

## University of Rhode Island DigitalCommons@URI

---

Museum Services Act (1984)

Education: National Endowment for the Arts and  
Humanities, Subject Files II (1962-1996)

---

1983

# Museum Services Act (1984): Correspondence 09

Edward M. Kennedy

Claiborne Pell

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell\\_neh\\_II\\_45](http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_45)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kennedy, Edward M. and Pell, Claiborne, "Museum Services Act (1984): Correspondence 09" (1983). *Museum Services Act (1984)*. Paper 12.  
[http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell\\_neh\\_II\\_45/12](http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_45/12)[http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell\\_neh\\_II\\_45/12](http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_45/12)

This Correspondence is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files II (1962-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Museum Services Act (1984) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu).

## United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

February 17, 1983

Ms. Lilla Tower  
Director  
Institute of Museum Services  
330 C street, SW  
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Ms. Tower:

Senator Pell and I would like to express our deep concern regarding the proposed revision of the Institute of Museum Services regulations as published in the Federal Register, December 21, 1982. These proposed changes would have a substantial impact on the museum community and therefore merit careful consideration.

Eligibility for IMS awards would be significantly altered in a number of ways. Assistance from the Institute would be limited to 3 years in any successive 5 year period. This inconsistency in funding would result in a decline in the quality and services of museum programs and would establish an arbitrary selection process that would preclude consideration of applicants on the basis of merit. This represents a significant change in rationale for the IMS program.


The restricting of Challenge grantees from applying for IMS funds in the same year overlooks the acknowledged differences among these funding sources. Each source is a distinct and important resource for museums. Should this restriction be adopted, many museums which have already been awarded Challenge grants would lose general operating support monies in fiscal 1983. Museums would also be ineligible to apply for both general operating support and special project monies in a single year under the new qualifications.

The omission in the proposed IMS regulations of a stated minimum award for museums that report budgets under \$50,000 is of great concern, as the majority of the museum community falls under this budget category. Also, the Board would receive the authority to determine that funds awarded from IMS be matched with non-federal dollars contributed to the museum for its immediately preceding year. Given the current economic state, museums, despite aggressive fundraising, would be forced to substantially reduce or eliminate programs rather than seek other economic sources.

Finally, we urge the reinstatement of the IMS Emergency Grants program to ensure timely emergency assistance for institutions that experience catastrophic circumstances.

It is our hope that the final regulations will reflect a return to former qualifications guidelines and the original intent of encouragement and assistance to the museum community.

Sincerely,

  
Edward M. Kennedy

  
Claiborne Pell