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ARTICLES

The Institute of Museum Services and the Conservation of America’s Heritage

Theodore Sky*

I. Introduction

As museums in the United States have become increasingly significant to and visited by the American public, issues involving their financing and administration have gained national prominence. In its bicentennial year, the United States Congress established a federal agency to provide financial assistance to its museums. This is the Institute of Museum Services (IMS), an agency within the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities. Perhaps not as well known to the average American as its larger partners in the National Foundation, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Humanities, IMS has become a household word to the museum community that it has now served for over a decade.

Museums are recognized as vitally affecting the economic well-being of their immediate communities. The primacy of museums in preserving, as well as exhibiting and interpreting, the cultural, historic, and scientific heritage of the United States is now also well understood. Indeed, among the many complex and critical issues that
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confront contemporary American museums, that of conservation ranks high. Conservation of cultural property so that it may be observed and appreciated by future generations is a key function of the American museum. This function, however, has not always been fully served. In 1976, the very year in which IMS was established, a report of the National Conservation Advisory Council observed:

A large percentage of the art objects, historical records, books, monuments, buildings, and other cultural property making up our national patrimony receive little or no care for their preservation or they are treated in ways which actually increase the rate of deterioration. This condition exists partly because of the large number of holdings relative to limited curatorial staff, partly because of a lack of awareness of the seriousness of the problem, and partly because of the lack of adequately trained conservators. In no small measure, the situation is worsened by the low commitment of financial resources devoted to the amelioration of conservation problems.¹

In view of these and other factors, the Institute of Museum Services has played an increasingly active role in assisting museums to expand their conservation activities. The purpose of this paper is to examine this role, to determine how it evolved, and to assess the significance of this role in the enhanced conservation of America's cultural property. In addition, the role of Pennsylvania museums and museum professionals in this process will be particularly emphasized.

II. IMS and Its Structure

While most museums are generally familiar with IMS, not all readers may know of its origins, framework, and how it fits into the overall fabric of federal assistance to cultural institutions in the United States.² IMS was established in 1976 by a federal law, the

¹ NATIONAL CONSERVATION ADVISORY COUNCIL, CONSERVATION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY IN THE UNITED STATES vii (1976).
² For background on the state of American museums, see AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MUSEUMS, MUSEUMS FOR A NEW CENTURY, A REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON MUSEUMS FOR A NEW CENTURY (1984) [hereinafter MUSEUMS FOR A NEW CENTURY]; AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MUSEUMS, AMERICA'S MUSEUMS: THE BELMONT REPORT (1969); E.P. ALEXANDER, MUSEUMS IN MOTION (1979). For a general discussion of federal and other public aid to the arts, see L. BIDDLE, OUR GOVERNMENT AND THE ARTS (1988); D. NETZER, THE SUBSIDIZED MUSE, PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR THE ARTS IN THE UNITED STATES (1978). As of 1979, the museum universe in the United States was thought to consist of almost 5,000 institutions including the following: art, history, and science museums; historic houses; science-technology centers; aquariums; botanical gardens; arboretums; nature centers; zoos; children's museums; park museums; and visitor centers. See MUSEUMS FOR A NEW CENTURY, supra at 17, 28, 118. A collection of thoughtful and provocative essays on museum topics including museum law may be found in S. WEIL, BEAUTY AND THE BEASTS: ON MUSEUMS, ART, THE LAW, AND THE MAR-
Museum Services Act, which is title II of the Arts, Humanities, and Cultural Affairs Act of the year. Under this federal legislation, IMS consists of a policy-making body, the National Museum Services Board (NMSB), and a director. The fifteen members of the board are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. One member is named by the President to be chairman. The Director of the Institute is also appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The Board’s role is essentially to establish policy for the administration of the Institute’s programs. The director provides the Board with information, implements its policies, and carries out the grant-making and other executive functions of the Institute.

The basic function of IMS is to provide federal financial assistance to museums through the award of grants for a variety of specified activities. Financial assistance to professional museum organizations is also authorized. Currently, IMS provides four types of assistance: (1) general operating support to museums; (2) conservation project support to museums; (3) assistance to museums for museum assessment (MAP); and (4) financial assistance to professional

3. Pub. L. No. 94-462, 90 Stat. 1975-78, 20 U.S.C. §§ 961-68 (1982 & Supp. V 1987). For additional perspectives on IMS and its history, see Loar and Sky, General Operating Support for Museums: Problems in Paradise, 7 J. of College and University Law 267 (1981); Institute of Museum Services, The Collaborative Spirit: Partners in America, Tenth Anniversary, 1977-87 (1987) [hereinafter IMS Tenth Anniversary Report]; Museums for a New Century, supra note 2, at 113-17. Livingston Biddle vividly chronicles the genesis of the Museum Services Act and the roles played by Senator Pell of Rhode Island and Representatives Brademas of Indiana and Quie of Minnesota in the enactment of the Museum Services Act. BIDDLE, supra note 2, at chapters 43 and 45. While originally opposed by those concerned with program proliferation, the legislation had the warm support of the museum community and was favored by Senator Pell and Representative Brademas. As Biddle recounts it, Representative Quie’s support was assured when it was determined to place the agency in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare rather than make it an independent agency. Id. at 325-28. Mr. Biddle’s key role in the formulation of the earlier National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as well as his close ties to Pennsylvania, are also described in Our Government and the Arts.

4. The current NMSB includes one member from Pennsylvania, James H. Duff, Director of the Brandywine Museum and Executive Director of the Brandywine Conservancy. The current chairman of the NMSB is Willard L. Boyd, President of the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago. Prior chairmen include Peter H. Raven, Director of the Missouri Botanical Garden in St. Louis; C. Douglas Dillon, who served the United States as Secretary of the Treasury and the cultural world as President of the Metropolitan Museum of New York; and George Seybolt, formerly President of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, who presided over the NMSB during the formative years of the Institute. Other members of the NMSB are broadly representative of the museum community and of the regional diversity of the United States.

5. As of this writing, the Director of IMS is Lois Burke Shepard. Former directors include Lee Kimche, Lilla Tower, and Susan Phillips. The many contributions of these directors to the development and strengthening of the Institute in preserving the cultural heritage of the United States is set forth in the IMS Tenth Anniversary Report. See supra note 3, at 5-7.
museum organizations to help strengthen museum services.

Originally placed in the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, IMS was transferred to the United States Education Department when that department was formed in 1980. In 1982, IMS was again transferred, this time to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, where it is a sister agency to the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. As such it is housed along with the other agencies in the Foundation in the Old Post Office Building, an historic edifice in its own right, overlooking Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D.C.

III. General Operating Support and Conservation

The principal form of financial assistance provided to museums by IMS is general operating support (GOS). General operating support is distinguishable from the project support that is the common form of direct federal financial assistance. The applicant for a project grant typically seeks funds to carry out a new and discrete project that it would not have carried out in the absence of such assistance under its normal operations. It must frequently find new private funds to match the federal project funds, and its application is judged on the quality of the project and of the institution proposing it, and not solely on the quality of the applicant's overall operation.

Under a GOS grant, the grantee museum may use grant funds to maintain or improve its on-going institutional operations without regard to the confines of a particular project and a particular product (or report) growing out of that project. Grants are awarded on the basis of a peer review assessment of the museum's overall operation in accordance with published criteria that focus on the institution as a whole rather than on any discrete project for which the funds will be used. GOS is a type of assistance that is difficult for a museum to obtain from any source. The availability of IMS as a source of GOS was a welcome innovation for museums in the 1980s.

Those who derive pleasure and amusement from searching ancient citations in the Congressional Record or congressional committee reports will find ample evidence to support the proposition that the authors of the Museum Services Act wanted IMS to concentrate

on the provision of GOS. Recognizing this direction, in its formative years IMS promulgated regulations allocating a majority of its funds to GOS and establishing general rules to administer this novel form of assistance, replete as it was with unfamiliar legal and administrative problems. Since fiscal year 1978, its first year of actual operation, IMS has granted more than $134 million in GOS to American museums. Pennsylvania museums have been well represented among the beneficiaries.

The assistance provided by the GOS program is more significant for small and medium sized museums than for large museums. This is because IMS, in its first grant cycle, placed a cap or limitation on the amount that a museum might expect to receive through a GOS grant. The cap is presently fixed at $75,000. This guideline, together with the limitation that a museum may not expect to receive a grant in excess of ten percent of its operating budget or $5,000, whichever is greater, is set forth in the agency's program regulations. The combined effect of these limitations is to enhance the significance of GOS assistance for the relatively smaller institutions. For example, a museum with an operating budget of $750,000 which receives a GOS grant in the maximum amount obtains a grant equal to ten percent of its budget, a substantial addition to its operating support. A larger institution with an operating budget of $7,500,000 may not receive a GOS grant in excess of one percent of its budget. This is not to say that GOS support is meaningless for the larger museums. In addition to the intrinsic value of the grant, the IMS award serves as a mark of distinction that may be of con-

9. GOS funds have been used for a variety of purposes which the recipient museums could not have undertaken without the additional financial support. For example, the Trout Gallery of Dickinson College in Carlisle has used its GOS for outreach programs designed to reach elementary and secondary school students in the Carlisle area. Conversation with Dr. David A. Robertson, Director, Trout Gallery (April 7, 1989).

At the time of this writing, the most recently completed grant cycle is that for the fiscal year 1988. As reported by IMS, 42 GOS awards were made to Pennsylvania museums out of the 415 grants made throughout the nation in that fiscal year. Among these grantees are four arboretums or botanical gardens; seven art museums; eight historic houses; eight history museums; six specialized museums; four general museums; two science and technology museums; one natural history museum; one children's museum; and one zoo, a testament to the range and richness of the Pennsylvania museum community. The grant amounts ranged from $75,000, the regulatory cap described above, to $5,000. Institute of Museum Services, Press Release, May 18, 1988. For a list of the Pennsylvania recipients and grant amounts see Appendix.
siderable assistance to the institution when it seeks private support. Certainly, the regulatory limitations discussed above have not dissuaded larger museums from applying for support.

The size of IMS appropriations has partially colored public perception of the agency as a significant factor in the support of the cultural institutions it serves. This in turn has driven IMS to set the limitations described above. In resolving the funding issues that faced it by ensuring that it could meet the needs of small and medium-sized museums through GOS, IMS, in this observer's view, adopted the proper course for a federal agency responsible for museum assistance throughout the nation and for improving the museum services of many institutions.

IMS did limit the amount that a museum might receive under a GOS grant and thus its relative value to large museums in terms of percentage of budget covered. It did not limit, however, the purposes to which the grant could be put and thus left museum grantees, both large and small, with the option of using their GOS funds for conservation support. Theoretically, GOS was a potentially valuable tool to meet vital museum conservation needs. IMS regulations left considerable discretion to the grantee museum as to how to use GOS funds. IMS peer reviewers might scrutinize the museum's application of the funds in terms of quality of collection, quality of museum services, management capacity, or community support. The review process, however, made no effort to direct museums as to how the GOS money, once awarded, should be spent. Thus a GOS grantee was free to use these funds for a variety of purposes including guards, improved displays, museum education programs, or heating bills. A grantee museum could also use its GOS funds to obtain conservation services through the retention of a conservator or the purchase of services from a private conservator.

IMS regulations, however, did not require a museum to use its GOS funds for conservation. The IMS Board and staff fully recognized the importance of conservation, but no mandate through regulation or otherwise was given to museums to require or encourage any particular use of GOS funds. Use was to be field driven. A museum could, but need not, use its GOS money for the type of activities encouraged by the 1976 National Conservation Advisory Council. How many museums took this route or how much GOS money was targeted by the field on conservation activities during the first five years of IMS history is not clear and has not been documented. As became evident, however, the number of museums reporting the
IV. The Congressional Conservation Initiative

In 1983 Congress provided appropriations authority for IMS to commence a new program, independent of GOS, that would direct IMS resources to the conservation of cultural property in the United States. This grant of authority occurred perhaps because GOS was not regarded as a sufficient spur to museum conservation or because museum professionals believed that greater emphasis must be given to conservation by the federal agency charged with providing assistance to museums. Congressional direction to IMS generally occurs by means of changes to its enabling statute, the Museum Services Act. The Act establishes the structure of the agency, provides its authority, and authorizes Congress to make annual appropriations for its programs. There was little question that this Act specifically authorized IMS activities in aid of conservation. Indeed, a central purpose of the Museum Service Act was to assist museums "so that they may be better able to conserve our cultural, historic, and scientific heritage." IMS, however, lacked appropriations authority to operate a conservation program separate from GOS. In its report on the IMS appropriation for fiscal year 1984, the House Appropriations Committee on the Interior Department and Related Agencies, under the chairmanship of Representative Sidney Yates of Illinois, included language which filled this hiatus. The report stated as follows:

The amount recommended by the Committee includes a new initiative for conservation grants in the amount of $3,000,000. This will provide a maximum of $25,000 to be matched equally, in addition to any general operating support grant an institution may receive. This will provide support to at least 120 institutions to provide for conservation of art objects either by hiring new staff or through contracting. The Committee expects the Board to develop program guidelines which may include the use of a special panel for this grant program. 

12. H.R. Rep. No. 253, 98th Cong. 1st Sess., 113 (1983). While the report language addressed a need for the conservation of art objects, IMS plainly understood the language to be fairly directed at the conservation of objects held by all the types of museums within its statutory mandate as set forth in the definition of the term "museum" in section 208 of the Museum Services Act, 20 U.S.C. § 968 (1982). See 45 C.F.R. § 1180.20 (1988). The number of objects in question is formidable. It has been observed that the Nation's museums house more than a billion objects. See MUSEUMS FOR A NEW CENTURY, supra note 2, at 36. For
By this language from the legislative history, Congress included a direction that a portion of the IMS appropriation for that fiscal year be targeted on conservation, particularly conservation of art objects. The House Appropriations Committee was evidently moved by a justifiable concern that insufficient efforts were being made to conserve America's cultural heritage and that future generations of Americans might lose valuable objects that were part of the national patrimony.

While the House Committee report did not discuss the factors that had led it to the conclusion that a separate appropriation for conservation support was needed, it is significant that the committee action came at a time of considerable focus within the museum community regarding its conservation needs. The comprehensive study by the AAM, "Museums for a New Century," appeared in 1984. It contained an extensive discussion of conservation, and its recommendations clearly pointed in the direction of an enhanced conservation effort by the museum community. Moreover, with the support of the National Endowment for the Humanities, the American Association of Museums published in 1984 an influential study on strategies for conservation, maintenance, and documentation of collections, entitled, "Caring for Collections." At the same time, IMS had initiated a study of the status of collections management designed to gather factual information on conservation practices within the community. This study resulted in the report on "Collections Management, Maintenance and Conservation," discussed below. This period of considerable recognition by the organized museum community of the need for intensive conservation efforts coincided with the House committee's determination to provide a specific appropriation to cover these needs. The discussions, colloquia and other activities that preceded the publication of the reports no doubt influenced the House committee in its determination to provide a specific appropriation for conservation even though the House committee report appeared in 1983 before the studies noted above were actually published.

While the 1983 House Committee report contained no extensive discussion, it seems clear that Congress believed that even a small federal program whose dollar amount did not begin to meet the over-

several different contemporary perspectives on conservation, see Watkins, Conservation: A Cultural Challenge, 68 MUSEUM NEWS 36 (1989); Walters, Tracking Advances, id. at 44; Garfield, Filling the Gaps, id. at 50. For a discussion of the possible legal implications of a museum's failure to care for its collections, see Ullberg and Lind, Consider the Potential Liability of Failing to Conserve Collections, id. at 32.
all need, might operate as a stimulus to action on the part of the museum community. In its report regarding the fiscal year 1985 IMS appropriation, the same committee reinstated the conservation grant program for that year by providing for $25,000 matching grants that would “allow . . . institutions to provide for conservation programs either by hiring new staff or through contracting.”

The need for such a conservation program was contemporaneously documented in a study conducted by a prominent professional museum organization. In July of 1985 the American Association of Museums, in collaboration with the American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works and the National Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Property, which served as subcontractor, concluded a comprehensive study of collections management, maintenance, and conservation among museums pursuant to a contract with IMS. The study involved surveys of a significant number of U.S. museums. Although it concluded that conservation ranked first among museum priorities, it also made the following conclusions: that fifty-six percent of conservation laboratories serving non-living collections had budgets of less than five percent of the parent institution’s operating budget; that thirty percent of the museums participating in the study reported that they had surveyed none of their collections for conservation purposes and that another thirty-six percent had surveyed only a half or less; that thirty-three percent of the participating museums reported a need for conservation treatment; that five percent reported a serious need; that forty percent reported an “unknown” need; and that only twenty-eight percent of the participating museums had long range plans for conservation.

The need to stimulate museum conservation activities beyond that provided by the IMS general operating support program seemed manifest. Launched through “report language” in 1984, the IMS program has been extended, not surprisingly, through fiscal year 1989.

15. Id. at 5-7.
V. Implementation of the New Program: The First IMS Conservation Regulation

After receiving Congressional direction to initiate a conservation program in fiscal year 1984, IMS proceeded to implement that direction through administrative regulations, guidelines, and instructions. Throughout its history, IMS had resorted to the establishment of implementing regulations, published first in the *Federal Register* and later codified in the *Code of Federal Regulations*. While tedious to formulate and sometimes regarded as inevitably intimidating, regulations at least gave the museum community an authoritative sense of the policy decisions made by IMS, through the NMSB, in carrying out its congressional mandate. Matters such as eligibility for assistance, key application requirements, funding criteria to guide application reviewers, and post-award grant conditions were the stuff of which these regulations, binding grantor and grantee alike, were made. The regulations in turn were amplified by more detailed, informal guidelines and instruction packets. These packets were painstakingly fashioned by the dedicated IMS staff, in consultation with conservation professionals in the field, and contained further directions, illustrations, and suggestions consistent with the underlying regulations.

First published as proposed rules for public comment in the *Federal Register*, the regulations gave the NMSB and the IMS Director a chance to learn what the field thought about the issues involved. In response to the public comment, the final regulations indicated changes in or justifications for the policy stance taken by IMS. This process, of course, assumed that museums followed the *Register* directly or through professional organizations and were thus in a position to respond when their interests were at stake.\(^{17}\)

Within the framework of the rulemaking process, IMS proceeded to establish an initial set of regulations for the new conservation program. Given the limited time frame for award of grants in fiscal year 1984, IMS issued regulations applicable only to that fiscal year. Permanent regulations were established in 1985 through the initial publication of a proposed rule followed by a final rule in July. The latter had the informal blessing of the House Committee. The committee urged the agency to observe its 1984 guidelines in making

---

The final regulations established the framework that was to guide the program for the next several years through the addition of section 1180.20 to the agency's grant regulations. In section 1180.20, conservation was expansively defined to include a variety of functions. A broad set of illustrative activities for which project applications could be submitted was also supplied.

Tight limits were set on the benefits that could be expected. The regulations reflected the congressional direction that the federal grant not exceed $25,000 and be matched with nonfederal funds. The regulations also plainly affirmed that a conservation grant could be in addition to a GOS grant thus relieving the grantee of the need to choose between the two types of support. Evaluation criteria were included, focusing on the following types of programmatic questions: the importance of the object or objects to be conserved; the significance of the object or objects to the museum's collection and/or audience; the need for the project, including the relationship of the project to the conservation needs and priorities of the applicant museum as reflected in a survey of conservation needs or similar needs assessment.

In sum, through the thoughtful deliberations of its policy-making board and in the light of advice and information from its director

---

19. 45 C.F.R. § 1180.20 (1986). These regulations were in significant measure the product of a committee of the NMSB established to formulate guidance for the new conservation program. The NMSB Committee was under the chairmanship of Craig Black, currently the Director of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.
20. Id. at § 1180.20(c). These functions include the following:
   (1) Technical examination of materials and surveys of environmental and collection conditions;
   (2) Provision, insofar as practicable, of optimum environmental conditions for housing, exhibition, monitoring, reformatting, nurturing and transportation of objects;
   (3) Physical treatment of objects, specimens and organisms, for the purpose of stabilizing, conserving and preserving their condition, removal of inauthentic additions or accretions, and physical compensation for losses; species survival activities; and
   (4) Research and training in conservation.
21. Id. at § 1180.20(e). These activities include the following:
   (1) Projects to conduct or obtain training in conservation;
   (2) Projects to conduct research in conservation;
   (3) Projects to develop improved or less costly methods of conservation or both;
   (4) Projects related to museum conservation needs not regularly addressed by other Federal funding agencies;
   (5) Projects to meet the conservation needs of museums which are unable to maintain their own individual conservation facilities, such as the use of regional conservation centers or mobile conservation facilities;
   (6) Projects to conserve particular objects in a museum's collection.
and staff, IMS commenced a conservation project support program involving the following major thrusts:

(1) Reflecting its role as a source of assistance to all categories of museums, IMS formulated a program that addressed the conservation needs of all museums (including zoos, botanical gardens, and arboretums) and that embraced living as well as nonliving collections.

(2) IMS took a broad view of the functions of conservation reflecting the 1976 report of the National Conservation Advisory Council.

(3) IMS did not attempt to limit the types of projects for which funds would be available, leaving this largely to the field.

(4) IMS made clear, in keeping with explicit direction of Congress, that a museum could receive both GOS and conservation support.

(5) IMS recognized the importance of training in conservation in order to meet the critical conservation needs of the nation.

(6) IMS included surveys of collection conditions among the types of activities that could be funded.

The first IMS conservation program regulation, therefore, made no effort to target or focus the program on a set of conservation-related activities that the agency thought most effective. Instead, the program was presented to the agency’s museum constituency in as broad a fashion as possible, expressing no priorities or preferences for categories of conservation projects such as collection surveys or treatment projects. The museum community thus had the responsibility to formulate applications that met the needs of individual museums as they perceived them. In this broad context, the regulation left the task of reviewing the applications and recommending funding for particular projects to the peer reviewers who were also drawn from the field. This nontargeted, nonfocused approach preserves maximum flexibility for all, and is presumably favored by many museums that desire to participate in the program. It leaves the agency, however, open to the charge that it is merely sniffing perfume without any coherent sense of what it is seeking to accomplish. It also exposes the agency and ultimately the taxpayers to the possibility that extremely limited federal resources are not being used in the most economic, efficient, and effective manner practicable. For these reasons, IMS turned to another approach after several grant cycles of experience with the conservation support program.
VI. Perestroika in the IMS Conservation Program — 1986 Amendments to the Regulations

Following its experience with the conservation project support program in fiscal years 1984, 1985, and 1986, IMS concluded that its conservation program needed substantial restructuring in order to meet the intent of Congress and ensure the effective use of appropriated funds. Strong leadership for this reform came from the Director of the Institute, Lois Burke Shepard, who initiated and coordinated the consultative sessions and later the regulations drafting process that resulted in the implementation of these changes. Valuable contributions were made by the NMSB in collegial session and in subcommittee meetings, and by persons knowledgeable in the field of conservation who were consulted by IMS.

At least several factors, growing out of the experience of IMS with the early years of the program, prompted the agency to initiate a restructuring of the program. The agency observed that a number of museums were seeking assistance for treatment of projects without setting priorities among their conservation needs. It appeared that some museums were basing their treatment needs on exhibition plans. Objects slated for exhibition were proposed for treatment under the IMS program without regard to priorities on the basis of an overall survey of the collections. Furthermore, IMS noted that a number of treatment proposals tended to precede efforts to improve the environmental conditions in which the object was housed. A serious question could be raised if limited federal funds were applied to the treatment of objects whose conditions then degenerated due to unsatisfactory environmental conditions. Such activities as the setting of priorities and the establishment of optimum environmental conditions should precede rather than follow treatment projects. Indeed, the need for a reasonable process of priority setting both at the museum level and at the federal agency level was recognized as essential to improving the effectiveness of the conservation support program.

One particular issue that concerned the Institute was the extent to which it should provide financial assistance for the treatment of specific objects in a collection before the grantee museum had conducted an overall survey of that collection to determine conservation needs and had systematically established conservation priorities as among those needs. IMS felt that its limited funds would serve a greater public purpose if museums could be encouraged to first survey their collections before seeking assistance for specific treatment
projects. Similarly, the Institute questioned whether it should target its funds on particular types of conservation projects, especially collection surveys, rather than attempting to powder its funds over the entire range of conservation needs, as determined by the field each year. IMS recognized the danger that its program might become no more than a finger-in-the-dike effort treating a few objects here and there, without regard to a consideration and assessment of the overall conservation needs of the museum community, and thus of the Nation as a whole.

Consequently, in August of 1986, IMS issued proposed amendments to its conservation program regulations that had been issued in July of 1985. The 1986 amendments proposed three major changes:

(1) The NMSB would be authorized to set annual priorities among the types of conservation projects that could be funded. As explained in the Federal Register notice of proposed rulemaking:

Experience with the administration of the conservation program indicates the need for greater focus with regard to certain types of projects in order to use Federal funds most efficiently and effectively. In particular, the Board finds that it may be appropriate in a fiscal year to target all or part of the funds available for conservation on one or more types of projects (such as projects involving training, surveys, or establishment or maintenance of optimum environmental conditions) rather than to distribute funds on the basis of applications covering the broadest range of projects.

If such a priority were set, under the proposed regulations, applications from museums proposing a priority project must be evaluated and ranked before applications proposing other types of projects.

(2) Authority was provided to the Director to make grants in excess of $25,000 in exceptional circumstances. This change provided greater flexibility to assist projects, such as conservation training for conservators, that might serve many museums.

(3) The Director of the Institute was authorized to require that an applicant museum proposing a project to treat particular objects must show that, prior to the submission of the application, it had carried out a survey of its conservation needs and priorities — in the

23. Id. at 29,501. Different priorities were set for the following categories: nonliving collections, systematics/natural history museums, living collections/animals and living collections/plants. These priorities have varied as between categories and different fiscal years. See note 27 infra.
specific area of focus — and that the project in question was consistent with that survey.

Response to the 1986 proposed rule was generally favorable although some museums worried that the new priorities might affect them adversely. Some museums were concerned, however, that the survey requirement was too formidable. In order to obtain funds to treat several objects, a museum might have to perform an in-depth, object-by-object survey of its entire collection or at least the part of it that was related to the objects in question. Other commentators thought the IMS proposal was too narrowly focused to effectuate its positive goals.

Addressing these concerns in the final regulations, IMS modified the proposed rule. A museum applying for a treatment project could be required to conduct a general survey of its collections to ascertain conservation needs as a condition to obtaining treatment assistance, rather than an in-depth survey confined to the specific area of focus. A comment from a professional organization proposed this viable resolution and was cited by IMS in its preamble to the final regulations. It suggested that in the context of the rulemaking process, a useful dialogue between agency and field could be established and could lead to resolution of policy conflicts in a way that facilitated program administration.

In its 1987 annual report, following the first fiscal year in which

24. Commenters representing various Pennsylvania museums participated in this process.
25. 45 C.F.R. § 1180.20(g)(3) (1988). This key final rule states as follows:
   The Director may, to the extent appropriate, require (by instructions in the application materials) that an applicant which proposes a project to conserve particular objects must show that, prior to the submission of the application, it has carried out a general survey of its conservation needs and priorities and that the project in question is consistent with such survey.
26. The commenting conservation organization’s observation was quoted in part in the preamble to the final rule as follows:
   Our concern is that the limitation imposed on [IMS] by this terminology would mean that a museum without a viable survey of its entire collection could only be required to survey that single part or parts of its collection included in the grant request. While any kind of survey of an undocumented collection would be of some value, the purpose of a survey should be to establish priorities among the overall conservation needs of an institution’s entire collection. In point of fact, there are really two kinds of surveys: a general survey of an institution’s entire collection; and a more specific, detailed survey of various components of the collection. Both are important, but the general survey should clearly come first. However, according to the language of the proposed revision, [IMS] would be unable to require a general survey.
51 Fed. Reg. 43,352 (1986). (It should be noted that the comment addressed a limitation in the original IMS proposed rule that would have confined the required survey to a “specific area of focus.” The commenter thus encouraged IMS to broaden its vision in seeking to encourage collection surveys.)
the amended regulations were operative, IMS noted with some apparent satisfaction:

Conservation Project Support grants are competitive awards designed to help museums meet the basic conservation needs of their collections, living and non-living. The program was restructured this year in response to conservation needs demonstrated by the museum field. The new application framework encourages museums to develop their conservation plans from very basic activities, such as general collection and environmental surveys, to more advanced ones, such as treatment of objects. The goal of the program is to assist museums in fostering far-sighted, long range plans as they care for their collections.27

Implicit in this is the suggestion that the 1986 amendment (which was first effective in fiscal year 1987) had the effect of encouraging museums to begin with a general survey before proceeding to actual treatment. A scanning of the descriptions of the 248 conservation projects described in the fiscal year 1987 annual report indicates a large number of general survey projects and a smaller number of specific treatment projects. The emphasis seems appropriate. The limited dollars available to IMS could never meet all the treatment needs of the Nation's museums. By emphasizing surveys, museums could put themselves in a position to seek nonfederal or other federal support (such as GOS) for treatment in accordance with the surveys and resulting long-range conservation plans. The program, which has now targeted more than $15 million on conservation over five fiscal years, has assisted in developing a much more systematic inventory of conservation needs to be addressed, a salutary process in which Pennsylvania museums have fully shared.28

27. INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM SERVICES, 1987 ANNUAL REPORT 13 (1988). For other perspectives on the 1987 IMS conservation regulations, see Shepard, Shaping a Conservation Plan Through General Surveys, 13 AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR CONSERVATION OF HISTORIC AND ARTISTIC WORKS, NEWSLETTER 1 (1988); Beale, Long Range Conservation Planning for Museums published by the Virginia Association of Museums (1988). (Arthur Beale is a member of the NMSB.) For fiscal year 1988, pursuant to the amended regulations, IMS selected, as its first priority, the survey of collections and environmental conditions, including development of long-range conservation plans, for two categories of applications, non-living collections and systematics/natural history collections. For living collections/animals, it selected, as first priority, research for improved conservation techniques. For the category of living collections/plants, it selected, as first priority, survey of collections and environmental and site conditions. See IMS, 1988 CONSERVATION PROJECT SUPPORT, GRANT APPLICATION AND INFORMATION 9-19. Training of museum staff and provision, insofar as practicable of optimum environmental conditions, were high priorities in the other categories. Id.

28. In fiscal year 1988, IMS awarded 219 conservation grants totaling $2,902,541. Twenty-two Pennsylvania museums received such grants, which ranged in amount from
VII. Some General Observations on the Making of a Federal Conservation Program

A. Leadership v. Direction

A recurrent theme in the administration of federal programs of assistance to cultural institutions has been the potential tension between the exercise of administrative leadership in ensuring the effective use of federal funds, on the one hand, and the avoidance of action that could be regarded as the exercise of federal direction and control over cultural, historic and scientific matters properly left to the discretion of the individual institution, on the other. An agency such as IMS that provides financial assistance to cultural institutions is not, by virtue of its mandate to make grants, vested with authority to exercise direction and control over the day-to-day cultural determinations of its grantee institutions. In the case of some federal agencies, notably the U.S. Department of Education, this no-control principle is expressed in a statutory prohibition.29

For other agencies such as IMS the principle is implicit in the statutory scheme. Moreover, the no-control principle is a matter that has always been of deep concern to the Congress in the authorization of programs of aid to education and to the arts and humanities. Federal agencies with responsibilities in these areas wisely steer clear of action that would suggest the extension of such control. Thus, IMS regulations have made no attempt to define standards of collection

$25,000 (the general ceiling) to below $1,000. Reference here to a number of the grants may give some flavor of their scope and purpose.

Nine of the conservation grants to Pennsylvania museums in fiscal year 1988 were for general surveys or assessments or examination of collection or storage facilities. These included grants to the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia ($9,402); the Carnegie Museum of Natural History in Pittsburgh ($19,760); the Everhart Museum in Scranton ($6,362); Fallingwater in Mill Run ($2,725); Hope Lodge and Mather Mill in Fort Washington ($3,570); the Philadelphia Academy of Fine Arts ($11,217, grant included survey for part of collection); the Southern Alleghenies Museum of Art ($25,000) (examination of collections storage and display facilities); the Westmoreland Museum of Art, Greensburg ($16,912); and the Wyck Association in Philadelphia ($11,535) (environmental survey and rehousing and storage of decorative arts collection following through on 1987 conservation survey). These grants, as can be seen, reflect the priority set by the Institute in favor of general surveys and examinations in accordance with the 1986 regulatory changes described above in the text.

A number of the grants were for treatment projects. These included grants to the Historical Society of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia ($19,450 to treat 34 paintings); the Morris Arboretum in Philadelphia ($22,193 to treat a portion of the collection); the Railroad Museum of Pennsylvania in Strasburg ($25,000 for restoration of an object in the collection); and the State Museum of Pennsylvania in Harrisburg ($25,000 for the restoration of Rothermell's painting "The Battle of Gettysburg, Pickett's Charge"). Other grants were made for the installation of equipment to conserve collections, for duplication projects, and for the development of collections and related data bases. See Institute of Museum Services, Press Release, Aug. 11, 1988.

quality or to establish some absolute level of quality of museum services, although peer reviewers drawn from the field may necessarily make individual comparative judgments regarding these matters in the course of evaluating applications. How many Renoirs an art museum should own and where to hang them is clearly not a matter for IMS regulation.

At the same time, a healthy respect for the no-control principle should not paralyze an agency into failing to take steps to ensure that its inevitably limited funds are being spent in such a way as to achieve, to use a phrase popular in Britain, "value for money." In more bureaucratic terms, an agency must be satisfied that its program is being carried out in a way that obtains maximum economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the expenditure of public funds, particularly in view of the fiscal constraints that affect such expenditures today. When the agency comes to believe that changes in its program must be made to achieve that objective, it would seem to be duty bound to pursue them.

IMS launched a conservation program in the light of a fairly terse congressional direction contained in a committee report on appropriation legislation. It fashioned broad and general regulations to guide the new program for its first three years of administrative life. Thereafter, IMS recognized a need to restructure the program and to encourage or lead the museum field into a more systematic and efficient approach to the identification and fulfillment of conservation needs. It achieved this through regulatory changes spurred by the strong and persistent leadership of its director, and considered and approved by the IMS policy-making board, acting in response to needs identified by the organized museum community itself. Far from being an exercise in direction and control, the implementation of these changes reflected an exercise in administrative leadership in ensuring the effectiveness of federal expenditures. Moreover, the changes were fashioned through the open Federal Register rulemaking process that involved the field (to the extent it wished) in a dialogue with the agency over the merits of the changes.

Where the line between leadership and direction is to be drawn in each case is a matter of sensitive administrative judgment and statecraft for which little legal guidance can be given. At least one commenter on the second regulation plainly recognized the IMS proposal for what it was designed to be — an effort at sound administrative leadership in response to a recognized need:

None of us seems to have any quarrel with the rightness of the proposed priorities themselves. Indeed, some of us feel very strongly that the economic conditions of our era require priority setting within institutions on the basis of surveys and not just in the area of conservation. The logic of subordinating treatment itself to safe conditions for collections overall and to staff education in conservation procedures also seems unassailable; what good is it to put a restored artifact back into an uncontrolled atmosphere where an unknowing staff may nail it up in an exhibit hall? Clearly you, your colleagues, and the National Museum Services Board are trying to provide leadership in identifying a need as well as financial help in meeting needs, and that is commendable.\textsuperscript{31}

The 1986 amendments ever so gently nudged the museum community to take better stock of the condition of its collections. That there was evidence of a need for such a nudge seems clear from the survey conducted by the American Association of Museums, the National Institute for Conservation, and the American Institute for Conservation in 1985.\textsuperscript{32} The Director of IMS, Lois Shepard, has indicated that information in that survey — revealing that the condition of a substantial portion of the Nation’s museum collections was unknown to the very museums caring for them — demonstrated to her the critical need for general conservation surveys and thus led to the regulatory changes initiated by IMS in 1986.\textsuperscript{33} That such surveys constitute an essential and early step in the orderly formulation of a coherent conservation plan for a museum has in turn been clearly articulated by a member of the NMSB with profound knowledge and experience in the field of museum conservation.\textsuperscript{34}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[31] 51 Fed. Reg. 43,353 (1986).
\item[33] See Shepard, \textit{supra} note 27, at 1 which states: The survey, “Collections Management, Maintenance, and Conservation,” conducted for IMS in 1985 by the American Association of Museums, the National Institute for Conservation, and the American Institute for Conservation revealed several disturbing statistics about collections in the respondent museums. Among them was that the condition of 40\% of their collections was unknown. It was this situation that indicated to me the need among museums for general conservation surveys.
\item[34] See Beale, \textit{supra} note 27, at 1 which states: As with any long range planning, the first steps are the establishment of goals. In conservation planning certain general prioritized goals can be suggested. First is the stabilization of collections, second their preservation or maintenance, third restoration, and fourth technical examination and scientific research. Stabilization efforts might begin with a general survey by a conservator to assess the overall condition of the collections and the environment in which they are housed. Then the general survey might result in recommendations, which if
\end{footnotes}
Perhaps not all museum managements share this view or believe that it should be given force in a federal regulation or guideline. Inherent in the relationship between a federal grantor agency and the grantee community is a tension that any effort in leadership may exacerbate. No doubt some in the museum community may perceive the efforts of IMS to exercise leadership in the administration of its federal conservation funds as a manifestation of federal direction and control. Be that as it may, the thrust of the public comment on the IMS proposal, including that from conservation organizations, was positive. The evidence suggests that museums have responded with their applications, that more survey applications have been approved, and that these have in turn led to the orderly development and implementation of conservation programs for individual museums.

Pennsylvania is not a stranger to the concerns that shaped the restructuring of theIMS Conservation Support Program or to the needs that the restructured program sought to address. Nor has Pennsylvania been a stranger to that program’s benefits. Its museums have participated fully in the restructured program carried out under the regulation amendments adopted by IMS in 1986.35

implemented, would significantly slow serious deterioration of the collections. Normally such recommendations would include suggestions for easily implemented environmental improvements, procedural changes, staff education, and in some cases, emergency conservation treatments.

35. In 1988 the William Penn Foundation of Philadelphia issued a report on the conservation of art and historic artifacts in that city, a report that in many respects mirrors the nation-wide findings of the 1984 study carried out by the American Association of Museums, in concert with other museum professional organizations interested in conservation, that in part prompted the changes in the IMS conservation program described in this article. The William Penn Foundation report, entitled, “Preserving Our Heritage,” makes the following central findings:

Of the 18,867,036 artifacts reported in the survey, 39 percent or 7.3 million objects are in need of conservation treatment, and the condition of an additional 33 percent or 6.2 million is unknown. Only 28 percent of these artifacts are reported in “treated” or “preserved” condition.

More than three quarters of the institutions responding to the survey do not have a long-range plan for conservation.

Thirty-six percent of the institutions have not surveyed the physical condition of any of their collections, while another 29 percent have had less than one quarter of their collections surveyed.

The two most serious problems affecting the care of collections are lack of proper storage and funds for conservation. William Penn Foundation, Preserving Our Heritage 7-8 (1988). For a description of the conservation support grants made by IMS to Pennsylvania museums in fiscal year 1988 under the amended program regulation see supra note 28. See also American Association of Museums, Caring for Collections 11 (1984) (four levels on which conservation of collections takes place: provision of controlled environments and adequate housing; object preservation (prevention and retardation of further deterioration); actual conservation restoration;
The perestroika in the IMS conservation program appears to have led to a better understanding of the state of a larger portion of the Nation's aggregate treasure. This, in and of itself, must be regarded as a measure of effectiveness in the administration of a small, categorical program, as well as a lasting contribution to the conservation of America's heritage.

B. Museums, Education, and the Conservation of Objects

Where does the IMS conservation program fit into the broader mission of the agency in providing resources to maintain and improve museum services, and particularly in enhancing the educational role of museums in a Nation increasingly awakened to its pressing educational needs and liabilities? Congressional interest in museum conservation is evidenced by the committee report language regarding the fiscal year 1984 IMS appropriation that led to the establishment of the IMS conservation project support program. This language reflects a governmental recognition of the importance of conservation of cultural property to the maintenance and improvement of museum services throughout the United States. That the conservation project support program is the most significant IMS program (in terms of appropriation dollars) other than GOS underscores this emphasis on conservation as a key function of the modern American museum.

While conservation for its own sake is a positive national value, one may also perceive in these developments an understanding of the importance of conservation to the broader educational aspirations of the Nation. The vital linkage between the achievement of an enhanced level of national literacy and the improvement of our level of cultural literacy has been amply and eloquently described by E.D. Hirsch in his widely read book on that subject. The need to expand the overall fund of cultural literacy through changes in school curriculum is a cardinal theme of the Hirsch prescription for effective education. Is there in turn a vital link between an expanded level of cultural literacy and the aggregate effort to conserve our cultural property through the type of activities fostered by the IMS program?


An appreciation and understanding of our cultural heritage that builds cultural literacy is in part dependent on our ability to view and consider first-hand the surviving evidence of that heritage as it comes to us in museum exhibits and collections. The acquisition of cultural literacy is a complex process buttressed and supported by, among other things, the museum experience both in the context of school-sponsored and private visits. Hirsch himself observes, "It is probably true that the full range of cultural literacy will be conveyed by a broad variety of experiences, inside and outside school." Surely, the particularly enriching experience of a museum visit must be accounted as within the ambit of that variety of experiences. Moreover, the school-museum partnership in education, which the Museum Services Act strongly seeks to promote, can be seen as one of the promising elements in the conveyance of cultural literacy.

Central to all this is the assumption that the American museum will do what is needed to conserve the objects that are at the core of its ability to provide this service and which in effect constitute the instruments of its educational contributions. As James Duff, a Pennsylvania member of the NMSB, has aptly observed in a session of that body, museum education is in the collections.

The ties between the essential educational and conservation roles of the museum and between the museum and the efforts of society to achieve educational change are thus inextricably intertwined. Limited as they may be, the endeavor of IMS to encourage a rational and systematic approach to museum conservation can be seen as a small but significant part of this much broader matrix.

C. The Role of the Law in a Federal Program of Aid to Cultural Institutions

From one perspective, the body of law particularly pertaining to IMS may appear rather puny. It consists of one abbreviated enabling statute and a set of program-specific regulations that occupy approximately 14 pages in the current Code of Federal Regulations. IMS has not been the subject of voluminous judicial decisions or formal administrative adjudications. Happily for those who administer it, it has not even been the subject of program-related litigation. This relatively sparse body of statutory and regulatory materials is thus hardly the stuff of which a viable law practice is made. Indeed, one may wonder why space in a law review should be devoted to the

38. Id. at 130.
functions of an agency that has been the object of so little formal lawmaking.

Yet, there is another side to the coin. Law and legal process, as the foregoing account demonstrates, have been essential to the establishment and administration of IMS and its programs. Law was present at the creation of the agency. Before it could be launched, an enabling statute had to be formulated, introduced, debated, and enacted. In the case of the conservation support program, another legislative green light was provided in the form of congressional report language on a fiscal year appropriation, which has served as a legal basis for administering the program under congressional mandate.

The framework of the program and the overall policies that guide it were fashioned through legal process, a process that structured the way in which IMS went about implementing the program. The federal rulemaking process, embodied in 5 U.S.C. § 553 (1982), enabled the museum community to comment publicly on the agency's administrative approach; it also required the agency to respond publicly and coherently to the public comment.

Moreover, because IMS followed the practice of seeking NMSB review of all its regulations, at both the proposed and final drafting stages, the rulemaking process enabled the Board to exercise its statutory policy-making role in the important context of converting policy statement to legally binding regulation. In doing so, the Board brought to bear its collective experience with museums throughout the land as well as the information it received from such valuable sources as peer reviewers and other museum professionals. In the case of the conservation support program, it was through this legal process of rulemaking that IMS achieved the restructuring of the program and exercised the leadership role that it believed necessary to an effective use of the appropriation for which it was steward.

The administrative process became a vehicle for loosening the grasp of Washington on the formulation of the program. The establishment of a federal agency, the framing of its programs, and the legal incidents thereof, necessarily have their Washington ties. So it was with IMS and its conservation support program. This does not mean, however, that the program and the agency which spawned it were exclusive Washington products. Quite to the contrary. Museums, museum professionals, and others throughout the land appropriately play a preeminent role in IMS functions. They do so through service on the NMSB, service in professional organizations seeking program direction or redirection, service as peer reviewers,
and, most importantly, as conscientious and effective grantees of IMS funds. Pennsylvania museums and museum professionals in particular have in these various ways played an important role in the conservation program and its administration.

By providing commenters outside Washington with a relatively convenient means of commenting on IMS proposals—an informal letter of comment rather than a costly trip to testify—the legal process of rulemaking makes available to the agency input from beyond the Washington Beltway in a context in which it must be taken into account. It is not the purpose of this article to argue that that process is without blemishes or that the agency does not have a wide berth in deciding how to respond to public comment. Whatever its limitations, however, the opportunity to provide comment relieves tension in the grantee community and serves as essential glue in permitting program formulation to proceed efficiently. In the instant case, the shape of the second IMS regulation, which significantly restructured the conservation program, was in fact substantially influenced by the notice and comment process, particularly as a result of comments from the organized museum community. It is fitting, therefore, that the role of law and legal process be recognized in this account.

D. Future Directions

By focusing on the merits of the determination by IMS to target surveys of collection condition as a critical first stage in the conservation process, IMS did not intend to minimize the need for assistance to museums in the actual treatment of objects. The importance of IMS assistance of this nature to one Pennsylvania museum was indeed highlighted by IMS itself in its own assessment of its contributions to the museum community on the occasion of its tenth anniversary:

[An] institution that has used IMS grants in its development is the Woodmere Art Museum in Philadelphia, which concentrates on works by artists who have worked or do work in Pennsylvania. Among the centerpieces of its collection are Benjamin West’s “The Fatal Wounding of Sir Phillip Sidney,” and George Morland’s “The Fox Inn.” Visitors to the museum who see those paintings will be looking directly at the results of an IMS grant. The IMS conservation program paid for their con-

39. The amendments accomplishing these changes are found in 51 Fed. Reg. 43,351 (1986) (codified at 45 C.F.R. § 1180.20 (1988)).
To celebrate the achievement of one institution in using its IMS funds may, however, cloud a larger and less happy point. The availability of IMS conservation support funds for treatment and other purposes, in this age of budget deficits, is sorely constrained.

The danger of a categorical federal program, such as the IMS conservation support program, is that it may create the impression that the federal government should, can, and will do it all. Throughout its history, IMS has diligently sought to dispel that impression through various regulatory devices such as the rule that a GOS grant may be no more than ten percent of a museum's operating budget; the cap on individual GOS grants, and on conservation support grants; a matching requirement; and an unvarying policy that annual grants are competitive in each cycle rather than continuing.41 In some quarters the myth of the bottomless federal purse may nonetheless persist. This is counterproductive if it stifles local and private efforts to meet the vast needs that the federal program has served to reveal.

The dollars that IMS can devote to conservation can in no way meet the aggregate treatment and other conservation needs of the Nation. Nor were they intended to. A program such as that carried out by IMS to support conservation plays a useful role by demonstrating and dramatizing that conservation represents an important federal interest. It can encourage museums to identify, systematically and regularly, the scope of the conservation need on a museum-by-museum basis. In addition, it can provide funds, here and there, for discrete treatment, climate control, training, and research projects. A body of federally funded experience is thus developed to aid in further stages.

This, however, leaves to other sources the task of addressing the immense corpus of treatment needs that the conservation support program has helped to uncover. That task will require many more resources in addition to those provided by the IMS program.

In order to preserve America's cultural heritage for future generations, the energies of the broad community of museum professionals, supporters, and visitors must be effectively mobilized. These individuals and others interested in the continuing conservation of our heritage will need to consider and formulate precise steps for the

40. See IMS Tenth Anniversary Report, supra note 3, at 13.
coming decades. Among these steps the following may warrant consideration by those far better versed in the field:

— Unquestionably, there is a conservation deficit. Its dollar magnitude is, however, not clear. Quantification of the aggregate funds necessary to meet the nation's annual unmet museum conservation need may be of assistance in marshalling the resources and energies necessary to meet the need. In this process, the restructured IMS conservation support program, which has helped individual museums to identify their own conservation needs and priorities, could be a starting point.42

— This article suggests that the federal government, through IMS, has played a significant role in assisting museums to identify their conservation needs but that sufficient funds to address the vast bulk of these unmet needs, particularly in the area of training and treatment, must necessarily come from non-federal resources. Perhaps, consideration could be given to gathering those resources on a functional rather than a museum-by-museum basis that may leave some institutions, particularly small ones, with insufficient funds to address their conservation priorities. A privately funded national conservancy endowment, available to all museums, the income of which could be used to serve conservation priorities on a national basis might be one approach worth considering, despite the difficulties in mounting and administering such an enterprise.

— Museum conservation is a highly specialized and technical function and must in large measure be performed by highly trained professionals; however, the cause of preservation of the nation's patrimony is one that should properly engage as well the energies of those who are not museum professionals but, nonetheless, wish meaningfully to contribute to the effort. Whether there are areas where the services of properly trained volunteers, particularly college, university and other students, could add to the overall available resources is a matter that would seem worth considering, particularly in view of national attention currently being devoted to volunteer service programs.43

42. It has been estimated that, as of 1984, the annual cost of operating the nation's museums was $1 billion. See MUSEUMS FOR A NEW CENTURY, supra note 2, at 114. (There is evidently no estimate of the aggregate dollar amount needed to meet the nation's museum conservation needs.)

43. See Remarks by President Bush regarding Youth Entering Service to America program proposed in 25 Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents 445 (in Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session with High School Students, March 29, 1989); id. at 365 (in Remarks at the Junior Achievement National Business Hall of Fame Dinner in Colorado Springs, Colorado, March 16, 1989); id. at 212 (in Remarks to Students of Washington Uni-
America's Heritage

Whatever the merit of these individual suggestions, it is ultimately upon the rededication of individual museums and their governing bodies to the task of museum conservation, bravely foregoing where necessary more visible and popular activities, that the successful solution of conservation problems will turn. In helping the museum community to identify and focus on conservation needs, the creative partnership between IMS and the museum community that constituted the IMS conservation support program has provided a stimulus for that rededication and has thus performed a valuable service in furthering the preservation of the nation's heritage.
APPENDIX

INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM SERVICES
GRANT AWARDS — FISCAL 88
General Operating Support
Listed by State and Discipline within State
RECIPIENT AMOUNT

PENNSYLVANIA

Arboretum/Botanical Garden
Bowman's Hill Wild Flower Preserve Assn. $39,000.00
Washington Crossing
Morris Arboretum $75,000.00
Philadelphia
Scott Arboretum $48,000.00
Swarthmore
Bartram's Garden $19,081.00
Philadelphia

Art
Allentown Art Museum $75,000.00
Allentown
Freedman Art Gallery $13,296.00
Reading
Philadelphia Museum of Art $75,000.00
Philadelphia
Southern Alleghenies Museum of Art $25,000.00
Loretto
Temple Gallery $17,261.00
Philadelphia
Trout Art Gallery $9,317.00
Carlisle
Wharton Esherick Museum $5,000.00
Paoli

Children's/Junior
Please Touch Museum $72,000.00
Philadelphia

General
Dauphin County Historical Society $8,155.00
Harrisburg
Everhart Museum $32,513.00
Scranton
Packwood House Museum $15,200.00
Lewisburg
Rosenbach Museum and Library $46,850.00
Philadelphia

*Historic House/Historic Site*
- Brandywine Battlefield Historical Park $30,605.00
- Chadds Ford
- Bushy Run Battlefield $9,863.00
- Jeannette
- Cliveden $18,285.00
- Philadelphia
- Ebenezer Maxwell Mansion $6,236.00
- Philadelphia
- Erie County Historical Society $18,445.00
- Erie
- Hans Herr House $5,000.00
- Willow Street
- Lehigh County Historical Society $55,918.00
- Allentown
- Pennsbury Manor $61,025.00
- Morrisville

*History*
- Balch Institute for Ethnic Studies $75,000.00
- Philadelphia
- Fort Ligonier Memorial Foundation $39,556.00
- Ligonier
- Historical Society of Pennsylvania $75,000.00
- Philadelphia
- Historical Society of York County $37,949.00
- York
- Johnstown Flood Museum $21,000.00
- Johnstown
- Mercer Museum $74,605.00
- Doylestown
- Valley Forge Historical Society $8,252.00
- Valley Forge
- Germantown Historical Society $15,637.00
- Philadelphia

*Natural History/Anthropology*
- Carnegie Museum of Natural History $75,000.00
- Pittsburgh

*Science and Technology*
Buhl Science Center $75,000.00
Pittsburgh
Franklin Institute Science Museum $75,000.00
Philadelphia

Specialized
Afro-American Historical & Cultural Museum $75,000.00
Philadelphia
American Swedish Historical Museum $30,317.00
Philadelphia
Canal Museum $33,581.00
Easton
Fabric Workshop $32,117.00
Philadelphia
National Museum of American Jewish History $75,000.00
Philadelphia
Pennsylvania Lumber Museum $18,883.00
Galeton

Zoo
Pittsburgh Zoo $75,000.00
Pittsburgh