cultural district programs. Collaborations can expand the resources that a state arts agency can bring to bear to support cultural districts and can widen the circle of supporters and stakeholders that buy into creative place-making efforts.

As noted above, many states use partnerships to offer, facilitate or leverage technical assistance to local cultural districts. While arts agencies often administer technical assistance through partnerships with other state agencies, sometimes they also tap foundations, universities, tourism associations and other third parties for help. Because there are funding challenges to running cultural district programs, partnerships are especially important because they present cost-sharing opportunities. Another benefit of partnerships is that they help arts agencies forge new alliances and strengthen their position within state government as well as in local communities. Informal partnerships even exist between arts agencies in different states.

Main Street Programs

Partnerships with state and local [Main Street programs](#) deserve special mention for several reasons. Main Street programs can overlap cultural districts, and they share with them the values of preserving culture and heritage. They also have similar management structures. While cultural districts and Main Street districts do not always overlap, when they do, there is commonly a partnership between the local managers of the programs. Through such a partnership, the expertise of Main Street programs guides various cultural district activities, such as zoning planning, urban design and public finance. While there is potential for Main Street and cultural district programs to share data collection efforts, the reporting requirements for the two types of programs may not align.

New Mexico is a good case study that demonstrates how statewide cultural district and Main Street programs can work together. In New Mexico, the Main Street office actually helps New Mexico Arts run the state cultural district program. As a result, the Main Street office contributes funding, staff expertise and other resources. Main Street staff, for example, provide abundant help to communities applying for cultural district certification. Staff members conduct intensive, three-day site visits, and subsequently create a report to help communities with cultural planning. Main Street staff also convene cultural districts twice each year for capacity building and leadership development.

EVALUATION

Types of Evaluation

Evaluations yield information that is beneficial not only to state arts agencies and other policymakers, but also to local cultural districts. As a result, most statewide cultural district programs have a data collection and reporting component. Data collection protocols are developed by state arts agencies with respect to a number of factors, including legislative requirements, staff resources and expertise, and feedback from cultural districts and their stakeholders. While each evaluation process is unique, evaluations of cultural districts are based generally on four building blocks.

- **Systematic reporting:** Many state arts agencies require that individual cultural districts file routine reports. Some state arts agencies are bound, in turn, to report back to their legislature. The cycle for these reports can be biannual, annual or biennial. Some states without a reporting mandate still ask cultural districts to file information on their activities and goals.
- **Special evaluations:** Some state arts agencies have conducted one-time evaluations. In some cases, this research is done as a supplement to routine reporting, such as an in-depth review of a program at a particularly meaningful point in its development (e.g., after a pilot stage or during maturation). Evaluations also can be used by state arts agencies to inform improvements in the management or coordination of the state program.
- **Personal contact:** Personalized contact—over the phone, by e-mail or in person—is not necessarily as systematic as surveys and quantitative analysis, but it can be an effective evaluation tool. Personal interaction helps state arts agencies understand local district issues and provides anecdotal evidence and stories.
- **Consultants:** Some state arts agencies hire consultants to analyze cultural district evaluation data. Forming partnerships with universities and other state agencies is another option.

Mandated Reporting

Some state cultural district policies include statutory requirements to assess cultural districts in a particular way or at a particular time. Other policies contain no requirements. However, many states without mandatory measurements are increasingly interested in data collection to substantiate program value, demonstrate accountability or make the case for program resources.

While the absence of measurement mandates can offer states welcome flexibility, it has resulted in a great deal of variation in how measurement is approached. Some evaluations are quantitative, others are qualitative and many are both. Some evaluations are formal and others are informal. Broadly speaking, the cultural district evaluations conducted by state arts agencies can be categorized as looking at cultural district identity, operations and programming; cultural district assets; cultural district goals, challenges and accomplishments; and fiscal and economic impact. Examples of the data elements or indicators examined in each category are listed below.

Cultural District Identity, Operations and Programming

- demographic changes (e.g., artists, volunteers, local leadership, race, age, disabilities)
- list of stakeholders, such as local arts councils and development corporations
- budgets for the current and the following years
- arts education data

- marketing materials
- changes in operations, local leadership and programming

Cultural District Assets

- value of capital investments
- number of galleries and other art or entertainment venues, historical buildings, art studios, and live/work spaces
- occupancy rates of businesses and buildings within cultural districts
- visitation rates
- cultural events and programs as well as attendance rates

Goals, Challenges and Accomplishments

- goals coupled with annual plans and activities for meeting them
- progress in meeting goals
- district accomplishments (such as new arts organizations and events, new public art projects, new partnerships, crime rates and perceived benefits)
- challenges and steps to overcome them

Fiscal Impact and Economic Impact

- tax revenues from business in the district
- total sales figures for business within the district
- local incentives offered by cultural districts
- number of grants received by artists and arts groups
- number of new stores, restaurants and other service businesses
- property values
- employment.

Evaluation Issues

Despite the recognized benefits of evaluation processes, measuring the impact of cultural districts is not easy. It can be difficult to pinpoint the appropriate data to track. Even when it is identified, selecting an evaluation mechanism can be a challenge, especially when more than one state agency is involved in the process. In addition, some states allow individual districts to determine their own method and frequency for information collection, which is a detriment to data coherence.

Data on tax incentives and tax revenue is particularly valuable in support of cultural district programs. Securing and analyzing this data may mean negotiating several challenges. For example, not all state arts agencies have the resources or authority to collect tax information. Additionally, data collection expertise is not often available at the local level, and district businesses can be resistant to data collection efforts. Communication and standardization of data collection is a long-term educational challenge.

Despite these challenges, states have found excellent and substantive ways to report on their cultural district and creative place-making efforts.

This strategy sampler was authored by Ryan Stubbs and Paul Pietsch in 2013. Information about each state's cultural district program, including the number of certified districts, is up to date as of April 2016.

The National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NASAA) is the membership organization that serves the nation's state arts agencies. NASAA helps state arts agencies fulfill their many citizen service roles by providing knowledge services, representation and leadership programs that strengthen the state arts agency community. NASAA also serves as a clearinghouse for data and research about public funding and the arts. For more information on the work of state arts agencies, call 202-347-6352 or visit www.nasaa-arts.org.

APPENDIX A: Program Profile: Number of Districts, Certification Processes and Evaluation Methods

State	Number of Districts (Year Program Began)	Certification Cycle	Recertification Process	Decertification	Evaluation/Metrics Method
CO	18 (2010)	Biennial (pending)	Yes (every 5 years)	n/a	Annual report
IA	35 (2005)	Ongoing	Yes (every 10 years)	No	Periodic evaluation by the department of revenue
IN	6 (2008)	No policy; in practice about every other year	n/a	Yes, but no formal process	Annual report
KY	6 (2011)	Annual	Yes (each year district files public value report)	Yes	Annual report, site visits
LA	78 certified (2008)	Annual	n/a	Yes	Annual report
MA	32 (2010)	Rolling applications	Yes (every 5 years)	No formal process	Annual report, site visits
MD	24 (2001)	Biannual	Yes (every 10 years)	n/a	Annual report
NM	8 (2008)	Biennial (districts in cities with population over 50,000 can self-designate)	Yes (every 5 years)	Yes	Annual report, site visits
OK	7 (2013)	Triennial	Yes (every 3 years)	n/a	Annual report, site visits
RI	9 (1999)	Ongoing (legislation necessary to certify)	n/a	No formal process	State tax office collects data on tax incentives; state arts agency has conducted one survey
SC	6 (2014)	Ongoing	Yes (every 5 years)	No	Annual report
TX	28 (2009)	Annual	Yes (every 10 years)	n/a	n/a
WV	8 (2005)	Ongoing	Can be evaluated every 3 years	Yes	State arts agency evaluation any time after first 3 years of designation

APPENDIX B: Program Profile: Technical Assistance (selected programs)

State	Key Technical Assistance								
	Access to Data, Knowledge and/or Software	Consulting Services/Referrals	Convening	Events Assistance	Evaluation Assistance	Fund-raising Assistance	Governance Assistance	Marketing Assistance	Program Design and Planning Assistance
CO	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
IN	X	X	X					X	X
KY	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
LA		X	X					X	X
MA	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
MD	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
NM	X	X	X			X		X	X
OK		X		X	X		X	X	X
RI		X	X					X	
SC				X				X	
TX		X	X	X		X		X	

Note: technical assistance is implemented through consultants, grants, partnerships and state arts agency staff. In the above table we qualify the key technical assistance aspects as being “in-place” for types of assistance that are formalized. Many types of assistance may also be available “ad hoc” in several states through program administrators and partnerships.

APPENDIX C: Program Profile: Key Certification Elements

State	Applicant Is Municipality or County	Applicant Is Nonprofit	Cultural Asset List, Map	Anchor Institutions	Local Designation or Resolution	Partnerships, Community Support	Boundary Map	Demographic and Socioeconomic Information	Leadership, Goals or Long-Range Plan	Marketing/Tourism	Existing Incentives	Signage Requirement	Accessibility Requirement
CO	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
IA	X		X			X			X	X		X	X
IN	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
KY	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X
LA	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X			
MA	X		X			X	X		X			X	
MD	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X
NM	X		X		X	X	X		X	X		X	
OK			X			X	X		X				
RI	X						X						
SC	X		X		X	X	X		X				
TX	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X
WV	X	X			X	X			X				