

All Feedback

| | Source | Name | Section Name | Comment |
|---|----------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| 1 | Online | | Established Orgs Comments | I am extremely alarmed by some of the established orgs comments at last night's listening session. The insinuation that they should not even have to apply as their work remains the same year over year suggests that they are not in fact expanding access and instead using this grant to simply do business as usual. Given those comments and the intent behind measure p I would like to see an even more strict rubric for general operating funds that outlines how this grant will allow them to expand the work they do either by proving hardship or expansion opportunities. |
| 2 | Online | Christina Olague | Fiscal Sponsorship, Application Questions, & Rubric | The applications questions actually don't make very much sense to someone who is in a fiscal sponsorship. There's also no information in the rubrics regarding fiscal sponsorship. If fiscal sponsorships are allowable in this process, to increase accessibility, then the application questions should be written with that perspective in mind. There's already so few arts non-profit organizations in Fresno to choose from, so we should be making it easier for fiscal sponsorships and emerging orgs to apply, rather than limiting them even more. |
| 3 | Online | Nicholas | General EAAC | How does a counsel expand access without going to the people to hear and address their issues? The EAAC will continue to fail the communities it says it wishes to help as long as those community opportunities are cherry picked for saving face instead of addressing legitimate local issues and cultural red lines. I would like to see projects that are small from small people who can make a big change in the world. Not more large groups that make little substantial changes for the people of fresno |
| 4 | Listening Session #2 | | General Feedback | Training- Goals that have been achieved. Hihglights from previous cycles. |
| 5 | Listening Session #2 | | General Feedback | This has been discouraging with the irresponsibility. |
| 6 | Listening Session #2 | | General Feedback | Will we get it right this time? |
| 7 | Online | Diana Sine Chan-Golston | I. Overview and Background | For 1.4(e) I'd recommend adding a new Funding Priority for "Engaging traditionally underserved/underrepresented communities," to honor the original goal of Expanding Access and Measure P. "Diverse engagement/equity" does not fully address this. |

| | | | | |
|----|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| 8 | Online | Ashley Marie Mireles-Guerrero | I. Overview and Background | Please clarify how "youth" is defined. The Cultural Arts Plan includes young adults, but the City has referenced minors. Which applies? Will programming for young adults still require higher insurance and additional licensing? |
| 9 | Online | | I. Overview and Background | In Section I.5, please provide clear guidelines for "diverse public engagement." Some organizations applied this term loosely last round; more specific criteria are needed. |
| 10 | Online | Jennifer Mikesell-Champlin | I. Overview and Background | I watched the subcommittee meeting for the new Measure P grant, it mentioned there was a copy of the outline available. Is there a possibility of having a digital outline or couple pick-up an outline of the new grant outline? |
| 11 | Online | | I. Overview and Background | We need more transparency and clear guidelines on what projects we're looking for. The Arts & Culture Plan is vague. Let's see some examples of what worked. |
| 12 | Online | | I. Overview and Background | I would like to see diversity defined as BIPOC, LGBTQ+, disabled, and marginalized communities. |
| 13 | Online | | I. Overview and Background | For grants that "reasonably expand access" what does this actually mean? |
| 14 | Online | Colin W | I. Overview and Background | The Council has proven it can not be responsible stewards of the tax payers money. Revoke the funding!! |
| 15 | Online | Naomi Guzman Esquivel | I. Overview and Background | Would love to have more insight |
| 16 | Listening Session #1 | | I. Overview and Background | Define youth and diverse public. What are you really looking for? |
| 17 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | I. Overview and Background | Pg. 6/19: Please add that "Youth" is defined as Ages 25 and below. The Fresno Arts & Cultural Plan defines "Youth" as including minors & adults up to the age of 25. Please make sure this is accounted for in both the guidelines AND the ARC Handbook. |
| 18 | Online | Cassandra German | I. Overview and Background | I think that in Section 5, there needs to be specific examples of what kinds of projects would and would not be funded. This allows applicants and proctors to have a more comprehensive scope of what types of projects will move forward. |
| 19 | Online | Paula | I. Overview and Background | In Section 5, Funding Priorities, examples of what would be funded and what would not be funded would be helpful in the application process to cover the questions that arose, by the applicants and by the proctors scoring the applications. |

| | | | | |
|----|----------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| 20 | Online | | I. Overview and Background | The most important things in this EAAC grant process are: over communication, setting the expectations, transparency of the process, and consistency across all aspects. These are the things we have not had so far and expect will be rectified now. |
| 21 | Listening Session #3 | | I. Overview and Background | More funding should be allocated to emerging than the established orgs. |
| 22 | Online | William Reeve | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | 250 character limit is silly. Can't really explain comment in detail. Frustrating |
| 23 | Online | William Reeve | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | 100% or 0 is problematic. Only experienced will succeed. Works against inclusion/diversity goal to build less experienced into vibrant contributors. FAC advised proposals be scalable but 30% is low. Op grants w/part funding works if options built in. |
| 24 | Online | Diana Sine Chan-Golston | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Most public grant programs have multiple guidelines to differentiate funding opportunities. Applicants should be able to submit multiple apps, with mini-grant opportunities for individual artists, public events, & differently sized NFP organizations |
| 25 | Online | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Organizations should qualify for either General Operations or Project-Specific funding based on their greatest need. |
| 26 | Online | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Partial funding should apply only to General Operations grants, which are supplemental. Project-specific grants should be fully funded to ensure projects proceed as planned. |
| 27 | Online | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Separate Project Support and Program Support into distinct rubrics and funding pools. A mural shouldn't be evaluated like a year-long workshop; their scopes and funding ranges differ significantly. |
| 28 | Online | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | For operational support, cap funding at \$100k or 70% of the annual budget, whichever is less. These grants should support expansion, and the rubric should require evidence of projected growth. |
| 29 | Online | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Cap the funding amount requested for general operating support. \$100k or 75%, whichever is lower, of the orgs budget should be the limit. It is unfair to new/smaller organizations for a majority of the money to go to large established organizations. |
| 30 | Online | Stephen Wilson | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Applicants should only be allowed to submit one application per grant cycle for either Gen Op or Project Support, provided that maximum grant awards for Gen Op grants are set sufficiently high to achieve the important goal of stability for arts orgs. |

| | | | | |
|----|--------|----------------|---|---|
| 31 | Online | Stephen Wilson | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | At least 50% of funding should be allocated to Gen Op grants. The organizations eligible for Gen Op grants are dedicated to arts & culture programming and serve thousands of Fresno residents. Supporting these orgs is crucial for expanding access. |
| 32 | Online | Stephen Wilson | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Maximum grant awards should be framed as a percentage of budget. Gen Op: applicants may apply for up to 30% of their total annual expenses, capped at \$400,000. Project: applicants may apply for up to 100% of eligible project expenses, up to \$75,000. |
| 33 | Online | Stephen Wilson | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Setting a lower cap (\$75K vs. \$150K) for Project Support grants will allow for funding more projects. |
| 34 | Online | Stephen Wilson | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Amount Awarded vs. Amount Requested. Suggestion: set a goal to award at least 80% of amount requested for applications that score sufficiently high. Needs some flexibility to balance amount of awards with number of organizations to be funded. |
| 35 | Online | Emilia Borjas | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Please fix funding timelines and overlap with cycle 2 payouts . No one should lose funding just because they are in the last round. |
| 36 | Online | Laura Ward | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | 1. Available Funding: Is the \$6,498,200 amount reduced by the cost to hire the three new staff positions? |
| 37 | Online | Laura Ward | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | 3. Multiple Solicitations: Are applications from sponsors and their projects deemed separate? Organizations shouldn't get many grants for themselves; being a sponsor shouldn't limit applications/awards, if reaching different audiences. |
| 38 | Online | Laura Ward | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | 4. Multiple Solicitations: To make sure funds go to a wide breadth of applicants - perhaps add new category for midsize, or new category for (sponsored) individual artists/new collective applicants, so funds reach a wide range of recipients. |
| 39 | Online | Laura Ward | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | 5. Award Amounts: Dr. Francine Oputa advocated for 50% of funding to go to projects and 50% of funding to go to operations, so that there was not a value judgment placed on one grant category as favored over the other. I think that's fair. |
| 40 | Online | Laura Ward | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | 6. Award Amounts: As a maximum, no more than 5% of total available funding (about \$300k) to any one award, or to one organization for themselves in a grant cycle (not counting sponsored projects against their total max). |
| 41 | Online | Elliott Balch | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | I support multiple apps per applicant to facilitate collective work: 1) There's a lot to do downtown; 2) Other leveraged resources & permits are often needed for funded projects; 3) Orgs w/ systems to manage funds help ensure execution, reporting. |

| | | | | |
|----|----------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| 42 | Online | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Partial payments to more organizations should be prioritized over 100% awards to fewer organizations. |
| 43 | Listening Session #1 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Would like to have full awards vs partial awards. |
| 44 | Listening Session #1 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Established orgs can receive for smaller projects but have a cap of \$500,000 to apply themselves. |
| 45 | Listening Session #1 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Ensure that established/ legacy orgs are not prioritized over emerging/new orgs and or projects. |
| 46 | Listening Session #1 | Kiel | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Create targeted grants or grant pools for neighborhoods or demographics not being awarded in the past. |
| 47 | Listening Session #1 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Is there a way to streamline the application process to make project-specific & operating less redundant? A common app for both? |
| 48 | Online | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | It should not be forgotten that these grants were meant to help sustain our city's established arts orgs with general operating funds. This type of funding is so hard to find and our local orgs need it desperately to survive. |
| 49 | Online | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | The maximum for general operating support should be \$400,000. |
| 50 | Online | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Grantees should be awarded either 100% or 75% of what they requested, depending on their scores. If they don't score high, they should be awarded zero. It's not realistic for projects to only receive 30% or even 50% and still be expected to deliver. |
| 51 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Pg 6/19: Partial awards MUST be defined & must be MINIMAL in scale. Last cycle's 60% & 30% awards were deliberately discriminatory. Many awardees declined award cuz they saw it as a trap to fail scope of grant & be barred from future applications. |
| 52 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Pg 6/19: Partial awards MUST be clearly defined in NOFA & must be MINIMAL in scale. Last cycle's 60% & 30% awards were absurd, deliberately discriminatory, & without any warning. It was used as a weapon by Fresno Arts Council to thin the herd. |
| 53 | Online | Stephen Wilson | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | The percentage allocated to different buckets should not be determined by the number of applicants in each category. It is appropriate that grant funds are scaled to organizational budget sizes and the number of residents they serve. |
| 54 | Online | Stephen Wilson | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | It is not surprising that the percentage of applicants funded in Cycle 2 was lower in categories where there were more applicants. That's just math, not evidence of inequity. |

| | | | | |
|----|--------|----------------|---|--|
| 55 | Online | Stephen Wilson | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | The metric of success for Measure P is the art actually created, expansion of access and the number of people served, not the number of organizations funded. |
| 56 | Online | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Funding proportion and minimum/maximum values should be transparent and included on the Guidelines if people are to know what is available and worth pursuing as a grant application. As of comment, all fields on page 6 remain blank and ambiguous. |
| 57 | Online | Ome Lopez | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Funding should be allocated to keep opportunities balanced across categories. Distributing resources proportionally, based on applicant numbers and requested amounts, helps prevent any group from being favored and supports a more equitable process. |
| 58 | Online | Ome Lopez | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | This approach also allows the process to better reflect actual need, ensuring funds are used where demand is greatest while maintaining fairness. Over time, it can build trust and consistency in how decisions are made. |
| 59 | Online | Ome Lopez | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | This approach also allows the process to better reflect actual need, ensuring funds are used where demand is greatest while maintaining fairness. Over time, it can build trust and consistency in how decisions are made. |
| 60 | Online | Ome Lopez | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | This approach reflects real need while maintaining fairness. It recognizes that emerging projects often have fewer resources, so funding in that category should be valued equally or even prioritized to support growth and long-term sustainability. |
| 61 | Online | Ome Lopez | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Funding pools should not vary widely in competitiveness. Last year showed disparities, with some categories receiving a much higher share of requested funds especially the largest operating grants resulting in inequitable outcomes across the program. |
| 62 | Online | Ome Lopez | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Standardizing award percentages across categories, based on demand and request size, could help create more consistency and ensure applicants are evaluated on a more level playing field regardless of category. |
| 63 | Online | Amaya Weldon | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | During the application process, if there is a max percentage of funding that is allocated for emerging and established organizations. The percentage should reflect an allocation that can sustain the expanded access initiative. |
| 64 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | We support the consolidation of grant guidelines into one set used for multiple solicitations as long as eligibility requirements and timelines remain clear. Applicants should not be able to apply for both operating and project support. |
| 65 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Applications should be limited to one per organization with the exception of those serving as fiscal sponsors as they should be able to submit multiple applications for themselves and on behalf of their fiscally sponsored projects to support access. |
| 66 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | It is important to keep a distinction between established and emerging organizations to help ensure a more level playing field for applicants with less resources. There should be a % of funds earmarked specifically for emerging organizations. |
| 67 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | We support the recommendation that grant awards be made for 100% of eligible expenses to ensure applicants are able to implement grant activities as outlined in the proposal and to simplify the contract execution process. |

| | | | | |
|----|----------------------|------------------|---|---|
| 68 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | We support implementation of a minimum threshold, but it should not be set too high to ensure it is still accessible for emerging organizations. Somewhere in the range of \$1,000 seems reasonable but we defer to emerging organizations on that amount. |
| 69 | Online | Erin Burd | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Adjust the revenue levels for Emerging vs Established. An organization who is growing and has a \$250k annual revenue should not be competing in the same category for funding as an organization that has an annual revenue of over \$1million. |
| 70 | Online | Ome Lopez | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Recommend three funding tracks: (1) non-501c3 artists, \$2K–\$20K, no fiscal sponsor, contract directly with the city; (2) 501(c)(3) project grants up to \$150K; (3) gen operating grants up to \$150K, ensuring access and flexibility across applicants. |
| 71 | Online | Erin Burd | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | When making allocations of total funds - a smaller % of award dollars should be allocated to organizations that have revenues of over \$1million dollars. Allowing more awards across the board to be made, creating a larger impact in the community. |
| 72 | Online | Alicia Rodriguez | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | To honor adherence to the goal of EXPANDED ACCESS, the distribution of funds to various categories(emerging versus established) should be set to realize equity, the result should reflect growth in historically and systemically overlooked entities. |
| 73 | Online | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Organizations should be allowed to submit one application for each Project and Op funds. Established versus Emerging specifications need to change. It's very hard for entities making only \$200K to compete with multimillion dollar organizations. |
| 74 | Online | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | I would suggest that funding only be 100% down to 75% of the amount requested. I do feel that there should be a maximum amount an organization can request, but not a minimum. |
| 75 | Online | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Last cycle showed major disparities across categories. Established Gen Op's funded 96% of applicants(\$3.1M),while Emerging Project Support funded only 54%(\$1.07M).This imbalance is inequitable; funding levels should align w/ community need & demand. |
| 76 | Online | Blake Ellis | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Awards need to be no less than 75% of project ask, even if that means awarding less artists and organizations. With 30% awards - projects do not get completed or have to be so scaled back that they are not in alignment with anything proposed. |
| 77 | Online | Cassandra German | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Grants should be awarded at the full amount requested under the limit. Funding should be enough to make a project sustainable. Organizations should be allowed to apply to both project and general operating support grants. Max. limits but no minimum. |
| 78 | Online | Ome Lopez | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Organizations should be limited to applying for only one grant, either project-based or general operating, to ensure a fairer distribution of funds and prevent any single entity from accessing multiple funding streams in the same cycle. |
| 79 | Online | Erin Burd | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Awards should be funded in full at execution of contract/agreement. Asking artists or new organizations to "float" the remaining 10% is a barrier to successful completion of a project. |
| 80 | Online | Amaya weldon | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Talking away the ability to only award 30%, 60% of funding to project specific. The application process is lengthy and time consuming and after multiple applications just to get through the final stage a 30% award (in most cases) is not feasible. |
| 81 | Listening Session #3 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | More funding/support for emerging, not less established orgs are generally already funded/resourced |

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------------------|--------|---|--|
| 82 | Listening Session #3 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Equity in funding money? |
| 83 | Listening Session #3 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Funds also provide pathway for emerging artist to become 501c3 |
| 84 | Listening Session #3 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Cap established organizations receiving both project and operating support grantees unless acting as a fiscal sponsor |
| 85 | Listening Session #3 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Draft addresses established programs but not emerging projects. Last year had a section. |
| 86 | Listening Session #3 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | 55% for emerging artists |
| 87 | Listening Session #3 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | More access to emerging orgs and projects that established orgs |
| 88 | Listening Session #3 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Half of the funds should be protected for emerging |
| 89 | Listening Session #3 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Establish a percentage of funds for artist led and emerging projects |
| 90 | Listening Session #3 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | More of the funds should go to emerging artists than established orgs |
| 91 | Listening Session #3 | Eddie | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | 50% for emerging , 50% for established |
| 92 | Listening Session #3 | Sophia | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | What is funding? How is it made up and how do they get representation. |
| 93 | Listening Session #3 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | If established can apply for larger amounts, the % should still fund the emerging projects and organizations. Equity! Organizations who are established to receive smaller or capped funding to offer opportunity and funding to emerging organizations. Example: If CMAC can operate without Measure P funding, why should they receive the max funds |
| 94 | Listening Session #3 | | II. Available Funding and Funding Allocations | Individual artists smaller grants without a fiscal sponsor. Becoming a temporary vendor within the city. Streamline reporting (such as business submits for renewal with the city financial reporting). PARCS/City?Arts Council to guide or create a hub |

| | | | | |
|------------|------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--|
| 95 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Chair McCoy | III. Timeline | Why are we switching from the letter of intent to an eligibility form? |
| 96 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Chair McCoy | III. Timeline | Is there an estimated grant term? I don't think anyone will be ready in twelve months. |
| 97 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Stephen W. | III. Timeline | Is it possible to have asynchronous application periods? First general ops and then project grants. Funding would be received halfway through nonprofit fiscal years. Is it possible to do the first round of grants for FY June 2026 to June 2027? This would allow fewer panelist to be recruited all at once. |
| 98 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Parvin M. | III. Timeline | Quarterly funding feedback: Paying quarterly does not work for all organizations. Prizes are given to some participants. Would a gift card be okay? Multiple outreach attempts to the City. Where can reporting be done for cycle 2. |
| 99 | Online | William Reeve | III. Timeline | Letter of intent was a screening letter. Full schedule needed to anticipate/plan. Create a template schedule that works for typical year. Staff up and coordinate to meet the schedule. Reliable schedule is important to recipients and public image. |
| 100 | Online | | III. Timeline | I could not find the June 30th date codified in the Measure P Ordinance. I'd like to see flexibility on this date as it would allow for more access and clearer guidelines. |
| 101 | Online | | III. Timeline | Allow timeline exceptions for Cycle 2 grantees impacted by funding delays. Those affected by FAC mismanagement or awaiting final 10% payouts should not be penalized in Round 3. |
| 102 | Online | Stephen Wilson | III. Timeline | Strongly recommend opening application only for General Operating applicants with July 1-June 30 fiscal year in August/September. Open Project Grant applications in November/December for projects occurring in calendar 2027. |
| 103 | Online | Stephen Wilson | III. Timeline | Separating the timing of Gen Op and Project grant cycles will make it easier for PARCS to administer, recruit panelists and have fewer applications to deal with at one time. The reporting timelines will also be easier for PARCS to administer. |
| 104 | Online | Stephen Wilson | III. Timeline | If General Operating and Project Grant applications are separated, the grant term can be 12 months for each (July 1-June 30 for Gen Op; January 1-December 31 for Project), with final reporting 30-60 days after term ends. |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 105 | Online | | III. Timeline | Need more time for NOFA, many folks are still working on their previous projects, given the issues with FAC and the transfer of contracts. People won't be ready. |
| 106 | Online | Laura Ward | III. Timeline | Timeline - Eligibility screening form cutoff will effectively close the application period, so this needs more than 30 days from RFP/NOFA. Extend eligibility period; permit eligible organizations to access application after screened (rolling basis). |
| 107 | Online | Elliott Balch | III. Timeline | If multiple project grants are allowed, it would be helpful for an applicant to know what applications are eligible at the eligibility screening stage. |
| 108 | Online | Elliott Balch | III. Timeline | Round 2's support period retro from award was bad; support periods should start in the future so there's time to ramp up. Could we use the calendar year as period every year, starting w/ 2027 for Round 3? Or shorten Round 3 to let #4 start earlier? |
| 109 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | III. Timeline | The two month period should be increased to three months, to apply for the grant due to all of the evidence documentation needed. |
| 110 | Listening Session #1 | Ashley | III. Timeline | Cycle 2 would not be able to participate in cycle 3. |
| 111 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | III. Timeline | Where is ordinance that says NOFA must be complete by June 30? |
| 112 | Listening Session #1 | | III. Timeline | Due to short turn around of eligibility form to application deadline, we should be provided w/ app questions ahead of time |
| 113 | Listening Session #2 | | III. Timeline | This is rigorous to apply by Sept 1. |
| 114 | Listening Session #2 | | III. Timeline | Add to the milestones when the ARC will be picked. |
| 115 | Online | Johannus Leonardus A T Reijnders | III. Timeline | Pg. 6/19: Give 90 days between NOFA & deadline (if NOFA Jul 30, deadline is Oct 30). As much time as possible is necessary for expanding access to those who have existing operations & day jobs that dont allow them to be full-time grantwriters. |
| 116 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | III. Timeline | Please keep "Grant Term: twelve (12) months project delivery, one (1) month for final reporting" AKA, timeline that begins AFTER grant funds are disbursed. The old policy deliberately blocked those who didnt have thousands in liquid cash. |
| 117 | Online | | III. Timeline | Grant application window should be 3 months or more. These guidelines will require getting a lot of evidence documents (budget costs, permitting, artist commitments) not just narrative |
| 118 | Online | | III. Timeline | Dont start grant timeline til funds are sent to awardee. Fresno Arts Council used to force timeline to begin July 1, 3 months before funds were sent. They claimed you should just pay out of pocket & reimburse yourself later which is crazy for us. |

| | | | | |
|------------|--------|------------------|---------------|--|
| 119 | Online | | III. Timeline | We need more time to review this, why is the review committee handbook only given a week when these guidelines are still so messy?? You need to delay this by like a month at least so it can be done right |
| 120 | Online | | III. Timeline | Having only 60 days between notice of funding approval and the application deadline is too limited a time period. Since Timeline is already flexible this should be easy to adjust to allot more time for applicants to complete. |
| 121 | Online | Stephen Wilson | III. Timeline | The process outlined by PARCS includes robust community engagement and input. This has been an exceptionally transparent process. Calls to delay the process further are without merit and will cause substantial harm to grantees who need these funds. |
| 122 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | III. Timeline | Assuming there is significant outreach, TA, and tech support provided in advance, we support the implementation of an eligibility screening form that makes the initial application a lighter lift for all applications as we won't have to draft an LOI. |
| 123 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | III. Timeline | It would be very helpful for PARCS to create a flow chart or test form applicants can use to assess their eligibility before submitting our official eligibility screening form so we can potentially address issues impacting our eligibility. |
| 124 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | III. Timeline | We support any timeline accommodations needed to allow Cycle 2 grantees (especially those who haven't received their awarded funding yet) to be eligible for Cycle 3 funding. Any delays in Cycle 2 should not be a barrier to accessing Cycle 3 funds. |
| 125 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | III. Timeline | We're concerned there is not adequate time for all needed technical assistance workshops to occur before the eligibility screening form is due. TA should continue from the time the NOFA is posted through the deadline for the final application. |
| 126 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | III. Timeline | As written, there would be less than a month between the time eligibility is confirmed and the time the full application is due. This is not enough time to submit, even if the application template is significantly simplified from last cycle. |
| 127 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | III. Timeline | There must be a minimum of one month from the time applicants are notified of our confirmed eligibility (including those who go through the appeals process) in order for the application to be submitted. More time to apply is ideal & more accessible. |
| 128 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | III. Timeline | One month (or less) is a very tight turnaround time for submitting the application, even as an established organization with full-time development staff. We strongly recommend more than a one month timeframe to access TA and submit a full proposal. |
| 129 | Online | | III. Timeline | Yes to the Eligibility Screening Form instead of an LOI. The timeline becomes inhibited if an eligible applicant is given access to the application in August and it's due September 1st. That doesn't leave time to create a well-rounded application. |
| 130 | Online | | III. Timeline | I agree with the proposed 13 month term for the annual process. The timeline is doable except for only a few weeks to create the application (unless the questions are available before eligibility is determined). |
| 131 | Online | Cassandra German | III. Timeline | Timeline is appropriate as long as applicants are able to view questions prior to application period. One month produces rushed and incomplete answers. Eligibility Screening Form instead of LOI is needed. Allows pre-screening. |
| 132 | Online | Jackson Kytle | III. Timeline | As an experienced grant seeker and administrator, the guidelines are well organized but the timeline and September 1 submission date are not realistic. Valley Town Hall is still trying to complete Cycle 2, and waiting on your process and the funding. |
| 133 | Online | Erin Burd | III. Timeline | Space needs to be created in the timeline for fiscal sponsor recruitment and training prior to NOFA so applicants can reach out to potential sponsors early and to make sure they are a good fit. |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-----------|------------------|---|
| 134 | Listening Session #3 | Esther | III. Timeline | June - July cycle would work best |
| 135 | Listening Session #3 | Katherine | III. Timeline | Go with fiscal years. |
| 136 | Listening Session #1 | Juan C. | Internal Process | Create a map of all of the awardee organizations and market their offerings. |
| 137 | Listening Session #1 | | Internal Process | Would be helpful to have examples in the workshop sessions from other cities with similar programs |
| 138 | Listening Session #1 | | Internal Process | City ran parks facilities should be free/reduced to utilize for Measure P projects offerings |
| 139 | Listening Session #1 | | Internal Process | City should provide a pairing system for artist seeking sponsorship |
| 140 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | Internal Process | This exact same draft/review outreach process should be done for the ARC Handbook and the Arts/Cultural plan |
| 141 | Listening Session #1 | | Internal Process | Make it easier to get approval for the arts and culture in the city parks |
| 142 | Listening Session #1 | Juan C | Internal Process | Transparency. Mimic Tower Porchfest digital map shows location of organizations and what time they open and what they provide. These organizations should be transparent with the award amount and what they are providing to the public. |
| 143 | Listening Session #3 | | Internal Process | Video's step by step to support with application process |
| 144 | Listening Session #3 | DevoyN | Internal Process | Fresno County provides cultural humility trainings via vendors they partner with. |
| 145 | Listening Session #3 | | Internal Process | Review f the guidelines should happen every 2-3 years not every 5 years considering this is such a new process |
| 146 | Listening Session #3 | | Internal Process | Clarity on oversight roles of EAAC subcommittee and FAC, to avoid lack of accountability |
| 147 | Listening Session #3 | | Internal Process | Better oversight for the overseers commission, FAC, City who are not equipped to manage these funds. |
| 148 | Listening Session #3 | Zach | Internal Process | What resources are available to help newer or non-established organizations to be a part of Measure P and EAAC |
| 149 | Listening Session #3 | | Internal Process | Break down to show what districts got how much money |
| 150 | Listening Session #3 | | Internal Process | Correct and clear verbage on culture. A lot of projects got overlooked because what I consider culture is different to someone else. |
| 151 | Listening Session #3 | | Internal Process | Access to past applications across various scores as templates for application success. |
| 152 | Listening Session #3 | Sophia | Internal Process | Create a frequently asked questions on how to be eligible and how to navigate to a necessary resource |

| | | | | |
|------------|------------------------------|--------------|------------------|---|
| 153 | Listening Session #3 | | Internal Process | EAAC Subcommittee should include an equal amount of working artists and cultural bearers as administrators/Measure P Commissioners |
| 154 | Listening Session #3 | Sophia | Internal Process | Create resources for potential applicants to navigate how they fit into the application process? |
| 155 | Listening Session #3 | | Internal Process | There needs to be a lot more clarity and attention to conflict of interest in all parts of the process |
| 156 | Listening Session #3 | | Internal Process | Transparency of roles and information about the process. Gatekeeping info does not make these programs accessible, makes it harder for artists to access these opportunities |
| 157 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Christine | IV. Eligibility | Dear Subcommittee, After reviewing the draft guidelines, I am concerned about the restriction against religious organizations. I support protecting the use of public funds against proselytizing or other inappo (E comment was cut off) |
| 158 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Chair McCoy | IV. Eligibility | Is there a dollar amount for food? What is reasonable and unnecessary? Knowing the cap will help plan out events. What falls under equipment? Examples will be helpful. |
| 159 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Chair McCoy | IV. Eligibility | What is an excuse for an organization who does not complete previous reporting? Someone could be ill. Why should we stop them from applying for the next round. A detailed form for case by case. |
| 160 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Chair McCoy | IV. Eligibility | Need more explanation under ineligible applicants, 3a. There are faith based nonprofits in the community with a youth component. This could exclude some nonprofits. What if a project is brought into a classroom, would they be excluded? |
| 161 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Ome L. | IV. Eligibility | Requiring nonprofit status restricts applicants. It creates a barrier and does not make the work more impactful. Fiscal sponsorship makes this accessible. Meet artist where they are at, do not require them to become something else. |
| 162 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Smiley | IV. Eligibility | Shocking to create a barrier to access funds by requiring applicants to be nonprofits. Some may not want or know how to become a nonprofit. Could we use this money to reimburse the process of becoming a nonprofit. This requirement would stop funding from going to the community. Only established organizations would get funding. What if we are late on water bills to the City. Would this make us ineligible? |
| 163 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Christine B. | IV. Eligibility | More clarification for faith based applicants. Smaller organizations may depend on faith based organizations as a fiscal sponsor to apply. This may exclude organizations. |

| | | | | |
|------------|------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|
| 164 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Erin B. | IV. Eligibility | Altering the eligibility for activities during the school day may restrict some projects such as field trips. How will we identify fiscal receivers and how do we ensure they have followed all the guardrails. How do we check this before the money is released and make sure projects are mentored well. It is not fair for established organizations budget differences between new organizations. |
| 165 | Online | William Reeve | IV. Eligibility | Core Op expenses for project specific limited to 10%. Rent and insurance can be tough. ie \$1600 for a venue to host a concert. ie Funding a Latin Jazz Band is great but there are not many places that will host a concert for free in the city. Fact. |
| 166 | Online | William Reeve | IV. Eligibility | Construction is too expensive to be eligible & would drastically reduce how much of the funding supports actual arts projects. Perhaps a low percentage at most. Be specific, not entire buildings/additions. Would require lots of extra oversight. |
| 167 | Online | William Reeve | IV. Eligibility | Yes: fund programs to assist organizations/artists to become effective non profits. How to plan, fund, manage projects, organizations. This should be a separate track not a grant. The City could manage this to improve the net return of Measure P. |
| 168 | Online | William Reeve | IV. Eligibility | Please define, in writing, Fresno's sphere of influence. ie There are several county islands completely surrounded by the City of Fresno. Those people do their shopping and work in the City of Fresno. They pay the sales tax too. Help us clarify. |
| 169 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Require NTEE Arts designation only for Gen Ops grants. Expand fiscal sponsorship by allowing nonprofits across sectors to sponsor arts projects—e.g., financial services orgs can provide strong fiscal oversight and support. |
| 170 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Section 2.6: Requesting clarity. What qualifies as a quote? Do we need it in our application? Do we need to have them on file for reporting? Where do these come into play? |
| 171 | Online | Michael Birdsong | IV. Eligibility | I do not support the use of taxpayer money to fund projects that are administered by religious organizations. I believe the “separation of church and state” should disqualify, churches and church affiliated group groups from taxpayer funding. |
| 172 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Can a non religious nonprofit apply if they share a facility with a church? Many events/showcases are at schools/during school hours. This ineligibility restricts access for families unable to attend outside events due to cost, transportation, etc. |

| | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------------|-----------------|--|
| 173 | Online | Stephen Wilson | IV. Eligibility | Need clarification of what you mean by “good standing” with IRS, CA FTB, etc. Your list seems like overkill. Most granting agencies would require only an IRS 501(c) 3 determination letter and the most recently filed 990. |
| 174 | Online | Stephen Wilson | IV. Eligibility | For “good standing,” are you asking for documents to be uploaded (e.g. most recent 990) or something else (e.g. applicant certification that they are in compliance)? Please be specific about what you are asking for to demonstrate eligibility. |
| 175 | Online | Stephen Wilson | IV. Eligibility | Eligibility for Gen Op support needs more than an NTEE code. To be an arts/culture organization, more that 50% of the organization’s expenses should be dedicated to arts or culture programming. Having an arts NTEE code is not sufficient. |
| 176 | Online | Stephen Wilson | IV. Eligibility | General Operating funds support the whole mission of the organization funded. Eligibility should be more restricted than Project Support and limited to organizations primarily or exclusively engaged in arts & culture programming. |
| 177 | Online | Stephen Wilson | IV. Eligibility | Fiscally sponsored organizations should not be eligible for General Operating support. This funding should be limited to 501(c)3 organizations, as it was in previous Measure P grant cycles. |
| 178 | Online | Stephen Wilson | IV. Eligibility | Expanding the Measure P grants to construction costs/capital expenses is not a good idea. Given that Measure P funds are limited and cannot fund all current requests, expanding the list of eligible expenses doesn’t seem to make sense. |
| 179 | Online | Stephen Wilson | IV. Eligibility | Construction/capital expenses raise certain problems: what if an improved space currently owned by an arts nonprofit is then sold to a for-profit or non-arts organization? Significant Measure P funds could be wasted here. |
| 180 | Online | Stephen Wilson | IV. Eligibility | Wording of ineligible expenses (“programming... occurring outside of the City of Fresno sphere of influence.”) significantly expands the geography of eligible applicants/projects. Previously limited to activities in the City of Fresno. |
| 181 | Online | Stephen Wilson | IV. Eligibility | Projects limited to school/college students, occurring during school/academic hours, should be treated the same whether they are on or off campus (e.g. field trips). Policy question: should projects not open to the general public be eligible? |
| 182 | Online | Stephen Wilson | IV. Eligibility | Expanding eligibility to cash prizes and scholarships does not seem like a good idea given limited funds. |
| 183 | Online | Krista Aranda | IV. Eligibility | There are a lot of community organizers that aren’t at that 501c3 or an established nonprofit for 2 years. If the goal is to bring out more art by using the funding, it should be more accessible. It gives those who are still growing be a recipient. |
| 184 | Online | Anissa Andrade | IV. Eligibility | I’m looking to see how to become eligible for funding opportunities |
| 185 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | I would like to see an exception for Cycle 2 grantees who have been impacted by issues caused by FAC. |

| | | | | |
|------------|--------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 186 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Where is the Info for emerging artists? What is the ordinance that states that non profit that are religious, political, sole proprietor or private foundation are ineligible? |
| 187 | Online | James Bass | IV. Eligibility | IRS NTEE CODE: R20-R28 allows political issues |
| 188 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | What is the ordinance regarding non profits outside of the arts and culture being ineligible? Where? |
| 189 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Would like to see specific guidelines around emerging artists. |
| 190 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Will we see eligibility guidelines for established vs emerging orgs and artists? |
| 191 | Online | Jacob Soto | IV. Eligibility | There should be a section or something that is meant for emerging artists. Also people outside of Fresno should not be on the judge panel. Also who will be in charge in the council since the members of the last council have been terminated. |
| 192 | Online | Denise “Astro” Williams | IV. Eligibility | How does the program reduce barriers for emerging artists who may not have grant writers or prior funding experience? |
| 193 | Online | Rachel Reyes | IV. Eligibility | I don’t see a section for emerging artists eligibility. |
| 194 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Can a for-profit org be eligible with a fiscal sponsor? This isn't clear on page 7 |
| 195 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Previous rounds had a number of years a non-profit had to be in operation before being eligible that's not indicated in the drafts. Is this no longer a requirement. |
| 196 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Where does Fresno’s sphere of influence end? This is too vague. |
| 197 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Pg 8. Sec. 3 Must the project be of specific culture in order to expand access? |
| 198 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Emerging artist eligibility isn't listed. |
| 199 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | No religious, political, or private foundations is listed. Is this an ordinance requirement? |
| 200 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Does equipment above \$5000 need three quotes in the application, to approve the budget, or to be funded? At what point in the process is this required? |
| 201 | Online | Elliott Balch | IV. Eligibility | Eligible expenses #2 includes insurance as “core-op expense.” But some ins. may be a project cost, e.g. DFP has event ins. separate from daily ops, w/ a premium per event. Separate project-specific insurance costs from core ops, outside the 10% cap. |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|
| 202 | Online | Elliott Balch | IV. Eligibility | Comment A10 asks: Should construction be eligible? I say: Let's do it! For example, at DFP we would love to help facilitate creating pop-up art spaces in vacant buildings. |
| 203 | Online | Elliott Balch | IV. Eligibility | Re construction, consider a multiyear carveout for marquee arts facility projects. Measure (& Charter) bar bonds against P \$\$, but dedicating some % of \$\$ for 5-year awards, pay-as-you-go, could create amazing projects thru the life of the Measure. |
| 204 | Online | Elliott Balch | IV. Eligibility | A13: scholarships. Having seen what it takes to run a compliant scholarship prog. at CVCF, I urge caution. For example administering scholarships requires a broad enough eligibility pool. Maybe just do stipends for students working on projects? |
| 205 | Online | Elliott Balch | IV. Eligibility | A14: projects on univ. campuses. DFP had a great collab with FCC on a downtown mural. Projects with an offsite component should be eligible, showing impact in the community beyond just on campus. And what happens on campus can play an important role. |
| 206 | Online | Elliott Balch | IV. Eligibility | Re: "Owner Permissions," events in public ROW may need City permits not yet filed at time of app. Instead ask whether applicant has history of obtaining such permits and satisfying insurance reqs., or whether ever denied a permit in recent years. |
| 207 | Online | Laura Ward | IV. Eligibility | 1. Eligible applicants – NTEE code too strict; specific purpose statement in Articles of Incorporation with art or culture should be accepted. 2. Ineligible Applicants – Does new contract address or restrict? Support 'corrective action plan' approach |
| 208 | Online | Laura Ward | IV. Eligibility | 3. Ineligible Applicants – can city legal evaluate broader 501(c)(3) orgs OK if award is for art and/or culture? 4. Ineligible Expenses – remove restriction on schools/school campus/during school hours. Artificial limitation reducing youth access. |
| 209 | Online | Laura Ward | IV. Eligibility | 5. Eligibility: Eligible Applicant – can city legal clarify what 'in good standing with City of Fresno' means in the context of fiscally sponsored projects or individuals? Or does it just apply to their sponsor? |
| 210 | Online | Krista A | IV. Eligibility | non 501(c)(3) should be allowed space to apply for grants. Not all orgs are at that level but still have value to add to the community. it would be beneficial to allow those type of organizations to apply for grants. |
| 211 | Online | Krista A | IV. Eligibility | sec 4 ineligible expenses: fundraising should be accepted as a way to capitalize on even being able to receive funds. It is not guaranteed that orgs will continuously receive funds throughout each cycle. Fundraising could be used as a tool to cont. |
| 212 | Online | Crystal Rocha | IV. Eligibility | I would like to advocate for only arts and cultural organizations to be able to apply for funding. I believe having it any other way would open the door to bad actors who don't have a core belief of uplifting arts and culture |
| 213 | Listening Session #1 | Grisanti | IV. Eligibility | Can we define the "political" ineligible applicant? |
| 214 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | IV. Eligibility | Be more specific in eligible and non eligible categories. |
| 215 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | IV. Eligibility | #2. Eligible Expenses- Please bring back 10% overhead costs. Rent should be different from this. |
| 216 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | IV. Eligibility | #3. Ineligible Applicants- I support not allowing religious orgs applying. Please keep this. |
| 217 | Listening Session #1 | Armando | IV. Eligibility | There was a minimum budget that an organization has to have in order to be considered an established org. Can this be adjusted? |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 218 | Listening Session #1 | Johannas | IV. Eligibility | Part "I" would bar all cycle 3 participants. |
| 219 | Listening Session #1 | Grisanti | IV. Eligibility | Food can usually fall under event supplies. Adding here could cause confusion. |
| 220 | Listening Session #1 | | IV. Eligibility | What are costs associated with tech assistance? What counts here? |
| 221 | Listening Session #1 | | IV. Eligibility | Support for non-arts organizations who may want to complete one project: i.e. mural or event |
| 222 | Listening Session #1 | | IV. Eligibility | EAAC funds should be allowed to use on food because food is an important part of culture |
| 223 | Listening Session #1 | | IV. Eligibility | Equality among all organizations when it comes to the opportunity to apply for the grant |
| 224 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | "Organizations that have not completed reporting for prior funding cycles must complete outstanding reporting" - this should NOT be used to prevent Round 2 grantees from applying for Round 3, due to the current uncertainty re: reporting requirements. |
| 225 | Online | Jazelle Marie Pinkston | IV. Eligibility | I want to understand why the eligibility process is being made more difficult to attain. Not everyone can find a fiscal sponsor and as an artist who's received funds from measure p I think we should be able to apply and gain access ourselves. |
| 226 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | It should be made clear and enforced that grants are meant to support nonprofit arts/culture organizations, and NOT individual artists. |
| 227 | Online | Gary Pigg | IV. Eligibility | I propose that grantees who are not 501c3 be funded up to \$10,000.00 for their projects without the need for a Fiscal Sponsor. Fiscal Sponsor's need to recover their interal costs. Changing this requirement would allow fledging ideas to sprout. |
| 228 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Thank you for removing requirement for the Attorney General Registry of Charities & Fundraisers. The old policy deliberately blocked applicants & was used as a weapon to thin the herd. This isnt an industry standard requirement for any normal grants |
| 229 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Make deadlines for good standing AFTER notice of award. Old policy was used as a weapon to discriminate. Fresno Arts Council picked & chose when to disqualify. For some, this was waived until grant contract. For others, they immediately disqualified. |
| 230 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Pg. 7/19: Make deadline for good standing with the City AFTER notice of award. Clarify what City requires and provide accessible docs/websites to prove good standing. IRS, CA Tax, & Sec of State have clear requirements & accessible docs/websites. |
| 231 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Add category of "Overhead costs" with this language: "Overhead costs refer to expenses required to run program not covered in the direct costs. Industry standard is 10%. In budget template, include overhead calculated at 10% of total project budget." |
| 232 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Move "venue rent" & "community outreach" out of "Core-operating expenses" 10% cap. Its unreasonable to apply this cap to necessities like venue rental for a project or community outreach for equity & accessibility required by the Cultural Arts Plan. |
| 233 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Pg 8/19: Add a cap of "\$5k or 10% whichever is greater" to technical assistance costs. Needed to define what is competitive. Previously, Fresno Arts Council coerced panelists to lower scores for budgets asking for "too much" of any item arbitrarily. |

| | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------------------|-----------------|---|
| 234 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Pg 8/19: "6. Equipment exceeding \$5,000 in purchase price requires three quotes prior to purchase & must be listed as an individual line-item in the budget." Please add: "quotes due during grant performance. NOT before submission deadline." |
| 235 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Pg 8/19: "Any organization considered ineligible by Measure P (Fresno Municipal Code sections 7-1500 to 7-1519)" Please change to quote SPECIFIC Code sub-sections. This is unacceptably vague & quotes >200 sub-sections & 6,400 words of Municipal Code |
| 236 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Pg 9/19: Change to explicitly list eligible expenses "artists' fees", "contractors", & "stipends". Previously, Fresno Arts Council coerced panelists to lower scores for apps accidentally using terms like "scholarships" & "artists' fees" synonymously. |
| 237 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Pg 8/19: "3. Expenses for food & non-alcoholic beverages[...]; 4. Construction expenses[...]; "5. Costs associated[...]to establish an arts &/or culture non-profit." Thank you, these are FANTASTIC concepts & increase accessibility. Please do so. |
| 238 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Pg 8/19: "3. Expenses for food & non-alcoholic beverages[...]; Please add that food is eligible specifically for EXPANDING ACCESS TO PARTICIPANTS. When reasonable & non-excessive, this is ESSENTIAL for removing barriers for disadvantaged Fresnans. |
| 239 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Pg 8/19: "4. Construction expenses[...]; Please add that NON-PERMANENT or NON-PERMIT "construction" is also eligible. So many types of improvements increase access but DON'T rise to level of building permits (modular AC units, lighting, ramps, etc.) |
| 240 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Pg 8/19: ""5. Costs[...]to establish an arts &/or culture non-profit." Please add this explicitly includes costs like accounting, legal, & filing fees, etc. Initial 501c3 establishment is extremely cost burdensome to emerging orgs & totals above \$2k. |
| 241 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | One of the many bad faith actions by Fresno Arts Council last year was auto disqualify applicants that didnt show good standing on Attorney General Registry. By AG staff's own admission, their Registry is chronically out of date due. Dont require AG. |
| 242 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Pg 8/19: Please KEEP religious orgs ineligible. It is a matter of separation between church and state and taxpayer dollars. There is too much history of conflict of interest & discrimination between religious orgs and arts demographics. |
| 243 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Please maintain the ineligibility requirements to exclude religious organizations or affiliations' use of funds. |
| 244 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Pg 8/19: Please define eligible area "of the City of Fresno's Sphere of Influence" to include the reasonable areas just outside of the Fresno City Limits BUT explicitly excluding Clovis City Limits. This will make sure equity is achieved. |
| 245 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Pg. 7/19: arts/cultural NTEE code should be due by grant award contract. NOT by application deadline. Should NOT be a grading factor in ARC process. Orgs often miscategorized. NTEE changes take 4+ weeks. Old policy was as a weapon to thin the herd. |
| 246 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | IV. Eligibility | Pg. 7/19: Add that arts/cultural NTEE code will be due by grant award contract. NOT by application deadline. Should NOT be a grading factor in ARC process. Orgs are often MIXED medium. Old policy was used to discriminate and "KEEP ART FOR ARTS SAKE". |
| 247 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Timeline on good standing (2) ambiguous. Without a transparent timeline, exclusion on this basis can be unequally applied to discriminate. For most inclusion, this should have a deadline after Notice of Award. |
| 248 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | NTEE code requirements enforcement timeline is ambiguous. Organizations are commonly misclassified and NTEE updates take 4+ weeks to process. For greatest transparency, requirements should have deadline of grant award contract and not affect grading. |

| | | | | |
|------------|--------|------------------|-----------------|---|
| 249 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Overhead costs [expenses to run business not covered in direct cost] need to be included in eligible expenses, and likewise declared in grant budget applications for accountability. The industry standard expectation of overhead is 10%. |
| 250 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | IV. Eligibility | We strongly support the inclusion of food, non-alcoholic beverages, construction, and providing technical assistance for emerging organizations as allowable expenses. |
| 251 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | IV. Eligibility | Organizations who have not completed reporting for Cycle 2 due to external delays and adjusted timeframes should absolutely still be eligible to apply for Cycle 3. Please allow additional time for grantees to complete reporting requirements. |
| 252 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | IV. Eligibility | We support the eligibility of arts and cultural activities taking place in schools during school hours or on university campuses that are open to the public. |
| 253 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | While I do appreciate the changes made under eligibility and agree with them for example #3 and #4, on #5 I would think this would only be in an Operations grant and not a project grant. |
| 254 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | If an organization has completed reporting and is up to date, they should be allowed to apply for the next round regardless of whether or not the round is complete. If they are behind in reporting, they need to be in good standing before applying. |
| 255 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Given the current situation, everyone should be leveled out for Round 3 and start from here. We do not have correct reporting for Rounds 1&2 so let's clean the slate and go forward from here. |
| 256 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | What constitutes "the City of Fresno's sphere of influence?" This term leaves it very open and can be interpreted as inside the city of Fresno all the way to encompassing a majority of the Central Valley. |
| 257 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | One of the biggest deterrent to families attending cultural events in Fresno is transportation. We need to take the activities to where they are located. Having activities in schools has shown to increase family engagement. |
| 258 | Online | | IV. Eligibility | Projects should be allowed to take place in schools during school hours. |
| 259 | Online | Cassandra German | IV. Eligibility | I think that construction needs to be heavily monitored. I think building expansion to make a project a success is acceptable, but maintenance is not and should not be covered under these grants. |
| 260 | Online | Cassandra German | IV. Eligibility | Projects SHOULD be allowed to occur during the school day and on campus. Schools do not have access to that much art, even with alt funding. Our children deserve more immediate access. Parents cannot always transport to after school events. |
| 261 | Online | Erin Burd | IV. Eligibility | Organizations applying for EAAC funds (whether Gen Op or Project), should be required to have an Arts and Culture NTEE code. If an artist does not have their 501c3 status, the fiscal receiver must make sure the project aligns with the guidelines. |
| 262 | Online | Alicia Rodriguez | IV. Eligibility | Pathways for non C3 entities(likely the majority of Fresno's arts and culture community) need to exist in a tangible way, such as increased outreach to overlooked demographics and structures to relieve the burden of sponsorship on existing orgs. |
| 263 | Online | Ome Lopez | IV. Eligibility | Requiring commitment letters from every artist is unrealistic for large-scale projects. A more practical approach would be to limit this requirement to projects that involve only a couple main artists. |
| 264 | Online | Erin Burd | IV. Eligibility | Projects that happen with students during the school day should be eligible (as they were in Round 1). Projects that happen during school hours (performances, programs, and experiences) are expanding access and should be allowed. |
| 265 | | Devoyn | IV. Eligibility | Provide reasonable options for potential projects for community members who likely have never applied for money but would explore said options if folks made the effort on the front end. |

| | | | | |
|------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|--|
| 266 | Listening Session #3 | Munirah | IV. Eligibility | Food is a big part of culture and supports youth engagement. Consider allowing |
| 267 | Listening Session #3 | Jazmen | IV. Eligibility | Reduce prioritization of institutional stability over community level impact. |
| 268 | Listening Session #3 | | IV. Eligibility | Expand to nonprofits outside of arts and culture |
| 269 | Listening Session #3 | | IV. Eligibility | Re: "Expanding Arts Access" > Legacy orgs who are well funded, staffed, established, doing fine and not offering anything new, more diverse, outside of their established programs... don't need this money, or near as much of it. |
| 270 | Listening Session #3 | Francesca | IV. Eligibility | Identify each application category a little more in the description of who can apply. |
| 271 | Listening Session #3 | | IV. Eligibility | If sponsorship becomes limited the city should create a direct funding pathway for emerging/ independent artists. |
| 272 | Listening Session #3 | | IV. Eligibility | A flow chart would be helpful to see who can qualify for what. |
| 273 | Listening Session #3 | | IV. Eligibility | How do you determine what contributes to arts and culture vs what doesn't? (eligible vs ineligible expenses) |
| 274 | Listening Session #3 | | IV. Eligibility | Not limiting artists and orgs on how much funding they can apply for based on previous years' budgets. |
| 275 | Listening Session #3 | | IV. Eligibility | Where is the emerging artists eligibility? |
| 276 | Listening Session #3 | | IV. Eligibility | Projects through organization groups/ individuals should be allowed to work at schools within school hours. Such as supported programming not offered at schools. Opens reach and possibilities. |
| 277 | Listening Session #3 | | IV. Eligibility | Yes to opening funds to support event support as far as food/ drinks, as well as lighting, event support structures. Should not exceed the funds towards actual arts and outreach. |
| 278 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Chair McCoy | IX. How to Apply | Would each applicant have their own unique sign in to the EAAC Grant Portal? Will the portal accept appeal documents? There should be another component to accept appeals document. Keep the status of the appeal available. |
| 279 | Online | Diana Sine Chan- Golston | IX. How to Apply | Artists/Orgs should be limited to 1 Operating application and multiple Project applications, with the understanding there is a max number (1-3?) that can receive funding. Fiscal sponsors should be excluded from application limits. |

| | | | | |
|------------|------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| 280 | Online | | IX. How to Apply | Section XI. Appeals, sentence two: "along with any grounds for appeal" needs to be further defined. Please elaborate on what some grounds for appeals could be. Additionally, please change 10 calendar dates to 10 business days to provide ample time. |
| 281 | Online | Laura Ward | IX. How to Apply | On Item 3, are fiscal sponsored projects counted against the sponsor # for limit? This will limit the number of sponsored projects and reduce access. Community wants to encourage collaboration and sponsorship, not reduce or restrict. |
| 282 | Online | | IX. How to Apply | I think organizations should be allowed to apply and receive grants for both general operating and project support. They shouldn't have to choose one or another or be penalized by ARC for applying for both. Limit to 2 projects. |
| 283 | Online | Alicia Rodriguez | IX. How to Apply | Outreach, outreach, outreach! If the applicant pool and subsequent awardee pool is not reflective of the diversity of Fresno, the outreach is sub par, use multiple routes such as physical media, intentional targeting of overlooked demographics, etc. |
| 284 | Online | | IX. How to Apply | Each organization can apply for 1 each GenOps and Project. If fiscal sponsors are allowed to fiscally sponsor 2 organizations and you can apply for 1 each for your organization, your limit is 6. It's just simple math. |
| 285 | Listening Session #1 | Dallas | Last Cycle Application | Questions were very redundant. |
| 286 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | Measure P Ordinance | "annual basis" does not mean NOFA by June 30. |
| 287 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | Measure P Ordinance; NOFA Timeline | These guidelines cant possibly be ready for a June 30 NOFA. This timeline is absurd & hangs on just 2 words in Measure P: "annual basis" (SEC. 7-1506.b.4.A). More edits MUST be done to avoid discrimination & the NOFA CAN legally be pushed past June. |
| 288 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | Measure P Ordinance; NOFA Timeline | June 30 NOFA timeline is absurd based on: "annual basis" (SEC. 7-1506.b.4.A). City has already bypassed (SEC. 7-1506.b.4.B): "implemented[...] in partnership with the Fresno Arts Council". City MUST do the same with NOFA timeline to avoid lawsuits. |
| 289 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | Measure P Ordinance; NOFA Timeline | Only 1 week for review on ARC Handbook & with no outreach sessions is absurd and deliberately discriminatory. Its established that 30 days was not enough for Draft Guidelines. More edits MUST be done to avoid lawsuits & the NOFA CAN legally be pushed past June. |
| 290 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Johannus R. | Multiple | Fiscal Sponsor Cap: This is inaccessible. Open to an onramp to help build nonprofits. ARC Review: They must be public, on zoom and recorded. This helps fix transparency. Concerns about the recommendation quotas. The training are important |
| 291 | Listening Session #3 | | Organization of the Guidelines | On page 7, renumber them to start with 4, 3, 1, 2. Starting with #1 eliminates candiadates who can still apply. |
| 292 | Listening Session #1 | Camarillo | Other | Currently, I am only aware of 1 organization that provides free music lessons (CCAT). Why is there not more programs that provide free/reduced music lessons |
| 293 | Listening Session #1 | Juan C | Other | Is there any consideration to sports clubs or leagues to use existing school grounds? Would they be able to apply for funding? |
| 294 | Listening Session #3 | | Other | Laura Ward's law firm is the legal advisor of FAC and there is zero trust with her. She should NOT be on the EAAC subcommittee or PRAC. |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|----------------|-------------|--|
| 295 | Listening Session #3 | Raymond H. | Other | Does the city keep up with the different programs and their impacts? To see what is actually happening with these programs |
| 296 | Listening Session #3 | | Other | We are one of the only cities without a cultural affairs department and it shows |
| 297 | Online | Joseph Catania | Other Topic | I am opposed to churches receiving Measure P Grant Funds, even for churches with arts programs. Public funds, our tax dollars, should be used for church activities. I support the requirement that organizations be required to be 501c3 Arts and Culture entities. |
| 298 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | Outreach | Outreach should include posters, digital marketing and community based partners. |
| 299 | Listening Session #1 | Diana | Outreach | Outreach should happen at events like Art Hop, Farmers Markets, etc. |
| 300 | Listening Session #1 | | Outreach | Social media campaigns with Fresno "influencers" to share grant info |
| 301 | Listening Session #1 | | Outreach | Connect & share information with local businesses where people gather |
| 302 | Listening Session #1 | | Outreach | How are we reaching working artist and student artist for feedback? This is a 30 year program that will impact them |
| 303 | Listening Session #1 | | Outreach | go to popularized events such as diadel Niño, Porchfest, etc. |
| 304 | Listening Session #1 | | Outreach | More ways for the city to provide project promotion thru the city. Flyers and calendars |
| 305 | Listening Session #1 | | Outreach | Outreach post physical flyers and posters in public meeting places & streets |
| 306 | Listening Session #1 | | Outreach | The City PARCS should visit the organizations to learn about what they have to offer to the community |
| 307 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | Outreach | Most artists will be unavailable at Porchfest during your 4/25 listening session |
| 308 | Listening Session #1 | | Outreach | Would appreciate outreach coordinator or member of PARCS to attend one (minimum) of the projects offerings |
| 309 | Listening Session #1 | Armando V | Outreach | Is the city PARC know who, where are our community organizations location? What do they offer? |
| 310 | Listening Session #3 | Munirah | Outreach | Outreach at Art Hop and other arts and culture events. |
| 311 | Listening Session #3 | | Outreach | There is a need to help expand cultural arts is by having major newspaper as was provided by the Fresno Bee, Spotlight Section that provided promotions, reviews and upcoming events. |
| 312 | Listening Session #3 | | Outreach | Having cultural arts spaces/past fiscal sponsors act as information distribution/hosting grant led workshops |
| 313 | Listening Session #3 | | Outreach | Make info available on multiple platforms: Local cultural news outlets, social media, newspaper, news outlets. Include several languages |
| 314 | Listening Session #3 | | Outreach | Outreach to nonprofit organizations. Partner with local social media influencers. Churches, run clubs, city council meetings |

| | | | | |
|------------|------------------------------|--------------|----------|---|
| 315 | Listening Session #3 | Christina O. | Outreach | Advertise and communicate the categories and applicant types (6 total) |
| 316 | Listening Session #3 | Krista A. | Outreach | There should be outreach for EAAC/Measure P during Arthrop hours, tabling and having a rep go to different downtown/tower to pass out zines/info to working artists |
| 317 | Listening Session #3 | A | Outreach | Think out of the box with outreach. If applicant demographics don't match in representation of fresno's actual demographics, "expanded access" is not achieved. |
| 318 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Yolanda R. | Overall | This process is transparent and notetaking is helpful. |
| 319 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | Have an arts org that has been involved in arts and culture grant making process perhaps partner with Fresno EAAC to share some best practices so we have a broader range of ideas. |
| 320 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | Are we making space for marginalized communities? Using words that resonate more with different communities? |
| 321 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | Give examples of what cultural programs look like in practice. You can not separate culture from healing. |
| 322 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | 50/50 Split of funds between emerging and established grantees. |
| 323 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | Operate on a timeline that is the same every year. |
| 324 | Listening Session #3 | MC | Overall | Operate on a fiscal year. |
| 325 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | There needs to be a handbook of resources for applicants of where to find IRS numbers, and other information needed to gather documentation. |
| 326 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | Breakdown wording such as "diversity" to make it more relatable and understanding. |
| 327 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | The LGBTQIA community was dismissed by not having representation in the scoring committee last round. |
| 328 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | There is no mention of emerging artists in the document. |
| 329 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | Community guided definition for terms. Example: Culture. |
| 330 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | Legacy orgs with deep pockets do not need as much money. Expanding access means funding newer, smaller orgs. |
| 331 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | Arts and Culture should be treated as one word and not two. |
| 332 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | Application examples should be given to understand what a good application looks like. |
| 333 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | What theoretical framework are we working off of? What lens are we using to identify "diversity", "culture", "art" etc. |
| 334 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | More clarity around "diversity" |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|---|
| 335 | Listening Session #3 | Crystal | Overall | Support for keeping the 90% funding and 10% later as the final reporting is submitted. |
| 336 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | Terms should be made user friendly and easier to read. At least 7th grade level. |
| 337 | Listening Session #3 | | Overall | A glossary would be helpful for context. |
| 338 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | Overall Feedback | Glossary of Definitions |
| 339 | Listening Session #1 | | Overall Feedback | Lower income voices need to be heard. |
| 340 | Online | Alicia Rodriguez | Overall process | Attention to the distribution, transparency, and equity of the process is paramount to not only regain the community's trust, but to foster adherence to the spirit of the ordinance and process, which is to ENRICH and EXPAND resourcing to arts and CULTURE. |
| 341 | Listening Session #3 | | PRAC | PRAC should have themes that include some type of cultural awareness. |
| 342 | Online | Gene Richards | Purchase of Tower Theater | Please show me in Measure P where capital purchases are allowed, re the purchase of Tower Theater. It was silly to allow the church to occupy that space but there were more direct ways to move them out, zoning being not the least. |
| 343 | Listening Session #3 | | Right of Way | This is difficult to navigate. Do we need the permission before applying, after applying, before funding? And what exactly needs to be provided? |
| 344 | Listening Session #3 | Esther | Right of Way | There should be a better process for getting permission for projects in the City's right of way. |
| 345 | Online | | Scoring | If we want people who are familiar with culture and arts ect. can we not pitch this to a professor, maybe at city college, to do the scoring as an assignment? It would expedite the process & I'm sure the classrooms can participate without worrying so much about conflict of interest. Or are we worried about that process? If we look at the pros & cons.. It's a good thing probably. Think about it. |
| 346 | Online | | This comment form | 250 characters is an unreasonable limit on comments if you want nuanced discussion. |
| 347 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Chair McCoy | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | New nonprofits need a fiscal sponsor because they haven't been established for long enough. A clarification would help. |
| 348 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Samuel C. | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Change the policy for who qualifies to be a nonprofit. Open it up for new nonprofits. Encourage folks to start their own nonprofit. Allow projects at university campuses. |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|--|
| 349 | Online | William Reeve | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Limiting # of grantees under a fiscal sponsor. The arts community is just now starting to get creative with the possibilities. The greatest power of the grant program is to activate people. Do not limit this potential. Add relevant guidelines. |
| 350 | Online | Crystal Rocha | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | I would like to advocate against a cap on fiscal sponsorship numbers. This goes against expanded access which is the purpose for the grants in the first place. It narrows the margin for emerging artists and groups to find avenues of support |
| 351 | Online | Christina | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Why is there so much increased regulation of fiscal sponsors but not increased regulation/qualifications for the people overseeing the process. They are the ones who negligently lost 1.5 mil. In tax payer dollars. |
| 352 | Online | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | There should be no limit on fiscal sponsorship. If an org has the capacity to take on projects, they should be allowed to. |
| 353 | Online | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Proposing a limit on Fiscal Sponsorship appears to be a direct retaliation against one particular org. This could be grounds for a lawsuit and should not be considered. |
| 354 | Online | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | I would actually like to see more orgs be allowed to fiscally sponsor a project. Any non-profit should be eligible to sponsor a project that falls under the EEAC guidelines. |
| 355 | Online | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Restricting fiscal sponsors does the opposite of expanding access. |
| 356 | Online | Laura Ward | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | 1. Fiscal Sponsor: Remove limitation on number of fiscal sponsored projects/applicants. 2. Fiscal Sponsor: Add minimum requirements for role of sponsor, and maximum percentage of money to sponsor (typically 10% but varies by contract). |
| 357 | Online | Krista | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Having a limited amount of grantees that a fiscal sponsor may sponsor is damaging to the applicants. It will limit the amount of projects that can be offered to the community. It also gives a "first come first serve" as opposed to be inclusive. |
| 358 | Online | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Non-profits should be limited to fiscally sponsoring 10 applicants to ensure adequate and responsible support of sponsored projects, and to encourage more organizations to seek their own 501(c)3 status. |
| 359 | Listening Session #1 | Grisanti | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Request that there not be a cap on sponsorship. Cap could be good for organizations sponsoring for the first time. |
| 360 | Listening Session #1 | Dallas | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | A Fiscal Sponsor application process should be open to more marginalized folks. |
| 361 | Listening Session #1 | Kiel | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | What is the criteria for sponsoring someone? Please explain. 5% is not enough to provide good fiscal sponsorship. |
| 362 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal Sponsors should be vetted through admin capacity, budget, staffing and who they are serving in the community. |
| 363 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsorship should be reduced to 1 admin : 3 project ratio |
| 364 | Listening Session #1 | Dallas | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | There should be a cap on how many proposals an org can submit and cap the amount they can receive. |
| 365 | Listening Session #1 | Grisanti | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Wonder if there can be a goal of percentages of audience served here since not everyone wants to be a non-profit |
| 366 | Listening Session #1 | Armando | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Can the City help organizations to build capacity with becoming a 501(c)(3)? |
| 367 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | If you limit number of orgs under one sponsor, how can you ensure smaller orgs have access to sponsors? |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|----------|-----------------------|---|
| 368 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Can the City pair individuals/smaller orgs with sponsors? Can they apply and request to be paired? |
| 369 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Role: relay information to people they sponsor |
| 370 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | protect fiscal sponsors |
| 371 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | locations need vetting |
| 372 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | smaller organizations sometimes don't have the capacity to complete large applications |
| 373 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Role: to be the financial liability liaison for an emerging or disadvantaged applicant who would otherwise be discriminated |
| 374 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Limit the fiscal sponsorships. Accountability. |
| 375 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Physical, accessible location |
| 376 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | match fiscal sponsor capacity with the project log |
| 377 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | challenges to finding a fiscal sponsor: It is inherently discriminatory. Private orgs are dictating who they sponsor and block |
| 378 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsor should not be capped at a maximum because there is no alternative that's been offered for accessibility |
| 379 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsor should not be capped because it is discriminatory. Emerging applicants need to get through the door to grow but this stops them. |
| 380 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Role of fiscal sponsor: to be an accessibility resource for projects and programs that shouldn't/can't form a 501C3 |
| 381 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsors also help to expand access by allowing folks who could not or are not interested in operating a nonprofit |
| 382 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Priority to grassroots organizations |
| 383 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | clearer instructions on fiscal sponsors and eligibility |
| 384 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | sponsors-mentorship to grantee disperse finds |
| 385 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsors seem to be using it as a business |
| 386 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Need more outreach on 501c3 build capacity |
| 387 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Role of a fiscal sponsor: fiscal receiving agent folks who help manage bookkeeping answer questions etc. |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| 388 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | No limitations. Limitations on fiscal sponsors directly limits access which is the goal of the grant itself and against the cultural arts plan |
| 389 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | limits to sponsors puts barriers to artist (especially individuals) |
| 390 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Barrier =need to already know the sponsor |
| 391 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Experience of fiscal sponsor: good standing, arts experience, arts/culture events/activities in last 3 years. |
| 392 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Allow non cultural arts agencies to be sponsors = more accessibility |
| 393 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsor: oversight, accounting, ability to step in if artist doesn't deliver, mentorship |
| 394 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | City outreach to connect grantees w/ fiscal sponsors |
| 395 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsors for 2 years or fiscal sponsor needs to be in business 2 years? |
| 396 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsor fee only 5% = barrier |
| 397 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Barriers to 501c3: IRS review is 8 months, state requirements, fees |
| 398 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Ratio for sponsors b/t admin/grantees |
| 399 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Pairing sponsors and artists |
| 400 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Define roles and responsibilities of both sponsor and grantee |
| 401 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Workshop sessions for sponsors and grantees |
| 402 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsors acctg in house |
| 403 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Role: financial reports and updates (fiscal and otherwise) |
| 404 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Categorize fiscal sponsors |
| 405 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Targeted grants for underserved neighborhoods/groups |
| 406 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Clearer language around eligibility of arts/culture organizations |
| 407 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Limit in \$ amount not # of grantees |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| 408 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Experience: accounting |
| 409 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Two years on experience should be removed! Two years of what?? Of existing? Of sponsoring? |
| 410 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Increase fiscal sponsor rate to 8% for grants under \$50k |
| 411 | Listening Session #1 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Connection to sustainability - sustainable= long term outcome |
| 412 | Listening Session #2 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Needs to be an advisory type of role. Help with insurance. |
| 413 | Listening Session #2 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Need ways to find a fiscal sponsor. How? |
| 414 | Listening Session #2 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | # of sponsorship- Limits should be set because they are volunteers. 0-5 max. |
| 415 | Listening Session #2 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Training for fiscal sponsors is needed |
| 416 | Listening Session #2 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Challenges- An experienced fiscal sponsor and have worked with non- profits should be their experience. |
| 417 | Online | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | I agree with this policy. Too many individual artists try to apply for their own one-off projects and they have no interest in forming arts organizations and providing public programming. |
| 418 | Online | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | I agree there should be a limit on how many applicants one fiscal sponsor can support. It should be no more than 20. |
| 419 | Online | Elena Harvey Collins | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | The requirement that artists become 501c3's or establish a fiscal sponsorship relationship with an existing creates barriers for artists. A bottleneck is already being created. Do not compound this inequity by limiting the number of FS per org. |
| 420 | Online | Elena Harvey Collins | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | A funding pool should be set aside for artists to apply to funds directly. In addition, set up an artist incubator to align with the stated goals of "building capacity" for artists and expanding access. |
| 421 | Online | Elena Harvey Collins | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | The draft guidelines continue to favor existing non profits and shuts artists out of accessing funding. Artists are the ones making art and producing culture. If we want a sustainable and equitable community, they must be prioritized. |
| 422 | Online | Elena Harvey Collins | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | A fund for emerging artists - perhaps with grants capped at \$10,000 - should be made available. In order to develop emerging artists skillsets and art practices, they must have direct access to funding. Could be administered by a nonprofit (fac?). |
| 423 | Online | Elena Harvey Collins | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | The CAP recommends a grant program for emerging orgs and local artists. Where is this program established in the draft guidelines? Right now there is a disorganized free for all with those with the most resources coming out on top. |
| 424 | Online | Elena Harvey Collins | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | I have worked in the arts and in arts education for 10+ years, and have NEVER encountered an arts grant process in which an individual artist is required to become a non profit to be eligible for funding. There are other rigorous models out there! |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| 425 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Pg 9/19: "To support the aim of capacity building, fiscal sponsors may sponsor a maximum of # grantees." This is contradictory on its face and makes City liable to a lawsuit. Throttling sponsors directly blocks emerging orgs from building capacity. |
| 426 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Pg 9/19: "[...]fiscal sponsors may sponsor a maximum of # grantees." This is deliberately discriminatory & makes City liable to lawsuits. City MUST facilitate emerging orgs ability to apply within boundaries of Measure P's "non-profit" restrictions. |
| 427 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Pg 9/19: To facilitate emerging orgs ability to apply, please add that fiscal sponsors do NOT need to have arts/cultural NTEE codes. Fiscal Sponsors' only purpose per Measure P is to be the financially responsible party to accept Measure P funds. |
| 428 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Pg 9/19: To facilitate emerging orgs ability to apply, the City MUST actively recruit fiscal sponsors to serve the pool of applicants. Otherwise the sharp drop in eligible orgs will be deliberately discriminatory & make City liable to lawsuits. |
| 429 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Pg 9/19: To facilitate emerging orgs ability to apply, the City MUST actively recruit fiscal sponsors to serve the pool of applicants. Otherwise the sharp drop in eligible orgs will be deliberately discriminatory & make City liable to lawsuits. |
| 430 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Pg 9/19: To facilitate emerging orgs ability to apply, proof of non-profit status or fiscal sponsor should be due by grant award contract. NOT due by application deadline. And it should NOT be a grading factor during ARC process. Accessibility issue. |
| 431 | Online | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Limiting the number of proposals a fiscal sponsor may administer *may* in the long term lead to the stated goal of capacity building, but in the short term will only reduce access. Until a public option is available, this is a non-starter. |
| 432 | Online | Ome Lopez | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Restrictions on how many projects a fiscal sponsor can support create barriers to access. In Fresno, there are only a few sponsors with the capacity, experience, and systems needed, so limiting them reduces opportunities for applicants. |
| 433 | Online | Amaya Weldon | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Until the emerging artists have adequate support and funding reflecting the success of incoming arts and culture orgs in the city, there shouldn't be a cap limiting an organizations to a specific number to facially sponsoring. |
| 434 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | We oppose capping the number of grantees an organization can fiscally sponsor. We echo others who've flagged adding this cap would be a structural barrier for individual artists and emerging organizations/projects who already have limited options. |
| 435 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | To truly build capacity, we should instead invest in TA & training for fiscal sponsors and fiscally sponsored projects. Ideally all navigating fiscal sponsorship should have access to optional templates, 1x1 assistance, peer learning spaces, etc. |
| 436 | Online | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsorship is a professional administrative service, not a capacity-building outcome. It involves accounting, compliance, reporting, and fund management. The current 10% fee does not adequately cover the true cost of providing these services. |
| 437 | Online | Erin Burd | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | First Year Fiscal Sponsors should be limited to 5 projects they can manage, so they can demonstrate they can handle the responsibility of the role. After they successfully complete year 1, meeting all requirements, the restriction will be removed. |
| 438 | Online | Alicia Rodriguez | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Potentially placing a cap on the amount of projects one entity can fiscally sponsor is an explicit limit to access that could place the city in a litigiously precarious situation, not to mention inherently contradicts the goal of expanding access. |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|
| 439 | Online | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsorships should not be limited to the amount they serve, but they need to be fully vetted and trained in a uniform way and agree to adhere to guidelines. |
| 440 | Online | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal Sponsors need a guidebook and with responsibilities laid out. Right now an organization only has to proclaim they are a fiscal sponsor to become one. |
| 441 | Online | Cassandra German | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | First year of fiscal sponsorship should be capped at 5. Expectations of fiscal sponsors need to be clear. If a returning fiscal sponsor has met all criteria, the following year, they should be allowed more. This should continue for future cycles. |
| 442 | Online | ome Lopez | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Requests from some legacy organizations to cap fiscal sponsorship may indicate a limited understanding of the role, which is to expand access and provide administrative support, not restrict opportunities for emerging or smaller projects. |
| 443 | Listening Session #3 | Devoy | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Consider having legacy orgs sponsor emerging groups as part of the role as an established org. Giving back is important! |
| 444 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | There needs to be more time to review documents that are open to comments. Example: The scoring handbook is only open for review for about a week! |
| 445 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsors should not only be a conduit for emerging artist access but should provide mentorship |
| 446 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Some kind of guideline for how a fiscal sponsor should apply |
| 447 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Per ordinance, do sponsors need to show 2+ years of artist culture programming? |
| 448 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsor fair an event for artist and sponsors to connect |
| 449 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsor open enrollment for emerging artist |
| 450 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | A list of fiscal sponsors would be helpful for everyone needing to team up with one |
| 451 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Reconsider policies that reduce access before alternatives are in place |
| 452 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsors can state what type of mentorship they are able to offer |
| 453 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsors should have little to no burden in order for easier access. No cap on fiscal sponsorships limit for grantees |
| 454 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Announcing who can fiscally sponsor emerging artists since they can't apply for grant without one |
| 455 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | City/PARCS to create an information hub or resources to offload some of the responsibility/load of fiscal sponsorships |
| 456 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Can submit grant ahead and have fiscal sponsor pick projects to support |
| 457 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Support provided by the City or FAC to non-profits willing to be fiscal sponsors |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|--------|-----------------------|--|
| 458 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Spaces saved funding for those in highest need |
| 459 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | List of eligible fiscal sponsors |
| 460 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal Agents should be able to self manage their # of applicants. Autonomy |
| 461 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsors does not equal mentorship. PARCS employee would support? |
| 462 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Having a fiscal sponsor has a lost. I didn't know that. |
| 463 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Established organizations need to fiscal sponsor to a number of emerging artists from highest need |
| 464 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Ability for individual artists to apply for smaller grants 2K or less, mini projects, one day. Individual artists as temporary vendor with the City of Fresno |
| 465 | Listening Session #3 | Sophia | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | List who can be a financial agent. How many are they allowed to sponsor? |
| 466 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | There shouldn't be a # cap of how many a fiscal sponsor should sponsor. It creates a narrative of "first come, first serve" |
| 467 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Create criteria for fiscal sponsors to pay it forward or they fall into "X" funding bracket |
| 468 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Criteria for established organization should be defined. Should include community members who have been doing the work |
| 469 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Sponsor artist should negotiate participation |
| 470 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Remove culture art affiliation |
| 471 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Create a platform to network with fiscal sponsors well before application deadline |
| 472 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Remove fiscal sponsor requirement all together or at least open the non-profit eligibility to organizations outside of the arts |
| 473 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Remove barriers, do not add barriers, requiring art categorization requirement for fiscal sponsors |
| 474 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Emerging artist/non-profit determine level of support needed/available |
| 475 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsors should have more help to be able & support more artists. Open the non-profits so that anyone can be a fiscal sponsor regardless of being arts & culture or not. Having a place where people can say they want to be a fiscal sponsor & connect artists |
| 476 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Database of willing fiscal sponsors for artists to know of and possibly work with |
| 477 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | "Mini grants" that don't require a 501(c)(3). Treat small projects independent artists a "vendors" |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---|
| 478 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsors should not be limited in the # of fiscal sponsees they may support or apply on behalf of |
| 479 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Avenue for individual artists to apply for funding. Possibly at lower dollar levels (\$15K-\$20K). As vendors? |
| 480 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Matrix for who to connect with feedback from surveys to provide resources. List of nonprofits/fiscal sponsors. Should apply to all nonprofits. Emerging fiscal sponsors need support. |
| 481 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Clear flow chart of groups. Identifying categorized groups and ensure fair division of funds. No cap on grantees for fiscal sponsors. Open fiscal sponsors to 501c3 outside of cultural arts nonprofits |
| 482 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsors should have experience administering programs for the community. Not just arts 501c3 status |
| 483 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Artist barre because they don't have fiscal sponsor. Orgs are confused of process |
| 484 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Website of fiscal sponsorships for easy connection to artists |
| 485 | Listening Session #3 | Kayla | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | We need to provide more education and routes for emerging organizations to either find sponsorship or nonprofits |
| 486 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Change ordinance to allow any 501(c)(3) |
| 487 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Entity has to demonstartae the capacity to fiscally sponosr a certain # of emerging artists. Use KPIs to determine success in how many emerging artisist becasme a non-profit with their sponosr's help. |
| 488 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | No cap on number of grantees a fiscal sponsor can take on. |
| 489 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Limiting fiscal sponsorship limits entry points for emerging artisits. |
| 490 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Networking tools are needed to help identify fiscal sponsors. |
| 491 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | No limit on fiscal sponsorhsip. |
| 492 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Fiscal sponsors should not be limited int he number of grantees. This is an access issue. Fresno has limited number of qualified fiscal sponsors witht he infastructure and experience and administrative systems needed to provide this service. |
| 493 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | Higher % for fiscal sponsors to help them be able to helo more people apply for grants. |
| 494 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | There should be a complaint system in place to help orgs and emerging artists voice their concerns about their fiscal sponsor. |
| 495 | Listening Session #3 | Francesca | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | No cap on how many projects can be sponsored. The fiscal sponosr's requirements should be reduced so that there can be more sponsorship. |
| 496 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | If you are and established org with funding. You need to sponsor emerging artisits. |
| 497 | Listening Session #3 | | V. Fiscal Sponsorship | There should be a rubric for fiscal sponsors as well. |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 498 | Online | Stephen Wilson | VI. Application Questions | Artists' Commitment should be handled through applicant certification rather than a letter from the artist. Less cumbersome. |
| 499 | Online | | VI. Application Questions | I would like to see a restriction or ban on AI. |
| 500 | Online | | VI. Application Questions | If work samples will be required this year, I'd like to see a description of what that should be. |
| 501 | Online | Laura Ward | VI. Application Questions | Add a question which will allow applicants space to discuss the impact of their work. Feedback from past award recipients was that they want to share their impact with the review panel when new request is evaluated. |
| 502 | Online | Rych Withers | VI. Application Questions | NTEE is what I was trying to remember. The IRS they no longer handle it. I was told to guidestar.org , which is now Candid.org I contacted them and went back and forth and as of the last day or so we are now ARTS-RADIO under the NTEE. |
| 503 | Listening Session #1 | Kiel | VI. Application Questions | It would be helpful to streamline the questions. Check boxes where possible. Add an area for a short video for organization to add work examples or a short interview. |
| 504 | Listening Session #1 | Kiel | VI. Application Questions | Right of Way is unclear as to what needs to be asked to who and when. Before or after award? |
| 505 | Listening Session #1 | | VI. Application Questions | Making the application questions public before the application actually opens. |
| 506 | Listening Session #1 | | VI. Application Questions | Application process needs to not less redundant and more easily approached. |
| 507 | Listening Session #2 | | VI. Application Questions | Will application questions be made public? |
| 508 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | VI. Application Questions | Pg 10/19: "Artists' Commitment". Please add its NOT less competitive to have "unnamed artists" if their project roles are clearly described. Previously, Fresno Arts Council picked & chose when to attack apps that didn't have named artist commitments. |
| 509 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | VI. Application Questions | Narrative AND reporting should include explicit tracking of how they EXPAND the org's services. NOT just supplant their existing funds with Measure P funds. Too many Established Orgs just stockpile, not expand services to our DAC communities. |
| 510 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | VI. Application Questions | Many Cycle 2 application questions were redundant, making the application longer and more time intensive than most of our other grants. We urge you to consolidate the application questions to allow for a more streamlined, accessible application. |
| 511 | Online | | VI. Application Questions | App. Questions should pertain to the grant applied for. The GenOp grant should have different questions than the Project Grant. In the past they were the same questions and the GenOp seemed to ask irrelevant questions. For reporting as well. |
| 512 | Online | Cassandra German | VI. Application Questions | Questions should be clear, concise, and to the point of the grant being requested. Access to these questions should be given prior to the application process so that organizations can get together necessary information. |
| 513 | Listening Session #3 | | VI. Application Questions | Please have PDF versions of the application available for printing and downloading for our records. |

| | | | | |
|------------|------------------------------|---------------|---|---|
| 514 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Chair McCoy | VII. Application Review and Scoring Budget | I don't see members with experience with budgeting or cultural experience. There should be alternates in place that is culturally diverse and knows how to read a budget. They would replace the 2 members who reside outside the City of Fresno. The Highest Need qualification may restrict artists. We need a diverse panel, but highest needs does not need to be captured. |
| 515 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Chair McCoy | VII. Application Review and Scoring Budget | What does compensation look like? There are committees in the City that do not receive a stipend. Why do we feel the need to compensate ARC? PRAC volunteers their time because they are passionate not because they are compensated. |
| 516 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Monica C. | VII. Application Review and Scoring Budget | Adding more creatives to this process would be helpful. Emerging projects were not treated right and established orgs were favored in the past. Panelist compensation is not necessary. Transparency and education are what's important. Having an opportunity for panelist to communicate with applicants would be beneficial. |
| 517 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Alicia R. | VII. Application Review and Scoring Budget | Outreach needs to be done besides social media. Not everyone is young and has this. Look at the framework for what is required of organizations. Laura Ward should not be on the committee because of past FAC affiliation. People from outside of Fresno should not be on the ARC. Starting a non profit takes hard work and doesn't expand access. |
| 518 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Amy K. | VII. Application Review and Scoring Budget | This is more clarity than previous cycle. Paying ARC provides value to the members. Organizations should not be allowed to apply for project and operational grants. Money should be spread out by making them decide which grant to apply for. This is silent on the review process. A scoring process is not thorough enough. It does not have accountability and doesn't allow orgs to know why they were scored that way. There needs to be more than one month between the announcement and application start. there needs to be at least 8 weeks. |
| 519 | Subcommittee Meeting 4/15/26 | Krista A. | VII. Application Review and Scoring Budget | People on the panel need to know what it's like to be a struggling artists. Non established nonprofits should be allowed to apply. |
| 520 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | It is not the job of reviewers to know the applicants - that can even lead to bias. I am very much in favor of two or more outside reviewers. |
| 521 | Online | William Reeve | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | ARC: Some w project management. Many artists lack experience in planning aspects of a successful project. This is an area Measure P should invest in and applications should be looked at through this lens. How to help applicants be successful. |
| 522 | Online | William Reeve | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Review/scoring handbook. Will this be available to the public? |

| | | | | |
|------------|--------|-------------------------|---|---|
| 523 | Online | Diana Sine Chan-Golston | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | I recommended paying panelists. I was a grant panelist for the California Arts Council (State-Local Partnership, relatively few applicants) & was paid \$300. It's important to give panelists an incentive for completing the role/following guidelines. |
| 524 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Have 90% of ARC members represent at least 1 experience area. If lots of applicants, more experience=priority. Non Fresno members can only be used for appeals. HNN requirement must stay, access to arts is needed. Please train and compensate ARC. |
| 525 | Online | Stephen Wilson | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Better not to put hard numbers on the ARC representation from various experience areas. Best to preserve some flexibility to assemble the ARC without violating the guidelines. |
| 526 | Online | Stephen Wilson | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Strongly support allowing non-Fresno residents to serve on ARC. Perhaps this could be worded differently: "each three-member grant panel may have no more than one non-Fresno resident." |
| 527 | Online | Stephen Wilson | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Meetings with the ARC panelists to provide training, guidance and to discuss scores should not be subject to the Brown Act. This would be consistent with the way CAC handles grant panels. |
| 528 | Online | Stephen Wilson | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | CAC: "Intermittent virtual check-ins with Arts Program Specialists will be scheduled to address and resolve any panel process, application, or adjudication questions. [These] meetings are a training and support space for panelists only." |
| 529 | Online | Stephen Wilson | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Rubric should not automatically award more points for addressing multiple goals in the Cultural Arts Plan. Applicants have different missions and focus areas. A strong application could address a single goal in a highly impactful way. |
| 530 | Online | Stephen Wilson | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | The rubric is more specific than in previous cycles, which is good, but errs on the side of removing all discretion/judgment from panelists. Rubric prioritizes quantitative over qualitative measures. |
| 531 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | There should not be a quota on experience areas, but rather a preferred experience similar to a job listing |
| 532 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | I would like to see a separate rubric for Projects (single day/single mural) and Workshops (multi-day, multi-project) applications. |
| 533 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Would like to see specific diversity guidelines that match the demographics of the city. |
| 534 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | No members from outside of the city. This was a tax voted on by the people and should be decided by the people. |
| 535 | Online | Elliott Balch | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | All representations matter but "experience in Arts" should be bifurcated into experience: (1) as an artist; and (2) in hosting, staging, curating, or promoting arts. Perspective #2 considers what it takes, surrounding the art, to engage communities. |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|------------|---|---|
| 536 | Online | Laura Ward | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | 1. Application Review – ARC should be intentionally diverse (age/gender/financial/etc.). Reviewers must understand budgets & have cultural sensitivity for evaluate proposals. Better to state ARC numbers as goals than fixed, for flexibility. |
| 537 | Online | Laura Ward | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | 2. Training – is money coming from grant awards? Better spent on cultural sensitivity and bias training than review time. 3. Training – basic financial literacy for review of proposed budget should be required or training provided to ARC members. |
| 538 | Online | Laura Ward | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | 4. COI Disclosures – how are conflicts define? Should draw out preexisting relationships with applicants, not just a family/board/staff formal relationship or true legal conflict of interest. |
| 539 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Please include at least two outside reviewers with experience reviewing grant applications. They do not need to know the applicants - in fact they shouldn't. |
| 540 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | The guidelines should specify that scores should be released to all applicants upon the completion of scoring. In past cycles applicants had to request their scores but were not told how to do so, and not all applicants received their scores. |
| 541 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | The use of the scoring rubric is a welcome improvement to the process, and will be most effective if scores are released automatically to all applicants. Individual rubrics and comments need to be released, not just final point totals. |
| 542 | Listening Session #1 | Grisanti | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Application review committee should include youth to incorporate their perspective as well. |
| 543 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Organizations should have access to their scores and comments. |
| 544 | Listening Session #1 | Marianne | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Application process was too redundant last time. You almost needed a grant writer. |
| 545 | Listening Session #1 | Grisanti | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | As a previous panelist, I have appreciated the additional training and revamped scoring. |
| 546 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Applicants should submit a short video to help the scoring committee understand the project. |
| 547 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Have a full list of all fiscal sponsors before application is due. |
| 548 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Scores and comments from rubric should be made available to all orgs. |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|----------|---|---|
| 549 | Listening Session #1 | Ashley | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Rubric for projects should be split into two. One for projects and one for programs. |
| 550 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Scores and comments should be made available. |
| 551 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Panelists should feels safe and not at risk during public review sessions because there will be strict rules and transparency against coercion. |
| 552 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Training for panelists should include showing that non-academic is fine. |
| 553 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | I don't think "representation" or "quotas" for experience areas is good. I think we need diversity that is varied, not tokens. |
| 554 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Clearly identify what a conflict of interest is. Knowing someone? Financial? |
| 555 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Highlight diversity in the Applications Scoring Committee. |
| 556 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Choosing ARC, willing to go through training, lack of conflict of interest. |
| 557 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | ARC should recuse if needed. |
| 558 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | ARC, 3 people per group is not enough. |
| 559 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Paid positions to score via stipend incentive to see it through. |
| 560 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | ARC questions, allow for budget clarifications only. |
| 561 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | ARC, more than 3 panelists need to be grouped. 5 to 10 range. |
| 562 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | There were a lot of news articles last time. When process is public, there is no room for rumors. |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|--|---|---|
| 563 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Anti-Bias training |
| 564 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Observation should be allowed. |
| 565 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Love the idea of interviewing applicants. |
| 566 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | See the interview only for appeals, not the scoring. Stick to the rubric. |
| 567 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | If there is a rubric, there is no room for retaliation. Last cycle, the scoring was reliant on conversations, scores were changed. |
| 568 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Diversify by zip code potentially. |
| 569 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Concern about the quota, too rigid. |
| 570 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Fear of retaliation with public scoring. Should not be tolerance for intimidation, no laughing/ snickering, guardrails of respect in place. |
| 571 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Proposal assignment should be random. |
| 572 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Arts/ Culture training experience necessary to know budget details. |
| 573 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | 5 panelists to get feedback. |
| 574 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Diversity and representation is vital. |
| 575 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Training in what scores mean, on the rubric. |
| 576 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Last time, certain groups were placed with certain reviewers. Example, "White Woman Established" |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|--|---|--|
| 577 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Score with a comment of a minimum of 200 words |
| 578 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Will we get our scores and comments? |
| 579 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Optional presentation to entire ARC by applicants. |
| 580 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Average decimal, how calculated by half point. |
| 581 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Broad representation, but not all scoring- how do we ensure broad perspectives? |
| 582 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Will scorers discuss at the table? In public or not? Peanut gallery is too much. |
| 583 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Scorers will be put on the spot if done in public. |
| 584 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Review by three people and then another. |
| 585 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Threshold of attendance. Not 2/5. |
| 586 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Last cycle- Scoring at home, attending the discussion after. |
| 587 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Look at high/low scores- if they vary widely. |
| 588 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | How to handle knowing each other when scoring? |
| 589 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Applicant should be able to come answer questions. |
| 590 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | If subgroups: 1 of each in each of the review panels. |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|--|---|---|
| 591 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Benefit for panel to ask questions. |
| 592 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Make comments public. |
| 593 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Some people use AI. |
| 594 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Public Process while scoring. There should be a message or note card to change points without announcing. |
| 595 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Who can be part of ARC? How long have they been in the community? How long have they been engaged with the community? |
| 596 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Some previous grantees were new to Fresno. They don't understand the needs. |
| 597 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Communicate to schools to ask the needs of parents/kids. |
| 598 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Residents from City of Fresno, not Clovis or outside of Fresno. |
| 599 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | I think stipend to scorers gives them incentive and supports. |
| 600 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | 0 outside of Fresno. |
| 601 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | More points if located or serving HNN areas. |
| 602 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | More than 3 scorers should create a group. They should be part of the community. |
| 603 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | How can we close the equity gap? What equity rubric is in place for HNN. |
| 604 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Yes, to sending questions. |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|-------|---|---|
| 605 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Ask about artistic or cultural experience. What organizations they are a part of. |
| 606 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Grant review or proposal experience on proposals. |
| 607 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Rubric: I appreciate that clear examples were given for applicants and panelists. |
| 608 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Panelists need bias training not to fill in the blanks. |
| 609 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | How long have they lived in Fresno? A question for ARC. They should have at least 5 years. |
| 610 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | 6 panelists, last time was about 3. They reviewed independently and discussed. |
| 611 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | "Applications are reviewed in a transparent, competitive process" transparent= public rubric or score sheet |
| 612 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Like the addition of reviewer training and stipends |
| 613 | Listening Session #1 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Review process training in all aspects of the scoring process |
| 614 | Listening Session #2 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Training- How to define "conflic of interest". Percieved vs legal |
| 615 | Listening Session #2 | Linda | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Training- "conflic of interest" meaning |
| 616 | Listening Session #2 | Linda | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Members of the ARC should be people who teach art. |
| 617 | Listening Session #2 | Linda | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Scoring Rubris- Evaluation after scoring and mentoring how to get higher score. |
| 618 | Listening Session #2 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Donald M form The Bee for application reviewer. |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|----------------|---|---|
| 619 | Listening Session #2 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Application challenges- The rubric is intimidating, takes a lot of reading. |
| 620 | Listening Session #2 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Who will be reviewing the apps? Do they get paid? |
| 621 | Listening Session #2 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | More mentorship during the application process. |
| 622 | Listening Session #2 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Josh T. at The Bee proposed as an application reviewer. |
| 623 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | I would love to see trainings on cultural competency. There are trainings that exist on understanding cultural differences and practices to consider. |
| 624 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Stated goals for ARC membership favors those with classical expertise. Having expected representation demographics without equal voice for each demographic creates a situation whereby stacking the ARC with more of a given demo. can incentivize bias. |
| 625 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Review standards and grading rationale should be publicly available information, ideally accessible for review by future applicants to maintain standards. Transparency is vital for ensuring no discrimination is taking place in review process. |
| 626 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Compensation for ARC members should be appropriate and respectful for the expected workload of members. Lack of timeline for establishing ARC membership is deleterious to Measure P's execution when ARC presence is necessary by scoring session. |
| 627 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | The proposed number of ARC members, at 20-25, is too low. There were problems with similar numbers last year. To be able to give each proposal the time and attention it needs, expecting each person to review 25 each is unreasonable. |
| 628 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | The proposed number of ARC members, at 20-25, is too low. If the goals to have many viewpoints and backgrounds represented in the reviewers, you need more than 3 people reviewing each proposal to be able to reasonably cover that. |
| 629 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | We do not support the inclusion of reviewers residing outside of the City of Fresno. We agree it is crucial to have a clear conflict/recusal process but this is a false solution. All reviewers must be deeply rooted in the Fresno community. |
| 630 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | We strongly support the inclusion of compensation and in-person trainings for all ARC participants to ensure the process is accessible to working artists, cultural bearers and community leaders. |
| 631 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Panelists should come together to review & rank applications collectively. This approach encourages dialogue, aligns understanding of the criteria, and brings in diverse perspectives, helping ensure decisions are thoughtful, consistent, and equitable. |
| 632 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | The ARC should explicitly require representation of working artists and our diverse Fresno communities (e.g. diversity of race, gender, class, sexual orientation, etc) to bring their lived experience as valued expertise to this review process. |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|------------------|---|---|
| 633 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | It is essential that review meetings be open to the public to uphold transparency and accountability, especially following FAC's mishandling. Public access helps rebuild trust and ensures confidence in how decisions around public funding are made. |
| 634 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | The ARC should explicitly require representation of working artists and our diverse Fresno communities (e.g. diversity of race, gender, class, sexual orientation, etc) to bring their lived experience as valued expertise to this review process. |
| 635 | Online | Alicia Rodriguez | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | The community at large, especially that of the global majority, have expressed plentiful requests for full transparency of the review process, from panel selection to scoring and review, and adherence to Brown Act requirements. |
| 636 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | A small stipend should be given to ARC members for their time and efforts. Also, they should be required to attend a full training session on the process and what is asked of them. Hopefully this training will circumvent the bias we saw in the past. |
| 637 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | I do not feel that the public should be able to sit in on scoring sessions. It would not allow open discussion from the ARC members. Every organization should receive their score and feedback when awards are announced. |
| 638 | Online | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | A small stipend should be given to ARC members for their time and efforts. Also, they should be required to attend a full training session on the process and what is asked of them. Hopefully this training will circumvent the bias we saw in the past. |
| 639 | Online | Erin Burd | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Panel Review/Scoring should NOT be open to the public. Opening up those scoring sessions is not best practice in the grant world, regardless of where the funds come from. I have never been invited to listen in to CA Arts Council or the NEA. |
| 640 | Online | Cassandra German | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Panels should NOT be open to the public. This leads to bias and fear of retaliation and can ultimately sway outcomes. Feedback and scores should be laid out after awards are announced so that organizations can make improvements for future cycles. |
| 641 | Online | Cassandra German | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Thorough training should be given to panel members to ensure that they all understand what their task is and how to accurately score applications. |
| 642 | Online | Ome Lopez | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | pay reviewers. |
| 643 | Listening Session #3 | Devoy | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Cultural humility training for potential candidates for review board. |
| 644 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Reach out to past panelists |
| 645 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Process being able to have feedback for next time confusing not to get reason scoring |
| 646 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Disabled. BDOC. LGBTQ. Needs to people from highest needs |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|-----|---|--|
| 647 | Listening Session #3 | RMH | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Suggestion for it to be manadory for people on panels to keep up with programs being chosen for grants to see what is being funded. |
| 648 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Zoom (not live) be able to watch it later to understand more |
| 649 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Comments from FAC opinion/thoughts rules about listening |
| 650 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Ensure diverse panels |
| 651 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | To increase emerging projects simplify the process |
| 652 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Room for changing project details if the plans change due to unforeseen circumstances and or cancelations |
| 653 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Is there representation on the panel from those who are ACTIVELY involved in the arts scene? POC? Struggling artists? |
| 654 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Feedback amazing thing-rarely get feedback-never got it last time. On grant questions, simpler is better. 2nd year quite involved-many hoops-didn't know why solicit from emerging groups with less grant writing lost |
| 655 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Hybrid Fresno county residents and external experts to review application with priority to Fresno residents |
| 656 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Keep the panel process open to public. Keep review of application open to public. |
| 657 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Will applicants receive a copy of their score? |
| 658 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | No one outside of Fresno |
| 659 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Public funding means public viewing |
| 660 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Are the people on the panel that don't have the same academic background as someone who had access to an education |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|--------------|---|---|
| 661 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Application through canvassing in highest need |
| 662 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Feedback amazing that can happen |
| 663 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Stipends for panelist for their time and energy |
| 664 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | ARC representation should not include members from outside City of Fresno or region. The reviewers should have lived experience as active cultural participants engaged in local arts & culture |
| 665 | Listening Session #3 | Christina O. | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Important to inform applicants that they can attend the panel review of their project to learn |
| 666 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Working artists. Are they on the panel? |
| 667 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Incentives (\$250-500) for workload completion |
| 668 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | FAC should not be running review panels too many conflicts of interest |
| 669 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Remove members residing outside of Fresno. Review panel discussions should be public - transcript at minimum |
| 670 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Balance # of representation among the 7 districts |
| 671 | Listening Session #3 | Catherine M | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Similar budget every year grant writing. Applicant should not be dinged for this. |
| 672 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | The discussion portion should be on Zoom |
| 673 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | ARC should not have members outside of City of Fresno. They don't know our community |
| 674 | Listening Session #3 | Sophia | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | How was the rubric vetted? Was there any outside review to identify opportunity for improvements? |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|--------------|---|--|
| 675 | Listening Session #3 | Sophia | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Reflect the selection process in the ARC section where applicants understand how are those individuals selected. |
| 676 | Listening Session #3 | Sophia | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | All reviews debateds should be recorded & levied for the full transparency & decision |
| 677 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | "Reflecting" youth/senior experiences should mean that they either are a youth or senior or work with those population |
| 678 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | # members residing within the City of Fresno and rural areas with Fresno County only |
| 679 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Each ARC review team of three - needs to include experience in arts & culture |
| 680 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Issue - people of color not many scoring last time |
| 681 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Census-data or population scoring to reflect population of Fresno |
| 682 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Applications should be annoying, remove names rename w/ applicant #'s |
| 683 | Listening Session #3 | Sham Johnson | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Emerging applicants should get 65% of funding |
| 684 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Per the scoring rubric, will there be different guidelines for emerging vs established? I am pro recoded Zoom |
| 685 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | In support of a structured group deliberation before final scoring to ensure critera are interpreted whsistently and to reduce uneven or isolated application of scoring standards |
| 686 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | There should be full transparency with regard to panel review sessions. Every single one |
| 687 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | How are you making sure people aren't just picking their colleagues to receive this grant? |
| 688 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Survey panelists/applicants/fiscal sponsors at the end of each cycle for ongoing process improvements |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|---------------|---|--|
| 689 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Highest needs: Needs to be a high priority with proper representation |
| 690 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Outreach & incentive to ensure procuring a diverse & culturally aware panel |
| 691 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Transparency and adherent to Brown Act requirements & good faith |
| 692 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | If work samples required at least look at them |
| 693 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Questions on applications ask what being scored - the questions didn't translate to those points |
| 694 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Compensate reviewers for their first time |
| 695 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Every applicant should get a copy of their score to ensure they make the corrections & learn through the process |
| 696 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | Remove language for representation from outside of Fresno on the ARC. We have enough diversity in Fresno. |
| 697 | Listening Session #3 | | VII. Application Review and Scoring Process | A hybrid review committee. Primarily Fresno County residents and outside experts. |
| 698 | Online | | VIII. Scoring Rubrics | We need more time to review the rubric. This is the most important part of these guidelines and the limited time to comment is an undue restriction. |
| 699 | Online | | VIII. Scoring Rubrics | We need to be very specific. I'd like to see rubrics for operational support, project, workshop, etc. |
| 700 | Online | Elliott Balch | VIII. Scoring Rubrics | "Expanded Access": be specific. What # of community pop. is expected to engage? Which underengaged communities will be served, how, and how are they otherwise underserved? What are the methods of promotion? Don't just lower barriers; draw people in! |
| 701 | Online | Laura Ward | VIII. Scoring Rubrics | Support for much more clear connection to Cultural Arts Plan and detailed information on how responses will be evaluated and scored. This will help ARC members evaluate proposals more uniformly. |
| 702 | Online | | VIII. Scoring Rubrics | The 90%/10% award structure for funding should be preserved, and not replaced with a model of quarterly payments. Especially with the history of delays in Measure P implementation, quarterly payments threaten to destabilize the smallest organizations |
| 703 | Online | | VIII. Scoring Rubrics | Applicants must be allowed to apply for both project specific and operational support. This is essential for the growth and stabilization of emerging organizations specifically. |
| 704 | Listening Session #3 | | VIII. Scoring Rubrics | Provide a rubric for each type of applicant (6 total) |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| 705 | Listening Session #3 | | VIII. Scoring Rubrics | Some of the language in the scoring rubric is not concise. |
| 706 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | X. Questions and Technical Assistance | Workshops should be on different dates, Zoom recordings, office hours should be made available to stop by for assistance, have clear FAQs on website. |
| 707 | Listening Session #1 | Grisanti | X. Questions and Technical Assistance | Consider facilitators who can resonate well with the community. |
| 708 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | X. Questions and Technical Assistance | TA should have walk through videos that are easy to understand. Short and easily accessible. |
| 709 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | X. Questions and Technical Assistance | It is crucial that TA workshops be held in person with a virtual option and recording publicly available. We also suggest continuing the information sessions like last cycle and making workshops accessible by offering times and locations. |
| 710 | Online | Diana Sine Chan-Golston | XI. Appeals | Any applicants eligible to submit an appeal should be specifically notified of the appeal process and the next steps, either with their rejection or after the panel sessions are concluded. |
| 711 | Online | | XI. Appeals | "grounds for appeal" is vague. What qualifies as something we can appeal? This was not applied fairly in previous rounds. |
| 712 | Online | Laura Ward | XI. Appeals | Does 10 calendar days timeframe accommodate request by applicant to see information on why they are not eligible or not recommended? Seems too short for an informed appeal process. Consider lengthening timeframe. |
| 713 | Online | Cassandra German | XI. Appeals | Appeals are tricky. In the past, the committee has withheld funds until appeals are completed. If appeals are allowed, they need to be completed in a more timely manner. |
| 714 | Listening Session #3 | | XII. Post Award Requirements | Quarterly progress reporting and a final report is too much. Does the city have capacity to track this? Suggest requiring a midterm review and a final review only. |
| 715 | Online | Laura Ward | XII. Regulated Communications | Can city legal clarify how this applies to commissioners? We are not elected officials but can voluntarily abide by the same restrictions; clarity would be helpful on this issue. |
| 716 | Listening Session #1 | | XIII. Post Award Requirements | Identify what "youth" means. Cultural Arts Plan states up to age 25. |
| 717 | Listening Session #1 | | XIII. Post Award Requirements | Payment terms. 100% funding upfront or 90/10% is best. Quarterly payments would be rough for projects. |
| 718 | Listening Session #1 | Armando | XIII. Post Award Requirements | Be more specific for what the sphere of influence is. |
| 719 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | XIII. Post Award Requirements | IRS docs and insurance should be required AFTER notice of award |
| 720 | Listening Session #1 | | XIII. Post Award Requirements | Simpler Reporting |
| 721 | Listening Session #1 | Johannus | XIII. Post Award Requirements | Permits should be required AFTER award notification |
| 722 | Online | Tyler Hergenrader | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | This is not about Cycle 3. For the current cycle, where do we submit our Q3 report, which was due yesterday April 15th? Thank you for providing a phone number to call, but no one appears to be answering. We can be reached at 559-###-#### (redacted number) |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| 723 | Online | Stephen Wilson | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | Given that Cycle 3 is rolling out so late, quarterly payments would be an additional burden to applicants. We're already looking at receiving funding at least 6 months into the fiscal year. |
| 724 | Online | Stephen Wilson | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | Quarterly reporting requirements create a lot of work for both grantees and PARCS staff. A single final report is typical for most grants occurring within a single year. A compromise would be to require a mid-year report and a final report. |
| 725 | Online | Stephen Wilson | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | Understand the need for grantees to retain all relevant financial records (payroll, invoices, etc.) but requiring these to be submitted for payment is highly unusual. Fresno is asking for a lot of things that other granting agencies do not require. |
| 726 | Online | Stephen Wilson | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | Suggest that PARCS contact other cities which have public arts grant programs to see what their contracts and reporting requirements look like. There seems to be something off about how Fresno is understanding the relationship with arts grantees. |
| 727 | Online | Stephen Wilson | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | Fresno should follow the best, or at least common, practices of most other public arts funding agencies. The insurance requirements are highly unusual for grants not involving publicly owned property. |
| 728 | Online | Stephen Wilson | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | It is not uncommon for a grant contract to have a list of certifications (check boxes) where the grantee affirms that they are in compliance with laws, regulations, etc. Most granting agencies find this to be sufficient. |
| 729 | Online | Stephen Wilson | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | The risk of confidential or sensitive information being released publicly is greater with all of these documentation requirements (e.g. artist contracts frequently have confidentiality provisions regarding fees.) |
| 730 | Online | | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | I would like to see specifics on TB & background checks related to minor serving projects only. |
| 731 | Online | | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | I would like to see insurance requirements up front. If the insurance can't be met by an org they shouldn't have to wait until they are funded to find out. |
| 732 | Online | Elliott Balch | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | Insurance: say what is likely required. Typically a funder would NOT impose insurance reqs. in a grant agrmt., relying on grantor-grantee separation as protection from liability. With City now making grants, what insurance does City need to require? |
| 733 | Online | Laura Ward | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | Payment Terms: Consider different payment terms for projects (may require more upfront to do the work) than operating grants (depending on budget/intended use, may be able to pay out periodically instead of larger upfront payment). |
| 734 | Online | Jaiden Sanaa sherman | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | What specific insurance is required for this section |
| 735 | Online | | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | In reference to No. 9 "Itemized invoices will be required for payment requests." I would just like clarity that this grant is not moving toward a reimbursement model, which would make the grant unusable for virtually all emerging organizations. |
| 736 | Online | | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | Requiring all itemized invoices/receipts to be submitted with reports is asking too much. This is unusual for arts grants. Funding agencies have moved away from such arduous requirements. |
| 737 | Online | | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | Quarterly reporting is too much. This is not typical of other arts grants in the state. One final report should be all that is necessary. Or at most, a report in the middle of the cycle and then the final report. |
| 738 | Online | Johannus L Reijnders | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | Pg 17/19: "Proof of right of way, owner permission or other related agreements may be required, if applicable." Add that this is due by grant award contract. NOT due by application deadline. And it will NOT be a grading factor during the ARC process. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------|------------------|---|---|
| 739 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | We strongly support continuing the practice of providing 90% of funding up front and 10% upon completion. Relying on a quarterly reimbursement process that requires organizations to front the costs of projects and operations is not feasible for all. |
| 740 | Online | Radio Bilingüe | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | Many of our current grants request only an interim and final report instead of quarterly reporting. We recommend shifting to this model and would greatly appreciate making the reporting a lighter lift for all awarded grantees in Cycle 3. |
| 741 | Online | | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | The 10% hold for the end of the cycle creates a hardship for organizations to get their projects completed throughout the year. They have to cover that 10% until it is released and their organization feels that strain. |
| 742 | Online | | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | should stay 90/10 disbursement to not go in to debt while trying to fulfill program needs. |
| 743 | Online | | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | Instead of the 10% hold, for GenOps do quarterly disbursements. For projects, this gets trickier and I don't have a solution, but would also like to see this be a positive experience instead of punitive, like it is now. |
| 744 | Online | Cassandra German | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | Giving funds in such small increments makes it imp for a smaller organization to successfully complete projects. A better payment schedule needs to be figured out. If organizations have funding needs in a timeline upon applying, this might help. |
| 745 | Online | Erin Burd | XIII. Post-Award Requirements | Payments should be made in full at the onset of the award term. Quarterly payments, etc will not only cause more work for the City, but will also be problematic for the awardee based on the type of project awarded and timeline. |
| 746 | Online | Daisy Pelayo | XIX. Accessibility and Non-Discrimination | Please provide a free, accessible, course on what a fiscal sponsor is and what processes they have to follow on their end to be able to uphold an organization who is looking for fiscal sponsorship. |
| 747 | Online | Arthur Robinson | XIX. Accessibility and Non-Discrimination | Dulce Upfront & their supporters have been hosting educational initiatives focused on accessibility. Is it possible to allocate funding to their efforts and invest in local artists within the community to enhance access to these resources? |
| 748 | Online | Alicia Rodriguez | XIX. Accessibility and Non-Discrimination | Processes to make the process more equitable: no cap on fiscal sponsorship by one entity, outreach to overlooked demographics, examination of end result distribution and comparison with aim of expanded access, transparent review process. |
| 749 | Online | | XIX. Accessibility and Non-Discrimination | The EAAC subcommittee should include working artists, ensuring that those with direct, lived experience in the field help inform decisions and bring relevant, current perspectives to the funding process. |
| 750 | Online | Alicia Rodriguez | XIX. Accessibility and Non-Discrimination | Given Fresno Arts Council's demonstrated lack of integrity and harm, and her historic unprofessional approach to attempt influencing outcomes, FAC affiliate Laura Ward should not serve on the PARCS subcommittee for EEAC. |
| 751 | Online | | XIX. Accessibility and Non-Discrimination | Please clearly define the cultural framework guiding this process, including the values, priorities, and criteria used to evaluate applications, and how it actively addresses potential bias and discrimination in funding decisions. |
| 752 | Online | Ome Lopez | XIX. Accessibility and Non-Discrimination | The concept of healing should be clearly defined in the context of cultural programming, including how it is interpreted, applied, and evaluated to ensure a shared understanding of its role and impact within funded activities. |
| 753 | Online | | XV. Debarment | The relevant municipal code section should be made easily accessible, either as part of this, or linked to from the guidelines. |
| 754 | Online | | XV. Debarment | Concerns about Commissioner Laura Ward's ties to the Fresno Arts Council have led to a lack of trust among many artists and organizations. I recommend her removal from the commission and EAAC subcommittee to help restore confidence in the process. |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|------------------|---|--|
| 755 | Online | | XVII. Indemnification | I realize this is probably standard boilerplate for this kind of situation, but I wonder about situations where through the City's actions (or inaction), projects are liable for commitments they've made and end up with extra costs or other liability. |
| 756 | Listening Session #3 | | XVIII. Applicant Disclosure of Conflict of Interest | Conflict of interest forms for all ARC members and PRAC. |
| 757 | Online | Linnea Alexander | XVIII. Applicant Disclosure of Conflict of Interest | Grants should be given to 5013c organizations only. Organizations need to provide documentation to confirm their status as a 5013c. No churches or other unofficial organizations. |
| 758 | Online | Alicia Rodriguez | XVIII. Applicant Disclosure of Conflict of Interest | Conflict of interest considerations need to be given to the WHOLE process, from PARCS subcommittee, to review panel selections, to any city or affiliated entity involved in the process. Also carefully examine ANY entity/person affiliated with FAC. |
| 759 | Online | | | |
| 760 | Listening Session #2 | | | How will partial funding be allocated? |
| 761 | Listening Session #2 | Linda | | I would rather get some funding rather than nothing. |

Updated 5/6/2026