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Abstract

This Master's terminal research project investigates the community values of Portland'5 Centers for the Arts. The research focuses on three broad areas of impact: public engagement, economic, and cultural. Through the use of interviews, surveys, organizational data, and other qualitative and quantitative data gathered throughout the in-depth case study, this study sought to illuminate the value of Portland'5 Centers for the Arts to the city of Portland and its surrounding region.
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INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

"Is a facility merely housing, or can it be a force that alters a community’s version of itself?...If a facility does not seriously attempt to fulfill both its mechanical (night-filling) and moral (soul-stretching) roles, it is a failure; it does not deserve to be built."~ Joseph Golden (as cited in Webb, 2004, 51).

While there have been reports and studies highlighting the economic and fiscal impact of performing arts centers, a significant gap exists in measuring and describing a more comprehensive value to their communities. To begin to address this need for a thorough investigation into defining and measuring myriad community values provided by performing arts centers to their communities, this study aimed to describe and analyze the economic, cultural, and public engagement values of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts to Portland, Oregon.

What is the community value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts to the city of Portland and its surrounding region? More specifically, how does this organization contribute to and create community through public engagement impacts, economic impacts, and cultural impacts? There is a lack of theory and previous research surrounding this topic. While there are studies focusing solely on economic impact, there had not been a comprehensive investigation of multi-faceted and multi-perspective community value. This important topic has been overlooked in research and literature and this in-depth case study project will attempt to contribute a systematic study to the field.
This research project investigated the community value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts by delving into three main categories: public engagement value, economic value, and cultural value. The investigator completed on-site, in-depth field research in all three areas of value during winter 2014. By examining these three categories in detail, this project illuminated the overall value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts to the community of Portland.

This project includes an in-depth introduction to Portland’5 Centers for the Arts. Literature surrounding the history, mission, governance structure, and basic background data was compiled and summarized to offer a comprehensive understanding of the organization.

Economic Impact reports done for Portland’5 Centers for the Arts indicate that it has a positive economic impact on its community. The organization provides employment for hundreds and generates taxable revenues and it also serves as a catalyst for peripheral businesses in the area, such as restaurants, hotels, and bars.
Portland’5 Centers for the Arts has important cultural impact value for the community as evidenced by its resident company relationships, which include substantial subsidies each year. Further, this project investigated the expansion of programming to a more diverse offering of arts over the past several seasons, including more visual, literary, and community art, as well as expanded free events.

The final area of focus was the public engagement aspect of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts’ operations and activities. A thorough literature review of performing arts participation, including patrons and volunteers, and the benefits to the individual, organization, and community was completed to better understand this topic.

**Purpose/Methodological Paradigm/Role of the Researcher**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the community value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts. This project was completed within a constructivist methodological paradigm. The study took into account individual perspectives as a large portion of the research involved individual interviews, on-site observation and participation, and surveys. The study acknowledged that multiple realities exist because they are constructed by individuals who experience the world from their own vantage points. Further, this study focused on a local and specific community and its experiences, opinions, and value systems. Finally, the constructivist paradigm was utilized as the researcher completed an in-depth case study and was on-site at Portland’5 Centers for the Arts throughout the research period.
Research Questions

The main question of this study was ‘What is the community value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts?’ The three main sub-questions were ‘What is the public engagement value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts?’, ‘What is the economic value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts?’, and ‘What is the cultural value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts?’ To answer these sub-questions, more questions needed to be answered. How does a successful performing arts center—Portland’5 Centers for the Arts—lend credibility to a community’s reputation and contribute to local tourism? Does the location and activities of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts impact business decisions and operations of local business managers? How can the performing arts center positively impact education—both youth and adult—in its community? How does Portland’5 Centers for the Arts program specifically for its community? Has Portland’5 Centers for the Arts evolved from strictly a venue to a more community-focused center with more varied use and users? Does this evolution encourage more community engagement by welcoming those people who have never attended for a non-arts-related purpose and break down the barriers so they are more likely to return for a performance? How is the performing arts center shaped by its community and neighborhood, and vice versa? This study sought to discern that Portland’5 Centers for the Arts has a positive value to its communities in all aspects: public engagement, economic, and cultural.

Definitions

Portland’5 Center for the Arts is the fifth largest center for the performing arts in the United States, with more than 1,000 performances and over one million patrons annually. Portland’5 Centers for the Arts consists of five venues: Keller Auditorium (seats 2,992), the
Arlene Schnitzer Concert Hall (seats 2,776), the Newmark Theatre (seats 880), the Winningstad Theatre (seats 304), and Brunish Theatre (seats 200).

In the majority of cases, 'community' refers to Portland, Oregon and the immediate tri-county (Multnomah, Washington, Clackamas counties) area. According to Wikipedia (2014), the Portland population is approximately 588,000 while the whole metropolitan area has approximately 2,300,000 people in 2012, making it the 19th largest in the country.

Delimitations

Delimitations are used to narrow the scope of the study. The study focused on one in-depth case study of the Portland’5 Centers for the Arts organization in Portland, Oregon. Further, the project investigated specific areas of community value: public engagement value, economic value, and cultural value. Finally, the majority of the project focused on the 2012/2013 season/fiscal year. There were some historical context and patterns but the vast majority of the study investigated current conditions and impacts.

Limitations

As the project consisted of one in-depth case study in Portland, Oregon for a specific time period, one limitation is generalizability; the findings of this study may not be directly transferable or related to another organization in another location at another time. Another limitation is causation as there will be many variables that will not be investigated. Finally, the researcher has worked in this organization in the past and continued to be working on-site during the research period, thus there could be inherent bias on the part of the researcher. In full disclosure, the researcher completed this study on behalf of Portland Metro and Portland’5
Centers for the Arts and received a small stipend for doing so. The researcher attempted to address these limitations during the research design and final analyses.

Benefits of the Study

This investigation into the community value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts was extremely beneficial. A community value study such as this had not been designed or completed for other performing arts centers, thus this could be used as a template for further studies for other organizations. The study was highly anticipated by Portland’5 Centers for the Arts management, the city of Portland as the owner of the buildings, and Portland Metro as the regional government body in charge of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts. In fact, there had been a request for proposals for a community impact study of this type by Portland Metro for a number of years and no consultants or other groups bid due to the lack of design of a study of this type. This study will further research into the field of community value, arts engagement, and performing arts center value.
Research Design

**Figure 2.** Research Design.

In investigating the community value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts, this in-depth case study predominantly used qualitative research methods and strategies of inquiry. The researcher was working on-site at Portland’5 Centers for the Arts for three months in order to gather evidence and understand the inner workings of the organization and its members and constituencies. As Creswell (2009) details:

The intent of qualitative research is to understand a particular social situation, event, role, group, or interaction...This entails immersion in the everyday life of the setting chosen for the study; the researcher enters the informants’ world and through ongoing interaction, seeks the informants’ perspectives and meaning. (P. 194).

Creswell continues on to list a number of qualitative research characteristics including research conducted on-site, the researcher as the primary instrument of data collection, descriptive data, a focus on participants’ perspectives and perceptions, the use of a specific case, a concentration on
the participants’ realities, and a process of verification rather than through traditional validity and reliability measures (Creswell, 2009, pp. 195-196).

This study was conducted at Portland’5 Centers for the Arts, a performing arts center in Portland, Oregon. Portland’5 Center for the Arts is the fifth largest center for the performing arts in the United States, with more than 1,000 performances and over one million patrons annually. Portland’5 Centers for the Arts consists of five venues: Keller Auditorium (seats 2,992), the Arlene Schnitzer Concert Hall (seats 2,776), the Newmark Theatre (seats 880), the Winningstad Theatre (seats 304), and Brunish Theatre (seats 200). Its resident companies include the Oregon Symphony, Portland Opera, Oregon Ballet Theatre, Oregon Children’s Theatre, and the Portland Youth Philharmonic.

Many of the inquiry strategies stemmed from the researcher’s participation in a variety of performing arts center/venue management internship experiences. During the summer 2013 quarter, the researcher completed an internship at Portland’5 Centers for the Arts where she participated in a variety of activities and projects that shaped her research ideas, including expense analysis and supporting resident and local non-profit companies, as well as ticketing data of the community and programming trends. This experience allowed for intimate knowledge of the organizational structure, access to personnel, and an awareness of what data is available within the organization.

The participants in this study were varied in an attempt to fully capture the operations and impacts of Portland’5 Centers for the arts and in an attempt to identify the different community values of the organization. The study featured on-site observation over a period of several months in 2014. Further, this project featured interviews of the Portland’5 Centers for the Arts Executive Director, the Portland’5 Centers for the Arts Advisory Board Chair, Portland Metro
personnel, the resident company personnel, and Travel Portland personnel. This project also
surveyed local business managers (hotels, restaurants, cafés, bars, etc.), summer camp and
education personnel, and performer group personnel. These interviews and surveys gleaned
specific insights, perspectives, examples, and experiences of how Portland’5 Centers for the Arts
impacts the community. Participants were selected using purposive sampling of key informants
and the design timeline accounted for snowball sampling, if considered necessary.

This study utilized document analysis techniques by gathering and investigating
organizational charts, missions, personnel, governance structure, etc. Further, the on-site
observation and participation aspect allowed for the researcher to gather and analyze internal
data and experiences to truly understand how Portland’5 Centers for the Arts impacts its
community, and vice versa, and to learn how this relationship affects current operations and
future strategic planning.

The researcher looked at audience demographic data and some programming data to
determine how Portland’5 Centers for the Arts plays a role within a community and its
engagement. The programming data illustrates how center’s role is evolving and expanding.
Ticketing data indicating patron zip codes and their concentrations reveal what geographic areas
are most engaged and what percentage of patronage is due to tourism.

Finally, the researcher found a symbiotic relationship between Portland’5 Centers for the
Arts and its peripheral businesses by investigating economic impacts through the survey
described above. These methods of inquiry offered detailed and measurable insight into the
economic value provided by Portland’5 Centers for the Arts.

Throughout all of these different inquiry strategies, the data could be verified and
validated through corroboration and triangulation of sources. The researcher had established
credibility through prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, peer debriefing, being on the alert for disconfirming evidence, referential adequacy, member checks, confirmability of data, and a thorough audit trail. The researcher did not encounter any ethical issues during the project and did not foresee any risks to any participant in this study. Further, the study did not incorporate any data from vulnerable populations. By completing all of the strategies of inquiry outlined in this introduction, the researcher investigated the community value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts on public engagement, economic, and cultural levels.

Data Collection & Analysis Procedures

As discussed in other sections, this project was an in-depth case study at Portland’5 Centers for the Arts in Portland, Oregon where the researcher was on-site for three months (January-March) in 2014. During this time, the researcher conducted approximately 10 interviews (refer to Appendices F-J) and administered surveys to the business managers, summer camp and education personnel, and select performer group personnel (refer to Appendices M, O, and Q, respectively). Each audio-recorded interview was expected to last approximately one hour while each survey was expected to take approximately 15 minutes to complete. The surveys were administered to businesses within a specific distance (i.e. half mile) of the theatres. Businesses were notified in advance (refer to Appendix K). Both summer camp/education personnel and performer group personnel have on-going working relationships with Portland’5 Centers for the Arts and thus completing a survey was not out of the scope of this relationship. The data collection instruments, recruitment letters/scripts, and consent forms are included as appendices to this project (refer to Appendices D-S). As described above, there were no expected risks to any participant but all interview participants signed informed consent forms.
(refer to Appendix E) and all survey participants agreed to verbal consent (refer to Appendix L) or electronic consent (refer to Appendix N and P) and had the opportunity to decline to participate at any time during the study. Participant benefits included an understanding of the community value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts, an opportunity to offer improvements to Portland’5 Centers for the Arts, and an opportunity to be a part of the development of a community impact study that could be presented at conferences and replicated and/or expanded in the future.

In addition, the researcher attended department meetings, advisory board meetings, conferences, and was involved in daily operations during this time period. During this time, the researcher had complete access to internal documents and data (financial, ticketing, events, programming, etc.) for analysis and use in this study. All data obtained in this study was coded as described in the conceptual framework and will be kept for an appropriate amount of time before being destroyed. Some data may be kept for use in future studies and conferences; this will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

**Future Implications Regarding Terminal Project**

Understanding the relationship between a performing arts center and its community is vital to ensuring the success of that center and to ensuring that both the center and the community are thriving and exploring all collaborative and support options. Research in this area is useful for several parties: performing arts center executives can use this information for effective branding, partnerships, programming, development, and marketing; city and county governments may find it useful when deciding whether to build or to continue to fund these centers and to understand how these centers support their non-profit user groups and resident
companies; resident companies and non-profit user groups can understand how their venue supports their mission and the complexities facing venue managers. Finally, looking at the evolution into a broader community center may assist struggling centers with expanding their programming and community outreach. In short, there are concrete, practical applications for this study.

It is very possible that the researcher will use this study, which was presented to both Portland’5 Centers for the Arts and its regional government oversight organization, Portland Metro, as a future presentation at the annual Performing Arts Managers Conference or another International Association of Venue Managers conference or meeting. Further, should the researcher enter into a consultant role in the future, it is possible that she will build on/expand this study to adapt to other venues and communities.

**Investigator Experience**

Annie Salamunovich graduated *cum laude* from the University of Notre Dame with her BBA in Accountancy and a focus in French and Francophone studies and Theatre Production. She is a licensed CPA in the state of Oregon and has worked as a Senior Auditor and Revenue Manager in the US and internationally. Ms. Salamunovich has always been a performer and has sung, acted, and played violin with local and international groups for over 20 years. Ms. Salamunovich enjoys the creativity expressed through the arts while supporting and implementing efficient operations within an organization. Her dual passions for the arts and management led her to pursue a Master’s degree in Arts Management, with a concentration in Performing Arts, at the University of Oregon. Ms. Salamunovich completed a four-month internship with Portland’5 Centers for the Arts in 2013 where she performed in-depth expense
analyses by venue and by user, provided revenue generation strategies, assisted with events, and participated in a broad variety of venue management areas, including summer concert series’ production, donor development, marketing, rebranding, artist relations, ticketing, customer service, house management, and volunteer management. Ms. Salamunovich is a member of the International Association of Venue Managers and enjoys attending the annual Performing Arts Managers Conference and other IAVM events. Ms. Salamunovich is researching the community value of Portland'5 Centers for the Arts and she looks forward to a career in venue management.
LITERATURE REVIEW

What is the community value of Portland’s 5 Centers for the Arts to the city of Portland and its surrounding region? More specifically, how does this organization contribute to and create community through economic impacts, cultural impacts, and public engagement impacts? There is a lack of theory and previous research surrounding this topic. While there are studies focusing solely on economic impact, there has not been a comprehensive investigation of multifaceted and multi-perspective community value. This important topic has been overlooked in research and literature and this in-depth case study project will attempt to contribute a systematic study to the field.

Performing Arts Centers Having Positive Impact on Communities

Current literature concurs that performing arts centers are vital for community empowerment and contribute to the value of a community. During his lecture on the arts and public value at the Queensland Performing Arts Center, Mark H. Moore (2013) proffered that Robert Putnam, a political scientists and Malkin Professor of Public Policy at the Harvard University John F. Kennedy School of Government, studied social capital and demonstrated that societies with a lot of social capital (i.e. arts and performing arts centers) tend to do better economically, socially, politically, and governmentally. Culture is an instrument through which social capital gets constructed.

In their textbook on public assembly facilities, Russo, Esckilsen, and Stewart (2009) offer many examples for how performing arts centers can benefit their communities, including ...
...quality of life, putting the facility ‘on the map,’ attracting outside dollars into the community to generate economic impact, meeting the demands of the corporate community to help attract and retain the necessary workforce at all levels, cultural
enhancement, (and) helping to fill hotel room nights and attract tourists. (P. 49).

Webb (2004) offers similar community benefits in his book about running theatres, including “...downtown revitalization, improving the quality of life for all citizens, attracting companies and workers to a community, or building cultural tourism...” (p. 5). He later points out that performing arts centers should be valued “...not just in terms of cultural and economic impacts, but also in terms of broader community impacts, such as tolerance..., educational opportunities..., corporate recruitment..., [and] quality of life” (p. 182).

Webb (2004) further notes that “...one of the most interesting and positive trends in the development and operation of performing arts facilities is their increasing sense that they are a vital tool for community development...” (p. 179). When proposing to build new performing arts facilities, many pro-community arguments are used to gain funding and support, including casting facilities as a catalyst for economic activity and/or redevelopment, arguing that facilities create a focal point for the community, and demonstrating that facilities create a high-quality home for local cultural organizations and thereby supporting and elevating those organizations’ missions (Webb, 2004). “All of this means that performing arts facilities can and should play an important role in the life of the community, not just serving audiences and their audiences but also contributing to the achievement of broad community goals...” (Webb, 2004, p. 182).

This insistence upon a performing arts center having community value in general is also used specifically in the context of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts. The Portland’5 2007 Annual Report asserts that “...MERC’s role, through its facilities, is to serve as an advocate and catalyst for the community [and] culture...The PCPA exemplifies this vision...” (p. 3). Robyn Williams (2007), the Executive Director of Portland’5, goes on to state that she feels “...that the arts bring cultural and economical benefits that contribute to making Portland a thriving and vibrant
community. As a prominent member of the arts community, PCPA feels that it has a responsibility to give back to the community” (p. 11).

**Measurement Difficulty**

As demonstrated above, there are a myriad of sources that agree that performing arts centers and arts organizations benefit the community in a variety of ways on philosophical levels. The difficulty lies in quantifying, measuring, and communicating these benefits and providing a cohesive narrative to the community at large on practical levels. The entire theme of the Queensland Performing Arts Centre Lecture (QPAC) (2013) centered on how public and community value for a performing arts organizations can be measured and shared with others. In fact, Judith McClain, QPAC Scholar in Residence, summed it up as “...Problem 1: How do we tell the whole story of the arts and culture's public value...” (Queensland Performing Arts Center, 2013). She went on to ask “...how do we identify and describe appropriate measures of public value that reflect what we are trying to achieve and how we are doing it” (Queensland Performing Arts Center, 2013).

The issue is that community value is so much more than easily quantifiable data, such as attendance or economic multipliers. While these are certainly pieces of the puzzle, and will be discussed in later chapters, a more comprehensive narrative must be developed through the design and measurement of community value indicators. Moore summarized it well when he stated that “…a more expansive narrative needs to be told...” (Queensland Performing Arts Center, 2013) other than purely economic measurements. McClain agrees that “…measurement is important and we need to get past the bit that feels uncomfortable and unknowable and be more ambitious about measuring the value of culture so we simply don’t rely on proxies such as
Playing the Roles: Investigating the Community Values of Portland’s Centers for the Arts

ticket sales and number of visitors” (Queensland Performing Arts Center, 2013). It is the additional information—the information beyond the attendance records and profit and loss statements—that can tell the community story and it is this narrative that is most persuasive to specific communities.

The QPAC lecture (2013) exhorted venue manager professionals to begin to work to...find measures, be they numerical measures or be they narrative measures that are persuasive and can win arguments... the arts and culture work across so many domains and what we haven’t done is we haven’t gathered that together to tell the whole story....

McClain queried how venue managers can get hold of these qualitative data sets in order to tell the story to the community:

We’re not good at [quoting industry knowledge and ramifications if we were to lose funding]. We don’t have those statistics at our fingertips. We don’t have the narrative to tell about what our industry does and the breadth of our industry. How do we get control of this data and how do we tell our story (Queensland Performing Arts Centre, 2013).

Moore explains that corraling this community value data is difficult because it is a different model of valuation from the standard production model:

This picture we have of value coming at the end of a value chain in which there’s a production process and a product or service gets delivered and then the value is attached to it by the person who uses it, which is the standard model—it’s not quite the right picture here because there’s an awful lot of value in arts that is being produced when people are producing it with no audience. This is not just about audience. This is not just about the public. (Queensland Performing Arts Centre, 2013).

Given the differences in models, the value measurements must be different, so creating this valuation of the community portion must be created from the ground. These performing arts centers exist because they are creating value for the public, as explained above, and not because of a physical product that can be valued based on the sum of its parts.

This idea of community value can certainly be defined in terms of economic benefits, cultural benefits, and so on, but there is not necessarily a uniform way of measuring these
definitions or even communicating them to stakeholders and constituencies. As will be discussed in the next section, measuring and communicating these stories is extremely important to the survival of a performing arts center and thus finding a way to measure these values is of the utmost priority.

Benefits of Measurement & Communication

The ability to measure and communicate community value is, quite simply, a critical element of a performing arts center’s survival. “Theater managers have come to understand that they must prove themselves to be a fundamental part of the community...It is the manager who is ultimately responsible for reaching out to the community and making the theater responsive to and supportive of broad community goals” (Webb, 2004, p. 5).

One reason to measure this elusive community value and communicate it is one of self-representation. Organizations “…had to invent a way that would allow them to describe themselves. So they had to develop statistics as a way of representing the whole population so that they could create a cultural basis” (Queensland Performing Arts Centre, 2013). Another benefit of communication is to create a bond between the community and the facility. Williams notes that

...community relations are a big part of my job because we’re trying to make our facilities important to the community. People like the old facilities and have warm fuzzies about your building. If you lose your funding, you want the community going to the political powers that be and asking them to take care of these buildings. It’s so critical that you be an important part of the community fabric. (Webb, 2004, p.184).

Perhaps the most important reason to communicate a facility’s value is that of funding and governmental support. As will be discussed in later chapters, many performing arts centers come under the jurisdiction and funding whims of governmental bodies and agencies. The QPAC
lecture (2013) noted that venue managers “...have to straddle public value 1 and 2—the tangible and the intangible. They have to get the tangible, account for it, and try to communicate the intangible to... [the] politicians...” (Queensland Performing Arts Centre). Webb (2004) further confirms the importance of telling both the tangible—the attendance data, the number of events, the bottom line—and the intangible community value piece when he explains that

...if a performing arts facility is viewed...as a tool for economic and community development, there is a much greater chance to secure financial support from both the public and private sectors. Those funders need [to]...see that support of a performing arts facility supports broader goals for the community. (P. 183).

In essence, measuring the intangible, qualitative community value and sharing that story with stakeholder constituencies and the general public is imperative for them to understand the vitality the performing arts center brings to its community—and them—and to realize that the organization does not operate within a vacuum and that it requires support. To paraphrase McClain, everyone must get better at defining and communicating what they do in order to obtain the always-shrinking and contestable funding (Queensland Performing Arts Centre, 2013). The organizations that measure their community impacts and tell their stories the best will be the ones that survive and thrive.

The Portland’5 Community Value Story: An Opportunity

As discussed in the previous section, there is a serious need to define, quantify, and share the community value of a facility. Similar to all other performing arts centers, Portland’5 Centers for the Arts shares this dilemma of how to best tell its story. Teri Dresler, General Manager of Visitor Venues at Metro, knows that helping people understand the benefits of Portland’5 is vital to ensuring that it continues to flourish as a premier performing arts center:
I think actually the community value...is one of the pieces that is so hard to describe and illustrate for people to understand. The community piece is more elusive than the obvious economic impact. If people don’t understand the types of benefits we provide and everything we bring to the community, it’s easy to be critical. Helping people understand that is really important. That’s the reason we started talking about measuring the community impact. (Dresler, 2014, personal interview).

Williams concurs that there is room for improvement in telling the Portland's 5 community value story:

We do a terrible job of telling our story. We don’t tell the clients what we do for them. We don’t tell the public why we are important. We don’t tell politicians why we need to be supported. We just don’t do a good job of telling our story, I think because we’re so busy focusing on day-to-day operations. We don’t even do a good job of debunking myths. ‘Oh, you’re so expensive; nobody in the world pays as much rent as I do.” We kind of sit back and don’t rebut that. So we’re not a very good advocate for ourselves. That’s what we should do more of, spending more time with public officials and other boards and funders and so forth so they really understand what we do, how we do it, and why. (Williams, 2014, personal interview).

It is this discontent with the status quo that led to the community impact study proposal. The Request for Proposal (2012) states that “…the chief objective of [the Metro Visitor Venue] Group is to maximize the fiscal, economic, and community impacts of its operations throughout the Portland metropolitan region” (p. 2) and yet the community impacts have never been documented. As such, the purpose of the study is to “…quantify these...community and educational resources provided in the tri-county metropolitan area.... Metro is seeking proposals...to conduct research and analysis on the...community impacts specific to [PCPA]” (Metro, 2012, p. 2).

This RFP was sent out to bid and not one person, consultant agency, or other organization responded. Williams noted that “…no one is doing [any community impact studies] that I know of” (2013, personal communication). This was the genesis for this research project investigating the community value of Portland’s 5 Centers for the Arts. This literature review has demonstrated that there are documented values of performing arts centers to their communities, including
cultural engagement, economic catalysts, and better quality of life for citizens. Further, this literature has demonstrated that there is currently no uniform or easy way to measure these community impacts and benefits. The literature review has illustrated that performing arts centers in general—and Portland’5 Centers for the Arts in particular—have a great need to consider measurements and communication of these values to the general public and its constituencies for funding, support, and self-representation. This research project will attempt to go beyond the qualitative numbers and statistics that—while important—are only a fraction of the story of Portland’5, in order to present a cohesive narrative documenting the myriad of community values to the people of Portland and its surrounding metropolitan region.
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT VALUE

The following chapter will document and analyze the different public engagement values of Portland's5 Centers for the Arts, including its role as a visitor venue within the Metro framework, what Portland's5 does as a venue within the community, and the general community served by Portland's5.

Portland's5 as Visitor Venue: Portland's5 Centers for the Arts Within the Metro Framework

"Governments, whatever they may think, do not make culture. In the best of circumstances, they provide it through strategy, policy, strategic intervention, and regulatory frameworks" (Queensland Performing Arts Centre, 2013).

Figure 3. Metro Council Visitor Venues Governance Structure, as described by Portland City Auditor (2011, p. 8).

Portland's5 Center for the Arts is the fifth largest center for the performing arts in the United States, with more than 1,000 performances and over one million patrons annually.

Portland's5 Centers for the Arts consists of five venues: Keller Auditorium (seats 2,992), the Arlene Schnitzer Concert Hall (seats 2,776), the Newmark Theatre (seats 880), the Winningstad Theatre (seats 304), and Brunish Theatre (seats 200) contained in three buildings owned by the
City of Portland. The Portland’5 Centers for the Arts resident companies include the Oregon Symphony, Portland Opera, Oregon Ballet Theatre, Oregon Children’s Theatre, and the Portland Youth Philharmonic (Portland’5 Centers for the Arts, Homepage). Portland’5 Centers for the Arts is managed by Metro, a regional government commission comprised of members of several counties and cities in the Portland metropolitan region, and a sub-commission of Metro, Metro Exposition and Recreation Commission (MERC). MERC oversees several different visitor venues in Portland, including the Oregon Zoo and the Oregon Convention Center, but this section will focus solely on its governance of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts. Please refer to Figure 3. Please note that Portland’5 Centers for the Arts underwent a rebranding and name-change in August 2013; it may be referred to as ‘Portland Center for the Performing Arts’ or ‘PCPA’ in documents.

A thorough understanding of the Portland’5 governance structure and cultural policy environment is vital to understanding its community impact. This section will investigate the governance structure of the Portland’5 Centers for the Arts in Portland, Oregon and specifically look at the cultural policy needs that were in place for the creation of this structure. By introducing a brief history of Metro, describing the governance structure of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts and offering examples of strengths and challenges associated with this governance structure, this section will argue that Metro and MERC, as regional government commissions, are effective managers of cultural policy in relation to Portland’5 Centers for the Arts and prove that the governance structure is a mutually beneficial relationship and provides a framework for public engagement.
Metro History

Metro is a regional government that was founded in the 1940s and has evolved to be an effective cultural policy managing body. Metro was formed due to population growth in the Portland metropolitan region and a means to manage services and facilities for a larger population expanding beyond city limits. The “…growth of urban and suburban populations had created problems…that “extend beyond the individual units and local government and cannot adequately be met by such individual units” (Abbott, p. 4). In effect, Metro was created because of “…the desire for effective regional coordination and comprehensive regional planning…(and)...to develop ways to deliver regional services under regional management” (Abbott, p. 1). In the beginning stages, coalitions were formed so that “…local governments could meet together to discuss common problems…[and]…administer services and functions of area-wide concern” (Abbot, p. 2).

There were several iterations of what became the current Metro model. Some of the earlier versions possessed “…neither the authority nor the supportive consensus to deal with regional issues” (Abbott, p. 8). Another response was “…unstable funding” (Abbott, p. 9). To counter these weaknesses, the coalition pursued a more structured, elected body with a charter and began to look elsewhere for funding in order to serve the region with health, safety, and cultural services.

The current model evolved due to a National Academy for Public Administration awarding an 18-month grant to study the possibilities of multi-level government in metropolitan areas to the tri-county (Multnomah County, Clackamas County, Washington County) coalition as winners of a national competition. The coalition edged out its competition due to the “…strength of its neighborhood associations and the existence of functioning regional agencies on which a
study could build” (Abbott, p. 10). The coalition provided matching funding from local
government, business, civic, and education sources that were cooperative and representative of
the entire population (Abbott, p. 10) in order to “...design...an upper tier system of government
that will attend to the common needs of the entire Tri-County community” (Abbott, p. 10).

Representatives to the commission were directly-elected officials specifically focusing on
the Metro commission in order to maintain their priorities and properly represent their
constituents. Direct election was decided to be “...the best, and perhaps only, way to secure a
democratic, responsive, responsible and effective area-wide government” (Abbott, p. 11). The
commission required “...approval of a tax base before taking on the metropolitan aspects of a
long roster of regional functions, including...human services, regional parks, cultural and sports
facilities,...and libraries” (Abbott, p. 12).

In 1987, Metro established the Metropolitan Exposition Recreation Commission (MERC)
to “...build and operate...regional trade and spectator facilities” (Abbott, p. 14), including
Portland’s Centers for the Arts. Abbott notes that MERC operates with independence, but is
subject to general budgetary and administrative review by Metro. MERC is the primary arbiter
of cultural policy as relates to Metro and is the main governing body of Portland’s Centers for

Portland’s Centers for the Arts History

According to the Portland’s Centers for the Arts Performance Venue History (2013),
Portland’s citizens opened the first publicly-owned facility in 1917: the Municipal Auditorium,
which later became Keller Auditorium. In the 1920s, the city of Portland built the Paramount
Theatre, which later became the Arlene Schnitzer Concert Hall. In 1972, Portland City Council
declared this building a historic landmark. In the 1980s, the Portland Mayor appointed the Performing Arts Center Committee, which recommended the purchase of the Paramount and two new theatres to be built as the Antoinette Hatfield Hall across the street. The venue history states that Portland citizens “...approved a measure that provided $19 million of initial financing for the new Portland Center for the Performing Arts” (2013, p.1).

Portland’5 Centers for the Arts became an official organization in the 1980s and was governed by Metro/MERC. The history of this organization and significant public investment is concrete evidence that the people and community of the Portland region are committed to cultural institutions and cultural policy.

Benefits of Cultural Institutions to Communities

Metro and MERC are committed to providing excellent cultural policy to the Portland and Tri-County community due to the many economic, civic, and educational benefits that organizations such as Portland’5 Centers for the Arts provide. The MERC Chair and Metro General Manager co-authored a letter to the Portland Central City Urban Renewal Area Evaluation Committee stating that Portland’5 is

...a proven economic catalyst for the neighborhood by inducing patron spending in nearby businesses and drawing tourists into the city...There is a direct relationship between a thriving and diverse cultural community and a strong, healthy economic base: businesses and conventioneers make location and investment decisions in part due to the quality of cultural infrastructure. (Dozono & Dresler, 2010, personal communication).

Grodach (2011) notes that cultural institutions such as Portland’5 Centers for the Arts provide value to urban communities because “...they point to the potential role and influence of individuals and organizations outside the traditional business and property-led coalitions, which the dominant approach to urban politics, regime theory, has tended to ignore” (p. 84). In effect,
Grodach is highlighting the importance of an organization, such as Portland’5 Centers for the Arts, in terms of cultural policy and community politics.

Redaelli (2011) agrees that cultural institutions have a positive impact on communities and regions: “...the vision of a creative city can bring together an interesting mix of civic actors: business organizations, higher education institutions, arts organizations and the city council” (p. 90). Redaelli discusses the reasons why the ‘creative city’ movement gained traction in Columbus, Ohio and investigates the different actors and their motivations for participating in the movement, which can easily be transported to the community of Portland. The creative city movement can be seen in Portland as the regional government commissions a yearly economic impact study from Crossroads Consulting for Portland’5 each year to demonstrate to the public the value of having such an organization in the community and managed by Metro/MERC.

According to the 2012 Crossroads Consulting study,

...PCPA...generates significant economic activity to the Portland metropolitan area...In FY2011, the PCPA...generate[d] $57.5 million in total spending which supported 640 full and part-time jobs and created $22.2 million in personal earnings.... Tax revenues generated from PCPA-related activities were estimated to be approximately $1.4 million in FY2011. (P. 1).

Redaelli (2012) discusses that both developers and the arts were interested in building symbiotic networking relationships and partnerships as both parties could benefit. Redaelli (2012) comments that “…governance dynamics can foster cultural and economic creativity” (p. 86), which can be seen by Metro governing Portland’5 and fostering cultural and economic creativity within the community. Finally, Redaelli highlights the importance of cultural institutions—such as Portland’5 Centers for the Arts—in terms of uniting different actors from different areas, such as businesspeople on the board, politicians on the regional government council, resident company personnel, Portland’5 Centers for the Arts management, etc. A
creative city, built of symbiotic relationships between public governors and institutions like Portland’s 5 Centers for the Arts, has many positive implications that come from a diverse array of supporters, partnerships, motivations and actions.

Shaw (2013) investigated Portland as a specific example of successful regional cultural policy. He posited that organizations such as Portland’s 5 Centers for the Arts improve the civic health and reputation of the community by

...a) networking, or “making connections” between artists in Portland and other art centers around the world and b) making place distinctions, or extending Portland’s “foothold,” securing the city’s reputation “as a widely known destination...” In addition, the conversation implies a third strategy c) making place, by which I refer to the building and development of art venues, supports, and infrastructure at the local level. (P. 237).

Metro/MERC views Portland’s 5 as a means to connect audiences (aka the community of Portlanders) with other perspectives, groups, presenters, nationalities, etc. and thus believes that a regional government management structure is vital. Portland’s 5 Centers for the arts is a way to connect and engage the community with the outside world, artistically, economically, and culturally. Further, the management structure of the buildings, which are owned by the city of Portland and managed by the regional government entity Metro, is evidence of cooperation and networking that transcends politics. Portland’s 5—and its very distinction PORTLAND sign on the front of the Arlene Schnitzer Concert Hall—is certainly a place-making distinction and Portland’s 5 is one of the most highly-regarded performing arts centers in the nation.

The management structure is evidence of the development of arts venues in Portland as a cultural policy and the importance both the regional government and the city place on cultural policy and the performing arts in Portland. Many important cultural policy and political leaders in Portland understand that Portland’s 5 Centers for the Arts is an influential player in shaping the urban landscape of Portland, OR economically and culturally for the people who live and work
within the region. Portland’5 is an integral member of the urban cultural landscape from both an arts perspective and as an organization that brings vitality and attracts other businesses and political players. Portland Mayor Sam Adams wrote that “…PCPA is a vital resource for Portlanders that contributes significantly to the quality of life, culture and the economy of our region” (Sam Adams, as cited in Appendix A of the Portland City Auditor Report).

Governance Structure

Metro/MERC is the governing entity of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts and Metro and MERC provide value to Portland’5 Centers for the Arts as its managers and arbiters of cultural policy. As illustrated in Figure 3, there is a complex organizational structure surrounding Metro and Portland’5 Centers for the Arts. The physical buildings (Keller Auditorium, Arlene Schnitzer Concert Hall, Antoinette Hatfield Hall) are owned by the City of Portland. The umbrella organization that manages these venues is Portland’5 Centers for the Arts, who are employees of Metro and are guided by MERC. Metro, which is the elected regional government, appoints and oversees MERC, which is the Metro Council Advisory Committee on matters pertaining to Metro’s visitor venues, of which Portland’5 is one. MERC is comprised of business and civic leaders recommended by local area governments. There are 2 members each from the City of Portland and Metro, and 1 member each from the counties of Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington.

Separation of Duties

There is a very distinct separation of duties between these different bodies. Portland’5 Centers for the Arts undertakes all of the daily operations of the venues, from booking and
contracting the different touring productions to events management to facilities maintenance to catering, etc. Metro takes care of all of the accounting, human resources, finance group, technical support, and other administrative support for Portland’5 Centers for the Arts and the other visitor venues under its care. MERC provides policy guidance and oversight to Portland’5 Centers for the Arts and the other visitor venues and is advised on Portland’5 Centers for the Arts matters by the Portland’5 Centers for the Arts Advisory Board. There is a positive, efficient, respected, and esteemed relationship between all parties in this structure and this operational model works well.

Challenges & Benefits to Governance Structure

As in any organizational structure, there are benefits and challenges in this particular relationship. One challenge that Portland’5 Centers for the Arts faces—much like many other cultural organizations—is funding for both operational and capital projects. The Portland City Auditor report (2011) underscores that due to the three intergovernmental agreements in place, “...PCPA receives no operational support from Metro. Most of PCPA’s…revenue [is] from charges for services including theatre rentals, admission fees, ticket commissions, food and beverage service, as well as income from the Transient Lodging Tax, and contributions from the City of Portland” (p. 9). And while Portland’5 Centers for the Arts is above the national level for earned revenue compared to similarly-sized venues (AMS Planning and Research, n.p.), it still relies on governmental support and this governance structure ensures that it must compete with the other visitor venue organizations under MERC’s management for a limited amount of fluctuating funding from transient and lodging taxes and the City of Portland. Metro (2008) notes that traditional funding approaches are “...not only failing to maintain existing
infrastructure, they are wholly inadequate to build to systems to accommodate growth...” (p. 6). The MERC Chair and Metro Manager further explain this problem by emphasizing that at Portland’5, “…there remains a serious need for further development and infrastructure improvements” (Dozono & Dresler, 2010, personal communication).

In seeking to address this funding challenge in a creative and collaborative way, however, Portland’5 Centers for the Arts and Metro/MERC have worked together to implement creative and cooperative solutions that are mutually beneficial and possible due to their relationship. Due to Portland’5 Centers for the Arts’ inclusion within the broad umbrella of Metro oversight, MERC and Portland’5 Centers for the Arts developed a strategy to increase paid patronage at events by “…assess(ing) pre-paid transit opportunities with city and Tri-Met for patrons” (MERC, p. 31). Portland’5 Centers for the Arts leveraged its organizational structure with Metro to collaborate with Tri-Met, the transportation organization under Metro’s purview.

Portland’5 Centers for the Arts Executive Director Robyn Williams notes several other examples where Portland’5 Centers for the Arts was able to leverage its relationship with Metro in order to institute effective changes to boost its revenues, including working with the Oregon Liquor Control Commission to allow alcoholic beverages in the performance area, thus drastically increasing concessions revenue, and lobbying politicians to create legislation to crack down on ticket scalpers (Williams, 2010, personal communication).

While being one of several visitor venues under the guidance of MERC can have its challenges, as described above, most sources acknowledge a much greater benefit to this structure as it has an immense capacity for knowledge- and cost-sharing among the venues. The Portland City Auditor report (2011) notes that “having Metro cover the administrative functions reduces overhead cost for Portland’5 since “…the costs [are] shared with more entities” (p. 9)
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and that “...PCPA experiences economies of scale that translate into cost savings” (p. 17). Further, the City Auditor (2011) states that the very expensive insurance liability for all visitor venues—including Portland’5 Centers for the Arts—is covered by Metro, which is a very big cost savings for Portland’5 Centers for the Arts. Due to MERC’s specialization in venue management, the City Audit Report (2011) explains that Portland’5 Centers for the arts benefits from the “expertise of staff at other visitor venues” (p. 17). This benefit is positive for all parties involved: Portland’5 Centers for the Arts, Metro/MERC, the other visitor venues under MERC, and the other myriad of departments under Metro’s governance.

Summation of Metro Framework

Metro/MERC and Portland’5 Centers for the Arts have a strong and positive foundation and will continue to positively impact the regional community and will create cultural policy for the region into the future. As this section has demonstrated, Metro and MERC, as regional government commissions, are effective managers of cultural policy in relation to Portland’5 Centers for the Arts and that the governance structure is a mutually beneficial relationship. Portland’5 Centers for the Arts improves the Portland community by bolstering livability, supporting the downtown neighborhoods, and positively impacting the local economy. Metro and MERC provide value in administrative support and economies-of-scale cost-savings as well as a structure that allows for knowledge-sharing and an ability to collaborate on interdepartmental projects that benefit multiple organizations. Metro/MERC and Portland’5 Centers for the Arts have a strong, positive, and collaborative relationship that ensures mutually-beneficial local cultural policy for the community. This relationship will continue to create local
cultural policy for the community of Portland, OR and its surrounding metropolitan region well into the future.

*Portland’5 as Venue: Portland’5 Events versus Industry Average by Season*

Williams notes that “...compared to the industry, we are heavily occupied...The more dates we can fill with shows..., the better we can hold down costs to some of our arts organizations; it actually allows us to support them more” (2014, personal interview). The data holds this to be true; when compared to similar-sized performing arts centers across the country, Portland’5 has significantly more events per year than the group average:

![Graph showing Portland'5 Events versus Industry Average by Season, 2006-2013.](image)

*Figure 4.* Portland’5 Events versus Industry Average by Season, 2006-2013. Portland’5 data was obtained from Portland’5 Centers for the Arts’ *Monthly Events & Attendance Summary by Fiscal Year* Internal Attendance Summary Reports. Industry Average data obtained from AMS Planning & Research’s 2012 *PAC Stats report: Prepared for Portland Center for the Performing Arts.*
Figure 5 below illustrates the average capacity of the 2012-2013 season by venue and type of event. Please note this data only includes ticketed events, so excludes the free or non-ticketed events. The Schnitzer and Keller had the highest capacity ratios. The ‘Popular’ genre, which includes commercial rock shows and comedians, was the most popular, followed by the Broadway series.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>B'way</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Dance</th>
<th>Fam</th>
<th>Film</th>
<th>Opra</th>
<th>Pop</th>
<th>Thtr</th>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keller</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schnitz</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nmrk</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winni</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunish</td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Average Capacity by Venue Type, FY2013. Data obtained from “FY12-13 Consolidated” worksheet prepared by Jeannie Baker for PacStats Report.

Portland’5 as Venue: Portland’5 Events & Attendance by Season

Portland’5 attendance has remained relatively stable over the past decade, ranging from 769k in FY2011 to almost one million in FY2006:

Figure 6. Portland’5 Events and Attendance by Season, 2006-2013. Portland’5 data was
obtained from Portland’5 Centers for the Arts’ Monthly Events & Attendance Summary by Fiscal Year Internal Attendance Summary Reports.

Portland’5 as Venue: Use Days

Portland’5 has a higher use day incidence per venue from 2009 to 2012 and in total for FY2012 as compared to similarly-sized performing arts centers in North America, as indicated by Figures 7 and 8.

![Graph of Portland'5 Use Days vs Industry Average by Season, 2009-2012.](image)

**Figure 7.** Portland’5 Use Days by Venue versus Industry Average by Season, 2009-2012.

Portland’5 data obtained from Portland’5 Centers for the Arts’ Monthly Events & Attendance Summary by Fiscal Year and Industry Average data obtained from AMS Planning & Research’s 2012 PAC Stats report: Prepared for Portland Center for the Performing Arts.
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Figure 8. Portland’5 Total Use Days versus Industry Average, FY2012. Portland’5 data obtained from Portland’5 Centers for the Arts’ Monthly Events & Attendance Summary by Fiscal Year and Industry Average data obtained from AMS Planning & Research’s 2012 PAC Stats report: Prepared for Portland Center for the Performing Arts.

Portland’5 as Venue: Defining the Portland’5 Patron

Moore (2013) posits that “...one of the ways to measure the value of art is the number of people who showed up and plunked their money down to see the show. Those measures are part of the story of value that’s worth attending to” (Queensland Performing Arts Center). In order to define the patron community and answer the question, who is the Portland’5 patron?, the investigator obtained Ticket Services Sales by Zip Code from the Portland’5 Centers for the Arts Tickets Services Department. The data included only commercial, local non-profit, and Broadway ticket data from the New Era Ticketing database and did not include resident company patrons as the Resident Companies do not utilize the Portland’5 box office, thus no data was available. Additionally, no third-party ticketing data was available. However, the 14% of data available for analysis is assumed to be representative of the total patron data as it represents
almost 110k patrons out of the total 785k and is a significant number of non-concentrated patrons and a diverse ticketing base. Out of the sample size, people from 21 different countries purchased a ticket and 99% of them were from the United States. There were 48 different states and 2 Armed Forces territories. 76% of tickets sold were to residents of Oregon and Washington. 63% of tickets were sold to residents of the three Metro counties. A large ratio of the community is extrapolated as patrons. Extrapolated, 44% of Multnomah County residents attended a ticketed event in the 2012-2013 season. 48% of Portland residents attended a ticketed event in FY13. On average, approximately one third of Metro counties purchased tickets and attended an event at Portland’5 in FY12-13. The Queensland Performing Arts Center lecture noted that “…art has living value [as demonstrated by participation in arts and culture]” (2013). As attendance rises and the number of events increases, this demonstrates that Portland’5 has immense value to the community. People are willing and ready to pay for the experience and this willingness carries value with it.

Portland’5 as Engager: Breadth of Offerings

A performing arts center is the center of a community. And the only way you can be a center of a community is to provide access. So the primary reason for corporate meetings, weddings, bar mitzvahs, spelling bees, schools, etc., to come is because those people need to understand that they have access to their center…. (Webb, 2004, pp. 45-46).

Portland’5 has seen a trend of expanded programming in the past several years, in order to better engage the community and provide more opportunities for access and entrance. In addition to the standard fare expected at a performing arts center (e.g. ballet, opera, Broadway, comedy, symphony, etc.), Portland’5 has made a conscious effort to include many free community events and many events that do not center on the performing arts. In order to reflect
this focus on the Portland community and the breadth of art available, a massive rebranding and renaming campaign was completed in 2013 to change the name from Portland Center for the Performing Arts to Portland’5 Centers for the Arts. Williams points out that “...we recognize that we do so much more than performing...We are so much broader than the performing arts and I'm glad we finally have a name that reflects what we really do” (2014, personal interview). Dresler (2014) agreed, stating that Portland’5 is “…always looking for new ways to bring people closer to the arts of all kinds...I really appreciate how well they have been able to push at every corner of the arts and really try to bring that to the citizens” (2014, personal interview).

Portland’5 has increased many of its non-ticketed and free events in order to entice the Portland community to stop in and experience its venues in a less-traditional format. The visual arts are represented through a popular revolving art gallery in the Antoinette Hatfield Hall Rotunda. “These exhibits serve the dual function of providing gallery space for professional as well as up-and-coming local artists and giving our patrons an opportunity to experience a diverse range of visual art” (Williams & Dresler, 2010, p. 11). The literary arts have a home through the Portland Arts & Lectures series, a popular client, and the Portland’5-produced ‘Poetry on Broadway’ series. Free tours are offered on a regular basis. Additionally, business meetings, film shoots, wedding receptions, conferences, charitable events, blood drives, dance auditions, etc. have all been a part of the events calendar over the past several season (Williams & Woodson, 2007). Williams (2014) notes

...I think the more we can get out in the community is good. One of the roles we really see ourselves in is a convener; one thing we have is space. We like bringing people together for conversations, whether it is hosting events like Business and Culture for the Arts, or hosting a meeting of Portland Arts Alliance, or different partnerships like that. (Personal interview).
Additionally, free performances are offered regularly through the ‘Noontime Showcase,’ ‘Summer Arts on Main’ and ‘Music on Main’ series. All of these events attract a different type of patron than might traditionally be interested in entering the venues. It is the hope that with familiarity, this person will return to purchase an event ticket and become a frequent attendee and supporter of the Portland arts scene.

As described above, three of the signature series of Portland’5 are Noontime Showcase, Summer Arts on Main, and Music on Main. Each series features local artists and groups in a concert setting, many of which would not usually have the opportunity to perform at Portland’5 or a venue of similar ilk. Through these series, the venue “...has the tools and capacity to call the public into existence” (Queensland Performing Arts Center, 2013). Noontime Showcase is a series run by the Volunteer Corps that features a one-hour performance in the Rotunda once per month. “The goal of Noontime Showcase is to make performance art accessible to everyone in Portland. This family-friendly event [brings] in over 1,000 people [each season]” (Williams & Twete, 2009, p. 7). Summer Arts on Main is an eight-week concert series each July-August with artisan booths featuring a variety of handmade crafts and free children’s activities.

Summer Arts on Main is a program that helps Portland artists gain visibility in the community. Every Wednesday during the summer, PCPA closes Main Street and hosts artisans from all over the Portland area in a street fair setting, providing free space to display and sell their artwork. Summer Arts on Main also provides fun activities for children, such as face painting and vegetable derby races. These activities are extremely popular with families and local daycares looking for fun and budget-friendly events during the summer. PCPA strives to make our community events affordable and accessible to Portland residents who otherwise might not have the opportunity to experience the arts. (Williams & Twete, 2009, p. 7).

Music on Main is the Portland’5

...free outdoor concert series that is...a Portland summertime favorite. The series, which brings in over 4,000 people to Main Street Plaza ever summer, is designed to keep people downtown...It also provides the community the chance to experience free performances from some of Portland’s most popular bands. (Williams & Twete, 2009, p. 6).
Barbara Steinfeld, VP of Tourism Sales at Travel Portland concurs that

...Music on Main adds a lively element to downtown. When a visitor is walking around and hears great music spilling into the Park Blocks and onto Broadway, they are drawn like a magnet to see what is happening—and what is happening is pure Portland. (Williams & Dresler, 2010, p. 8).

The investigator conducted a survey of performers of Noontime Showcase, Summer Arts on Main, and Music on Main. Of the respondents, 100% had a positive experience and would return to perform again, if asked. The following image is a word-cloud graphic comprised of all Performer survey responses:

Figure 9. Performer Group Survey Response Word Cloud.

When asked about the reason for initial participation, many cited Portland’5 as an entry into the Portland arts community; evidence that Portland’5 has value to local performers and groups in the region. Performers praised the diverse audiences of engaged and responsive multi-
generational people. Performers noted high community value of Portland’5 as it offers benefits both to the performers and to the community at large (All responses taken from the 2014 Performer Group Survey):

- “The public is exposed to music and art that they would not normally seek out”
- “The summer events...bring a wide variety of exciting local performers to the public at no charge”
- “It gives Portland an opportunity to be exposed to new artists at no cost. A nice community service”
- “PCPA helps maintain the downtown core as a vibrant arts destination. It affords Portland locals and visitors the opportunity to see top-notch arts and cultural entertainment”
- “It provides venues for the major arts organizations in fairly comfortable and accessible venues”

Williams (2014) notes that “…Portland’5 is evolving, being more proactive about how we fill dates and providing a whole breadth of activities, whether it’s paid tickets or it’s a free event...” (Personal interview). Dresler (2014) notes that Portland is “…a more attractive city because we have a vibrant arts scene...We are able to offer a wide variety of activities for people with many different interests” (Personal interview). Tamara Kennedy-Hill, Travel Portland Director of Community Relations, agrees. Portland’5 excels at “…having diverse shows and opportunities. Whether you want the symphony, Broadway, a youth program; it really provides, for our community, at various price points, various arts and culture experiences that you can be a part of in Portland” (Kennedy-Hill, 2014, personal interview).
Portland’5 as Arts Education Partner

Figure 10. Education Personnel Survey Response Word Cloud. Graphic comprised of responses from the 2014 Educator Survey.

Portland’5 is a key partner in providing meaningful arts education to the youth of the community. Williams (2014) explains how Portland’5 views its role a partner in providing important arts education to the community:

The primary thing we do is to make things easier for those who are really in arts education; they have arts education departments and arts educators who work for them. We try to have policies in place that make it easier for them to do their jobs, like the free summer camps that we’re going in the summer, picking up more of the costs for events that serve children, free offerings—Summer Arts on Main is really popular and geared towards families with kids, as is our Noontime Showcase…. We provide those opportunities for kids. We partner. We strategically don’t have an education department and I think that would be a duplication of what our arts organizations locally do so well. I think we look at what we can do to help them out and make it easier. (Personal interview).
Metro and MERC view the support of arts education by Portland'5 as an important part of the mission of Portland'5:

Often missing from annual business recaps is the impact the arts, and the free arts experiences provided by the PCPA, have on our community’s youth. I am particularly proud of the free access we provide to thousands of area students throughout the year, and while these programs are difficult to measure on a balance sheet, we know these investments return valuable future dividends for many years to come. (Williams & Dresler, 2011, p. 4).

The 2011-2012 Annual Report (Metro, 2014) mirrors this sentiment:

Education and schools is a core tenant of PCPA’s community support. Thousands of Oregon school kids visit the PCPA theatres each year through organized classroom fieldtrips, attending summer arts camps and enjoying monthly Noontime Showcase free family-oriented performances. Back-stage tours of “Wicked” during the show’s visit for the Broadway Across America series delighted students from George Middle School and Roosevelt High School, as well as guests from the Urban League’s Young Professionals. (P. 8).

Williams quantifies this support by stating that “…education programs held at PCPA venues reach thousands of youth each year who visit with classroom tours and participate in summer arts programs” (Metro, 2014, p. 5). This Metro report (2014) highlights that during the 2011-2012 season, Portland’5 donated $20,100 in rent and staff labor to summer arts camps (p. 5). These camps that are directly supported by Portland’5 “…inspire creativity in our region’s youth” (Metro, 2014, p. 7).

To better understand the importance of Portland’5 in supporting youth arts education, the investigator surveyed organizations who work directly with Portland’5 to fulfill their organization’s mission of providing quality arts education programming to the youth of the community. Niel DePonte, Founder, President, and Artistic Director of MetroArts Inc. noted that Portland’5 supports their mission: “Portland’5 has been a partner with MetroArts Inc for 20 years in providing educational programming for children and the community. They provide free
facilities for our kids camp, enabling us to keep costs low for campers” (Education Survey, 2014). A responder who wished to remain anonymous agreed that Portland’5 supports the organization’s mission, stating that the organization “…[is] able to do 2 weeks of classes in Hatfield Hall. This helps us offer quality education experiences to more children” (Education Survey, 2014).

The survey responses confirmed the idea that an introduction to the facilities at a young age could de-mystify the experience for youth and could promote attendance and participation in arts activities later in life. DePonte notes that Portland’5 has “…great facilities, staff, volunteers, central location” (Education Survey, 2014) and that participation in these education programs at Portland’5 “…demystifies the facilities and opens access for many students who could not attend the camp” (Education Survey, 2014). When asked to contrast Portland’5 venues with other venues in the region, responders agreed that Portland’5 is “…the best of the best” (Education Survey, 2014).

In the survey, responders were asked to rate the value of Portland’5 to their organization, especially focusing on youth arts education. The responses, summarized below in Figure 11, were overwhelmingly positive. In the majority of categories, all responses were 10 out of 10. In no case did any response rate Portland’5 less than 9.5 out of 10 as regarding its value to arts education.
Figure 11. Education Personnel Survey Results: Value of Portland’5.

Figure 12. Education Personnel Survey Results: Portland’5 Helps Fulfill Mission.

Figure 13. Education Personnel Survey Results: Continue Arts Engagement.
When asked a hypothetical question asking how the absence of Portland’5 would impact MetroArts Inc, DePonte noted that “…the impact on our programs would be devastating, and more to the point, the loss of arts education experiences for the community and the loss of revenue and economic impact for the surrounding businesses would be devastating for them as well” (Education Survey, 2014). Through the family- and youth-oriented educational programming presented by Portland’5 and its user groups, Portland’5 is able to serve over 100,000 of the community’s youth each season (Education Survey, 2014). Furthermore, after participating in the groups’ Portland’5-based education programs, children continue in their arts engagement. DePonte notes that the children who participate “…continue in music as performers and they continue their interests in the arts overall in their schools after camp experiences, and often major in the arts in college years later” (Education Survey, 2014). Other groups see a direct correlation between children “…who see a show [at Portland’5] then sign up for classes or dream to perform on those stages” (Education Survey, 2014).

As evidenced by the breadth of arts education opportunities Portland’5 provides to the youth of the community and the importance it has to the groups who provide these programs, Portland’5 has an immense value to the community pertaining to education and outreach. Dresler (2014) comments that this piece of Portland’5 is becoming even more valuable as schools are forced to cut arts funding and programming:

The education piece, for young people,…with cutbacks to the schools, whether they want to be a ballerina or opera singer or they want to run rigging or hang lights or be the soundboard person, that inspiration and opportunity to interact with the arts through education that we link to in the schools or we sponsor at P5 is just hugely beneficial to the region. (Personal interview).
Portland’5 as Volunteer Opportunity

Figure 14. Volunteer Survey Response Word Cloud. Graphic comprised of Volunteer Survey responses asking their feelings about being a volunteer.

Portland’5 has a very robust Volunteer Corps of over 600 people each season. Dresler (2014) thinks that the volunteer program is “...a wonderful opportunity for people who are interested in the arts to be involved in many different facets...I think that makes us a richer part of the community because of what they bring” (Personal interview).

 Volunteers serve in many different capacities, including working in the Gift Shop, welcoming patrons as Greeters, performing administrative positions in the office, acting as Tour Guides, and ushering events. Each season, volunteers donate approximately 50,000 hours and
save Portland'5 and its user groups over $600,000 in personnel costs (Williams & Woolson, 2007; see also Williams & Twete, 2009).

According to a 2013 Volunteer Program survey administered by the Events Department, 86% of the volunteers attended a social gathering in addition to their shifts during the previous season. This indicates a high level of engagement and feeling of community within the Corps. While many volunteers begin their tenure for the perks of seeing free shows, the vast majority of them continue—often for decades—due to the sense of camaraderie, feeling of worth, and genuine pride in Portland'5, even when required to pay for parking or volunteer at events that may not be their first choice. When asked to describe their feelings about being a volunteer, 100% of the hundreds of responses were completely positive, as depicted in the word-cloud graphic above.

The Portland'5 Volunteer Corps not only provides value in the sheer amount of free labor and personnel costs saved, but also provides a sense of community and empowerment to a large group of people in the Portland metro area.
ECONOMIC VALUE

PCPA’s three unique venues contribute to the vibrancy of Portland’s downtown core, its cultural identity and its economic stability. The region benefits from the on-going operations of the PCPA in a number of ways, including such tangible and intangible benefits as supporting a vibrant downtown Portland by attracting residents and visitors to local businesses, contributing to arts educational institutions including children’s theatre, generating public awareness and funding of arts organizations, providing an alternative entertainment option for both residents and visitors, enhancing business for other area companies involved in related services purchased by arts organizations (e.g. advertising, transportation, printing, etc.), attracting in-kind and cash contributions from local arts supporters. (Williams & Twete, 2009, p. 10).

Portland’5 as Vibrant Arts Hub & Driver of Cultural Tourism

There is no question that Portland’5 Centers for the Arts serves as a significant attraction for both tourism and the local tri-county region community. Kennedy-Hill (2014), an expert in cultural tourism in Portland, states that “…Portland’5 really is the center for the cultural district. It provides a central value of arts in our community, which makes it great for tourism” (personal interview). She goes on to explain that “…the Schnitz is an icon of the city of Portland. It is a way to bring people not only from outside of Portland, OR but within our own community into the downtown region…They are attracted to this arts district” (Kennedy-Hill, 2014, personal interview).

Portland’5 as an anchor and vibrant cultural hub was an important idea during many of the interviews. Dresler (2014) pointed out that Portland is a more attractive city due to its “…vibrant arts scene with Portland’5 as the hub downtown” (personal interview). Kennedy-Hill (2014) concurs, noting that Portland’5 “…provides a good hub and vibrancy for the region, especially the downtown area. People want to visit;…I think it helps put Portland on a sophisticated scale” (personal interview). Gus Castaneda (2014), Chair of the Portland’5
Advisory Board and local hotelier, agreed that “...Portland’5 keeps the energy of the area; it keeps [the neighborhood] safer and more vibrant” (personal interview).

As described above, Portland’5 is an important base in the city’s cultural tourism portfolio. Kennedy-Hill (2014) clarifies that “...it is the arts and the additional assets that make Portland a vibrant destination...Portland’5 is really a part of helping expand what makes our destination a great and vibrant place to be” (personal interview). Over the past decade, there has been a significant and increasing amount of financial impact related to cultural tourism, much of that directly related to Portland’5. Travel Portland’s consulting group, Dean Runyan Associates, Inc., reported that in FY2013, there was almost $120 million of Portland visitor spending related to cultural tourism. In FY2013, Dean Runyon reported almost $40 million in cultural tourism-related industry earnings.


The vitality and daily operations of Portland’5 have a very real monetary value to Portland and the tri-county metro region in terms of cultural tourism impacts.

*Portland’5 as Economic Catalyst*

As an organization, Portland’5 serves as an economic catalyst that has tremendous, direct, and real financial impact for the community of Portland. Williams and Dresler (2011) point out that “...PCPA’s performances are more than works of art. They stoke the economic engine that provides jobs, promotes local spending and contribute important tax dollars to state, county and city coffers” (p. 2). Cheryl Twete, MERC Interim Director, agreed, noting that
Portland’5 plays “...a substantive role in our community’s health and well-being by inducing spending, supporting local jobs and generating millions in tax revenues that, in turn, fund essential programs and services upon which we all rely” (Williams & Twete, 2009, p. 3).

Christopher Mattaliano (2014), Executive Director of Portland Opera, agreed:

Yes, there’s enormous value in people coming downtown...the performing arts are vital to the economic wellbeing of a city. People who are coming downtown to our opera performances, they are spending money on the max line, they are spending money in the parking garages, they are coming in early perhaps to do some shopping and then have dinner at a restaurant, and then have a drink afterwards. We are one part of an enormous economic engine...that keeps the lights on downtown, keeps downtown populated after 10 o’clock at night by people going to the theatres. That creates a safe environment for people who live here and creates enormous economic activity...I see enormous value in the cultural institutions having a venue. (Personal interview).

It is important to view Portland’5 not just as an organization where the community can experience transformative arts and culture, but also as a business that creates economic opportunities for its 46 full-time employees, hundreds of part-time employees, peripheral businesses, including its resident companies and other user groups, surrounding restaurants and hotels, and the rest of the community. Williams stated that Portland’5

...Is a big business and a big employer;...that is a key piece of who we are. That has trickle-down effects, too. If the arts organizations don’t have a place to perform, what are they going to do? That affects how many people they employ and their spending and that’s a whole cascade effect.” (personal interview).

“Portland’s performing arts center is an economic catalyst that is as important as any major company in our market” (Williams & Twete, 2009, p. 2). Crossroads Consulting (2014) states that Portland’5 is “...a unique business entity that generates significant economic activity to the Portland metropolitan area” (p. 1).

Each year, Crossroads Consulting conducts an economic impact study for Portland’5 which explicitly details out the very direct financial impact the organization provides to Portland.
In FY2013, the PCPA hosted 957 performances that attracted approximately 785,600 in total attendance... This activity was estimated to generate $63.6 million in total spending which supported 680 full and part-time jobs and created $24.5 million in personal earnings... Tax revenues generated from PCPA-related activities were estimated to be approximately $1.8 million in FY2013. (Crossroads, 2014, p. 1).

Crossroads (2014) broke out direct spending related to Portland’5 Operations, totaling almost $38 million for the fiscal year 2013 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2013 $ Generated by P’5 (in thous.)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendee Spending</td>
<td>25,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Producer/Cast &amp; Crew Spending</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility/Capital Outlay</td>
<td>11,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Spending</td>
<td>37,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Indirect Spending</td>
<td>25,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spending</td>
<td>63,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 17. Total Spending Generated by Portland’5, FY2013.*

As this financial data indicates, Portland’5 is an extremely important factor in the economic vitality of its community.

*Portland’5 As Neighbor*

All persons contacted for this study were unanimous in their agreement that the presence and activities of Portland’5 are imperative to the success and life of the peripheral businesses, specifically the surrounding restaurants and hotels that cater to the patrons and performing groups. Anecdotally, both Williams and Dresler knew that Portland’5 was a driver for many business’ operations.

Portland’5 is a catalyst for economic activity. That neighborhood and the vitality of it is really interlinked with everything that is going on at Hatfield Hall and the Schnitzer and the Keller. ... You don’t see a lot of people out on the street and frequenting some of these businesses unless there’s something going on. That’s why it is important to have Portland’5 functioning; the venues really do add to that vitality. (Dresler, 2014, personal
Portland’5 provides community value in terms of the economic impact to the community; the fact that the restaurants and the parking garages are all full when we are busy. That’s a major impact on the businesses downtown. If Portland’5 weren’t here, they would find that really missing. I think the businesses around really benefit. (Williams, 2014, personal interview).

Castaneda, who managed the Governor Hotel in Portland before moving to the Red Lion in Salem, knows first-hand how important Portland’5 is to the surrounding businesses. “Portland’5 creates a tremendous economic impact. Many restaurants [and hotels] budget their revenues and sales around the events and activities;...it’s a major reason people go downtown” (Castaneda, 2014, personal interview).

These theories were confirmed through a survey of local business owners located within a half-mile radius of Portland’5. Greg Higgins, owner of the popular Higgins restaurant a block away from Hatfield Hall and the Schnitzer Concert Hall, confessed that he specifically chose the location of his restaurant due to its proximity to the performing arts center.

You can be a phenomenal restaurant and do okay in a different location or you can be a phenomenal restaurant and do phenomenally in this location. We chose this location specifically because the surrounding venues bring in high-end entertainment and a clientele with disposable income. We wouldn’t change locations with any other restaurant in town. We’d be crazy to. (Greg Higgins, as quoted in Williams & Dresler, 2010, p. 15).

Chris Erickson, General Manager of the Heathman Hotel, which occupies the location directly adjacent to the Schnitzer Concert Hall, echoes the importance of Portland’5 to his business.

PCPA directly benefits all 225 of the Heathman Hotel team members. The business we receive from PCPA...propelled us through the recession. Theses venues continually provide us with consistent traffic...PCPA clearly has an impact on our economy. (Chris Erickson, as quoted in Williams & Dresler, 2010, p. 15).

Erin Hokland, General Manager of Veritable Quandary, a popular restaurant located about a block from the Keller, shared that they “…love having [Portland’5] as neighbors” (Business
managers survey, 2014). She further shared that “...during the snow storms this past year, we wouldn’t have had many guests if it wasn’t for the shows going on” (Business managers survey, 2014). Susan Bashel, Co-Owner and Marketing Director of Pastini, a popular restaurant located near Hatfield Hall and the Schnitzer, summed up the importance of Portland’5 by stating that “[Portland’5] is an incredibly important key to the success of Pastini’s downtown location” (Business managers survey, 2014).

This Business Managers Survey (2014) was sent to business managers asked a series of questions (Refer to Appendix M) asking the managers a series of questions about the importance and value of Portland’5 to their specific businesses. The following results are represented in graphical format.

![P5 is an economic catalyst in neighborhood.](image)

*Figure 18. Business Managers Survey Results: Portland’5 as Economic Catalyst.*

As illustrated by *Figure 18*, 100% of respondents agree that Portland’5 is an economic catalyst in the neighborhood.
P5 positively impacts business.

Yes  No

Figure 19. Business Managers Survey Results: Portland’5 Business Impact.

As indicated by Figure 19, 100% of respondents agree that Portland’5 positively impacts their business.

Notice a dropoff in business during dark days.

Yes  No

Figure 20. Business Managers Survey Results: Business Drop-off.

As shown by Figure 20, 100% of respondents notice a drop-off in business during days with no events at Portland’5.
Playing the Roles: Investigating the Community Values of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts

Location chosen due to proximity.

- Yes
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*Figure 21.* Business Managers Survey Results: Location Proximity.

As illustrated by *Figure 21*, two-thirds of respondents chose their location specifically due to its proximity to Portland’5. Please note that the locations that answered ‘no’ were in business prior to Portland’5.

![Average Impact of Portland'5](image)

*Figure 22.* Business Managers Survey Results: Impact of Portland’5.
As indicated by Figure 22, respondents were asked to rate the impact Portland'5 had on a series of criteria from 1 (low) to 10 (high). As evidenced, Portland'5 is extremely important to these businesses. The average was 9 or above for all sets of criteria.

Portland'5 has a clear, defined, and direct value for the downtown cultural district, cultural tourism, the local economy, and peripheral businesses.
CULTURAL VALUE

As a prominent member of the arts community, PCPA feels it has a responsibility to give back to the community. Providing affordable performance space to our non-profit user groups is one of the ways that we give back. Through subsidized rent, free performance space, discounted shows for school children and donated time from volunteers, we strive to provide space for groups that would otherwise be unable to perform in our venues. Our resident companies enjoy subsidized rent, while groups such as Metro Arts and Oregon Children’s Theatre...are given free performance space for summer camps. (Williams & Woolson, 2007, p. 11).

The balance between economic support and revenue generation and the communication of this topic is one of the biggest areas of interest when examining the relationship between Portland’5 and its resident companies: Oregon Symphony, Portland Opera, Oregon Ballet Theatre, Oregon Children’s Theatre, and Portland Youth Philharmonic. To better understand this relationship and the value Portland’5 has to these organizations, the interviewer spoke with management of the resident companies. The following chapter will attempt to delve into the relationship between the Portland’5 and its resident companies, how Portland’5 balances the support of these arts organizations, the difference in perception between the venue and the organizations as regards this support, a detailed analysis of Portland’5 subsidy amounts of these organizations, and a few recommendations for improved communication so that all parties can better understand the value the others provide. Figure 23 below is a word-cloud graphic comprised of all resident company personnel interviews:
Portland'5 as Balancer

Experts all agree that a performing arts venue faces challenges in balancing the events of their resident companies—many of whom often take up the majority of the calendar while paying the lowest rental rate—and the commercial events. Webb (2004) notes that “...one of the great programming challenges is the need to balance rental activities with touring programs” (p. 46). The International Association of Venue Managers concurs. “[The facility must provide] the best possible mix of events for the community...[while]...soliciting events to meet the programmatic and financial projections of the facility” (Russo, Esckilsen, & Stewart, 2009, p. 50). They (2009) go on to state that “…priorities given to prime tenants or facility users can ensure a high level of event activity” (p. 50) but caution against giving these users exclusive rights in order to maintain enough calendar space to generate enough revenue to support these same users. Williams feels that Portland’5 maintains a good balance of its calendar, acknowledging that supporting the resident companies is important and has immense value while...
maintaining that commercial business is important from both a financial standpoint but also as a way to cater to the broadest population possible. “The PCPA provides subsidized use of its venues to local resident and non-profit arts organizations as well as space for popular commercial shows such as Broadway musicals and concerts” (Williams & Woolson, 2007, p. 8). During the 2013 season, the five resident companies took up approximately 35% of the calendar while they accounted for just 15% of total revenue but 45% of total expenses.

All parties interviewed for this project are very aware of the precarious balance of revenue generation needs versus supporting the arts organizations. Stan Foote (2014), Artistic Director at Oregon Children’s Theatre, simply stated that “…they have economic goals they have to reach to stay in business; we have economic goals we have to reach to stay in business” (personal interview). Mary Crist, Interim Co-President and General Manager of the Oregon Symphony, knows that the need to book commercial promoters is a reality but feels that this impinges on the Symphony’s use of the Schnitzer. “The challenges come when pressures are put on Portland’5; their resources are limited and that has created some mutual challenges. I understand their need to be responsive to commercial promoters, but the promoters seem to want equal access to hall dates” (Crist, 2014, personal interview). Crist (2014) would

...like to see the pressures removed from [Portland’5] so they have better support—whether it’s governmental financial supports or through Metro—so that it really is viewed as a performing arts center for Portland-area performing arts as opposed to a generic venue for touring groups that come in...I understand it is essential to have sufficient revenues to support the facility. (Personal interview).

Neville Wellman, Director of Finance and Operations at the Oregon Ballet Theatre, values that resident companies get the first chance to book dates each season (Wellman, personal interview) but wishes that OBT didn’t have to “…compete for those dates with commercial promoters who come into town...It is an economic reason, which I understand...They have their budget
guidelines they need to meet each year, just like we do” (Wellman, 2014, personal interview).

Dresler (2014) summarized the situation as follows:

Within the city agreement is a defined mission for the theatres, and part of that mission is to subsidize the resident companies. There are some historic use patterns of the facilities by those resident companies that...are becoming more and more challenging to Portland’5’s ability to generate commercial revenue when theatres are dark. That arrangement is based in history...but as we are driven by expenses to generate more revenue and get more aggressive with commercial business, we really need to fine-tune how much use people get for little or no rent for rehearsals and things like that, and how we make those adjustments without creating a negative impact on the resident companies. It is this really tight balance, this subsidy versus being more economical and efficient. (Personal interview).

The next section will address the resident companies’ subsidized use by Portland’5 and the financial value to them in detail.

Portland’5 as Supporter

Williams is proud that Portland’5 is able to heavily subsidize the resident company organizations so they can continue to thrive while presenting their art in the five venues.

Our job is to responsibly manage the venues. We try to accomplish this within the means that we have; making sure that these are well-maintained, beautiful venues; that all the different shows can come in and have the equipment that meets their needs, that they have the tools to produce their art. We provide subsidized use, very heavy for our resident companies but to all of our local non-profits, as well as having venues that are competitive so our commercial promoters find us to be an attractive market and can bring in those shows that the public wants to see. (Williams, 2014, personal interview).

Castanada (2014) agrees that Portland’5 provides immense value to its resident companies, noting that “…Portland’5 definitely extends a large effort to accommodate the needs of the resident companies” (personal interview). Williams (2014) notes that “...it is very inexpensive for the resident companies to use the halls” (personal interview), which is confirmed by the fact that daily rental rates for resident companies can be as low as $400 per day, while commercial promoters may pay up to $15,000 for the same hall and level of customer service. “The
commercial users are not getting discounted rent...They pay the full-meal deal here, which they are accustomed to doing, and that money is used to help support the non-profit groups”
(Williams, 2014, personal interview).

Williams (2014) detailed out many of the services Portland’5 provides for which costs are not recovered:

We do all the customer service training. We do all of the uniforms and fire drills and the maintenance and all of the things that make the buildings good homes for them so that their audiences like to come here. We also spend money on theatrical equipment that enhances their art form; we buy sophisticated lighting systems for them and sound systems, staging, chairs, etc. The stuff that they really need. We own the symphony shell that the symphony has to use. All of those components that if they were out on their own they’d have to pay for and maintain. When the boiler breaks down, they don’t get billed for that, we pick up those extra costs. The buildings are getting old and a lot of equipment needs to be replaced and they’re not paying for that. By holding the costs down, that allows them to put more money into producing their art form and enables them to hold down ticket prices at very low levels. We do this particularly well for the organizations that serve children, like Oregon Children’s Theatre. They pay a $0.50 user fee. We have not increased the user fee in the 13 years I’ve been here because we know their challenges—they have to rebuild their audiences every few years as their audiences grow up and move onto other stuff. We absorb a lot of costs from them and smaller users that we do not pass on to them. For example, if you’re in the Brunish Theatre or the Winningstad Theatre or the Newmark, you’re not paying for the engineers or custodians that work your events that the big halls have to pay for because we feel like we need to nurture and support these organizations, particularly ones that serve students. We have very low costs for student shows. Brunish Theatre, we don’t charge rent for. You can go in rent free. We check you in, check you out with a stage hand. We turn over all the equipment to your people. You don’t have to hire our stagehands. We provide volunteers at no cost to anybody. Whether they are working as greeters in the big halls or actually working as ushers here in the smaller halls. That cost is not passed on to anybody; we absorb all the costs associated with training and supporting our volunteer corps at no additional cost to the user groups. I think those are important things that we give those organizations. (Personal interview).

Portland’5 as Supporter: Operational Expense & Revenue Analysis

A key strategy to accomplish this goal of subsidization and support for the community arts organizations while maintaining a balanced budget within its current Strategic Plan is to
understand the business mix and current rates while developing profit-and-loss methodologies by user and venue (Portland Center for the Performing Arts, 2012). To meet this strategy, the investigator undertook an analysis of the operational expenses and revenues of Portland’5 to determine an average ‘per use’ rate for each of the five venues, as well as the total allocated cost of operating each venue during the 11-month period of July 2012 through May 2013. These expenses were then allocated to specific users to present total 11-month totals, which were contrasted against the user-generated revenue during the same period. All data discussed in this section was taken from the Portland’5 General Ledger Financial Data in the EBMS software.

The sections below will present findings and will outline the procedures, allocation methodology, and data sources of the analysis.

Findings: Expenses Allocated to Venues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Keller</th>
<th>Schnitzer</th>
<th>Newmark</th>
<th>Winningstad</th>
<th>Brunnish</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Use</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Per Use</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Per Use</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Per Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>12,019</td>
<td>2,595,604</td>
<td>11,282</td>
<td>2,408,777</td>
<td>7,589</td>
<td>763,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket Off</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>39,953</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>27,284</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>40,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>142,300</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>152,631</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>114,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Stage Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>390,938</td>
<td>415,120</td>
<td>240,809</td>
<td>30,576</td>
<td>24,253</td>
<td>1,851,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Labor HK</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>82,585</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>76,403</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>24,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Labor OC</td>
<td>70,932</td>
<td>200,344</td>
<td>49,835</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>326,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket Agency</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>58,017</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>58,370</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>78,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Equip</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Equipment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,674</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17,735</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>32,943</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>103,282</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>139,028</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>50,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Use Days</td>
<td>14,840</td>
<td>3,437,416</td>
<td>14,269</td>
<td>3,466,209</td>
<td>5,288</td>
<td>1,362,412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 24. Operational Expenses Allocated to Venues.

*Figure 24* indicates the average per-use cost of each venue and the total expenses associated with this venue over the 11-month period under review. The average per-use
cost ranges from approximately $15,000 at the Keller to approximately $2,000 in Brunish. As stated above, the resident rental rates can be as low as $400 per day.

Findings: Expenses Allocated to Users (and Average per-use cost)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User</th>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Use Days</th>
<th>Ave Per Use Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Symphony*</td>
<td>2,058,816</td>
<td>139.5</td>
<td>14,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIER 1-Commercial</td>
<td>1,369,351</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>12,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>1,156,136</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>16,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Opera*</td>
<td>1,062,576</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>12,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIER 2-Local Non-Profits</td>
<td>869,580</td>
<td>280.0</td>
<td>3,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Ballet Theatre*</td>
<td>823,763</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>12,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Children’s Theatre*</td>
<td>664,422</td>
<td>176.0</td>
<td>3,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Bird</td>
<td>359,575</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>11,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing Christmas Tree</td>
<td>280,962</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Rail</td>
<td>203,389</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>2,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team of Joy</td>
<td>112,119</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>1,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Arts &amp; Lectures</td>
<td>102,164</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Youth Philharmonic*</td>
<td>74,045</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>14,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Dance</td>
<td>41,032</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Institute for Contemporary Art</td>
<td>32,423</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Youth Symphony</td>
<td>18,196</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18,196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Resident Company

Figure 25. Operational Expense Allocated to Users.

Figure 25 shows the total allocated expense by user, number of use days during the 11-month period, and the average per-use cost. This data indicates that the Oregon Symphony was allocated the most operational expense due to their heavy occupation rate. Portland’5 expends an average of almost $15,000 per use-day for the Symphony. This data shows that the Symphony has a higher operational expense allocation than all commercial and non-local non-
profit groups combined for the 11-month period under review.

Findings: Subsidy Amount by User Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsidy Amount by User Group</th>
<th>Rev</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Subsidy Amount</th>
<th>Subsidy %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tears of Joy</td>
<td>(24,202)</td>
<td>112,119</td>
<td>87,917</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Opera*</td>
<td>(281,248)</td>
<td>1,002,576</td>
<td>781,328</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Children’s Theatre*</td>
<td>(195,684)</td>
<td>664,422</td>
<td>468,738</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Rail</td>
<td>(72,531)</td>
<td>203,389</td>
<td>130,858</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Symphony*</td>
<td>(818,566)</td>
<td>2,058,816</td>
<td>1,240,250</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Ballet Theatre*</td>
<td>(337,457)</td>
<td>828,763</td>
<td>491,306</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Youth Philharmonic*</td>
<td>(30,848)</td>
<td>74,045</td>
<td>43,197</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing Christmas Tree</td>
<td>(156,806)</td>
<td>280,962</td>
<td>124,156</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2-Local Non Profits</td>
<td>(500,643)</td>
<td>869,580</td>
<td>368,937</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Bird</td>
<td>(237,711)</td>
<td>359,575</td>
<td>121,864</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICA</td>
<td>(26,971)</td>
<td>32,423</td>
<td>5,452</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Dancers</td>
<td>(34,912)</td>
<td>41,032</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Youth Symphony</td>
<td>(16,136)</td>
<td>18,196</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>(1,419,500)</td>
<td>1,156,136</td>
<td>263,364</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Arts &amp; Lectures</td>
<td>(126,554)</td>
<td>102,164</td>
<td>(24,390)</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1-Commercial</td>
<td>(2,407,988)</td>
<td>1,369,351</td>
<td>(1,038,637)</td>
<td>-76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticketing Incentive Award</td>
<td>(199,567)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Revenue</td>
<td>(40,914)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Totals</td>
<td>(6,928,238)</td>
<td>9,233,549</td>
<td>2,305,311</td>
<td>Net Op. Deficit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Op Rev/Exp-Beyond Scope</td>
<td>(3,934,872)</td>
<td>1,241,005</td>
<td>(2,693,867)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie Out to General Ledger</td>
<td>(10,863,110)</td>
<td>10,474,554</td>
<td>(388,556)</td>
<td>Net Income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 26. Subsidy Amount by User Group.

Figure 26 contrasts the user's revenue and expense over the 11-month period under review and highlights the subsidy amount and percentage per user. The list is sorted from most-subsidized to least-subsidized. This data shows that all but three groups are subsidized by Portland's. It is important to note that through non-operating revenue (this includes contributed income, food and beverage net income, and income earned from activities not directly related to specific events), Portland's is able to operate in the black, with periodic
net income of almost $400k.

Findings: Average Subsidy Percentage by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouped User</th>
<th>Subsidy %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average % of Tier 4 ResCo</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % of Tier 3 NonP</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2-Local NonP</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1-Commercial</td>
<td>(76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>(23%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 27. Average Subsidy Percentage by Group.*

*Figure 27* indicates that resident companies as a group have the highest rate of subsidy-levels with an average of 64%. Commercial events and Broadway are the only groups that are not subsidized by Portland'5. The revenue generated from these activities is used to help subsidize the local non-profit groups in the community.

This data presented in this section is an extremely important part of understanding just how much Portland'5 subsidizes and supports its resident companies. In just the 11-month period from July 2012 through May 2013, Portland'5 provided over $3 million in subsidies to its five resident companies. This is a real, concrete dollar amount for the value it provides the cultural organizations of this community.

*Portland'5 as Partner*

100% of the resident company management interviewed agrees that Portland'5 helps them fulfill their mission. Wellman (2014) states that Portland'5 is an integral piece of OBT’s art: “[Portland’5] certainly plays an important part [in helping fulfill our mission]. The facility
that Portland’5 offers is what we need in order to present what we do as a ballet company” (personal interview). Foote (2014) agrees: “[Portland’5] helps us a lot...they help us serve our intended audience...we get resident rates, that’s important” (personal interview). Mattaliano (2014) notes that Portland’5 fills a need in that “...we need a venue for audiences to come to and experience the art form we produce” (personal interview). Crist (2014) appreciates that “...the consistency facilitates familiarity with our core audiences and our musicians; their needs are anticipated” (personal interview). A response in the Education Survey noted that the value of Portland’5 is 10 out of 10: “...where else could arts organizations receive subsidies for rent which enables them to exist” (2014). When asked if Oregon Children’s Theatre saw any benefits to being a resident company, Foote (2014) replied with an enthusiastic “Hell, yeah” (personal interview).

When the resident company managements were asked to describe Portland’5, adjectives such as essential, supportive, compromising, professional, service-oriented, and accommodating were used consistently. Nouns such as managers, believers, partners, and a home were popular images, as well. Crist (2014) stated that “...our relationship with Portland’5 is positive. We have an interest in mutually supporting each other” (personal interview). Wellman (2014) offered that “...it is a very good relationship; a very supportive relationship on the part of Portland’5” (personal interview). One of the best descriptions was offered by Foote (2014) when he shared that “...our relationship with Portland’5 is like a good, healthy marriage. We talk about things...we are not afraid of each other” (personal interview).

During the research process, it appeared that in some areas, there was a slight disconnect in expectations and perceptions that could be improved with communication. This frustration over some lack of communication was shared by several people who were interviewed. It is the
hope that this research project, in detailing out the many values and benefits of Portland’5, will help with this communication and that it can facilitate discussions amongst Portland’5 and its resident companies. Mattaliano (2014) “...feel(s) there is frustration among the Ballet, the Opera, and the Symphony about the lack of communication between the users and PCPA” (personal interview). He urged Portland’5 to have “…better transparency and communication, erring on the side of keeping us informed” (Mattaliano, 2014, personal interview). Dresler (2014) shares this point of view, noting that she understands all involved are trying to run their businesses and that she would like all parties to participate in “…a facilitated session and really understand everybody’s goals and objectives and limitations and figure out how to live better together…Portland’5 and Metro need to…listen and really let people talk to us about the stresses they have about trying to operate within our rules and regulations so that we can understand what they are up against” (personal interview). Furthermore, sharing all of the benefits the resident companies receive, as detailed above by Williams and as indicated by the financial data, may assist all parties in reaching more mutually-acceptable compromises in terms of sharing dates, flexibility, and continuing the overall feeling of goodwill towards each other. Finally, it may be important for Portland’5 to remind its user groups that yes, part of its mission may be supporting their art form and helping them thrive, but it also contains language about diversity of programming and ensuring adequate funding through a balanced mix of offerings and that historic use patterns may not necessarily reflect the updated mission as stated in the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan.

All resident company management personnel agreed that Portland’5 is vital to their organization’s success. Without Portland’5, these organizations would have to scramble—a popular word choice when questioned—to find a new home capable of housing and supporting
their art. Foote (2014) commented that "...there is a need in the community for that space" (personal interview). Another resident company manager (2014) succinctly stated that "...there's no other venue that could house what we do in Portland" (personal interview).

Access to these buildings—these publically-owned assets—is of immense value to these organizations.
CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to determine whether Portland’5 Centers for the Arts provides community value to the city of Portland and its surrounding region. In this study, ‘community value’ is comprised of three themes: public engagement value, economic value, and cultural value. By methodically researching this question through conducting a thorough review of public engagement value, economic value, and cultural value, as described by the Conceptual Framework, it is determined that Portland’5 has enormous value in all of these areas. This study conclusively demonstrated that Portland’5 has immense value to the community of Portland and its constituencies. By providing a high number of events per year, increasing free programming, and broadening the scope of art presented within the venue, Portland’5 guarantees a multi-generational and diverse audience and performer base. By increasing engagement and participation, Portland’5 also serves as an economic catalyst within the neighborhood and the city. Portland’5 acts as a partner to its user groups, specifically its local, non-profit resident companies, by providing subsidies and supporting educational programming.

A thorough literature review revealed that performing arts centers have positive impacts on communities in a variety of ways, although there is a very real difficulty in measuring and quantifying these impacts. The ability to derive a measurement technique and communicate the values is a critical element of a performing arts center’s survival. This study successfully measured a broad variety of values, as described above, so that Portland’5 is able to represent itself and demonstrate to its governing entities, the City of Portland, which owns the buildings, its user groups, its patrons, and the public at large why it is important and the valuable roles it plays in the community. The following section will highlight the specific and very important roles that Portland’5 plays in the community and will serve as a reminder of some key findings.
Playing the Roles: Investigating the Community Values of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts

from this project.

Public Engagement Value

- Portland’5 as Metro Visitor Venue
  - Portland’5 derives immense benefits from its inclusion in the Metro framework. The ability to practice economies of scale and the immense personnel and technical resources available to Portland’5 point to a mutually-beneficial relationship.

- Portland’5 as Venue
  - When compared to similar-sized performing arts centers across the country, Portland’5 has significantly more events per year than the group average.
  - Portland’5 attendance has remained relatively stable throughout the past decade.
    - 48% of Portland residents and 44% of Multnomah County residents are extrapolated as patrons during 2012-2013 season.

- Portland’5 as Engager
  - In the past decade, Portland’5 has increased community accessibility by drastically increasing its offering of free public events. Additionally, there has been a focus on presenting a much broader scope of art to engage more of the community.
  - Survey of Noontime Showcase/Summer Arts on Main/Music on Main Performer Groups:
100% had a positive experience and would return.

Performers cited Portland'5 as a valuable entry to the Portland arts community.

Performers praised the diverse audiences of engaged and responsive, multi-generational people.

- Portland'5 is being more proactive about creatively filling dates to generate revenue and provide access.
- Portland'5 is directly building and contributing vibrancy within the community.

Portland'5 as Arts Education Partner

- Portland'5 has partners with user groups to provide access (free facilities and labor, reduced rent, etc.) for education purposes.
- Over 100,000 children served each year.
- Arts Educators rated Portland'5 9.5 and above out of 10 with respect to Youth Arts Education.

- 100% agreed Portland'5 helps organization fulfill arts education mission.
- 100% agreed that after participating in the organization’s Portland’5-related education programs, children continued their arts engagement.

Portland’5 as Volunteer Opportunity

- Over 600 people contribute over 50,000 hours each year.
- Volunteers provide over $600,000 in saved personnel costs each year.
86% of Volunteers attended a social gathering in addition to their shifts.
100% have positive feelings about their involvement with Portland’5.

**Economic Value**

- **Portland’5 as Vibrant Arts Hub and Driver of Cultural Tourism**
  - Portland’5 is center of the Cultural District and is a key driver in increased visitor spending related to Cultural Tourism.

- **Portland’5 as Economic Catalyst**
  - Portland’5 is an important business downtown.
  - Portland’5 generated $64M in total spending, created 680 jobs, contributed to $24.5M in personal earnings, and generated $1.8M in tax revenues during FY2013.

- **Portland’5 as Neighbor**
  - Survey of Peripheral Businesses:
    - 100% agree that Portland’5 is an economic catalyst in the neighborhood.
    - 100% agree that Portland’5 positively impacts their business.
    - 100% agree that they notice a drop-off in business during dark days.
    - Most respondents chose the location of their business specifically due to the proximity to Portland’5.
    - All respondents rate Portland’5 as having an impact of 9 or above on categories relating to their business.
Cultural Value

- Portland'5 as Balancer
  - Portland’5 offers a variety of events presented by local non-profit groups and commercial promoters.
  - Resident Companies and other local non-profit groups receive reduced rent and get priority for calendar dates.

- Portland’5 as Supporter
  - Portland’5 provides heavy subsidies to its user groups.
    - Portland’5 provided over $3M in subsidies to its 5 resident companies in FY2013.
  - Portland’5 does not break even on the vast majority of its event contracts and provides value to the users above and beyond contractual rate.
    - Resident companies are subsidized an average of 64%
    - Tier 3 non-profit users are subsidized an average of 30%
    - Local non-profit users are subsidized an average of 42%

- Portland’5 as Partner
  - 100% of resident company management interviewed agreed that Portland’5 helps them fulfill their organization’s missions.
  - Many resident company personnel appreciate the benefits they receive as a resident company.
Recommendations and Future Implications

The relationship between a community and its performing arts center is incredibly important in ensuring the vitality of both the center and the community and that all avenues are being explored as regards to accessibility, engagement, and participation. Research in this area is useful for several parties: performing arts center personnel may for partnerships, branding, programming, development, and marketing; government officials may find it useful when deciding whether to fund these centers and to understand how these centers support their non-profit user groups and resident companies; resident companies and non-profit user groups can understand how their venue supports their mission and the complexities of the venue management business and perhaps learn how to better navigate this framework for their own organization’s benefit.

This research project, as a cohesive narrative of the numerous values of Portland’5 to the community, is a way to begin to communicate with all the different constituencies and public offices and tell the story of Portland’5. This case study will help facilitate conversations between Portland’5 and its user groups, its governing entities, its performers, its volunteers, its arts education groups, its patrons, and many others and can help strengthen the bond felt between the community of Portland and its venues. By opening the lines of communication, it is hoped that even more value can be generated through teamwork, collaboration, and genuine understanding of the different roles undertaken by each of the players. By beginning to document and quantify the value of Portland’5 to the community, one can begin to understand the importance of cultural institutions that serve as a foundation for a community. Communicating this value to local officials, regional governing entities, donors, local non-profit groups, and the general public is vital to ensuring the continued success of Portland’5. The researcher anticipates presenting this
study at future Performing Arts Managers Conferences and International Association of Venue Managers conferences and will welcome feedback for future uses of this methodology.
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Appendix A: Conceptual Framework Schematic
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Appendix B: Data Collection Schematic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Strategies of Inquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portland'5 Centers for the Arts</strong></td>
<td>Document Analysis, Lit Review, Interview P5 Management, Interview Metro/MERC Personnel, Interview Advisory Board, Internal Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Value</strong></td>
<td>Lit Review, Document Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical business license data over time</td>
<td>Historical business license data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local businesses</td>
<td>Survey of local businesses (restaurants, cafes, hotels, bars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Interview Travel Portland personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts district</td>
<td>Interview P5 Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Value</strong></td>
<td>Document Analysis, Lit Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Companies</td>
<td>Interview ResCo personnel, Expense/Subsidy Analysis, Attendance Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Internal data, Interview P5 Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Interview P5 Management Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Engagement Value</strong></td>
<td>Document Analysis, Lit Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users/Patrons</td>
<td>Ticket data-geographic map, Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>Internal data and surveys, document analysis, data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Interview P5 Management, document analysis, data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Music on Main/Noontime Showcase</td>
<td>Attendance, Survey participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Executed Site Consent Form

November 12, 2013

I have been informed of the research titled *What is the community value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts?*, by graduate student researcher Annie Salamunovich. I approve research to be conducted on site, during business hours, and which may include interviews and document analysis with employees. I further grant researcher access to public emails lists.

I have authority to grant such permission.

[Signature]

Robyn Williams
Executive Director, Portland’5 Centers for the Arts
robynwilliams@portland5.com
1111 SW Broadway, Portland, OR 97205
(503) 248-4335
Appendix D: Interview, Recruitment Letter

ANNIE SALAMUNOVICH

19182 NW Snoqualmie Street • Beaverton, OR • 97006 • (503) 935-9999 • asalamun@uoregon.edu

Date

Interviewee Name
Interviewee Address
City/State/Zip

Dear ,

You are invited to participate in a research project titled Investigating the Community Value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts, conducted by Annie Salamunovich from the University of Oregon’s Arts and Administration Program. The purpose of this study is to investigate the economic value, cultural value, and public engagement value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts to Portland, Oregon and the surrounding region.

While there have been reports and studies highlighting the economic and fiscal impact of performing arts centers, a significant gap exists in measuring and describing a more comprehensive value to their communities. To begin to address this need for a thorough investigation into defining and measuring the myriad of community values provided by performing arts centers to their communities, this study aims to describe and analyze the economic, cultural, and public engagement values of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts to Portland, Oregon.

You were selected to participate in this study because of your leadership position with and your experiences with and expertise pertinent to Portland’5 Centers for the Arts in Portland, Oregon. If you decide to take part in this research project, you will be asked to provide relevant organizational materials and participate in an in-person interview, lasting approximately one hour, during winter 2014. Interviews will take place at , or at a more conveniently located site. Interviews will be scheduled at your convenience. In addition to taking handwritten notes, I will use an audio recorder for transcription and validation purposes. You may also be asked to provide follow-up information through phone calls or email.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 503.935.9999 or asalamun@uoregon.edu, or Dr. Patricia Dewey at 541.346.2050 or pdewey@uoregon.edu. Any questions regarding your rights as a research participant should be directed to the Office for Research Compliance Services, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, 541.346.2510, researchcompliance@uoregon.edu.

Thank you in advance for your interest and consideration. I will contact you shortly to speak about your potential involvement in this study.

Sincerely,

Annie Salamunovich
MA Candidate, Performing Arts Management
University of Oregon
Appendix E: Interview, Consent Form

Investigating the Community Value of Portland'5 Centers for the Arts
Annie Salamunovich, MA Candidate, Principal Investigator
University of Oregon Arts and Administration Program

You are invited to participate in a research project titled Investigating the Community Value of Portland'5 Centers for the Arts, conducted by Annie Salamunovich from the University of Oregon's Arts and Administration Program. The purpose of this study is to investigate the economic value, cultural value, and public engagement value of Portland'5 Centers for the Arts to Portland, Oregon and the surrounding region.

While there have been reports and studies highlighting the economic and fiscal impact of performing arts centers, a significant gap exists in measuring and describing a more comprehensive value to their communities. To begin to address this need for a thorough investigation into defining and measuring the myriad of community values provided by performing arts centers to their communities, this study aims to describe and analyze the economic, cultural, and public engagement values of Portland'5 Centers for the Arts to Portland, Oregon.

You were selected to participate in this study because of your leadership position with _______________ and your experiences with and expertise pertinent to Portland'5 Centers for the Arts in Portland, Oregon. If you decide to take part in this research project, you will be asked to provide relevant organizational materials and participate in an in-person interview, lasting approximately one hour, during winter 2014. Interviews will take place at __________, or at a more conveniently located site. Interviews will be scheduled at your convenience. In addition to taking handwritten notes, I will use an audio tape recorder for transcription and validation purposes. You may also be asked to provide follow-up information through phone calls or email. There are minimal risks associated with participating in this study.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study will be carefully and securely maintained. Your consent to participate in this interview, as indicated below, demonstrates your willingness to have your name used in any resulting documents and publications and to relinquish confidentiality. Your participation is voluntary. There are minimal risks from participation, including a possible breach of confidentiality or loss of privacy. To mitigate and ensure confidentiality and privacy, all data will be stored on a password-protected personal computer or locked in a filing cabinet before being destroyed. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

I anticipate that the results of this research project will be of value to the cultural sector as a whole, especially in the Portland, Oregon region. However, I cannot guarantee that you personally will receive any benefits from this research.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 503.935.9999 or asalamun@uoregon.edu, or Dr. Patricia Dewey at 541.346.2050 or pdewey@uoregon.edu. Any questions regarding your rights as a research participant should be directed to the Office for Research Compliance Services, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, 541.346.2510, researchcompliance@uoregon.edu.

Please read and initial each of the following statements to indicate your consent:

____ I consent to the potential use of quotations from the interview.

____ I consent to the use of information I provide regarding the organization with which I am associated.

____ I wish to have the opportunity to review and possibly revise my comments and the information that
Appendix E: Interview, Consent Form

I provide prior to these data appearing in the final version of any publications that may result from this study.

Your signature indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty, that you have received a copy of this form, and that you are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies. You have been given a copy of this letter to keep.

Printed Name

Signature

Date

Email Address

Phone Number

Thank you for your interest and participation in this study.

Sincerely,

Annie Salamunovich
MA Candidate, Performing Arts Management
University of Oregon
asalamun@uoregon.edu
503.935.9999
Appendix F: Interview, Portland’5 Centers for the Arts Management Personnel

Interview: Portland’5 Centers for the Arts ("P5") Management Personnel
APA Reference: Last, F.. (Year, Month Day). Personal interview.

Interview Date: Interview Time: Interview Location:
Interviewee Name: ___ OK to Quote
Interviewee Title: ___ Member Check
Interviewee Organization: ___ Thank You Note Sent

- Recruitment Letter Sent
- Written Consent Obtained
- Audio Recording

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. Describe P5’s strategic plan, especially as it pertains to its surrounding community.

2. What is P5’s mission and how do the strategic plan and daily operations reflect this?

3. How does the mission of P5 manifest itself in the community?

4. In your opinion, does P5 provide community value? Please explain.

5. Do you view P5 as a catalyst for economic activity in Portland and the downtown district? If so, how?

6. How would you define the value of P5 to the resident companies and non-profit user organizations?

7. What benefits do you see P5 providing to the resident companies?

8. Do you think P5 provides similar or different benefits to its resident companies/non-profit user groups as its commercial users? Please describe.

9. Is there a strategic programming plan? If so, please describe.

10. How has the breadth and scope of art presented and offered at P5 evolved since you started, if at all?
Appendix F: Interview, Portland’5 Centers for the Arts Management Personnel

11. What free things (programs, events, series, services, activities, etc.) are offered by P5 to the public and how are these important to P5’s mission and to the community?

12. What does P5 do for educational purposes? Please consider programs for children, youth, adults, seniors, etc.

13. Can you describe P5’s advocacy role?

14. If P5 ceased to exist, what would be the effect on Portland?

15. Describe P5 in one word or phrase.

16. If P5 could improve one thing, what would it be?

17. What does P5 do really well?
Appendix G: Interview, Metro/MERC Personnel

Interview: Metro/MERC Personnel
APA Reference: Last, F.. (Year, Month Day). Personal interview.

Interview Date: ____________________________ Interview Time: ____________________________ Interview Location:

Interviewee Name: __________________________ Interviewee Title: __________________________ Interviewee Organization:

___ Recruitment Letter Sent ___ Written Consent Obtained ___ Audio Recording

___ OK to Quote ___ Member Check ___ Thank You Note Sent

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. How does Metro/MERC view P5?

2. In your opinion, does P5 provide community value? Please explain.

3. Do you view P5 as a catalyst for economic activity in Portland and the downtown district? How?

4. In your opinion, does P5’s management structure provide benefits to the region? If so, what?

5. In your opinion, why should the performing arts be supported by the government?

6. Please define the current strategic plan as relates to P5. How has this evolved in the past 10-15 years?

7. What do you believe is the ROI on the public investment as relates to P5?

8. If P5 ceased to exist, what would be the effect on Portland?

9. Describe P5 in one word or phrase.

10. If P5 could improve one thing, what would it be?

11. What does P5 do really well?
Appendix H: Interview, P5 Advisory Board Chair

Interview: Portland's Centers for the Arts ("P5") Advisory Board Chair
APA Reference: Last, F. (Year, Month Day). Personal interview.

Interview Date:          Interview Time:          Interview Location:
Interviewee Name:
Interviewee Title:
Interviewee Organization:

___ Recruitment Letter Sent          ___ OK to Quote
___ Written Consent Obtained          ___ Member Check
___ Audio Recording                  ___ Thank You Note Sent

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. How do you view the role of the P5 Advisory Board?

2. What is P5’s mission and how does the strategic plan reflect this?

3. In your opinion, does P5 provide community value? Please explain.

4. Do you view P5 as a catalyst for economic activity in Portland and the downtown district? How?

5. Does P5’s Management/Ownership structure provide benefits to the region? If so, what?

6. In your opinion, why should the performing arts be supported by the government?

7. How would you characterize P5’s relationship with Metro? Its user companies? The community?

8. If P5 ceased to exist, what would be the effect on Portland?

9. Describe P5 in one word or phrase.

10. If P5 could improve one thing, what would it be?

11. What does P5 do really well?
Appendix I: Interview, Resident Company Personnel

Interview: Resident Company Management Personnel
APA Reference: Last, F. (Year, Month Day). Personal interview.

Interview Date: Interviewee Name: Interview Time: Interview Location:
Interviewee Title: 
Interviewee Organization: 

____ Recruitment Letter Sent 
____ Written Consent Obtained 
____ Audio Recording 
____ OK to Quote 
____ Member Check 
____ Thank You Note Sent 

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. How important are the performing arts in Portland?

2. How does P5 help fulfill your mission?

3. How would you characterize your relationship with P5?

4. Do you notice a difference in events you present at P5 versus non-P5 venues? If so, what?

5. What are some of the benefits of being a resident company of P5?

6. In your opinion, does P5 provide community value? Please explain.

7. If P5 ceased to exist, what would be the effect on your organization? Portland?

8. Describe P5 in one word or phrase.

9. If P5 could improve one thing, what would it be?

10. What does P5 do really well?
Appendix J: Interview, Travel Portland Personnel

Interview: Travel Portland Personnel
APA Reference: Last, F. (Year, Month Day). Personal interview.

Interview Date: 
Interviewee Name: 
Interviewee Title: 
Interviewee Organization: 

☐ Recruitment Letter Sent 
☐ Written Consent Obtained 
☐ Audio Recording 

☐ OK to Quote 
☐ Member Check 
☐ Thank You Note Sent

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. Could you please briefly describe the scope of Cultural Tourism in Portland?

2. How do Portland’s performing arts relate to tourism?

3. Do you notice any particular patterns of participation with tourists and the performing arts? In other words, what do tourists want most often want to do in relation to the performing arts?

4. How would you describe your relationship with P5? How has this evolved, if at all?

5. Why do you think P5 is important as it relates to Cultural Tourism?

6. In your opinion, is P5 an important factor in Portland tourism?

7. In your opinion, does P5 improve Portland? How?

8. If P5 ceased to exist, what would be the effect on Portland?

9. Describe P5 in one word or phrase.

10. If P5 could improve one thing, what would it be?

11. What does P5 do really well?
Appendix K: Survey, Business Managers, Verbal Recruitment Script

Verbal Survey: Portland Business Managers (Hotels, Restaurants, Bars)

Business Name:
Type of Business:
Address:
Proximity to P5:
Participant Name/Title:
Participant Contact Information:
Date of Telephone Recruitment:

Telephone Recruitment Script
"Hello, my name is Annie Salamunovich and I am a graduate student from the University of Oregon. I'm calling to talk to you about participating in my research study. This is a study about the community value of Portland’s Centers for the Arts, formerly Portland Center for the Performing Arts (The Keller, The Schnitzer, and Antoinette Hatfield Hall). You're eligible for this study because you manage a business in the vicinity of these theatres and I am interested in your opinion about P5's economic value to your business. I have a short survey that will take about 5-15 minutes of your time. Would it be ok to stop by next week to ask you a few brief questions (mostly Y or N)? Do you have any questions for me at this time? If you have any questions for me about this process or if you need to contact me, you may reach me at 503.935.9999. Thank you very much."
Appendix L: Survey, Business Managers, Verbal Consent Script

Verbal Survey: Portland Business Managers (Hotels, Restaurants, Bars)

Business Name:
Type of Business:
Address:
Proximity to P5:
Participant Name/Title:
Participant Contact Information:

Verbal Consent
“Hi, my name is Annie Salamunovich and I am a graduate student from the University of Oregon. I’m doing a research study about the community value of Portland’s 5 Centers for the Arts, formerly Portland Center for the Performing Arts (The Keller, The Schnitzer, and Antoinette Hatfield Hall). Would it be ok with you if I ask you a few brief questions for my study and use the information we talk about? This will take between 5-15 minutes of your time. I’d like to get your perspectives on questions surrounding the economic value of P5 to the neighborhood and to your business. This is completely voluntary and you may say no if you do not want this information used in the study. If you agree and we start talking and you decide you no longer want to do this, we can stop at any time. There is no expected risk to you for helping me with this study. There are no expected benefits, either. Do I have your verbal consent to ask you my survey questions?”
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Verbal Survey: Portland Business Managers (Hotels, Restaurants, Bars)

Business Name:
Type of Business:
Address:
Proximity to P5:
Participant Name/Title:
Participant Contact Information:

1. How many years has this establishment been in business at this location? ___ Y ___ N
2. Are you aware of PCPA/P5. ___ Y ___ N
3. In your opinion, does PCPA/P5 drive a portion of your business? ___ Y ___ N
4. Do you notice a dropoff in business on nights when PCPA/P5 is dark? ___ Y ___ N
5. Did you choose the location of the business in part due to its proximity to PCPA/P5? ___ Y ___ N
6. In your opinion, does PCPA/P5 positively impact your business? ___ Y ___ N
7. Do you believe that PCPA/P5 is a catalyst for economic activity in this area? ___ Y ___ N
8. If PCPA/P5 ceased to exist, would this negatively impact your business? ___ Y ___ N
9. The next series will ask you to rate P5’s value to your organization—based on the specific criteria—on a scale of 1 (low) to 10 (high).
   a. Clientele/customers ___ __
   b. Profitability of clientele/customers ___ __
   c. Financial impact of clientele ___ __
   d. Volume of P5 activities driving positive business results ___ __
   e. Draws attention to the area ___ __
   f. Brings people to this area of town after business hours ___ __
   g. Encourages people to spend time and money in the neighborhood ___ __
10. If you had to estimate, what percentage of your business is related to PCPA/P5 events? ___ __
11. Please describe P5 in one word or phrase. ___ __
12. Have you personally ever attended an event at P5? ___ __
13. Comments?

If Participant provides any comments in the comments section:
“Would it be ok to confirm any quotes I may use in my final study with you?”

Signature ________________

Date ________________

Contact Information
Appendix N: Survey, Summer Camp/Education Personnel, Email Recruitment/Consent Form

Electronic Survey: Summer Camp/Education Management Personnel

Recruitment/Consent Email:
“Dear ___,

My name is Annie Salamunovich and I am a graduate student from the Arts & Administration program at the University of Oregon. I am writing to invite you to participate in my research study investigating the community value of Portland’s 5 Centers for the Arts/Portland Center for the Performing Arts. You are eligible to be in this study because of your leadership role with _______. I obtained your contact information from the Portland’s 5 Centers for the Arts personnel.

I am interested in getting your opinion about Portland’s 5 Centers for the Arts and have drafted a brief survey below. If you decide to participate in this study, your response would be very helpful. By responding, you are agreeing to the use of your identification as a participant and the potential use of quotations in the study.

Remember, this is completely voluntary and you can choose to participate or not. If you have any questions about the study, please email or contact me at 503.935.9999.

Thank you very much,

Annie Salamunovich”
Appendix O: Survey, Summer Camp/Education Personnel

Electronic Survey: Summer Camp/Education Management Personnel

Organization Name:
Participant Name:
Participant Title:

1. What is the mission of your organization?

2. Does PCPA/P5 help your organization fulfill its mission? If so, how?

3. Please describe the PCPA/P5-related activities of your organization.

4. What are some of the benefits of working with PCPA/P5?

5. Does your organization present events at non-PCPA/P5 venues? If so, do you notice a difference in events you present at P5 versus non-P5 venues?

6. If P5 ceased to exist, what would be the effect on your organization? Portland?

7. On average, how many children are served through your organization’s PCPA/P5-related activities?

8. How does PCPA/P5 impact your organization?

9. In your opinion, does P5 provide community value? Please explain and assign a numerical value from 1 (low) to 10 (high)

10. On a scale of 1 (low) to 10 (high), please rate PCPA/P5’s value to your organization for the following categories:
   a. Administration
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b. Education

c. Participation

d. Constituency

c. Quality of experience

f. Image

g. Positive feedback

h. Attendance

i. Quality of output

j. Other (please explain)

11. After participating in your PCPA/P5 programs, do you notice many children continuing their arts engagement through lessons, continued program participation, other activities, etc? Please describe.

12. Please describe P5 is one word or phrase.

13. Comments.
Recruitment/Consent Email:

“Dear _____,

My name is Annie Salamunovich and I am a graduate student from the Arts & Administration program at the University of Oregon. I am writing to invite you to participate in my research study investigating the community value of Portland’5 Centers for the Arts/Portland Center for the Performing Arts. You are eligible to be in this study because of your group, _______’s, participation in P5’s Summer Music on Main or Noontime Showcase series. I obtained your contact information from the Portland’5 Centers for the Arts personnel.

I am interested in getting your opinion about Portland’5 Centers for the Arts and have drafted a brief survey below. If you decide to participate in this study, your response would be very helpful. By responding, you are agreeing to the use of your identification as a participant and the potential use of quotations in the study.

Remember, this is completely voluntary and you can choose to participate or not. If you have any questions about the study, please email or contact me at 503.935.9999.

Thank you very much,

Annie Salamunovich”
Appendix Q: Survey, Performer Group Personnel

Electronic Survey: Performer Group Personnel

Group Name:
Participant Name:
Participant Title:

1. How many times has your group participated in Music on Main and/or Noontime Showcase?

2. What was the first year of your participation?

3. What is the reason for participating?

4. How would you describe the audience for your most recent show at this event? How was this audience similar or different from your group’s usual audiences?

5. Would your group participate again?

6. In your opinion, does PCPA/P5 provide community value? Please explain.

7. Please describe PCPA/P5 in one word or phrase

8. If PCPA/P5 could improve one thing, what would it be?

9. What does PCPA/P5 do really well?
Appendix R: Document Analysis Data Collection

Document Analysis Data Collection Sheet

APA Reference:

Key Descriptor:

Date:  

Document Location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type (Circle)</th>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book/Article/Report</td>
<td>Govt Doc/ Policy</td>
<td>Cultural Statistics</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Information</td>
<td>Internal Data</td>
<td>Expense Analysis</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Ticketing Data</td>
<td>Bus. License Data</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix S: Participant Observation Data Collection

Participant Observation Data Collection Sheet
APA Reference:

Key Descriptor:

Date: Activity Location:

Activity (Circle) Consulting Arts Management Student Research Project

CODING OBSERVATION NOTES
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