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ABSTRACT

Government authorities support the production of public art more vigorously than ever before. But the role of government in public art production is being debated. Critics accuse government art funding agencies of catering to the artistic tastes of society's upper classes while advocates of governmental support argue that emphasis on high artistic quality and peer review selection process ensure fairness. To date poor descriptions of the variety of public artworks have focussed the debate on vagueries rather than statistical material.

The thesis presents a new typology of the public art system identifying five public art traditions: Monumental/Memorial, Civic/Functional, Formally Expressive, Place Identifying, Street Art. It describes the artists, sponsoring and administering agencies, funding sources and typical costs for each tradition and it illustrates each tradition's unique artistic or social-cultural priorities.

The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), the leading governmental arts support agency, exemplifies governmental public art activity throughout this discussion. 310 grants made through NEA's Art In Public Places program from 1967 to 1980 are categorized according to the traditions named in the typology. The categorization illustrates that the NEA is not meeting its goals in support of increases to availability of the arts, creative artists, artistic institutions, and to country's artistic heritage. Recommendations are made based on the assumption that the goals should be maintained.
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CHAPTER 1 -- Public Art: The Role of Government Arts Support Agencies

Introduction

Throughout the centuries, artists have embellished private and public buildings, parks and plazas. Though only a few artists created public sculpture in the past, today many artists are active and government authorities vigorously support more production of public art than ever before. The new interest in public art is fueling a debate between the artistic standards of the art world and the cultural standards of the public.

Past descriptions of the public art field, stemming partly from the desire to inform the debate, have presented public art in a dichotomy between the past and present. But this dichotomy does not allow for a careful study of elitism, of which government arts agencies are accused. Such inadequate typologies allow government art support agencies continued opportunity to pursue the interests of a closed circle of artists and art critics while dissenters gather only scant evidence to hold against them.

A new typology can improve our understanding of government public art activities. This paper provides such a typology, focusing on the distinct artistic and social priorities of five public art traditions. The typology enables us to recognize that the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) Art In Public Places program is biased in favor of one of these traditions. I explore why this is so and discuss its implications. The more complete typology I propose, is a useful
proscriptive tool for identifying new directions for government public art support.

Throughout the text, the National Endowment for the Arts Art In Public Places Program is used to illustrate the activities of government arts agencies. NEA is the recognized leader of government arts support in America. It provides more grant aid to more organizations and artists than any other governmental agency. In addition, these governmental art support agencies rely on NEA for block and program funds and must meet NEA's criteria to receive them. (1)

The Public Art Debate

The thought of more rather than fewer artworks in public places is not in itself disturbing. According to the American Council on the Arts' Americans and the Arts survey, most Americans agree that increased production of the arts (broadly defined) is beneficial. (2) Among survey respondents and writers from a variety of professional backgrounds, however, there exists considerable disagreement about the current and future direction of public support.

Public artworks are expensive. The average total cost of an NEA Art In Public Places project is about $60,000. (3) Though not typical, Christo's proposal to cover the walkways of New York's Central Park with vinyl at an estimated cost of $6 Million, illustrates how far artists are willing to go. (4) A confused public wonders how far government agencies will go. The NEA typically provides from 30% to 50% of public art project costs in grant aid and other state and local governmental arts agencies provide substantial amounts of public resources. We are well advised to consider alternative uses for public funds spent on public art (and the arts in general). At about $60,000 a shot, our
opportunity cost by anyone’s measure is quite high.

Even greater confusion arises in debates about the artistic and social merits of publicly financed art. Many critics believe that the NEA supports the production of "private art," reflecting the artistic tastes of society's upper classes. For Edward Banfield, the "usefulness" of public art has been "sacrificed to aesthetics." The Endowment's Art in Public Places program began under the direction of Henry Geldzhaler, whose interests lied with a small circle of avant garde artists, art critics and museum curators. In the words of other writers agreeing with Banfield, the NEA and its counterparts see the American public as "guinea-aesthetes." The peer review panel process, the standard for grant decision-making at governmental arts agencies, is often implicated in critics accusations of taste setting. Government agency set up these panels comprised of artists and arts professionals who are not government officials in order to isolate themselves from decisions about artistic quality that could suggest government bias. But Dick Netzer in his landmark study of government arts support concludes that "officials have a lot of influence on panel decisions because they determine the agenda and the ways in which matters are presented to panels for decisions." Moreover, he says that the review process may be biased in that panels favor what panel members are most familiar with. Acting in an "old-boy network," panelists may judge "in ways that effectively keep outsiders out." Michael Mooney shares Netzer's concern. Though generally considered a muckracker who does not carefully document his assertions, Mooney provides substantial evidence that NEA review panels form a "closed circle" of professionals who do not represent a variety of points of view.
Interestingly, the term "contemporary," often used to describe the tradition commonly associated with NEA Art In Public Places support, applies to all five traditions discussed herein. "Formally Expressive Art" is the label used in this study to describe the tradition previously described as contemporary. The label refers to the "formal" aesthetic components of an artwork -- line, color, surface texture, etc. which take priority in this tradition. You will gain greater understanding of the difference between Formally Expressive public art and the other public art traditions later; for now it is only important that we get rid of muddling preconceptions. By refusing to misuse the term we rid ourselves of the useless past versus present trap.

Advocates of formally expressive public art argue that the NEA is not an arbiter of tastes. The NEA "does not solicit grant applications nor does it demand that applicants purchase or commission a particular type of art." NEA supporters argue that it no longer takes any direct action towards selecting artists, sites, and artworks; thus it "supports an array of artworks as diverse as the sponsoring communities."(9) But with at least a perception that NEA is an institution serving upper class tastes, there may be some self-sejection by potential applicants to NEA's Art In Public Places program. Artists and potential sponsors of public artworks in other traditions may not bother to submit an application assuming that their proposals will not match NEA's tastes.

The criticism directed at formally expressive public artworks only reflects the pluralistic nature of society, according to proponents. Critics, curators and art agency administrators favoring the artworks say that resentment or derision by some viewers is expected and welcomed as a measure of the artists' success in moving the public audience, and
that regardless of the degree of controversy, high artistic standards should prevail. High quality artworks provide viewers with a variety of points of view, teaching them tolerance about perspectives other than their own.(10)

Public artworks are also supported on extra-aesthetic grounds. According to Beardsley, Public artworks are symbols of civic pride and humanize urban environments. They also provide economic benefits through their ability to attract to urban centers tourists as well as professionals and highly skilled workers. Gerald Ford, while a U.S. Senator from Michigan, commented that in this regard the "Calder" in Grand Rapids was a "worthwhile investment."(11) Discussions about extra-aesthetics benefits, like Beardsley's, are often framed as arguments in favor of Formally Expressive artworks, yet these benefits, if they do exist, apply equally to all public artworks.

Two professors of philosophy, Douglass Stalker and Clark Glymour, provide a carefully reasoned refutation of both the aesthetic and extra-aesthetic benefits of art in the public environment. Though they do not refer to them specifically, their arguments are directed at Formally Expressive artworks that lack direct literal meaning. They argue that outside the protective covering of museums and galleries, public display of art can be as harmful as the public display of pornography.

According to Stalker and Glymour, pushing people to think and respond to their world and providing alternative viewpoints as a backdrop to tolerance are justifications of public display of art that have nothing to do with aesthetics and could be used as well to justify public display of pornography. If thought provocation is a virtue, say Stalker and Glymour, it is "a virtue shared as much by every calamity." Formally expressive artwork in public places may make people tolerant,
but only of public sculpture "for the simple reason that if the object
is too large, too strong, or too well fortified, they have no
choice."(12)

As for the economic benefits, Stalker and Glymour suggest that
evidence of public art in booming areas does not imply that the art
makes a contribution to local economies. Few people or organizations
directly reap the monetary benefits of public art production and
insignificant amounts of money from outside a local economy enter. With
public art projects drawing from city treasuries, they are in fact
draining local economies. Public sculpture benefits cities' economies
slightly but museums, music and theatres probably enjoy a greater draw
and benefit local economies more. The implication in Stalker and
Glymour's writing is that artworks with non-literal meaning, being
mundane in its universality, cannot add positively to local atmo-
sphere.(13)

The debate will continue. In the meantime, other "contemporary"
public art forms with alternative artistic and cultural benefits do
exist. A few attempts have been made to describe the variety of public
art types. None are particularly useful, but their brief discussion
will provide a context. As might be expected based on the previous
discussion, these attempts highlight the dichotomy between Formally
Expressive artworks as the public art of the present and evetything else
as art of the past.

Public Art Typologies

Public artworks have been categorized according to location,
artistic medium employed, and stylistic maturity. Fundaburk and
Davenport present one locational typology hoping to illustrate how public artworks differ in museums, schools, civic and corporate buildings, and outdoor areas. But theirs is a "picture book" with very little text, and the photographs reveal no significant differences between the artworks from location to location. (14) Louis Redstone presents a similar typology, characterizing artworks by sponsorship: governmental, educational or and commercial. Again, the photographs reveal no insights except that most of the artworks displayed are Formally Expressive, lacking in identifiable iconography. (15)

In Art for Millions, a discussion of the WPA Federal Arts Project, Francis O'Conner advances a typology differentiating between murals, sculpture and easel painting. (16) Although this categorizing scheme describes the variety of public art more carefully than the others, it masks the important cultural and artistic priorities within a medium. Murals, for example, can have many functions ranging from formal expression to civic decoration to more direct applications of social 'street' themes. The same applies to sculpture.

One common typology which compares Formally Expressive artworks to 19th Century monuments and memorials implies that Formally Expressive types of public art are stylistically more mature than others. Campen's Outdoor Sculpture in Ohio highlights the "movement from studied realism" to the "artistic achievements" of non-objective expression. (17) And Beardsley says that "commemorative" artworks as traditional forms of public expression in art "appear inadequate to the contemporary situation." (18) This typology is also inadequate since artists in every art form make stylistic improvements on the past to maintain stylistic maturity. (In the next chapter, I illustrate specific examples of contemporary commemorative artworks.)
Do government art support agencies act as taste setters, influencing the direction of public art projects rather than supporting public art in all its variety? The aforementioned public art typologies do not answer this question, around which the public art debate is becoming increasingly focused. In the following chapter, a typology based on the artistic and cultural priorities of types of public art does speak to it.

In the next chapter, five public art traditions are named. For each its typical actors -- artists, administrators and sponsors, and funding sources -- are described as well as the range of costs. But more importantly the unique artistic and social priorities of each are identified.

The final chapter looks at the National Endowment for the Arts, studying over 300 grants made by the NEA Art In Public Places program from 1967 through 1981. By placing each grant among the categories established in Chapter 2, it becomes clear that, as many critics suggest, the NEA is biased in favor of Formally Expressive art. I consider the goals of the NEA Art In Public Places program and find that in no measurable way are these goals being met. NEA finances Formally Expressive art at the expense of other art types and at the expense of the public at large.
CHAPTER 2 -- The Traditions of Public Art

Five traditions express the variety of public artworks. This chapter describes each in terms of its artists, sponsoring and administering projects agencies, funding sources, and typical costs. The information available on these characteristics is admittedly sketchy, drawn from a diffuse literature. Moreover, the characteristics might change in different funding climates, thus they are presented to describe the traditions as they are currently understood.

The most important factor distinguishing one tradition from another is the combination of artistic and socio-cultural goals that artists, administrative and funding groups bring to each. The goals differ markedly among traditions from commemoration to pure artistic expression.

Table 1 summarizes the information provided in the next few pages. It is self explanatory, providing a review of each tradition's characteristics. The reader may wish to refer to it to compare the traditions as the discussion proceeds.

The first four traditions -- Monumental/Memorial, Civic/Functional, Formally Expressive, and Place Identifying Public Art -- appear in roughly chronological order; effecting the order in which they appeared on the American public art scene. The Street Art tradition, discussed last, does not fit the chronology as it exists outside the mainstream of American art, which encompasses the others.
## Characteristics of the Public Art Traditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major objective</th>
<th>Monumental/Memorial</th>
<th>Civic/Functional</th>
<th>Formally Expressive</th>
<th>Place Identifying</th>
<th>Street Art</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to remember great people or ideas</td>
<td>to create useful objects and environments</td>
<td>to display individual creative thought</td>
<td>to display symbols of a locale or region</td>
<td>to affirm ethnic, minority and community identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artists (training)</th>
<th>Professionals (traditional sculpture training)</th>
<th>Professionals (architect ability often employed)</th>
<th>Professionals (new sculptural techniques used)</th>
<th>Professionals (mixed training often traditional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsors/Administrators</th>
<th>Fine arts commissions (all gov. levels)</th>
<th>Governmental development and parks and rec. departments</th>
<th>City and regional arts councils, site sponsors</th>
<th>Redevelopment agencies, historical commissions, local arts agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>Private and public historical foundations</th>
<th>administrative sponsors, $X for art</th>
<th>administrators and site sponsors, $X for art</th>
<th>local governmental historical and development agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs range average</th>
<th>$5,000 - $400,000</th>
<th>$5,000 - $400,000</th>
<th>$200 - $400,000</th>
<th>$2,000 - $420,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>under $3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TABLE 1*
Monumental/Memorial Public Art

"Traditionally [public artworks] have been commemorative of great events or people, or illustrative of common socio-political goals. They have been brought into being to express values and beliefs assumed to be those of the audience, through a content and symbolism readily understandable to all."(19)

American interest in public art began with commemorative sculpture during the American Revolution. Patriots toppled an equestrian statue of England's King George III before the war, and at the war's end the independent colonies commissioned sculptors to erect statues commemorating revolutionary heroes.(20) With the perfection of bronze casting techniques in the mid-nineteenth century, memorial statues of famous statesmen and civic leaders multiplied.

Statues and monuments also displayed ideas of "communitas" and national pride. An example is the Statue of Liberty (Fig. 1). Given to the United States by the French government in 1884 as a symbol of the enlightenment that freedom offered, it may be the world's best known public artwork.(21)

Due to the substantial production of monuments and memorials between the Civil War and World War I, 20th century viewers thing of this public art tradition as "an endless parade of commonplace generals on prancing chargers and trite admirals with brass telescopes and cocked hats."(22) With endless examples of these artworks in many art styles and forms such as the neoclassical Washington Monument, the Statue of Liberty from the Romantic Era, and the contemporary examples discussed below, this view is obviously inadequate.
As the introductory quotation suggests, artists and sponsors in this tradition see immortalizing civic leaders and creating monuments to commonly shared ideals. The sculptor's artistry in this tradition is measured by the "immediacy and vitality" with which the artwork reveals its subject. Throughout the 19th century and continuing to the present, bronze has been recognized as the best medium for these artists. The additive process of creating a clay form from which the final bronze figure is cast, provides for more variety in composition and more freedom in modeling a direct and vigorous figure.

The new memorial to Boston's late mayor James Michael Curley (Fig. 2) exhibits the traditional "representational" character of artworks in
this tradition, yet exemplifies contemporary artistic merits. The Boston Arts Commission, sanctioned by the Mayor's office in 1978 to commission a memorial to Curley, "decided to solicit a representational piece because of Mayor Curley's image to the many people who remembered the man and identified with him."(23) But Curley was a difficult man to memorialize through a representational statue. Curley's son and a historian on the artist selection jury emphasized that Boston residents held two opposing views of the late mayor.

Figure 2 Lloyd Lillie, "Curley Memorial" 1980, Boston, MA.

The jurors selected Lloyd Lillie to create the memorial since his proposal reconciled the mayor's dual character. Lillie's proposed
memorial included two bronze statues, both life-size and without pedestals. One portrays Curley's stubborn and defiant character. It stands chin raised, a protruding belly nearly popping the vest buttons. Curley as a younger man sits near the other statue, on one of four park benches fit to the site by City landscape architects. Seated with one arm stretched across the back of the bench and his head turned as if talking to someone seated with him, the sculpture reveals Curley as a warm, inviting individual.

The memorial was applauded at its dedication for its creative but direct way of representing a complex man. Lillie's two statue/two image concept, the highly detailed life-size figures, and their position next to rather than above the viewer all work to create a memorial that is contemporary and fully understandable. It illustrates the insights and artistic ambitions of the contemporary artist as well as the social objectives of the tradition.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial (Fig. 3) takes another present-day cut at this tradition. Authorized by the U.S. Fine Arts Commission and the Department of the Interior, and funded through U.S. Senate appropriation, the memorial to 58,000 American soldiers who died in Vietnam was neither to justify nor discount U.S. involvement in the war. The group of veterans sponsoring the memorial/monument selected Maya Lin's proposal on that basis. Lin proposed two black marble slabs, on which the 58,000 names were inscribed, forming a V which rested below ground-level at the apex. (24)

Vietnam veterans and civilians alike feel the conflicting emotions of "grief, pride, anger, remorse" that the war embodies. The architectural rather than sculptural nature of Lin's design reflects
that conflict. Faced with the names of dead soldiers inscribed on austere black marble, the viewer retreats to "personal reflection and private reconciliation."(25)

Critics of Lin's design argue that it is not neutral but rather a negative black pit. Because of the disagreement, sited with Lin's memorial will soon be a sculpture of a more traditional nature; three soldiers standing alert, poised in combat fatigues. Also not part of Lin's original proposal is an American flag.

Monuments and Memorials are created predominantly by professional artists, trained in traditional casting and stone cutting techniques. Architects, such as Maya Lin, are commissioned with less frequency. Artists trained in contemporary metal slab and beam construction, use of earth shaping tools or temporary conceptual art materials rarely work in this tradition.(26)

Artworks in the tradition range in cost from about $10,000 to $400,000. Exceptions, such as the memorial to Albert Einstein at the
National Academy of Science, can exceed $1 million. An average cost for a monumental/memorial artwork is about $100,000.

Fine arts commissions typically manage artist selection procedures, fund-raising and bureaucratic requisites for artworks in the tradition. The commissions are usually governmental agencies with appointed officers, though sometimes city-level commissions are private non-profit groups. Many of the private groups form for the purpose of erecting a particular memorial or monument and disband afterwards. Some commissions provide administrative and monetary support to other traditions, but most are expressly authorized to install and maintain monuments and memorials.

It is important to continue to recognize the importance of memorializing great leaders and celebrating commonly held beliefs through public artworks. I have shown that new artworks in the Monumental/Memorial tradition are being created and that contemporary artistic concerns are employed.

Civic/Functional Public Art

"This art which is so utilitarian in its purpose as to be civic first and art afterwards [is] proper for the comfort of the citizens."(27)

Beyond the many fountains that adorn plazas and parks, such as Paul Lienard's Victorian "Brewer Fountain" (Fig. 4), Civic/Functional artworks have traditionally included stylized benches, drinking fountains, decorative statuary clinging to building facades, etc.
Contemporary versions of this tradition range in form and function from Richard Kinnebrew's "Grand Rapids Sculpture" to "Playscapes" by Isamu Noguchi.

Figure 4 Paul Lienard, "Brewer Fountain" 1867 Boston, MA.

Not all decorative functional objects in a locale could be called artworks. A multitude of ordinary cement fountains and benches exist. What distinguishes artworks in this tradition from ordinary civic objects is the care taken by a trained artist or craftsman in enriching a functional object beyond mere civic necessity.

Richard Kinnebrew's "Grand Rapids Sculpture" (Fig. 5) grew out of the need for a fish ladder over a dam on the Grand Rapids River in Michigan. Early in 1974, the Michigan Department of Natural Resources
planned to build a purely functional fish ladder, designed by Department engineers, only to aid migration of spawning fish. Kinnebrew convinced the Department that he could enhance the project artistically and provide public access to the ladder. Physical function and artistic interest were integrated: "the visual and auditory qualities of falling water, the migrating fish and the architectonic form all coalesce in an experience that is at once biological, social and aesthetic."(28)

Isamu Noguchi's "Playscapes" (Fig. 6) also exemplifies contemporary attempts in this tradition. Noguchi is well-known as an artist for his work in the Formally Expressive tradition, but when commissioned by the Parks and Recreation Department of the City of Atlanta, he successfully turned an underused public space into an engaging playground.(29)

As the photograph indicates, the slides and swings and other playthings look very much like what one would identify as 'modern art' -- concrete slab construction with bright solid colors. But the pieces are
functional, their form and visual display reflect and enhance their functionality.

Artworks in the Civic/Functional tradition are typically less controversial than artworks in other traditions. One explanation is that if an artwork meets a civic demand and suits its environment, viewers withhold judgements based on artistic tastes.

The variety of artistic styles Civic/Functional artworks take reflects the diverse backgrounds of artists working in the tradition. Professional artists and architects are most likely candidates for commissions. However, craftsmen and folk artists occasionally receive commissions. For example, a folk sculptor and 100 assistants from the surrounding community created the mosaic benches at a park next to Grant's Tomb in New York City.(30)

Cost information for individual artworks in the tradition is very sketchy. Civic/Functional artworks are often funded as part of civic
improvement and development projects. Judging by the variety of artworks, ranging from bottle walls in public libraries ($5,000) to works such as Larry Bell's "Solar Fountain" ($326,000), we can estimate the range of costs as roughly $5,000 to $400,000. Kinnebrew's "Grand Rapids Sculpture" and Noguchi's "Playscapes" both cost about $250,000. No single reliable average cost estimate can be made. NEA Art In Public Places supported artworks in this tradition average nearly $80,000 each, but this average may not reflect the cost of artworks not supported by the NEA.

The agencies administering these projects vary as much as the artists and artworks themselves. At all governmental levels, park and recreation departments, capital planning and building departments commission many Civic/Functional artworks. Schools, universities, airports and private corporations also incorporate these artworks into their public spaces. Often these institutions ask government arts agencies to secure funds, and to administer project selection and implementation.

The governmental agencies administering Civic/Functional projects usually seek direct appropriations from legislatures or administrative departments. In projects with commissions to 'significant' artists, funds are secured through the National Endowment for the Arts, state and local arts councils, and private foundations. Non-governmental profit-making organizations often include the cost of a fountain or reflecting pool in the total cost of the capital project and, as such, the funds are secured through a variety of private and governmental loans and grants. Even so, significant artistic components of a project may be funded through governmental sources. Non-profit hospitals, universities, etc. often garner grants from foundations and private individuals to
supplement government support.

Variety characterizes the Civic/Functional tradition more than other traditions. Artistic styles employed, backgrounds of artists, costs, sponsoring and funding groups all vary more in this tradition than in the others. Still one thing clearly identifies this tradition -- its artworks are "utilitarian." The artistic component is important but secondary to civic function. Michigan's fish ladder would not be public art without the involvement of an artist like Kinnebrew, but rather than creating a work of art from nothing, he identified the potential for artistic enhancement of a civic object.

Formally Expressive Public Art

"though offering no bedtime story, political or classical reference (unless to classical abstraction), moral or historical anecdote, or scientific model -- the works of art are rich in surface, structure, mass, pattern, detail, color, scale, site engagement, quality, even motion."(31)

The Formally Expressive tradition focusses on the perceptions of individual artists, who seek to engage viewers through "a new language of sculptural form" rather than literal meaning and iconography. The tradition grew in reaction to the centuries-old interest in representational depiction. Increasing scientific abstraction and industrial mechanization at the turn of the century were its catalysts, creating new painting and sculpting materials, new insights into the
individual creative process, and new worlds of thought. (32)

Structural steel is the predominant material employed by artists in this tradition, though earth-shaping and mural painting are common. Styles range from Roy Lichtenstein's theme collages to Paul Levy's decorative murals to the monumental plate constructions of Alexander Calder. The artworks have in common individual artistic expression using structure, mass, surface, color, etc., as tools.

Literal reference and social messages are usually not significant features of the Formally Expressive tradition. Both Lichtenstein's "Mermaid" (Fig. 7) at the Theater of the Performing Arts in Miami Beach, and Paul Levy's "420 Plum St." (Fig. 8) in Cincinnati employ recognizable images. However, these are typical cases in which the imagery acts as a theme on which to base creative individual expression rather than as a carrier of a significant social message. (33)
Alexander Calder's "La Grande Vitesse" (Fig. 9) is perhaps the best known, most characteristic example of the tradition. The 'Calder' became the first project funded by the National Endowment for the Arts Art In Public Places program as a result of a visit to Michigan by then-Director of NEA's Visual Arts program Henry Geldzhaler. Calder's 43' high, bold red sculpture made of shaped steel plates riveted to steel supports cost $128,000 and was heartily supported by art enthusiasts but scorned by many Grand Rapids residents. Most of the negative comments were aimed at the artwork's lack of direct meaning, but it also upset local taxpayers that the project required unearthing $18,000 worth of City-purchased pipes, newly installed for a fountain proposed for the same site.(34)
Figure 9 Alexander Calder "La Grande Vitesse" 1969
Grand Rapids, MI.

Graphic images of "La Grande Vitesse" are now displayed on everything from city dump trucks to the mayor's stationery. As is the case with many Formally Expressive public sculptures, controversy over the sculpture has diminished over time, and although not applauded by everyone, it has become an accepted addition to the urban landscape.

An infrastructure of professional artists and project administrators characterizes the tradition. Artists generally receive formal training in the history and methods of 'modern art.' Universities, hospitals, corporations and city governments sponsor projects in the formally expressive tradition. Often these groups select
artists and generate the necessary funds themselves. But probably more often, state and local art councils administer projects for the sponsoring groups. (35)

Many formally expressive artworks are funded by multiple sources includes governmental art council grants, private and public foundation grants, individual patronage, and appropriation by the sponsoring group or agency. The degree of support among these funders varies beyond generalization.

A fairly accurate estimate of the costs of Formally Expressive artworks can be made based on grant information provided in Beardsley's *Art In Public Places* reprinted in Appendix A. Costs range from about $2,000 for individual murals and small sculptures to over $400,000 for large sculptures by the best known artists. The total cost for most projects averages around $60,000.

Place Identifying Public Artworks

"These artworks can affirm pride and strengthen identity with a locale and, by examining our connections to it, help us understand where we come from, what we care for, and correspondingly, who we are." (36)

Modern Art enthusiasts called the Monumental/Memorial and Civic/Functional traditions out-moded and almost extinct when formal expression took to the outdoor environment. This accounts for the overwhelming dominance of the Formally Expressive tradition after 1945. But now, architects, city planners, and artists are reviving the old
traditions. They are also creating a new tradition, an extension of the old, which defines public spaces as 'places.'

Place Identifying artworks are a "reaction to the prevailing aesthetic" in both contemporary art and architecture. The prevailing aesthetic de-emphasises place, stressing instead minimal reference and individuality of expression. Advocates of artworks in the tradition believe that public art should establish a relationship to the local community that surrounds it. This creates as environment enhancing tourism and business activity as well as reflection on what it means to be part of a community.(37)

The photographs accompanying this section illustrate the broad range and simplicity of place identifying artworks. Figure 10 shows a "Manhole Cover Map" designed by artist Ann Knight. The maps have been installed throughout the City of Seattle, Washington, as part of a gift.

Figure 10 Ann Knight, "Manhole Cover Maps" 1977 Seattle, WA.
program initiated by Mayor Wesley Ullman. Seattle residents donate $200 to the program for a cover. Seattle's Department of Community Development paid $4,000 for the mold and installs the individual covers. The covers act as street maps directing tourists and residents to City landmarks, identified on the maps in relief. An Indian head, symbolizing the history of the area, is also presented on the maps.\(^{(38)}\)

In 1975 Mags Harries won a competition sponsored by the Massachusetts Bicentennial Commission, Boston 200, and the Boston Sculpture Commission. The sponsors sought an artwork that identified the character of Boston but did not act as a traditional monument or memorial. They commissioned Mags Harries for $10,000 to create "Araston 1976" (Fig. 11). Harries bronzed debris -- newspapers, vegetables, cardboard box sections to reflect the character of Boston's Haymarket. "Araston 1976" identifies place in very local terms, referring the viewer to a section of a city rather than to a whole city or region.

![Figure 11 Mags Harries, "Araston 1976" 1976 Boston, MA.](image)
George Segal's "Steelmakers" (Fig. 12) describes part of the history of a city, Youngstown, Ohio, and more generally, an entire steelmaking region. Segal is well known for his sculptures made of plaster molds from living models. After being selected by the Youngstown Arts Council and receiving a $27,500 NEA Art In Public Places grant for the $70,000 project, Segal held a competition among workers at a local steel plant for two models. The two bronze figures he created stand in front of a blast furnace, taken from a closed steelmaking plant.

Figure 12 George Segal, "Steelmakers" 1980
Youngstown, OH.

Artists working in this tradition often have formal contemporary art training, but opt to create artworks with place meaning rather than non-literal or formally expressive artworks with recognizable themes. Professional artists are the rule though generally their reputations may be regional.
Place identifying artworks range in cost from about $500 to over $400,000. The average cost at about $30,000 is much lower than that for any of the previously discussed traditions, possibly because artists with local, limited reputations seem to be commissioned most often at lower fees.

Local arts councils, redevelopment agencies, historical commissions and private citizen groups sponsor most projects in this tradition, with local governments and foundations probably providing the bulk of the support.

As with the Monumental/Memorial statuary, bronze is the predominant material in the Place Identifying tradition. It allows for a high degree of sculptural detail and great image expressiveness. Artworks in this tradition, like the Manhole covers, might have some of the functional qualities inherent in the Civic/Functional tradition. The distinction is that all Place Identifying artworks step beyond artistic enhancement by referring directly to the history and character of a place.

Street Art

"There are many standards which can be used in judging street art. The most logical ones include whether the work improves the immediate environment, the extent to which it involves neighborhood people, and its role in developing community identity...

For the street painter, the role of art in the community becomes a more important consideration than the technical quality of the painting."(39)
Like Place Identifying public art, street art reacts against the modern aesthetic. Though taking innumerable folk art forms, murals are clearly the most notable street artworks.

Street murals have become the most abundant publicly funded street art form, probably because of the support given to muralists during the WPA era. Other street art forms less apt to be funded publicly include sculpture made of found objects, creatively painted objects like manhole covers and fire hydrants, decorative exterior house painting using ethnic imagery, and graffiti.(40)

Most graffiti, the simplest street art, are "tags" identifying individuals or gangs. Some graffiti artworks, however, connect with a larger community enhancement ethic. "Merry Christmas" (Fig. 13) by PJay and Lyndah, two New York youths, is an example.

Figure 13 PJay and Lyndah, "Merry Christmas" 1981
New York City Subway Car
Because of its grass roots nature, street art illustrates regional and ethnic diversity more than the other public art traditions. Street art provides identity and a creative outlet to groups systematically left outside America's mainstream. It is a form of grass roots community development, attempting to make up for the lack of amenities such as movie houses, adequate parks and community centers.

The "Watts Towers" in Los Angeles, CA., (Fig. 14) were the lifelong work of a plasterer and bricklayer, Simon Rodia. With the help of neighborhood kids who brought unending supplies of broken glass, old plates, metal scraps, etc., he turned a commonplace home into a folk castle. City officials sought to tear the towers down after Rodia's
death, claiming they were unsafe and an eyesore. The towers still stand, though, their surprising sturdiness and local community opposition halted demolition plans.(41)

"Chi Lai--Arriba--Rise Up!" (Fig. 15) illustrates the history of Asian Americans throughout the United States and the solidarity of oppressed groups of all colors. The mural, completed in 1974, was administered by Alan Okada, the artist/director, and New York's City Arts Workshop. Over 150 residents of the mixed Chinese, Black and Puerto Rican neighborhood surrounding the project volunteered to paint. They also offered suggestions on the mural's content.(42)

Figure 15 Alan Okada, "Chi Lai -- Arriba -- Rise Up!"
New York City
Active community participation is a common element of street art. Most street artworks are created by people with little formal art training. The best graffiti artists often take high school art classes, some even get some college training. But most creators of found object sculpture, simple murals and graffiti, and decorative objects draw from their craft or labor skills and inner instincts. All but the simplest murals are the work of professional or semi-professional artists. These artists generally act as project directors, however, working closely with neighborhood people in design and implementation.\(^{43}\)

Cost information on street artworks is limited. No accurate cost estimates can be made of graffiti artworks like "Merry Christmas," or works such as the "Watts Towers" since non-professional artists donate most of their time and materials and do not keep records. Mural cost information is available but sketchy. The National Endowment for the Arts, for example, provides lump-sum matching grants through its Art In Public Places program to projects producing from one to six murals each. They keep no per mural cost records. Based on NEA information and Eva Cockcroft's report in *Towards a People's Art*, we can estimate the cost of individual murals at $1000 to $15,000 with most costing less than $5,000.

Virtually no administrative and funding infrastructure exists for street art. Murals enjoy greater administrative and institutional funding support than do other street arts, usually through Park and Recreation departments, local arts councils, and mural painting organizations. But street art projects including murals rely mostly on the creative individuals themselves to solicit funds, prepare materials, etc., and on local community residents for funds.
CHAPTER 3 --- The Tenor of Government Support

Government arts agencies could provide grant aid to any of the five traditions. In this chapter we consider to what extent the National Endowment for the Arts, the national leader in governmental art support activities, patronizes each. I begin by examining the policies of NEA and the project selection criteria of the Art In Public Places program (Art In Public Places is a sub-program of NEA's Visual Arts Program). NEA's policies imply that public art should be supported in all its variety and hence that grant aid should be provided to projects in all five traditions. Not doing so might suggest a lack of grant applicants from some traditions or that applicants from certain traditions are not able to meet NEA Art In Public Places criteria. But a more pervasive problem exists -- discrimination by grant-makers against some traditions on the basis of artistic taste.

Next, 310 Art In Public Places grants made between 1967 and 1980 are categorized according to the five traditions. An analysis of the categorization shows that NEA favors the Formally Expressive tradition. I speculate as to why this is so, arguing that such favoritism disregards the stated policies and represents unfair discrimination. At the end of the chapter I recommend four ways for making Art In Public Places activities more accountable to the policies, which rightly call for broad-based and varied public art support.

Art In Public Places Policy and Funding Criteria

The policies of NEA have remained basically unchanged, at least
since 1978 when Dick Netzer wrote: "The stated objectives of NEA are to make the arts more widely available to millions of Americans; to preserve our cultural heritage for present and future generations; to strengthen cultural organizations; and to encourage the creative development of talented individuals."(44) The presented stated objectives are basically unchanged:

* to make the arts available to all Americans
* to preserve America's artistic heritage "in its full range of cultural and ethnic diversity."
* to foster the creative efforts of arts institutions
* to foster artists' individual creative and excellence
* to provide leadership in arts advocacy and appreciation efforts.(45)

The first four of these policies mirror the earlier ones; only the last represents a change. NEA officials may feel its role as leader of governmental arts support agencies has faded recently or that some strengthening of that role is necessary. The new policy may be reinforcing that role. Still, all the policies suggest that the variety of public art traditions should be treated fairly. In fact, a statement in the pamphlet insures that while carrying out these policies NEA "must not, under any circumstances, impose a single aesthetic standard or attempt to direct artistic content."(46)

Both the NEA Visual Arts Program and its Art In Public Places sub-program operate under the abovementioned NEA policies. In addition to them an Art In Public Places program statement adds only that grants should "make the best contemporary art accessible in public places."34 To arrive at the best artwork, program grants are decided by peer review panels. The panels base their decisions on the following criteria:
* Quality of the artist's work
* Quality, innovation, and timeliness of project
* Commitment to payment of professional fees to artists
* Appropriateness of the site as an integral component of the overall project
* Involvement of the artist in all phases of the project
* Quality of the artist selection committee and the selection procedures
* Evidence of applicant's ability to administer the project, including organizational stability and appropriateness of budget for the proposed activities
* Evidence of a thoroughly developed and feasible fundraising plan to meet matching requirements
* Plans for community involvement, preparation, and dialogue (47)

NEA Support Among the Traditions

John Beardsley's book, *Art In Public Places*, lists the artist and administrative agency, and gives a brief description for 310 grants made by this NEA program from Fiscal Year 1967 to FY 1980. Appendix A reprints this information categorized according to the 5 traditions.

In most cases, the project description supplied by Beardsley was sufficient to place each grant clearly within one of the traditions. Beardsley's descriptions of Formally Expressive works, for example, are characterized by phrases such as "three groups of geometric concrete forms and granite boulders." Civic/Functional artworks were often described as follows: "a commission...to collaborate with a landscape architect in the development of a new mini-park."(48) Where Beardsley's
written description was not sufficient, I made a guess based on my knowledge of the artists and administrative agencies named.

I was unable to categorize 83 of the 310 Art In Public Places projects. Forty-seven of these are "Unspecified Murals." Most of these murals are likely to be either Formally Expressive or Place Identifying. A small number may be Street Art murals, Beardsley's description is not sufficiently to tell how many. I believe, for example, that most CityArts Workshop projects fall into the Formally Expressive tradition, but the many CityArts projects supported by the NEA were not described enough by Beardsley to be placed among the five traditions. The remaining 36 non-mural projects I label "Other Unspecified Projects."

This method of analysis is admittedly loose, relying on second hand descriptions of projects or on my judgements about artists and sponsoring agencies. The method may have led to errors in interpreting project objectives and categorizing projects, but misdiagnosed projects are probably evenly spread among the traditions and I may even have over compensated in liberally placing projects outside the Formally Expressive tradition so as not to bias the results against it.

An imbalance exists between NEA's Art In Public Places goals and its grants-making history. Table 2 indicates clearly that NEA favors the Formally Expressive tradition. It reveals that of the grants placed among the five traditions and the two "Unspecified" categories, 52% were for projects in the Formally Expressive tradition. The comparative figures for the other traditions are: Monuments/Memorials, 1%; Civic/Functional, 7%; Place Identifying, 10%; Street Art, 3%. Twenty-seven percent of the grants were made to projects in the two 'unspecified' categories. Estimating that about half of the projects in these two categories are for Formally Expressive projects, it is likely
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th># of Grants (1967-1980)</th>
<th>% of total grants</th>
<th>Average amount granted by NEA</th>
<th>Average Total Project cost</th>
<th>Average % of project granted by NEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument/Memorial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic/Functional</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20,813</td>
<td>77,927</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formally Expressive</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21,733</td>
<td>61,878</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Identifying</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15,640</td>
<td>51,871</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Art</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,688</td>
<td>24,724</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Murals</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8,415</td>
<td>24,508</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>53,878</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100%

Formally Expressive Grant Dollars = $5,853,131

Total Project Grant Dollars = $8,051,647

TABLE 2
that over 60% of all Art In Public Places grants are made to projects in the Formally Expressive tradition.

The disparity in numbers of grants made to each tradition might be explained by a lack of applications from traditions other than the Formally Expressive. A real imbalance of applications probably does exist, no information is available to confirm or deny the notion. But the imbalance in numbers of applications cannot justify NEA's support of the Formally Expressive tradition since other measures of the grantmaking activities illustrate very clearly that NEA values the Formally Expressive tradition more than others. Table 2 shows, for example, that NEA provides a greater percentage of total project cost (35%) to the Formally Expressive tradition than to all others exceed the Monumental/Memorial tradition (the high percentage of NEA per project support to the Monumental/Memorial tradition is based on only two grants to that tradition and thus is probably not significant). Because of more average per project support to the Formally Expressive tradition, the total grant dollars going to the tradition is substantial. Over 72% of NEA Art In Public Places grant dollars go to projects in the Formally Expressive category. That 72% of the funds go to 52% of the projects, indicates substantial favoritism.

Though it has not done so publicly, the NEA might justify its preference for the Formally Expressive tradition claiming that other governmental and non-governmental groups provide ample support to the other traditions. For example, making only two Art In Public Places grants to the Monument/Memorial tradition might be explained by that the U.S. Fine Arts Commission and many city and state level arts commissions expressly promote the tradition. Similarly, NEA grant-makers might
argue that Street Art murals are funded less often than other artworks because the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as well as many local parks and recreational departments fund street muralists.

But this rationale is insufficient. There certainly is not a void of Formally Expressive artworks which the NEA must fill. New books and art journal articles suggest that a threshold level of Formally Expressive artworks is being reached. The U.S. General Services Administration (GSA), the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), and state legislatures have initiated policies for inclusion of "contemporary art" into public buildings. The GSA, for example, during the periods 1963-66 and 1972-1978 (the program was suspended in the intermediate years due to controversies over the type of art funded) commissioned 136 artworks in federal buildings as part of its "% For Art" program. Most of the GSA funded artworks fall within the Formally Expressive tradition, as Louis Redstone's book Public Art: New Directions implies.(49)

Unmet Policies and Ambiguous Criteria

Given the variety of public art, favoritism to the extent shown does not lead one to believe that the accessibility goal is being met. Formally Expressive artworks are more widely available to the American public due to the Art In Public Places program. Yet, the assertion that the public wants easy access to more of these artworks is questionable. Likewise, the demand for artworks from the other traditions has not been determined. Proponents of Formally Expressive artworks may suggest that it should be made more available than others because it is at the leading edge of the arts. As I have shown though, this justification is
not valid since the other traditions also present artworks in contemporary and creative ways.

In a country with a variety of ethnic and racial groups, preserving a rich art heritage certainly must mean providing monetary and administrative support to artworks from a variety of traditions. The NEA is not doing this sufficiently through the Art In Public Places program. It certainly is important to insure that some Formally Expressive artworks of high quality are preserved but other artworks because of their direct often historical themes are an even more important part of our cultural heritage.

We should also consider that difficulty in preserving our artistic heritage results from the emphasis on direct grants for the creation of new artworks. The NEA Art In Public Places program, nor any other NEA program, does not provide funds for the conservation or restoration of important artworks. Many Civil War memorials and WPA murals represent a part of our artistic and cultural history that is only now deemed unimportant and are in need of restoration.

The Lippincott Company, one of the leading for-profit fabricators of cast metal and slab construction artworks, is certainly being strengthened by current Art In Public Places efforts. Some local arts organizations like New York's Cityarts Workshop also fare well as a result of NEA grants-making. The Cityarts Workshop received 25 grants from NEA during the 1967 to 1980 period. Because this is substantially more than NEA has given to any other single organization, it might indicate an interest other than service to the institutional support goal.

But NEA is wide of the mark on this policy as well. The "cultural
institutions" that truly require strengthening are the street art oriented groups such as the Chicano Mural group, People's Painters and Artes Guadelupanos de Aztlan. These groups receive most of their funding in small increments from individuals neighboring a proposed project site.(52) In addition, the many citizens groups organized to place a monument to a local leader or a place identifying artwork or functional park sculpture in their neighborhood need and should receive support that is not linked, either explicitly or implicitly, to the installation of Formally Expressive artworks.(53)

Identifying talented artists requires judgements of artistic quality, judgements which should be made in different ways for each tradition. NEA's efforts to encourage the creative development of the artist can be too easily translated into favoring the Formally Expressive tradition. Formally Expressive artworks measure artistic quality and the talent of artists in terms of the subtle relationships between line, color, texture, etc. The artistic quality of Civic/Functional artworks should be measured in regard to appropriateness of form and color to urban surroundings and use. For Monuments/Memorials artistic methods should be judged as to their ability to achieve the viewer's direct response to the symbolic message.

That NEA does not consider artistic quality and artists' talent with any reference to the traditions in which the artists work is strongly suggested by the composition of the peer review panels. Of 99 peer review panel members who made grant decisions on the 310 grants made from 1967-1980, 94 were critics for leading avant-garde and high art journals, contemporary art curators, and avant-garde artists. These panel members are listed in Appendix B as they appeared in Beardsley's book.
Regardless of how "liberal" these panel members may be, most probably have not been trained to fairly judge artworks other than Formally Expressive on their own merits. David Siqueros, one of the world's greatest Mexican muralists combining street art themes with civic uses, who received government commissions throughout the WPA years, would probably not have been encouraged by such review panels.

The evidence suggests that NEA administrators have done more than unintentionally disregard the variety of legitimate types of public art requiring government support: The "closed" peer review system, general protest to public presentation of Formally Expressive artworks, lower funding levels for projects not in the Formally Expressive tradition, failure to adequately meet any of its stated goals with any relevance to public art's variety. The Art In Public Places program is certainly not meeting the stated goals of the NEA and may even show purposeful intention to uphold the private interests of arts professionals.

Recommendations

If the Art In Public Places program sanctions art for a few, NEA as a whole is likely doing the same. Change must therefore be enforced from outside NEA. Concerned Congressional representatives must pressure the NEA to change its ways. The following recommendations are made with this in mind.

First, Congress must insist that the NEA audit its activities and provide measures of accountability and effectiveness towards program objectives. The Endowment has continually failed to measure its effectiveness in meeting objectives and has been criticized for allowing its grantees to misuse funds.(54) Though, the NEA is currently
conducting a study of the impact of the Art In Public Places program, the study will be the program's first in its 17 year history.55

Second, peer review panels should be opened up. Art In Public Places panels should include artists and administrative supporters from all the public art traditions. Well-known scientists, humanists, social theorists, as well as persons versed in arts other than the visual would also provide additional objectivity.

Finally, NEA should encourage community participation at the earliest stages of the development of public art projects. Currently, community representatives are given a minor role on committees that make recommendations to final selection juries. Or community hearings, museum lecture series, exhibits, newspaper articles appear after juries select a artists. In either case, community response is solicited in an effort to buffer the project from negative reaction after installation.(56)

The role of the community in which an artwork is to be placed should be broadened. Project selection should involve community representatives, artists and arts administrators in a discussion about the artistic and social statement all parties desire. Artists would prepare proposals based on the decisions of the "statement group."

Conclusion

The debate around government involvement in public art production will not end with this study. This study has, however, shed some new light on the public art arena. I have displayed the variety of public art in such a way that each public art tradition must be recognized as important and contemporary.
Appendix A

Listed here are all grants made by the National Endowment, Visual Arts, Arts In Public Places Program from 1967 through 1980. The grants are categorized according to the five traditions discussed in Chapter 2, with two additional categories for grants that could not be located within the five tradition framework. The public art categories, listed in order of their appearance in the appendix, are:

- Monumental/Memorial
- Civic/Functional
- Place Identifying
- Formally Expressive
- Street
- Unspecified Murals
- Other Unspecified

Monuments / Memorials

Tougaloo. Tougaloo College.
A sculpture by Bruce O’Hara in a mini-park on campus, commemorating the Amistad case. Pending.
Grant: $10,000 Total Project Cost: $20,000

MEMPHIS. Mallory Knights Charitable Organization.
I’ve been to the Mountainside by Richard Hunt. A welded, corten steel, 15’ high sculpture at Mid-American Mall next to Cook Convention Center, dedicated to Martin Luther King, Jr. Installed, 1977.
Grant: $25,000 Total Project Cost: $56,000

Civic / Functional

SAN RAFAEL. Center for Developmental Teaching.
Sixty billboards designed by Mike Mandel and Larry Sultan, at changing locations throughout the San Francisco Bay area over a six month period in 1976.
Grant: $5,000 Total Project Cost: $13,000

VENTURA. Ventura County Library.
A bottle wall sculpture by ‘Grandma’ Tresse Prisbrey for an interior site in the new Simi Valley Public Library. Work in progress.
Grant: $4,371 Total Project Cost: $12,760

DENVER. Denver Parks and Recreation Foundation.
Solar Fountain by Larry Bell and Eric Ott. A fountain sculpture of glass and solar-generated vapor for the plaza of the new Performing Arts Center. Work in progress.
Grant: $40,000 Total Project Cost: $126,260

MIAMI. City of
Master plan by Isamu Noguchi for the design of 18 acres of Bayfront Park, an urban waterfront site. The design incorporates two fountains, an amphitheater and an esplanade along the bay. 1983.
Grant: $50,000 Total Project Cost: $110,000 (planning and design)

ATLANTA. City of
Grant: $50,000 Total Project Cost: $250,000

MEMPHIS. City of
A cast iron fountain by Ivan Bailey in Municipal Park. Work in progress.
Grant: $40,250 Total Project Cost: $100,000

FORT WAYNE. Fort Wayne Fine Arts Foundation.
Seven billboard designs on abandoned buildings in the inner city. 1972.
Grant: $4,700 Total Project Cost: $9,690

KANSAS CITY. City of
A commission to Richard Hunt for a water sculpture in a new park in a residential redevelopment area. Work in progress.
Grant: $15,000 Total Project Cost: $30,000

NEW ORLEANS. City of
A planning grant for a downtown sculpture site for the city. Three artists, each working with a landscape designer selected through regional competition, developed design concepts for the site. A jury composed of art experts and design professionals selected one artist-landscape designer team to develop the final site design. Work in progress.
Grant: $40,250 Total Project Cost: $100,000

CAMBRIDGE. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
A collaboration between six artists and I. M. Pei and Partners in the design of the new Arts and Media Technology Facility. Each artist will work on a specific aspect of the building: Richard Fleischner on the courtyard, Dan Flavin on artificial lighting, James Turrell on natural lighting, Scott Burton on furnishings, Kenneth Noland on the exterior facade and Alan Shields on the main entry. Planning in progress.
Grant: $75,000 Total Project Cost: $150,000 (planning)

GRAND RAPIDS. Arts Council of Greater Grand Rapids.
Grant: $40,000 Total Project Cost: $245,000
Glen Cove, City of
A two month planning grant for a new downtown pedestrian mall. Lloyd Hamrol served as a design consultant for the new mall design, 1977.
Grant: $5,000  Total Project Cost: $10,000

Cleveland, Rapid Recovery.
Robert Morris served as an advisor for a feasibility study for the development of an urban recreational park on the west shore of the Cuyahoga River at Oxbow Bend. 1980.
Grant: $5,000  Total Project Cost: $14,663 (planning study)

Columbus, South Side Settlement.
Sculpture commission to Alice Aycock, for a grand entry staircase connecting the theater with the central courtyard of the building. Work in progress.
Grant: $20,000  Total Project Cost: $50,000

Coos Bay, City of
Purchase of Sign of the Pacific by Claire Falkenstein. The sculpture, incorporated into a fountain in Coos Bay Mall, commemorates the centennial of the city, 1975.
Grant: $7,500  Total Project Cost: $15,000

Equality, designed by Barbara Baylson. A 12’ x 8’ wool tapestry installed at Penn Mutual Visitors’ Center, Philadelphia, 1976. The work was woven by members of the Philadelphia Guild of Handweavers as a Bicentennial tribute.
Grant: $1,200  Total Project Cost: $5,784

Arlington, County Board of
A commission to Nancy Holt to design a new civic park incorporating sculpture for downtown Rosslyn, working with design and engineering professionals. Work in progress.
Grant: $18,000  Total Project Cost: $213,000

Salem, Roanoke College
Reading Garden by Siah Armajani. A 75’ long, redwood and iron environmental work installed on the campus between the Arts and Humanities Buildings and the Memorial Chapel. 1980.
Grant: $10,000  Total Project Cost: $28,180

Kent, City of
Mill Creek Earthwork by Herbert Bayer. The environmental sculpture will incorporate a system of retention basins to prevent further erosion. Work in progress.
Grant: $15,000  Total Project Cost: $93,100

Kirkland, City of
Grant: $4,200  Total Project Cost: $12,588

A commission to Joseph Kinnebrew to collaborate with a landscape architect in the development of a new mini-park at a 9,000 sq. ft. site which faces the riverfront. Work in progress.
Grant: $10,000  Total Project Cost: $20,000

Superior, City of
A two-piece bronze fountain sculpture by H. Boyd Christiansen, located in Center City Park in the central business district, 1974.
Grant: $5,000  Total Project Cost: $31,035

Hanna, Town of
A commission to Stanley Dolega to design an environmental earth sculpture for an abandoned open pit mine which will be reclaimed for public recreational use through the Rural Abandoned Mine Program. (Preliminary explorations by the artist of earth sculpture as a reclamation method were supported by an Artist’s Planning Grant.)
Grant: $50,000  Total Project Cost: $100,000

San Francisco, San Francisco Art Institute.
A planning project for the redevelopment of the Northern Waterfront area of San Francisco, involving Larry Bell, Newton and Helen Harrison, Robert Irwin, Edward Wortz, Joshua Young, Frank Gehry, Melinda Wortz and Eric Orr, 1976.
Grant: $10,000  Total Project Cost: $20,000
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Formally Expressive

Grant: $20,000  Total Project Cost: $40,000

Scottsdale, City of
Windows to the West (Atmosphere and Environment XIII) by Louise Nevelson. A black corten steel sculpture on the lawn between City Hall and the library at the Civic Center as part of the City’s cultural development program, installed 1973.
Grant: $20,000  Total Project Cost: $63,500
TUCSON. University of Arizona.
A commission to Athena Tacha for an environmental sculpture on the
grassy mall at the main entrance to the campus. Work in progress.
Grant: $50,000 Total Project Cost: $100,000

Bakersfield. California State College.
A commission to Maria Nordman for an environmental sculpture using
trees and landscape materials on an eleven-acre site at the campus. Work in
progress.
Grant: $18,000 Total Project Cost: $420,000

BERKELEY. University of California.
Sound sculpture by Doug Hollis for the Lawrence Hall of Science Plaza.
Work in progress.
Grant: $7,600 Total Project Cost: $22,900

CARSON. City of
A leaded stained glass wall by Edward Carpenter for a new community
center. Pending.
Grant: $10,000 Total Project Cost: $20,000

FAIRFIELD. City of
Space Continuum #3 by Lia Cook. A 65-sq. ft. fiber sculpture for the
interior main lobby wall of Fairfield Civic Center, 1976.
Grant: $2,000 Total Project Cost: $4,000

FULLERTON. California State University.
Soft Wall by Lloyd Hamrol. An environmental sculpture on a grassy knoll
north of the Visual Arts Center on campus, 1976.
Grant: $4,000 Total Project Cost: $10,157

INGLEWOOD. City of
A 50' high steel sculpture by Tony De Lap for the fountain at the Civic
Center's East Carriage Trade Plaza, 1974; and a white Italian marble
sculpture by Jack Zajac, at the Civic Center's South Plaza circular
reflecting pool. Installed in 1975.
Grant: $37,500 Total Project Cost: $75,000

LOS ANGELES. Brockman Gallery Productions.
Murals by artists throughout Los Angeles, 1976.
Grant: $5,000 Total Project Cost: $10,000

LOS ANGELES. Cedars-Sinai Medical Center.
An untitled wood sculpture by Loren Madsen. Installed at the most
prominent entry to the Medical Center, adjacent to a public bus stop at the
Grant: $10,000 Total Project Cost: $20,000

OAKLAND. Bay Area Rapid Transit.
Riuka by Harold Paris. A bronze and concrete sculpture garden at the
Oakland City Center Plaza subway entrance, 1976.
Grant: $30,000 Total Project Cost: $60,000

OAKLAND. The Oakland Museum.
Platform II by Michael Heizer. A 30-ton, 7' high, steel sculpture for
Estuary Park on the Oakland waterfront, 1980. The commission initiated
development of the site as a sculpture park.
Grant: $150,000 Total Project Cost: $100,867

RIVERSIDE. Riverside Cultural Arts Council.
Riverside Tripod by James Rosati. A 17' high aluminum sculpture at Main
Street Mall adjacent to City Hall, 1976.
Grant: $40,000 Total Project Cost: $80,000

SANTA BARBARA. Santa Barbara Contemporary Arts Forum, Inc.
Relay by Jud Fine. A redwood sculpture installed at an oceanfront site on
the campus of Santa Barbara City College, 1980.
Grant: $3,500 Total Project Cost: $7,000

DENVER. Denver Parks and Recreation Department.
For three projects: a mirrored glass sculpture by Robert Behrens, installed
in 1975 at the Currigan Convention Center; a plexiglass and steel sculpture
by Gerald Cross located at Broadway and Stout Streets, 1975; and a con-
crete sculpture incorporating water by LeRoy Butler, installed 1974 at the
intersection of Broadway and Welton Streets.
Grant: $24,000 Total Project Cost: $69,759

GREENWICH. Greenwich Arts Council.
Sod Drawing by Richard Fleischner. An environmental sculpture of
concentric sod mounds in low relief, 150' diameter, in Baldwin Park over-
Grant: $2,500 Total Project Cost: $5,000

HARTFORD. City of
Stone Field Sculpture by Carl Andre. An environmental work of 36 glacial
boulders on a triangular grassy plot at the intersection of Main and Cold
Grant: $50,000 Total Project Cost: $100,000

NEW HAVEN. Housing Authority of the City of New Haven.
For two projects: a mirror and stone, 17' high sculpture by Gary Lang and
Helen Kashimer, sited on the lawn of Edith Johnson Towers senior citizens' housing, 1974; and a steel sculpture by Avital Oz, installed at Robert T.
Grant: $5,000 Total Project Cost: $10,500
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Project Details</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>Sculpture commission to Reuben Nakian for a mini-park site downtown. Work in progress.</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$61,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Mermaid by Roy Lichtenstein, a painted steel and concrete sculpture, sited on the grounds of the Miami Beach Theatre of the Performing Arts, 1979.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>El Nuevo Mundo by David von Schlegell, a stainless steel sculpture sited atop a hill in Bicentennial Park, downtown Miami, 1977.</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Starboard Home on the Range, Part VI by Rockne Krebs, on the Municipal Pier. The piece consists of an interior sculptural installation housing laser light equipment, which projects beams of colored light over the harbor. Installed 1976.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>Two untitled murals by James Rosenquist, 10' x 16' each, for the west entrance lobby of the State Capitol, 1977.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>America, America by Barbara Nejma, a 25' high painted steel sculpture commissioned for the entrance of the Library, 1979.</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$29,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>Four commissions for interior sites at the new Hartsfield Atlanta International Airport Terminal: Four Walls for Atlanta by Stephen Amonkos, neon and acrylic paint, 30' x 15', each wall; Patang by Lynda Benglis, two panels of satin applique on canvas, 15' x 40' each; Delta Wave by Sam Gilliam, acrylic paint on canvas, 12' x 30' and 12' x 20'; Windows by Richard Smith, 10 suspended panels of acrylic paint on canvas mounted on aluminum poles, 76' x 12'. All installed 1980.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$102,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>Six Gate by Isamu Noguchi, a black metal, 24' high sculpture sited on the Civic Center green between the Honolulu Municipal Building and the Municipal Records and Reference Center, 1977.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$122,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>Purchase of three works of art by Elaine de Kooning, George Hagle and Anders Sjaever for public areas of the student center and the Alice Millar Center for Fine Arts, 1974.</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>Purchase of three works of art by Wilbrem Youngman, a concrete sculpture installed near the Department of Art &amp; Design on campus, 1977.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston</td>
<td>An untitled 60' long bronze sculpture by Peter Voulkos, on a grassy site adjacent to the Highland Park Library and City Hall. Installed in 1972.</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>Purchase of Windhover by Robert Murray, a painted corten steel, 13' high sculpture on the grounds of Hinsdale Junior High School. Installed in 1976.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macomia</td>
<td>Ancient Hump Ring: Western Berth by John Spellberth. An environmental brick sculpture, 18' in diameter, near the north entrance of the new library, 1978.</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$9,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Forest South</td>
<td>Community Consolidated School District. Purchase of Windhover by Robert Murray, a painted corten steel, 13' high sculpture on the grounds of Hinsdale Junior High School. Installed in 1976.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Des Moines. Civic Center of Greater Des Moines.

Cruise Umbrella by Claes Oldenburg. A corten steel, 33' high sculpture commissioned for the Civic Center plaza, 1979.

Grant: $50,000 Total Project Cost: $125,000

Des Moines. State of Iowa.

Five Stones and a Tree by Luther Uterback, for the lawn of the Herbert Hoover State Office Building, 1978.

Grant: $7,000 Total Project Cost: $14,000

Des Moines. State of Iowa.

Cosmic Seed by Ronald Bladen. A painted steel sculpture, 23' high, installed at the entrance of the Wallace Agriculture Building, 1980.

Grant: $44,000 Total Project Cost: $88,000

Iowa City. City of

For two works: an untitled, stainless steel, 18' high sculpture commissioned to Richard Serra for the plaza of the new Civic Center. Work in progress.

Grant: $50,000 Total Project Cost: $100,000

Iowa City. University of Iowa.


Grant: $15,000 Total Project Cost: $35,000

Sioux City. City of

Sioux City by John Henry. A 56' high painted aluminum sculpture, sited at the downtown Fourth Street Mall, 1977.

Grant: $25,000 Total Project Cost: $50,000

Waterloo. Waterloo Recreation Commission.

Reaching Out by Richard Hunt. A brass and bronze sculpture, installed in the foyer of the Waterloo Recreation and Arts Center, 1977.

Grant: $5,000 Total Project Cost: $10,000

Wichita. City of


Grant: $45,000 Total Project Cost: $107,000

Highland Heights. Northern Kentucky University.

Two sculpture commissions for the College campus: Box by Donald Judd, an 8' x 8' x 16' aluminum sculpture sited on a grassy knoll, 1977; and Way Down East by Red Grooms, a painted steel sculpture of D. W. Griffith directing Lillian Gish in his 1920 film "Way Down East," installed, 1979 on the plaza.

Grant: $50,000 Total Project Cost: $120,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Department of Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>Under Sky: One Family by Mark di Suvero. A corten steel, 54' high sculpture, commissioned for the landscaped site between the World Trade Center and the Baltimore Aquarium in the Inner Harbor redevelopment area, 1980</td>
<td>Grant: $50,000</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Cambridge Arts Council</td>
<td>Interior wall work by Gyorgy Kepes for the new Harvard Square subway station. A 100' long, backlit stained glass mural animated by light patterns generated by the movement of the buses</td>
<td>Grant: $30,000</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: $115,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Dundalk Community College</td>
<td>Baltimore Quarters and Halves by Allen Hartoldi. A 21' high, steel sculpture installed in the courtyard on campus. The piece is dedicated to the labor and industry of the Dundalk community. Installed, 1980</td>
<td>Grant: $10,000</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: $64,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Institute of Contemporary Art</td>
<td>Purchase of three sculptures: Square Throated Elbow by David Kibbey, and Ominous Icon #6 and Solar Stud by Dennis Kowal. Installed next to Gerber Hall on campus, 1976</td>
<td>Grant: $1,950</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: $27,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Babson College</td>
<td>Purchase of three sculptures: Square Throated Elbow by David Kibbey, and Ominous Icon #6 and Solar Stud by Dennis Kowal. Installed next to Gerber Hall on campus, 1976</td>
<td>Grant: $1,950</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: $27,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Institute of Contemporary Art</td>
<td>Works in Progress, 1975, an installation of works in public places along the Freedom Trail by twelve artists: Roswell Angier, Mary Beans, Tim Hamill, Susan Hoffman, Norman Hurst, Bill Jacobson, David Kibbey, Ed Rothfarb, Jill Stosburg, Gretchen Stevens, Molly Lipton and Dennis Kowal</td>
<td>Grant: $10,000</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: $38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Cambridge Arts Council</td>
<td>A commission to Richard Fleischner for a site-specific sculpture for the grounds of the new Alewife Subway Station, working with the station architects and landscape designers. Work in progress</td>
<td>Grant: $40,000</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: $309,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>Grand Rapids Art Museum</td>
<td>Grand Rapids Project by Robert Morris. Two intersecting asphalt ramps traversing the slope of Belknap Park. The project was proposed by the artist for &quot;Sculture off the Pedestal,&quot; a temporary exhibition of 12 sculptures in public places sponsored by the Art Museum in 1973. Permanent installation, 1974</td>
<td>Grant: $30,000</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: $60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>City of</td>
<td>Purchase of Solar Painting, by Ronald Watson, 1975. A steel, 6' high sculpture in a downtown park overlooking the river, installed 1979.</td>
<td>Grant: $5,000</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: $18,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>Color Cross Section by Anne Healy. A nine-panel vinyl sail cloth work, suspended in the nine-story interior courtyard of the Detroit General Hospital, 1976.</td>
<td>Grant: $10,000</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: $20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>City of</td>
<td>An untitled 24' high aluminum sculpture by Duwayne Haichert, sited in the Amphitheatre of Riverbank Park, 1979</td>
<td>Grant: $25,000</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: $75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>City of</td>
<td>La Grande Virese by Alexander Calder. A 43' high, red painted steel stabile installed at Vandenberg Center Plaza as part of the downtown urban renewal project, 1969.</td>
<td>Grant: $45,000</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: $127,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>City of</td>
<td>Purchase of Solar Painting, by Ronald Watson, 1975. A steel, 6' high sculpture in a downtown park overlooking the river, installed 1979.</td>
<td>Grant: $5,000</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: $18,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>City of</td>
<td>Purchase of Solar Painting, by Ronald Watson, 1975. A steel, 6' high sculpture in a downtown park overlooking the river, installed 1979.</td>
<td>Grant: $5,000</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: $18,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>City of</td>
<td>Purchase of Solar Painting, by Ronald Watson, 1975. A steel, 6' high sculpture in a downtown park overlooking the river, installed 1979.</td>
<td>Grant: $5,000</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: $18,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINNEAPOLIS, City of

Purchase of Construction #150 by Jose de Rivera. A 45' high stainless steel sculpture, installed in Washington Square Mall as part of an urban renewal project. 1972.
Grant: $45,000
Total Project Cost: $90,000

LANSING, Governor's Special Commission on Art in State Buildings.
The Equus That by Michael Heizer. The sculpture of seven concrete elements, commissioned for the new plaza at the State Capitol Complex, 1980. A 48' circle is divided into four 24' circles, three of which are further sub-divided into halves, quarters and eighths.
Grant: $15,000
Total Project Cost: $155,750

MINNEAPOLIS. Hennepin County Medical Center.
Choppy II by Andrew Leicester, Landscape by George Morrison and Jalley Window by Jerry Rudquist. Murals for interior sites at the hospital, 1976.
Grant: $12,500
Total Project Cost: $38,500

MINNEAPOLIS. Minneapolis College of Art & Design.
Purchase of an 11' x 13' milled cedar sculpture by Jackie Ferrara, for an outdoor campus site, 1979.
Grant: $2,340
Total Project Cost: $10,980

MINNEAPOLIS. Minnesota State Arts Council.
"9 Arts 9 Spaces," temporary installations of outdoor sculpture on public sites throughout the Twin Cities (9/1/70 - 10/15/70) by Siah Armajani, Allan Erdman, Fred Escher, Robert Cumming, Jud Nelson, Barry Leva, Ron Brodigan, Richard Treher and William Wegman.
Work #37, Red Wing by Charles Biederman. A three-dimensional painted aluminum wall sculpture, located in Jordon Court, a pedestrian mall in the City of Red Wing, 1973.
Grant: $20,000
Total Project Cost: $42,250

MINNEAPOLIS. Minneapolis St Paul Convention Center.
The Gate by David von Schlegell. A 26' high stainless steel sculpture sited near a rest stop on Interstate 35 atop a hill overlooking Duluth and Lake Superior, 1975.
Grant: $30,000
Total Project Cost: $60,000

MINNEAPOLIS. Regents of the University of Minnesota.
A commission to Robert Irwin for a sculpture for the University of Minnesota campus. Work in progress.
Grant: $30,000
Total Project Cost: $100,000

MINNEAPOLIS. Walker Art Center.
Two installations: Just another city boy watchin' the electrons flow by Cork Marcheschi, a neon sculpture on the east bank of the Mississippi River in downtown Minneapolis; and Black Stacks Helium Sculpture by Otto Piene, a floating red tube sculpture over the electric company smokestacks in downtown Minneapolis. Installed in conjunction with The River: Images of the Mississippi exhibition at the Museum, 1976.
Grant: $4,500
Total Project Cost: $10,036

ST PAUL. Division of Parks and Recreation.
A sound installation by Max Neuhaus for the Central Rotunda of Como Park Conservatory, 1980.
Grant: $19,000
Total Project Cost: $46,922

JACKSON, City of
An untitled welded steel sculpture by James Clover, 1973, for the entrance to Jackson Airport.
Grant: $10,000
Total Project Cost: $20,000

ST LOUIS. City of
An untitled monumental sculpture by the Joslyn Museum of Art, 1979, for a public site. Work in progress.
Grant: $20,000
Total Project Cost: $57,000

LINCOLN. Metropolitan Arts Council, Inc.
Wind Organ by Doug Hollis. An aerolian sculpture, 40' x 20' located at Standing Bear Lake, 1980. The commission was the result of a series of temporary installations at public sites sponsored by the Joslyn Museum, 1978.
Grant: $1,500
Total Project Cost: $4,140
OMAHA. Omaha Opportunities Industrialization Center.
Grant: $15,000 Total Project Cost: $30,000

HAMPTON. Dartmouth College.
Thorn by Beverly Pepper. A 125’ long, earth and steel sculpture, located on the green at the Sherman Fairchild Physical Sciences Center on the campus, 1977.
Grant: $20,000 Total Project Cost: $40,000

PARAMUS. North Jersey Cultural Council.
Grant: $20,000 Total Project Cost: $71,620

ALBUQUERQUE. University of New Mexico.
High Ground by Lloyd Hamrol. A concrete and sod sculpture (5' x 60’ x 45') commissioned for the outdoor courtyard of the law school building, 1980.
Grant: $30,000 Total Project Cost: $100,000

ALBANY. State University of New York.
Grant: $30,000 Total Project Cost: $60,000

BUFFALO. Media Study.
Grant: $1,075 Total Project Cost: $2,446

GARNERVILLE. Intermedia Foundation.
Grant: $2,000 Total Project Cost: $12,497

HOOSICK FALLS. Hoosick Valley Art Association.
Purchased of The Guardian by Jose de Creeft. The granite sculpture is sited in the village public park, 1979.
Grant: $3,000 Total Project Cost: $15,174

LAKE PLACID. Lake Placid Village, Inc.
Grant: $2,090 Total Project Cost: $4,180

LAKE PLACID. National Fine Arts Committee/XIII Olympic Winter Games.
Grant: $25,000 Total Project Cost: $58,121

LAKE PLACID. National Fine Arts Committee/XIII Olympic Winter Games.
Eight environmental sculptures (some temporary) around the Olympic Games sites, 1979-1980: Siah Armajani, Reading House; Richard Fleischner, Fence and Covered Fence; Lloyd Hamrol, Snow Tree House; Doug Holin, Field of Vision; Nancy Holt, Tumbling Glass Planes; Mary Miss, Veiled Landscape; and Ely Zimmerman, Untitled.
Grant: $45,500 Total Project Cost: $137,230

NEW YORK. Bronx Development Services Center.
DDS Sculpture by George Mittendorf. An aluminum sculpture sited on the north campus of the center, a community services agency for the developmentally disabled, 1979.
Grant: $10,000 Total Project Cost: $20,000

NEW YORK. Bronx Venture Corporation.
Puerto Rican Sun by Rafael Ferrer. A painted steel, 25’ high sculpture at the entrance to the community garden park at Fox and 126th Streets, South Bronx, 1979.
Grant: $22,850 Total Project Cost: $52,350

NEW YORK. Cityarts Workshop Inc.
The Phoenix by Pedro Turado and James Januzzo. A 55’ x 95’ mural at 42nd Street and 8th Avenue, 1975.
Grant: $4,000 Total Project Cost: $16,000

NEW YORK. Creative Artists Public Service (CAPS).
Asarte by Arline Shulman. A 12’ high, welded steel sculpture, located on the grounds of the Bronx Psychiatric Center, 1974.
Grant: $900 Total Project Cost: $3,800

NEW YORK. Creative Artists Public Service (CAPS).
Grant: $2,650 Total Project Cost: $6,250

NEW YORK. Creative Time.
Mausoleum by Bill Brand. A twenty-second animated sequence of 228 hand-painted images visible to passengers on Manhattan-bound B, D, N and Q subway trains from Brooklyn. The development of the concept to the point of feasibility was supported by an Artist’s Planning Grant, 1980.
Grant: $27,000 Total Project Cost: $58,000
New York. Dia Art Foundation.
A permanent fluorescent light installation by Dan Flavin in Grand Central Station, on commuter train platforms 18-19, 39-40 and 41-42. Completed 1977.
Grant: $20,000 Total Project Cost: $59,000

New York. Dia Art Foundation.
Sun and Moon Space by James Turrell. An environmental work sited within the volcanic Roden Crater in Arizona's Painted Desert, northeast of Flagstaff. Work in progress.
Grant: $9,000 Total Project Cost: $117,140

New York. 42nd Street Local Development Corporation.
Commission to Mary Miss for an environmental sculpture in Mini-Shubert Alley and to Stephen Antonakos for a neon mural on the east wall of 440 West 42nd Street. Works in progress.
Grant: $50,000 Total Project Cost: $100,000

Installations of sculpture by Beverly Pepper, Mark di Suvero and Sol LeWitt at the plaza at 2nd Avenue and 47th Street, July 1975 to June 1975.
Grant: $7,500 Total Project Cost: $19,750

Grant: $9,870 Total Project Cost: $19,750

Grant: $5,000 Total Project Cost: $20,000

Grant: $10,000 Total Project Cost: $25,000

Tide Park by Athena Tacha. A landscaped environmental sculpture for downtown Smithtown, New York, 1977. As part of the selection process three artists were invited by a panel to make proposals for the site. Selection of Tacha's proposal was made by townpeople.
Grant: $10,000 Total Project Cost: $40,000

New York. 112 Green Street Workshop.
Time Landscape by Alan Sounlas. The re-creation of a primeval Manhattan forest environment on a half-block site at LaSalle Place, 1977.
Grant: $15,000 Total Project Cost: $100,000

A commission to Eric Staller, to create an environmental installation along a 1/4 mile stretch of East River Park. Colored filters placed over existing street lamps create a kinetic experience of changing color when viewed from a car on the FDR Drive. Work in progress.
Grant: $4,750 Total Project Cost: $28,500

Troy. Hudson Valley Community College.
A.D. 1971 by Antoni Milowksi. A welded corten steel sculpture located in a primeval Manhattan forest environment on a half-block site at LaSalle Place, 1977.
Grant: $10,076 Total Project Cost: $20,152

Winston-Salem. Wake Forest University.
A sculpture commission to Robert Maki for an outdoor site on campus. Work in progress.
Grant: $25,690 Total Project Cost: $51,580

Two murals by Frank Faulkner and Ann Kesler Shields in the central business district, 1974.
Grant: $10,000 Total Project Cost: $23,290

Akron. Akron-Summit County Public Library.
Grant: $10,000 Total Project Cost: $20,000

Cleveland. The Kent State Quadrangle Committee of University Circle.
Grant: $4,000 Total Project Cost: $49,800

Columbus. Ohio Arts Council.
Four murals, through the Urban Walls project, in the commercial district of Cincinnati, 1972-1973.
Grant: $10,000 Total Project Cost: $21,000

Dayton. Dayton Art Institute.
Grant: $7,000 Total Project Cost: $21,000

Springfield, City of
Oracle's Jade by Ronald Bladen. A sculpture commission for the exterior plaza of the new City Hall. Work in progress.
Grant: $40,000 Total Project Cost: $100,000
Three murals designed by George Ramsey and one by John Schlump on downtown commercial walls, in 1973.

Grant: $2,000  Total Project Cost: $6,500

TWO SCULPTURE PROJECTS, 1975:
- Covenant by Alexander Liberman, a 50' high red painted steel sculpture commissioned for Locust Plaza on the axis of Locust Walk; and purchase of We Lost by Tony Smith, a 10' square black painted steel sculpture sited on the college green.

Grant: $40,000  Total Project Cost: $154,000

Two murals designed by George Ramsey and one by John Schlump on red painted steel sculpture commissioned for Locust Plaza on the axis of downtown commercial walls, in 1973.

Grant: $2,500  Total Project Cost: $16,500

Three murals designed by George Ramsey and one by John Schlump on red painted steel sculpture commissioned for Locust Plaza on the axis of downtown commercial walls, in 1973.

Grant: $2,500  Total Project Cost: $16,500

- We Lost by Tony Smith, a 10' square black painted steel sculpture sited on the college green.

Grant: $40,000  Total Project Cost: $154,000


Grant: $2,500  Total Project Cost: $16,500

- The horizontal, 20 foot diameter sculpture on the University campus will augment a group of permanently installed works on the campus. Work in progress.

Cost: $100,000  Total Project Cost: $160,000
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sculpture Description</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth, City of</td>
<td><em>Twelve Triangles Hanging</em> by George Rickey. A 51' six part stainless steel mobile suspended above a reflecting pool in the Fort Worth Municipal Building atrium. The piece, installed in 1974, is visible from all floors.</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Temple</strong> - Cultural Activities Center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Orpheus</em> by Richard Hunt. A sculpture for the plaza of the Cultural Activities Center, 1979.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>St. George</strong> - Dixie College.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A glass mosaic mural, 15' x 12', by Harrison Grounge, located on the second story facade of the Fine Arts Center, 1975.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$47,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Burlington</strong>, Burlington Planning Commission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thirty sculptures by Paul Aschenbach and Peter Ruddick, assisted by four students, for Battery Park promenade, 1975.</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Burlington</strong>, University of Vermont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marble sculpture by Robert Vesely and John Wittenberg for McDonough Park, 1974.</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$6,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Montpelier</strong>, Vermont Council on the Arts, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont International Sculpture Symposium, 1971. Ten sculptures from five countries designed and fabricated sculptures which were sited in picnic areas along Highways 89 and 91. Artists Isaac Witkin, James Silva, Katsuji Kishida, Carl Floyd, Rudolph Uher, Peter Ruddick, Clement Meadmore, Dieter Trantenroth, Eduardo Ramirez and Bradford Graves were assisted by ten students.</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$55,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bellingham</strong>, City of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Two Lines Oblique</em> by George Rickey. A 32' high stainless steel kinetic sculpture for City Hall Plaza, 1971.</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bellingham</strong>, Western Washington University.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Rock Rings</em> by Nancy Holt. A masonry stone environmental sculpture, 40' in diameter, sited on campus, 1979.</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bellingham</strong>, Western Washington University.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hawks Triangle</em> by Richard Serra. A corten steel sculpture, 39' on a side and 9' high, located on a knoll overlooking the quadrangle on campus, 1980.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$123,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Olympia</strong>, Olympia Technical Community College.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Tetradigm</em> by Ted Janson. A sculpture commission on the college campus, near main building, 1979.</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$31,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Seattle</strong>, King County Arts Commission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An earthwork by Robert Morris, reclaiming an abandoned 3.69-acre gravel pit as a community park and viewpoints, 1979.</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$158,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Seattle</strong>, City of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Black Sun</em> by Isamu Noguchi. A 9' diameter black granite sculpture located in Volunteer Park overlooking Elliott Bay, 1969.</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Seattle</strong>, Seattle Arts Commission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Moses</em> by Tony Smith. A black painted steel, 11' high sculpture located on the grounds of the Seattle Center, between the International Fountain, the Repertory Theatre Playhouse, and the Exhibition Hall, 1975.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Seattle</strong>, Seattle Arts Commission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Adjacent, Against, Upon</em> by Michael Heizer. Three groups of geometric concrete forms and granite boulders, commissioned for Myrtle Edwards Park on Seattle's waterfront, 1977.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Seattle</strong>, Seattle Arts Commission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Gyrojack</em> by Lloyd Hamrol. A cast concrete, 9' high sculpture for a new downtown neighborhood mini-park, 1979.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Seattle</strong>, Seattle Arts Commission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A commission to Robert Irwin for an environmental sculpture for the plaza of the Public Safety Building, facing the Municipal Building. Pending.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$146,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>South Charleston</strong>, Kanawha Arts Alliance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A sculpture commission to Charles Gittenner for the Post Office Plaza. Three artists were selected by a panel of art experts and prepared proposals for the site. Final selection was made by the citizens of Charleston, 1980.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Madison</strong>, Madison Art Center, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Art</em> by William King. An aluminum, 27' high sculpture for the new civic cultural complex downtown, 1979.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$100,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District of Columbia: Children's Hospital National Medical Center.
Periwinkle Shaft by Robert Rauschenberg. Four murals, each 23' x 8', of fabric printed images, mirrors, and found objects, commissioned for the escalator entrance of the hospital, 1980.
Grant: $50,000  Total Project Cost: $150,000

District of Columbia: D.C. Department of Housing and Community Development:
Lighthouse by Anne Truitt. A 10' high, acrylic paint on wood sculpture for an interior hall space of the Old Fort Lincoln Elementary School, 1980.
Grant: $4,000  Total Project Cost: $10,310

District of Columbia: D.C. Department of Housing and Community Development:
A sculpture commission to Elyn Zimmerman for an environmental sculpture designed as part of new park lands at Fort Lincoln New Town. Work in progress.
Grant: $35,000  Total Project Cost: $104,020

District of Columbia: Gallaudet College.
Two commissions for the new Learning Center grounds: Contrapposto by Jules Olitski, completed 1980, and a sculpture commission to Lloyd Hamrol. Work in progress.
Grant: $50,000  Total Project Cost: $100,000

Grant: $8,000  Total Project Cost: $16,000

District of Columbia: Private Arts Foundation.
Grant: $3,000  Total Project Cost: $6,490

Place Identifying

Berkeley, City of*
Berkeley, the City and Its People, a 10'5' x 16' mural by Romare Bearden, in the City Council Chambers. Installed in 1973.
Grant: $8,000  Total Project Cost: $16,000

Hayward, City of*
Grant: $50,000  Total Project Cost: $100,000

Salinas, City of
Hi in Three Stages of Landing by Claes Oldenburg, commissioned for the Community Center. Work in progress.
Grant: $50,000  Total Project Cost: $100,000

San Francisco, Chamber of Commerce
Mural by Richard Haas for a building facade at the Civil Center. Work in progress.
Grant: $30,000  Total Project Cost: $93,660

San Marcos, Palomar College.
A mural by Edgar Rodriguez, George Papciak and Manuel Sepulveda on the exterior west wall of the racquetball court building, 1980.
Grant: $8,210  Total Project Cost: $16,420

Greenwich, Greenwich Arts Council.
Grant: $5,000  Total Project Cost: $16,420

Boise, Idaho POW-MIA/Boise Gallery of Art.
Grant: $3,000  Total Project Cost: $7,000

Columbus, Driftwood Valley Arts Council.
Two paintings on the history and architecture of Columbus by Tom Shelton, 1978: Settlements, 62" x 63" located in Council Chambers and Date Lines, 61" x 110" for the second floor lobby of City Hall.
Grant: $5,825  Total Project Cost: $11,470
Detroit: Wayne State University.
For the removal and restoration of two murals on the theme of the auto
industry, painted by William Gropper in 1938, from the Northwest Station
Post Office to their installation at Wayne State Center student lounge,
1971.
Grant: $6,000
Total Project Cost: $6,000

Minneapolis: Urban American Indian Center.
A cedar wood inlay, 96' x 18', by George Morrison. Located on the facade
of the new building, the work is an abstraction based on a traditional Chippewa feather pattern. Installed, 1975.
Grant: $50,000
Total Project Cost: $120,000

Joplin, City of
Joplin at the Turn of the Century 1896-1966, a 5 1/8' x 13' mural by Thomas
Hart Benton, for the lobby of the Joplin Municipal Building. The mural,
commissioned to commemorate the City's Centennial, was dedicated in
Grant: $10,000
Total Project Cost: $60,000

Kirkwood, City of
A mural by Siegfried Reinhardt, for the lobby of the City Hall, depicting
Grant: $2,500
Total Project Cost: $12,500

Omaha: Riverfront Communities Development Foundation.
Development of a concept design proposal by Isamu Noguchi for a
Bicentennial fountain and park on the Missouri River, at the border of
Nebraska and Iowa. 1975.
Grant: $9,000
Total Project Cost: $49,773

Las Vegas: University of Nevada.
Flashlight by Claes Oldenburg. A 38' high, corten steel sculpture sited in a
plaza between the University Theater and the Concert Hall. Work in
progress.
Grant: $35,000
Total Project Cost: $70,000

Jersey City: Jersey City State College.
Welcome by William King. A cut sheet aluminum sculpture for the
entrance to the College library, 1978.
Grant: $3,950
Total Project Cost: $7,900

Corning, City of
People Walk by Elliott Erwitt. A 3,000 sq. ft. photographic mural of city
residents, located on the lobby wall behind the glass facade of City Hall. A
Bicentennial project, completed 1977.
Grant: $10,000
Total Project Cost: $35,000

New York: The Ben Shahn Foundation, Inc.
Restoration of a fresco by Ben Shahn, located in the library of a public
school in Roosevelt, New Jersey, 1972.
Grant: $5,200
Total Project Cost: $45,270

New York: City Walls, Inc.
Three murals by Todd Williams, Richard Haas and Helen DeMott at sites
throughout New York City, 1974-1975.
Grant: $10,000
Total Project Cost: $20,000

New York: City Walls, Inc.
Four murals by Richard Haas on Prospect St. in Brooklyn and one on Mulberry St. in Little Italy and one mural by Marina Stern on Mulberry St., 1976.
Grant: $15,000
Total Project Cost: $30,000

New York: City Walls, Inc.
Two murals by Richard Haas at South Street Seaport and one by Alan Sonfist at West Tremont Ave., Bronx, 1978.
Grant: $5,000
Total Project Cost: $20,000

Fargo Parking Authority.
A sculpture commission to Luis Jimenez for Red River Mall, downtown
Fargo. Work in progress.
Grant: $20,000
Total Project Cost: $47,000

Cincinnati: Contemporary Arts Center.
“Urban Banners” project: banners to be commissioned for major spaces
throughout the city. Pending.
Grant: $15,000
Total Project Cost: $31,660

Cincinnati: Save the Terminal, Inc.
The restoration of fourteen murals designed in 1933 by Winold Reiss, and
their relocation from Union Terminal to the Greater Cincinnati Interna-
tional Airport, 1974.
Grant: $20,000
Total Project Cost: $400,000

Cleveland: Governmental Research Institute.
For a sculpture commission to George Segal at the Justice Center. Work in
progress.
Grant: $50,000
Total Project Cost: $100,000

Yellow Springs: Public Works, Inc.
Six murals painted on truck trailers by Michael Fajans and Timothy
Grant: $7,500
Total Project Cost: $15,000
**Los Angeles:** Mechicano Art Center.
Eighteen murals throughout Los Angeles, 1972.
Grant: $5,000 Total Project Cost: $10,000

**Chicago:** Community Arts Foundation, Inc.
Grant: $10,000 Total Project Cost: $45,200

**Chicago:** Grand Community Organization.
For two mural projects: Stop Now Gallery with an ecological theme; and a mural depicting Puerto Rican History, Summer 1971.
Grant: $3,000 Total Project Cost: $8,018

**New York:** Cityarts Workshop Inc.
Mural by community artists apprentices on a wall at East Broadway and Catherine Street, 1975.
Grant: $4,000 Total Project Cost: $13,045

**New York:** Cityarts Workshop Inc.
Por Los Ninos by Alfredo Hernandez and Crear Una Sociedad Nueva by Tomie Arai. Two murals in the Houston Street area, 1976.
Grant: $5,000 Total Project Cost: $19,700

**New York:** Cultural Council Foundation.
For projects by the Community Arts Workshop's inner city mural program, 1972.
Grant: $8,000 Total Project Cost: $76,580

**North Carolina:** Cultural Council Foundation.
New Birth, a 50' x 100' mural in the lower East side by James Jannuzzi, Alfredo Hernandez and Pedro Tirado. 1974.
Grant: $8,000 Total Project Cost: $17,320

**District of Columbia:** Museum of African Art.
Mural facing a patio area and parking lot of the Museum. The design was based on the art of the N'Debele people of southeastern Africa. Installed, 1975.
Grant: $2,500 Total Project Cost: $7,929

**Los Angeles:** Mechicano Art Center.
Eighteen murals throughout Los Angeles, 1972.
Grant: $5,000 Total Project Cost: $10,000

**Chicago:** Community Arts Foundation, Inc.
Grant: $10,000 Total Project Cost: $45,200

**Chicago:** Grand Community Organization.
For two mural projects: Stop Now Gallery with an ecological theme; and a mural depicting Puerto Rican History, Summer 1971.
Grant: $3,000 Total Project Cost: $8,018

**New York:** Cityarts Workshop Inc.
Mural by community artists apprentices on a wall at East Broadway and Catherine Street, 1975.
Grant: $4,000 Total Project Cost: $13,045

**New York:** Cityarts Workshop Inc.
Por Los Ninos by Alfredo Hernandez and Crear Una Sociedad Nueva by Tomie Arai. Two murals in the Houston Street area, 1976.
Grant: $5,000 Total Project Cost: $19,700

**New York:** Cultural Council Foundation.
For projects by the Community Arts Workshop's inner city mural program, 1972.
Grant: $8,000 Total Project Cost: $76,580

**North Carolina:** Cultural Council Foundation.
New Birth, a 50' x 100' mural in the lower East side by James Jannuzzi, Alfredo Hernandez and Pedro Tirado. 1974.
Grant: $8,000 Total Project Cost: $17,320

**District of Columbia:** Museum of African Art.
Mural facing a patio area and parking lot of the Museum. The design was based on the art of the N'Debele people of southeastern Africa. Installed, 1975.
Grant: $2,500 Total Project Cost: $7,929

**Unspecified Murals**

**Tucson:** Una Noche Plateada.
A ceramic tile mural, 9' x 23', by Barbara Grygutis and Charles Hardy, for the interior lobby of Kino Community Hospital, 1977.
Grant: $2,500 Total Project Cost: $5,310

**Castro Valley:** Art Facade Corps.
A mural by Andrew Steinbauer in an Oakland neighborhood, 1977.
Grant: $5,000 Total Project Cost: $10,000
Los Angeles. Los Angeles Parks and Recreation Department.
Ten murals at inner city and highway locations in East Los Angeles, completed between June 1973 and May 1974.
Grant: $5,000  Total Project Cost: $10,270.

San Francisco. San Francisco Art Commission.
Mural s in an Hispanic neighborhood of San Francisco, 1975.
Grant: $7,000  Total Project Cost: $14,000.

Hartford. City of
Commission to Romare Bearden for murals in the entrance lobbies of the City's new Veterans' Memorial Coliseum at the Hartford Civic Center, 1980.
Grant: $25,000  Total Project Cost: $50,000.

Atlanta. Arts Festival of Atlanta.
Six murals painted on downtown commercial and residential buildings during the spring of 1974 by David Lewis, Anthony Greco, Larry Connaiser, E. Allen McGe, Vincenica Blount and Dale Pearson Hill.
Grant: $10,000  Total Project Cost: $30,000.

Chicago. Community Arts Foundation, Inc.
Grant: $4,000  Total Project Cost: $9,055.

Chicago. Community Arts Foundation, Inc.
Two wall murals by Santi Isrowuthakul and Steve Stahl in Northside Chicago, 1972.
Grant: $10,000  Total Project Cost: $27,600.

Chicago. Community Arts Foundation, Inc.
Grant: $4,000 and $4,000  Total Project Cost: $18,000.

Chicago. Community Arts Foundation, Inc.
Grant: $10,000  Total Project Cost: $34,400.

Chicago. Community Arts Foundation, Inc.
Mural commissions and restoration of several existing murals in Southside Chicago, Summer 1974.
Grant: $10,000 and $10,000  Total Project Cost: $32,708.

Chicago. Community Arts Foundation, Inc.
Grant: $10,000  Total Project Cost: $26,000.

Chicago. Community Arts Foundation, Inc.
Eight murals throughout Southside Chicago by Mitch Caton, Astrid Fuller, Justine DeVan, Celia Radek, Caryl Yasko, Bill Walker and Santi Isrowuthakul, Summer 1975.
Grant: $10,000  Total Project Cost: $23,800.

Chicago. Community Arts Foundation, Inc.
Three murals by Astrid Fuller, Mitch Caton, Justine Devan, Calvin Jones, Caryl Yasko and Lucyna Radychi in Southside Chicago, Summer 1976.
Grant: $7,500  Total Project Cost: $15,000.

Chicago. Community Arts Foundation, Inc.
Grant: $7,500  Total Project Cost: $21,179.

Indianapolis. City of
For a mural designed by Roland Hobart for walls of a downtown building, 1974.
Grant: $3,500  Total Project Cost: $7,000.

Cedar Rapids. Cedar Rapids/Marion Fine Arts Council.
Grant: $4,000  Total Project Cost: $17,280.

Sioux City. Art Center Association of Sioux City.
Mural on exterior wall of the Sioux City Art Center, designed by Peggy Parris, 1973.
Grant: $1,000  Total Project Cost: $2,000.

Baltimore. Department of Housing and Community Development.
Grant: $10,000  Total Project Cost: $20,000.

Boston. The Boston Foundation, Inc.
Grant: $5,000  Total Project Cost: $24,500.
New York City Walls, Inc.
Outdoor wall murals by Mel Pekarsky at St. Barnabas Episcopal Mission House and at New York Public Theatre, and a mural by Naon Daphnis at 620 West 47th Street, overlooking a playground, 1971.

Grant: $10,000
Total Project Cost: $20,000

New York City Walls, Inc.

Grant: $10,000
Total Project Cost: $20,689

New York City Walls, Inc.
Four murals by Alvin Loving, Todd Williams, Mel Pekarsky and Forrest Myers, at sites throughout New York City, Summer 1973.

Grant: $10,000
Total Project Cost: $20,000

New York City Walls, Inc.
Three murals by Nicholas Krushenick, Pierre Clark and Jay Rosenblum in Jamaica, Queens, 1974-1975.

Grant: $15,000
Total Project Cost: $30,000

New York City Walls, Inc.
Eight murals in eight major United States cities: by Romare Bearden in Atlanta, George Mead in Oakland, Richard Farley and Kip Farris in Denver, Karl Wirsum in Chicago, Jean Henderson in Louisville, Richard Haas in Boston, Sarah Lindquist and Bob Fishbone in St. Louis, and Marylin Propp in Kansas City, Missouri, 1976

Grant: $30,000
Total Project Cost: $132,800

Grand Forks. Grand Forks Chamber of Commerce.
Three murals designed by Brian Paudem, painted on downtown halls during Summer, 1977.

Grant: $4,000
Total Project Cost: $9,755

Cleveland. American Institute of Architects.

Grant: $5,000
Total Project Cost: $18,750

Cleveland. American Institute of Architects.
Continuation of murals project in downtown Cleveland, 1974.

Grant: $6,000
Total Project Cost: $32,800

Boston. The Boston Foundation, Inc.
As part of "Summerthing," 1971, thirteen artists were commissioned for mural and sculpture projects: Todd McKee, Maria Termini, Dan Palma, James Brown, James Huggins, Yanie Bell, Gary Rickson, Annette Cammarata, Deborah McAuley, Fern Cunningham, Robert Guilleman, David Robinson and Silvana Cenci.

Grant: $20,000
Total Project Cost: $41,000

Boston. The Boston Foundation, Inc.
For "Summerthing" festival, 1972, twelve artists were commissioned for murals and sculptures throughout metropolitan Boston: Robert Morgan, Dana Chandler, R. Edward Brown, Barbara Wolf, Al Smit, Annette Cammarata, Robert Cronin, Peter Lindenmuth, James Higgins, George Rogers, Donald Bergh and Fern Cunningham.

Grant: $15,000
Total Project Cost: $40,322

Ypsilanti. Eastern Michigan University.
Five murals, in redevelopment areas throughout Ypsilanti, by two artists and student assistants, 1973.

Grant: $5,000
Total Project Cost: $15,000

Minneapolis. Minnesota State Arts Council.
A mural designed by Albert Winton for the facade of the Sabathani Afro-American Cultural Arts Center, Minneapolis, 1972.

Grant: $4,000
Total Project Cost: $8,000

St. Louis. Double Helix Corporation.

Grant: $3,000
Total Project Cost: $13,400

St. Louis. St. Louis Beautification Commission.

Grant: $5,000
Total Project Cost: $10,000

Four murals in Jersey City by Darby Bannard, Clarence Carter, Richard Anuszkiewicz and Reginald Neal, 1972.

Grant: $10,000
Total Project Cost: $20,000

New York City Walls, Inc.

Grant: $5,000
Total Project Cost: $30,716

New York City Walls, Inc.
Murals by Pedro P. Silva at Delancey Street Subway Station, 1978.

Grant: $2,500
Total Project Cost: $8,600
DETOIT. Recreation Department.
Four sculpture commissions in public parks: *We the People* by Linda Riehl in Peck Park; *The Entrance* by John Piet in Grand Circus Park; *Untitled* by Stanley Dolega in Clark Park; and *Rabbit* by Michael Luchs in Cass Park. Installed, 1975.
Grant: $9,300  Total Project Cost: $20,300

MINNEAPOLIS. The Upper Midwest Regional Arts Council.
Grant: $9,000  Total Project Cost: $29,550

TRENTON. Department of Environmental Protection.
Planning study for incorporation of works of art in the development of Liberty State Park by artists Tony Smith, George Segal and Melvin Edwards, 1979.
Grant: $3,000  Total Project Cost: $7,000

NEW YORK. The Municipal Art Society.
Sculpture in the Environment, installations of works by seven artists in neighborhoods throughout New York City: Clement Meadmore along Riverside Drive; Eduardo Ramirez at Ft. Tryon Park; Jose de Rivera at Flushing Meadows; Inverna Lopez at McKenna Square; Ernest Trova at Heywood Tower; Peter Gourfain at Highbridge Park; and Terry Fugate-Wilcox at Wright Park, 1972.
Grant: $10,000  Total Project Cost: $35,000

NEW ROCHELLE, City of
Sculpture commission. Pending.
Grant: $25,000  Total Project Cost: $53,250

WEST HAVEN, Helen Hayes Hospital.
A sculpture by Alfons Schilling for an outdoor site on the hospital grounds. Work in progress.
Grant: $22,000  Total Project Cost: $53,400

YONKERS. The Hudson River Museum
Outdoor temporary installations of three sculptures by Ronald Bladen at Grand Army Plaza, Manhattan; Bronx River Parkway, Westchester County and on the Museum grounds, Yonkers, 1977.
Grant: $9,290  Total Project Cost: $19,000

COLUMBUS. City of
Sculpture commission to Melvin Edwards for the Focal Point Park of Mt. Vernon Plaza, a new publicly-financed residential complex. Work in progress.
Grant: $15,000  Total Project Cost: $91,700

DAYTON. Wright State University.
Grant: $2,000  Total Project Cost: $4,000

PHILADELPHIA. Philadelphia Museum of Art.
Grant: $8,000  Total Project Cost: $16,000

PHILADELPHIA. Philadelphia Museum of Art.
Ten murals and the painting of one subway train, July 1972 - February 1974, coordinated by the Museum's Urban Outreach Department.
Grants: $3,000; $6,000  Total Project Cost: $44,573

PHILADELPHIA. Philadelphia Museum of Art.
Eleven murals throughout Philadelphia, coordinated by the Museum's Urban Outreach Department, 1974-1975.
Grant: $15,000  Total Project Cost: $35,284

PHILADELPHIA. Philadelphia Museum of Art.
Seventeen murals throughout the city, coordinated by the Museum's Urban Outreach Department, July 1975-June 1976.
Grant: $10,000  Total Project Cost: $36,200

SCRANTON. Lackawanna County Regional Planning Commission.
Grant: $15,000  Total Project Cost: $40,000

MONTPELIER. Vermont Council on the Arts.
A ceramic mural, 9' x 20' by Dina Yellen, installed in the lobby of the Chittendon County Correctional Facility in South Burlington, 1976.
Grant: $5,000  Total Project Cost: $10,000

MILWAUKEE. Milwaukee Youth Foundation.
Three murals by Marie Burton, on inner city walls, 1974.
Grant: $2,000  Total Project Cost: $13,719
Other Unspecified Artworks

MONTEREY, City of
Sculpture commission. Pending.
Grant: $25,000  Total Project Cost: $50,000

WEST HARTFORD, University of Hartford.
Sculpture commission to Claes Oldenburg for an outdoor site near the
University Library and Lincoln Theater. Work in progress.
Grant: $25,000  Total Project Cost: $65,000

Boise, City of
For a sculpture commission for the plaza of the new City/County office
compex. Pending.
Grant: $17,500  Total Project Cost: $40,000

MACOMB, Western Illinois University.
Purchase of 22 prints by American artists for installation in public spaces
throughout Macomb, 1975.
Grant: $2,000  Total Project Cost: $4,000

AMES, Iowa State University, Class of '76.
Sculpture commission to Loren Madsen for courtyard, Iowa State Center.
Work in progress.
Grant: $15,000  Total Project Cost: $71,480

BETHESDA, Montgomery County Department of Recreation.
Acquisition of fifty prints by contemporary American artists for display
throughout the county in public spaces, 1975.
Grant: $8,500  Total Project Cost: $17,555

BETHESDA, Montgomery County Department of Recreation.
Purchase of 81 prints, watercolors and drawings by artists associated with
the Maryland and D.C. area, for display in public spaces around the
county, 1976.
Grant: $10,000  Total Project Cost: $22,380

SPRINGFIELD, City of
A sculpture commission for the Hall of Justice Plaza. Pending.
Grant: $22,500  Total Project Cost: $70,060

DETROIT, New Detroit, Inc.
For two projects: murals throughout the city by Lester Johnson, James
King, David Rubello, Noreen Green and Steve Faust, and sculptures by
John Pint and Hanna Steibel installed in public parks, 1973; and for
purchase of paintings by Allen Bryant, Harold Neal, Robert Duchin and
Allie McGhee for Detroit General Hospital.
Grant: $10,000  Total Project Cost: $26,000
Listed here are all the members of peer review panels of the National Endowment for the Arts', Visual Arts, Art In Public Places Program from 1967 through 1980.

Panel Members 1967-1980

The following were responsible over the years for coordinating the Art in Public Places Program:

- Henry Geldzahler, Visual Arts Program Director, 1966-69
- Brian O'Doherty, Visual Arts Program Director, 1969-76
- Richard Koselleck, Visual Arts Program Assistant Director, 1972-74
- John Coplans, Art in Public Places Coordinator, 1976-78
- Patricia Fuller, Art in Public Places Coordinator, 1978-81

The following is a list of Endowment-appointed consultants who served on joint artist selection panels for Art in Public Places projects between 1968 and 1978. The titles are current and not necessarily the positions held by the individuals at the time of their participation in the panels.

- Sebastian Adler
  Director
  La Jolla Museum of Contemporary Art
  California

- William Agee
  Director
  The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston
  Texas

- Deborah Allen
  Former Assistant Curator
  Denver Art Museum
  Colorado

- Lawrence Alloway
  Art writer
  New York, New York

- Robert Arneson
  Artist
  San Francisco
  California

- Benicia, California

- Don Ashton
  Art writer
  New York, New York

- Elizabeth Baker
  Editor
  Art in America
  New York, New York

- Edward L. Barnes
  Architect
  New York, New York

- Susan Barron
  Former Director
  Wadsworth Museum of History and Art
  Belingham, Washington

- John Beardsley
  Adjunct Curator
  Corcoran Gallery of Art
  Washington, D.C.

- Jay Belloli
  Curator, Modern Art
  The Detroit Institute of Arts
  Michigan

- Jack Boulton
  Vice President and Director of the Art Program
  Chase Manhattan Bank
  New York, New York

- Julie Brown
  Assistant Curator of Exhibitions
  The Hudson River Museum
  Yonkers, New York

- Robert Buck
  Director
  Albright-Knox Art Gallery
  Buffalo, New York

- Martin Bush
  Curator
  Edwin A. Ulrich Museum of Art
  Wichita State University
  Kansas

- Linda Catlett
  Director
  Contemporary Arts Museum
  Houston, Texas

- John Coplans
  Art writer
  New York, New York

- Suzanne Delehanty
  Director
  Newberger Museum
  Purchase, New York

- Jack Cowart
  Curator,19th and 20th Century Art
  St. Louis Art Museum
  Missouri

- James Demetrion
  Director
  Des Moines Art Center
  Iowa

- Anne d'Harnoncourt
  Curator, 20th Century Painting
  Philadelphia Museum of Art
  Pennsylvania

- Rene d'Harnoncourt
  Former Director
  Museum of Modern Art
  New York, New York

- James Elliott
  Director
  University Art Museum
  Berkeley, California

- Nina Felshin
  Curator
  Contemporary Arts Center
  Cincinnati, Ohio

- John Fitzgibbon
  Art writer
  Pilot Hill, California

- Suzanne Foley
  Curator
  San Francisco Museum of Modern Art
  California

- Howard Fox
  Assistant Curator for Exhibitions
  Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden
  Washington, D.C.

- Paul Friedberg
  Landscape Architect
  Portland, Oregon

- Paul Friedberg & Associates
  New York, New York

- Martin Friedman
  Director
  Walker Art Center
  Minneapolis, Minnesota

- Mildred Friedman
  Curator, Design
  Walker Art Center
  Minneapolis, Minnesota

- Patricia Fuller
  Former Director
  Art in Public Places
  Seattle Arts Commission
  Seattle, Washington

- Richard Fuller
  Director
  Seattle Art Museum
  Washington

- Thomas Garver
  Director
  Madison Art Center
  Wisconsin

- Henry Geldzahler
  Commissioner
  Department of Cultural Affairs
  New York, New York

- Anne Gerber
  Collector
  Seattle, Washington

- Constance Glenn
  Director
  The Art Museum and Galleries
  California State University
  Long Beach, California

- Marge Goldwater
  Curator
  Fort Worth Art Museum
  Texas

- Linda Goode-Bryant
  Director
  Just Above Midtown
  New York, New York

- Adolph Gottlieb
  Art writer
  New York, New York

- Donald Harvey
  Director
  University Gallery
  University of Akron
  Ohio

- Barbara Haskell
  Curator
  Whitney Museum of American Art
  New York, New York

- Thomas Hess
  Curator, 20th Century Art
  Metropolitan Museum of Art
  New York, New York

- Alanna Heiss
  Executive Director
  Institute for Art and Urban Resources
  New York, New York

- Henry Hopkins
  Director
  San Francisco Museum of Modern Art
  California

- Walter Hoppes
  Adjunct Curator, 20th Century Painting and Sculpture
  National Museum of American Art
  Washington, D.C.

- Richard Hunt
  Artist
  Chicago, Illinois
Mary Jane Jacob
Curator
Museum of Contemporary Art
Chicago, Illinois

Diana Jacob
Former Public Art Administrator
Department of Housing and Community Development
Baltimore, Maryland

Janet Kardon
Director
Institute of Contemporary Art
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

David Katzive
Assistant Director, Education and Program Development
The Brooklyn Museum
New York

Richard Koshalek
Deputy Director and Chief Curator
Museum of Contemporary Art
Los Angeles, California

Rosalind Krauss
Art writer
New York, New York

Philip Larson
Artist and Associate Professor
Minneapolis College of Art and Design
Minnesota

Thomas Leavitt
Director
Herbert F. Johnson Museum of Art
Ithaca, New York

Edward Levine
Professor of Art
Minneapolis College of Art and Design
Minnesota

Ira Licht
Director
Low Art Museum
Coral Gables, Florida

Howard Lipman
Collector
New York, New York

Jane Livingston
Associate Director & Chief Curator
Corcoran Gallery of Art
Washington, D.C.

Lisa Lyons
Curator
Walker Art Center
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Kynaston McShine
Curator
Museum of Modern Art
New York, New York

Ruth Meyer
Executive Director
Ohio Foundation on the Arts
Columbus, Ohio

Laurence Miller
Director
Laguna Gloria Art Museum
Austin, Texas

Ward Mintz
Director
Museum Aid Program
New York State Council on the Arts
New York, New York

Jan Muhler
Director
Amon Carter Museum of Western Art
Fort Worth, Texas

Robert Murdoch
Director
Grand Rapids Art Museum
Michigan

Dean Myhr
Director
Waterloo Recreation Commission
Iowa

John Neff
Director
Museum of Contemporary Art
Chicago, Illinois

Walter Netsch
Architect
Skidmore Owings & Merrill
Chicago, Illinois

Gerald Nordland
Director
Milwaukee Art Center
Wisconsin

Ellen Oppenheim
Assistant Curator
Kimbell Art Museum
Fort Worth, Texas

Peter Plagens
Artist and Writer
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Ted Potter
Director
Southeastern Center for Contemporary Art
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Stephen Prokopoff
Director
Institute of Contemporary Art
Boston, Massachusetts

Emily Pulitzer
Collector
St. Louis, Missouri

Martin Puryear
Artist
Chicago, Illinois

Brenda Richardson
Assistant Director for Art (Curator, Painting and Sculpture)
The Baltimore Museum of Art
Maryland

James Rosati
Artist
New York, New York

Nancy Rosen
Former Curator
Vassar College Art Gallery
Poughkeepsie, New York

Irving Sandler
Professor, Art History
State University of New York
Purchase, New York

Hideo Sasaki
Landscape Architect
Sasaki Associates, Inc.
Watertown, Massachusetts

Peter Selz
Professor of Art History
University of California
Berkeley, California

Marcia Tucker
Director
The New Museum
New York, New York

Dianne Vandcrlip
Curator, Contemporary Art
Denver Art Museum
Colorado

Jan Van der Marck
Director
Dade County Center for Fine Arts
Miami, Florida

Elayne Varian
Former Curator of Contemporary Art
John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art
Sarasota, Florida

Peter Voulkos
Artist
Berkeley, California

Ron Watson
Artist
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Carl Weinhardt
Director
Villa Vizcaya Museum and Gardens
Miami, Florida

Dolores Wharton
Collector
Albany, New York

James Wood
Director
The Art Institute of Chicago
Illinois

Virginia Wright
Collector
Seattle, Washington
FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER ONE


3. John Beardsley's Art In Public Places, Partners For Liveable Places, 1981, presents the costs of 310 NEA grants made from FY1967 to FY1980. These were tallied and averaged to arrive at the $60,000 figure.


13. Ibid., pp. 11


CHAPTER 2


21. Ibid, pg. 16.


25. Ibid.

26. Information on artists, sponsors and administrators, funding sources and project costs for this tradition is extracted from a variety of source books including:


29. Ibid., pg. 42.
30. Artist, sponsor and administrator, funding source, and cost material for this tradition is gathered from:


33. Ibid.

34. Beardsley, Art In Public Places, pg. 15-18.

35. Beardsley's book as well as the following were sources of information on the characteristics of Formally Expressive art:

Boulton and Solway, Urban Walls: Cincinnati, Solway Gallery, Cincinnati, 1976


36. Fleming and Von Tscharner, Place Makers, pg. 9

37. Ibid., Introduction

38. All examples of Place Identifying art are from Fleming and Von Tscharner's Place Makers. Information on artists, costs, and administrative and funding infrastructure are taken from this source book and Beardsley's Art In Public Places.


42. Cockcroft, Towards a People's Art.

43. Information of Street Art's characteristics is drawn from: Sommer, Street Art; Cockcroft's Towards a Peoples Art, and
CHAPTER 3


47. Ibid.


51. Beardsley, *Art In Public Places,* Appendix A.

52. Eva Cockcroft in *Towards a People's Art* discusses in detail the institutional backgrounds and funding climates of these mural groups.

53. Von Scharner and Fleming in *Place Makers* pg. 112 imply such arts council influence in the example of a proposal for public artwork at a Cambridge, MA high school.
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