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Abstract

Nationwide, there exists a wide disparity between municipal-based public art programs. Mid to large sized cities typically have public art commissions, percent for art ordinances and various programs with full-time, internal staff. Programs in smaller-sized cities vary immensely, many having lower capacity, formality or activity than others. Most operate on shoestring budgets and rely on occasional grants, donations or fundraising opportunities in order to commission artwork. This thesis explores the different approaches to public art taken by municipalities with respect to administrative guidelines, operational structure, financial resources, programmatic missions and strategic partnerships. The research question seeks to answer what these approaches are and how they connect with broader themes of public art and urban planning. The study scope consists of five smaller sized cities in Massachusetts with populations under 125,000—Cambridge, Somerville, Salem, North Adams and Pittsfield—whose programs were recently active and perceived as reasonably successful. Interviews with arts administrators were conducted to gain insight into successes and challenges confronted by each program.

The case studies reveal several findings with policy implications for the future of public art. An underlying goal of all the programs was to ensure that art remained “accessible” to the public. Other planning-related goals, such as economic development and revitalization, were key drivers of the programs, while strong political and public support appeared to be an essential ingredient that enabled the programs to function effectively. With limited budgets, most of the cities concentrated on temporary forms of public art, often tied to events or cultural programs. In managing their programs, the municipalities maintained a balance of formality and flexibility, which had effects on the public processes involved in the siting and selection of artwork. In the final section, a set of short and long-term recommendations are discussed to help address these challenges, along with topics for further research.
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the Great White Whale sits in a small park at the intersection of Maplewood Avenue and North Street. At the base of the granite sculpture is a large, uncut block of stone, which lifts the artwork a few feet above ground, making the whale appear in motion as it rides atop the crest of a wave. To characterize the carving as smooth and consistent wouldn't be accurate. The piece is expertly sculpted in the shape of a whale and could not be mistaken for anything else. Yet a closer look at the whale's skin exposes a rough cut of granite, a stylistic feature that makes the carving feel expressionistic, slightly obscuring its intended form.

It would be difficult to miss the whale as you walk up North Street, Pittsfield's major thoroughfare and figurative “spine” that serves as the elongated center of downtown. Although the whale is only a few feet wide, the piece is prominently located near the sidewalk and highly visible to both pedestrians and drivers. Adjacent to the park is a historic brick building with several ground-floor retail businesses, including Dotties Coffee Lounge, a popular breakfast and lunch spot for local residents and people who work nearby. On the opposite side of North Street lies the historic Lantern Bar and Grill with its brightly lit, iconic neon sign and banner proclaiming to make “the best burger.” As you walk north of Maplewood Avenue, the multistory brick buildings of North Street become increasingly sparse. The busy and dense storefront character south of the park quickly transitions to open parking lots with a firmly suburban character.
A small sign, no wider than a few inches, sticks out of the grass in front of the sculpture. The words on the sign indicate the artwork's title, its sculptor, C.R. Gray, and the group that worked to commission, fund and maintain the artwork, known as Artscape. A few feet from the sculpture stands a stone plaque revealing the significance of the piece: a commemoration of the period from 1850-1863 in which Herman Melville lived in Pittsfield and wrote his most widely celebrated novel and magnum opus, Moby Dick. In 2012, the city of Pittsfield, working in collaboration with the volunteer-based Artscape committee, set out to install works of public art with a “Melville theme” that paid tribute to both the writer himself and the novel's cherished association with the place it was written.¹

The installation of The Great White Whale sheds light not only on the presence of art in public spaces, but also on the delicate relationship between public art and urban planning. The material used to produce this work and how it's viewed aesthetically reflect only one lens from which to understand the meaning of public art. As greatly as the piece can be defined by these

---

¹ Tefft, Recreation Activities Coordinator, City of Pittsfield.
qualities, *The Great White Whale* is also defined by a host of other qualities: how the piece fits within its physical context, how the public (as viewers) experience and ascribe value to the sculpture, and how it represents a deliberate attempt by the city to promote Pittsfield's cultural history, albeit in a manner distinct from a traditional memorial, statue or monument. These qualities and others hint at a larger scope of discussion on the significance of public art. Undoubtedly, artists, and the work they produce, are central to the practice of public art. However, it is often local residents, municipal-based staff and members of a volunteer-led commission who are at the helm of setting a city's public art agenda and overseeing nearly every facet of implementation. In this regard, the work of these stakeholders remains fundamental to the entire process. Through a city's individual approaches, government officials and arts administrators, too, help shape the meaning of artwork in public spaces.

**Research Topic**

The chief aim of this thesis will be to explore the variety of approaches smaller-sized municipalities use in the practice of public art. While individual pieces of art will be discussed, the core subject of analysis will be the approaches themselves by which public art is administered, the institutional framework and policies that mold this process, and the interaction between groups of stakeholders. While there exist common strategies towards implementing public art—such as art commissions or percent-for-art ordinances—municipalities often mix these strategies, instead of using a one-size-fits-all approach. These approaches can be generally divided into three sub-topics: (1) the goals of the public art program, (2) the operational structure and financial resources of the program, and (3) special partnerships and collaborations that help sustain the program. Similarly, a program's history and institutional context can reveal further aspects of this approach.

This thesis seeks to meet three objectives. A primary objective will be to identify what these approaches are and highlight basic differences. A secondary objective will then be observing how these approaches speak to broader themes of public art and urban planning. The third objective will be to draw conclusions from these observations and propose a series of recommendations in the short and long-term. For the field of practice, it is
hoped that by closely examining the administration of public art, useful information can be gathered on how public art can be produced in smaller-sized cities and what types of policies or institutional frameworks are successful. The lessons learned from different approaches can have practical application for municipalities in Massachusetts and elsewhere, particularly cities in the early stages of forming a program.

Nationwide, there appears to be a great disparity between public art programs in larger cities and those in smaller- to medium-sized cities or towns. Larger metropolises—New York City, Chicago and Philadelphia, to name a few—have well-established Percent-for-Art Programs that supply a stream of funding for public art installations tied to the financing of large-scale infrastructure projects. On the other hand, smaller-sized cities rarely have such programs in place, relying instead on modest government grants or donations. In a similar vein, many larger cities commission projects through a formal review process administered by an art commission whose members are appointed and given legally mandated responsibilities. Though art commissions are much less common in smaller-sized cities, a municipal government may empower a committee of local residents to make decisions on behalf of the city or, in the absence of a volunteer-based group, have a city staff member manage the process in entirety.

Larger cities in the U.S. have many shared traits in the organizational structure and management of public art. In contrast, smaller to medium-sized cities exhibit a wide range of approaches, some with longstanding programs and others which are either budding or in the process of being conceived. Additionally, few studies, academic research or articles discuss public art in cities with smaller populations. For these reasons, the case studies are selected to only include municipalities with fewer than 125,000 residents. While more populous cities provide a rich source of information on public art, this research seeks to tackle how public art “happens” in less populous cities and study their differences in approach. This is not to suggest that programs from cities of all population sizes are not relevant to the discussion. Examples from such programs will be continuously mentioned and thus serve as a valuable backdrop for individual cases.

Besides the diversity of approaches taking place in smaller-sized cities or towns, another reason for maintaining this geographic scope relates to an issue of the present distribution of national funding for the arts. As will be
discussed in the following chapter, major cities have historically represented a larger proportion of grant recipients from the National Endowment for Arts (NEA), one of the top sources of funding for local public art projects. Analyzing small- to medium-sized cities afforded an opportunity to study municipal art projects that have received fewer grants and given less attention.

Municipalities in Massachusetts were chosen as a geographic scope in order to maintain a level of consistency between cities of similarly sized populations and minimize the comparison of places with substantially different political, social and economic contexts. Since only a handful of towns and cities in Massachusetts have established public art programs that are currently active, this enabled a more comprehensive overview of local and state-based programs. Despite the limits placed on the scope of population size and geography, findings from the case studies may have implications for cities and towns across the United States and beyond.

Honing in on a clear and straightforward definition of public art remains another crucial issue for narrowing down the scope of the research topic. The meaning of public art is naturally amorphous. It can embrace a variety of artistic movements and disciplines and even question what is ordinarily claimed as art. Works of public art can be permanent and semi-permanent, like *The Great White Whale*, or temporary, lasting for a month, a day, an hour or as a brief as a few minutes. A classic image of public art evokes a mural or sculpture, but art can also be performance-based or integrated into

---

**FIGURE 2:** Summary of Research Topics and Objectives

---

RESEARCH TOPIC

What approaches are smaller-sized cities in Massachusetts using to support public art?

SUB-TOPICS

1. Background and Context of Program
2. Strategic Goals
3. Operational and Financial Structure
4. Partnerships and Collaborations

OBJECTIVES

1. Identify approaches and highlight distinctions
2. Explore how approaches link to themes of public art and urban planning
3. Propose strategic recommendations

---
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an event itself. As a further complicating matter, *public* art can be in *private* spaces if the pieces are easily viewable to the public. The lack of clarity over defining public art poses a challenge that should be openly confronted and given appropriate consideration. In an effort to address this issue, this thesis does not intend to subscribe to one view over another, but rather let each of the cases tell their own story about the meaning of public art. Conforming to a predefined, uniform view of public art would miss the nuances of how individual municipalities view art and its relationship to other public initiatives.

A final note on the research topic concerns the meaning of "approaches" to public art. The term "approaches" was chosen as a way to encompass multiple topics influencing the development of public art at the municipal level. These include a wide array of topics: the type of art programs and their process of artist selection; the systems of governance and regulatory frameworks that affect these programs, the financial sources used to support projects; the involvement of staff and other individuals administering the program; the form of community engagement and public outreach; the style and characteristics of installations; and the ongoing management of a permanent or temporary collection. As the case studies show, there is much overlap between the individual topics that ultimately make up an "approach." The goal of this analysis is to look holistically at how each municipal government supports public art projects, as well as how these approaches connect with city planning efforts and theories of public art, as detailed in the second chapter.

By investigating specific approaches, it is hoped that other municipalities without public art programs can learn from these findings and pilot their own model. Further, by exploring how these approaches connect with the statewide system, the findings can inform a discussion on whether current policies in Massachusetts are working effectively and what short and long-term steps might be taken to make improvements. Lastly, the case studies suggest that public art programs are possible for cities with smaller populations and constrained budgets. In essence, there is a "promise" that the goal of installing public art can be fulfilled in every city and does not have to be limited to larger cities or more affluent municipalities. However, the playing field among cities is uneven and resources for public art remain increasingly difficult to obtain.
### Table 1: Study Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHY</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td>Cities/towns with less than 125,000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT OF ANALYSIS</td>
<td>Municipal governments or governing bodies responsible for administering arts programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFINITION OF PUBLIC ART</td>
<td>Highlight similarities and differences at municipal level; permanent or temporary; visual arts or other artistic mediums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC ART APPROACH</td>
<td>Public outreach and education, structure and organization of program, financial sources, maintenance and conservation, system of governance and regulatory structure, partnerships and collaborations, program vision and intergovernmental relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Methodology

A series of case studies were used as the primary research method in this thesis. Based on a review of active public art programs, five municipalities were selected for in depth analysis: Salem, Cambridge, Somerville, Pittsfield and North Adams. For each of these municipalities, interviews were conducted with municipal-based staff involved with the management of public art programs and other essential processes related to the programs. North Adams is the only exception in that this scope of work is completed almost entirely by a not-for-profit organization affiliated with a local college. In-person interviews were conducted with the purpose of gaining firsthand knowledge and detailed feedback of particular arts programs. In addition, they also helped reveal critical perspectives and themes of public art’s relevance in the context of other municipal-based programs.
A compilation of secondary research from online media, brochures, reports and official documents helped complement the case study interviews. Meanwhile, literature in books, academic journals and online publications served as a basis for obtaining a broader overview of public art programs at the state, national and international levels. These works were particularly valuable in identifying the current issues and debates occurring in the practice of public art and how they connect to the individual case studies. In general, these bodies of research can be characterized in two groups: research that surveys or reviews existing art installations and research that aims to instruct administrators and managers in the public and private sector.

Chapter Organization

The current and first chapter serves as an introduction to the thesis with a description of the research topic, scope of analysis, research methodology and structure of chapters. The second chapter provides an initial background on policies and programs governing public art in the
United States with a comparison to Great Britain due to the rich amount of research on the country’s programs. This section also highlights historic milestones and transitions in the development of public art. Then, the second part of this chapter provides a brief overview of existing methods of implementing public art, such as various financing tools, frequently used regulatory frameworks and methods of program administration. A final chapter section is devoted to reviewing approaches adopted by municipalities within the past few decades, including the publication of master plans or visionary documents and a movement towards temporary installations with events-based programs.

The third chapter acts as a bridge between the generic background on public art and the specific case studies by describing programs and policies that apply statewide in Massachusetts. This chapter discusses the function of the Massachusetts Cultural Council (MCC) and other public and private institutions that play a role in the administration of public art, especially in the realm of grant funding. The next five chapters, chapters four through eight, are dedicated to each of the five municipalities being studied. To standardize the method of analyzing the case studies, each of these chapters is organized into four sections. The first section provides an initial background and historic context of the city, along with the genesis of its public arts program. The second section dives into the city’s “strategic approach” by describing the goals of the program, its operational structure and financial resources, and any key partners or collaborators that have enabled the program to run effectively. The third section profiles one or two projects undertaken by the municipality as a spotlight for recent programs. In the fourth section, there is a critical analysis of the municipal programs in order to tease out features that distinguish its programs from other cities.

The ninth and final chapter synthesizes the analysis and information gathered from the case study chapters with the previous background sections. As part of a comparative analysis, this section presents a set of issues that cut across each municipality and reflect upon commonly shared opportunities and barriers. This section will also serve as a discussion on what lessons can be learned from the cases and how a place’s context can impact the practice of public art. The second section of the chapter crystallizes the aforementioned analysis with a short list of recommendations, while proposing topics for further research. The thesis then concludes with brief remarks about the topic as a whole as it relates to the field of urban planning.
Chapter 2
A History and Background of Public Art

The following chapter is a background on the history of public art and a review of ongoing and recent approaches. This is essential for framing a later discussion of the case studies and how their features link to the field as a whole. The first section of the chapter provides a brief historic overview of public art in the United States. A second section describes a few tools, policies and approaches commonly found in practice. Tying these two sections together, the third section examines theoretical perspectives and critical debates taking place in the field, such as the evolving meaning of public art. Though the United States represents the main context for policies and programs, Great Britain will be discussed due to the country’s widespread adoption of public art programs and the extent to which these programs have been researched.

Historical Perspectives

The origins of public art are inherently imprecise because, one could argue, works of art or objects characterized as art have existed in the public domain for centuries if not millennia. To a greater or lesser degree, artistic or stylistic elements have always been a feature in building facades or embedded within the urban design of spaces accessible to the public. Taking a liberal view of what constitutes art, a case could be made that public art has been a constant presence through the creativity manifested through architects, engineers and other individuals who collectively shape the built environment. Consequently, it can be difficult to disentangle art from architecture or
maintain a single, well-structured interpretation of art displayed publicly. Researchers who tackle this issue tend to distinguish a streetscape or buildings adorned with stylistic elements from individual works of art produced with the intention of occupying a public space. Under this viewpoint, the nature of public art not only hinges upon whether the artwork can be distinct from other built structures, but also whether the artwork's presence in a public space reflects a deliberate choice. In this regard, the historical roots of public art are defined less by the artist or even the artwork itself and defined more by the external forces enabling the "public" display of the artwork, determining how and why it should be placed where it is and for what purpose.

In the United States, one of the earliest examples of a public or private organization dedicated to placing artwork outdoors and in the public eye is Philadelphia's Fairmount Park Art Association (FPAA). The organization was founded in 1872 by a group of citizens concerned about the rapid expansion of industrial uses, united behind a goal of beautifying the area in and around Fairmount Park through works of sculpture. Bach notes that in 1906 FPAA was deemed such a success that it expanded to include the whole city in order to "promote and foster the beautiful in Philadelphia, in its architecture, improvements, and the city plan." Not only is FPAA consistently cited as one of the nation's first public arts organizations and a forerunner of subsequent art commissions, but it also continues to presently operate, although its name was officially changed to the Association for Public Art in 2012.

The rise of FPAA at the turn of the century represented a larger tide in which cities and towns across the country engaged in large-scale projects to improve the aesthetic qualities of urban spaces and foster the development of iconic civic institutions. Several researchers assert that this period, commonly referred to as the City Beautiful movement, marks the birth of public art as a distinct profession or field of practice. It was during this period of time that a handful of major U.S. cities formally established art commissions with detailed procedures for siting artwork, though mainly sculpture, while recognizing a unique worth of art in enhancing the built of environment. Cher Krause Knight and others indicate that the City Beautiful movement

3 Bach et al., New Land Marks, 13.
4 "FPAA Becomes the Association for Public Art (aPA) and Announces World Première of Sky-High Interactive Public Art Experience."
5 Knight, Public Art, 2.
reflected a particular strand of sculptural art that was "civic-minded" and advanced desirable social and political values, as well as promoting a wider appreciation for the arts.\textsuperscript{6}

Following the Great Depression, programs established during the New Deal era—such as the Federal Arts Program (FAP) under the Works Progress Administration (WPA)—marked a critical turning point in the history of public art. The FAP, along with several WPA programs, ushered in a wave of public arts investment by commissioning thousands of pieces in federally owned buildings. Knight notes that the New Deal-era programs laid the

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure4.png}
\caption{Employment and Activities poster for the WPA's Federal Art Project (Smithsonian Archives of American Art, 1936)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{6} Ibid.
groundwork for future federal-based arts funding and helped public art, artists and arts professionals gain wider recognition. At a fundamental level, Barbara Goldstein states assertively that the WPA “established the legitimacy of government-sponsored public art.”

Continuing its status as a municipal trailblazer, in 1959 Philadelphia became the first city to establish a percent for arts ordinance requiring that one percent of funding for capital projects on city-owned land be dedicated to public art. Taking Philadelphia's ordinance as a model, in the following decades municipalities across the country would adopt their own version of such an ordinance through a system of tying the costs of municipal-based capital construction projects to public arts funding. This system served as both a symbolic recognition of arts in the municipal capital budget and a dedicated funding stream to support individual pieces.

7 Ibid., 4.
8 Goldstein, Public Art by the Book, ix.
Another major turning point in the history of public art occurred with the creation of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) in 1965. Jeffrey L. Cruikshank and Pam Korza note that, prior to the NEA, only a handful of municipal arts programs were in existence. The NEA, and specifically its Art in Public Spaces Program, provided cities with matching grants to sponsor community-sponsored art projects. Pivotal, several art historians note that the Program's mission and statutory guidelines allowed public art to become "officially sanctioned as significant contributors to our nation's wellbeing" and function as a "legitimate government responsibility." On the heels of Philadelphia's ordinance, the Arts in Public Spaces Program also sparked the enactment of "percent for art" programs and municipal-based policies across major U.S. cities. Then, in 1972, the General Service Administration (GSA) unveiled the Art-in-Architecture Program, which developed a "percent-for-art" requirement for federal projects whereby one half of one percent of the project cost would be set aside towards public art. One initial drawback to these programs, as Cruickshank and Korza describe, was their primary goal of "honoring great American artists," rather than giving opportunities to all artists. As an illustration to this point, the first city to receive a matching grant in the Art in Public Spaces Program was Grand Rapids, Michigan for installing Alexander Calder's La Grande Vitesse. As shown in Figure 6, the imposing sculpture rises 43 feet tall and 54 feet long, located prominently in the public plaza fronting Grand Rapid's City Hall.

A few researchers claim that adjustments made to NEA guidelines in the 1970's greatly impacted public art at the local level. Knight suggests that when the Art in Public Spaces Program changed its program to give local governments more responsibility in the selection and review of projects, municipal art and design commissions were immediately granted more discretionary authority. During the same period of time, Miwon Kwon stresses that the NEA began to consider how proposed artwork would fit within its surrounding context. In 1974, the NEA added to its programmatic guideline that artwork must be "appropriate to the immediate site." Accordingly, there was a deliberate shift from producing large, striking pieces, exemplified by Calder's La Grande Vitesse, to pieces with smaller scales that were better suited to their physical context, an artistic feature typically defined

---

9 Cruikshank and Korza, Going Public, 1.
10 Knight, Public Art, 15.
11 Cruikshank and Korza, Going Public, 9.
12 Knight, Public Art, 17.
13 Kwon, One Place after Another, 57.
as being "site-specific." Kwon succinctly summarizes this shift as a movement from art "in" public spaces to art "as" public spaces.\textsuperscript{14}

Public art is associated with a variety of artistic disciplines, the most predominant being sculpture. However, since the 1960s, the traditional notion of public art as outdoor sculpture has been turned on its head with an ever-increasing array of materials and styles being used. Similarly, pieces often reflect the artistic movements at the time when the artwork was produced. In some cases, pieces represent prime examples of these movements. Though it is difficult to associate public art with certain artistic

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 60.
movements, there are two which are frequently cited and discussed. These are minimalism and realism. Cruickshank and Korza emphasize that many of the large-scale steel structures produced by such artists as Richard Serra, Isamo Noguchi and Alexander Calder embrace minimalist design with an emphatically abstract quality.\textsuperscript{15} On the other hand, much public art embraces realism by aiming to visually represent a group of people, an object, an event and so forth. In other circumstances, artistic movements can be exclusively bound with public art, such as the community mural movement, which began in 1967 with Chicago’s “Wall of Respect.”\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{wall_of_respect.jpg}
\caption{Wall of Respect by the Organization of Black American Culture (Mark Rogovin, 1972)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{15} Cruikshank and Korza, \textit{Going Public}, 10.
\textsuperscript{16} Miles, \textit{Art for Public Places}, 30.
While the aforementioned research has been primarily based in the United States, a sizable body of research on public art has been conducted in Great Britain. This research and scholarly work is worth briefly mentioning as a source of contrast. Selwood provides a detailed account of the “public benefits” associated with public art, crediting the rise of the Labour Party movement in the late 1970s with establishing a funding mechanism to support public art through the “Urban Development Program.” Selwood also mentions that British cities would incorporate public art projects in their competitive bid for City Challenge, a federal grant similar to U.S. Community Development Block Grants (CDBG). Compared to U.S. cities, British cities adopt percent for art ordinances to a far greater extent. The British-based Policy Studies Institute reports that 48% of all local authorities and 70% of urban authorities have percent for art programs. Hall and Robertson also stress that the national government was keenly aware of the contribution public art made to the “urban regeneration” of cities, frequently appointing town artists to work side by side town planners.

Methods of Implementation

The following section will function as an overview of strategic methods used by public and private organizations in implementing public art programs. A foremost topic is how such programs are managed and administered. As discussed in the previous section, many medium- and large-sized cities have special departments with administrative staff who work directly with artists in reviewing the placement of art on city-owned property. These offices and the duties of their staff are manifested differently from city to city. Often, they fall under a spectrum of municipal involvement, ranging from a sole staff member fulfilling this role among other responsibilities, to robust offices (e.g. Pittsburgh) that provide technical assistance to artists, organize events to promote public art and develop educational outreach initiatives. A great majority of these programs operate under the legal authority of the city as a quasi-public agency, acting as an “arts council” with an accompanying executive board or commission made up of appointed
members with various professional backgrounds related to visual arts, architecture and urban planning. As the forthcoming case studies will show, these volunteer-based boards can play varied roles in the review and approval of artwork. In major U.S. cities, these boards mostly serve as commissions with well-defined legal mandates, such as overseeing proposals for artwork initiated by a percent for art ordinance. In some circumstances, independent committees comprised of neighborhood residents and local stakeholders are formed to work together with artists in each phase of a project.

Separate from the administrative side of public art, funding-related aspects can be critically important. In Going Public: A Field Guide to Developments in Art in Public Spaces, Cruikshank and Korza find three categories of funding sources:21

1. Appropriations on a project-by-project basis
2. Appropriations in the form of line items in an administering budget
3. Percent for art legislation or ordinances

Here, it is worth noting that among the three categories, two are appropriations coming directly from a municipality’s budget. More unusual methods of funding projects include tying public arts funding with specific taxes (e.g. lottery or hotel taxes) or setting aside a portion of various state and federal grants.22 At the same time, grants from non-profits, foundations or other private entities can supplement or replace public sources of funding. Meanwhile, artwork located on privately-owned public spaces receive little to no public funds, being supported almost entirely by private developers.

Depending on the size and scope of a city’s capital budget plan, percent for art schemes can be powerful tools for securing funding and a location of artwork. The overarching concept is that “one percent” of a capital project be spent on public artwork, but there are striking variations to this fundamental scheme. First, there are significant differences on the basis for calculating the “percent.” Whether the “percent” is based on total project costs or excludes certain construction/development costs can greatly affect the amount of funding raised. Second, what capital projects qualify for “percent” funding can also have enormous effects. Some cities place restrictions on what types of projects qualify, while others have looser definitions. One example is Seattle’s

---

21 Cruikshank and Korza, Going Public, 27.
22 Ibid.
amendment to its percent ordinance that broadened the definition of qualified projects to include "public utilities," an adjustment that substantially increased the number of projects in the percent program. Los Angeles and a handful of other cities have taken this requirement a step further by including proposals for redevelopment on private property presented to the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA).

PERCENT FOR ART PROGRAM VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>BASIS OF “PERCENT”</th>
<th>What is the “percent” based upon (e.g. total costs of project, construction or development)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PROJECT ELIGIBILITY</td>
<td>What types of public projects in the capital budget qualify to be part of the “percent” program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PERCENTAGE RATE</td>
<td>What percentage rate is being used and does this rate fluctuate depending on project type?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>USE OF FUNDS</td>
<td>Are the funds strictly for art onsite or offsite? Can they be distributed to other arts-related programs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2 Variables in Percent for Art Programs

A third variation in percent for art programs relates to the percentage rate based on project type. These tend to fluctuate between 0.5% and 2%. Goldstein characterizes San Diego's scheme as a "negotiated model" whereby 2% is applied for public projects and 1% for multi-family residential development with project costs above $5 million. Portland enacted a 1.33% scheme that raises funds for administrative costs wherein 1% goes towards "acquisition, siting, maintenance and deaccessioning" and the remaining 0.33% goes towards "selection, administration, community education and registration." Based on a concern over the lack of public art in neighborhoods without much development of city-owned land, Portland amended its ordinance to create a Public Art Trust Fund, which permitted funds raised

23 Ibid., 31.
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through the percent program to be distributed to sites across the city. Los Angeles maintains an even more flexible approach by pooling together a portion of funds from the percent program into a cultural trust fund that can be used to support nonprofit arts institutions and various art enrichment programs.

One recent phenomenon among major U.S. cities is drafting Master Plans for public art that guide where artwork is to be sited, how it will be funded and who will be responsible for implementing the plan. As their name implies, these plans are developed under a framework similar to master planning documents that aim to manage land development and growth. In developing a shared vision for public art, they help set a citywide agenda for where artwork should be placed and under what criteria. One notable example among the many plans developed since the 1980s is the Public Art Master Plan for Arlington, Virginia, which was adopted in 2004. The plan lists numerous strategies for strengthening its existing program and identifies four criteria to evaluate project opportunities based on their visibility, accessibility, relationship to civic identity and financial adequacy. At a more practical level, public art master plans can also be a method of gathering public support in advance of developing a new arts commission, percent program or amendment to a preexisting ordinance. Cruikshank and Korza explain that:

"...the plan institutionalizes a discussion of the broadest range of artistic possibilities and recognizes artists as thoughtful contributors to the design of the environment."

With regards to the specific processes municipalities use to commission or approve artwork, there appears to be three general approaches. First, there is the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) method by which a city/town announces a "call for artists" seeking samples of an artist's body of work. Artists that meet certain qualifications are selected amongst a smaller group of applicants to develop a full proposal for a particular site. In streamlined RFQ scenarios, the artist is chosen solely to develop a full proposal with the expectation of working on the project. As an alternative to the RFQ, a Request for Proposal (RFP) invites artists to submit a "site-based" proposal. Many arts administrators believe that this method is less costly and more efficient.

25 Ibid., 28.
27 Cruikshank and Korza, Going Public, 51.
because the artist covers the costs of designing a proposal instead of the municipality. A third method can be described as a more flexible or ad hoc approach by which artists are selected based on a "call-for-artists" notice or by personal invitation. Embedded within each of these processes is some degree of permitting requirements, as well as a contractual agreement between the artist and municipality.

Beyond the core organizational and financial structure of a public arts program lies a central question of how the public, as viewers of the artwork and as residents of the city or town sponsoring a project, fully participate in this process. In an effort to ensure public participation, most art commissions and volunteer-led groups maintain a system where the general public is invited to attend meetings to voice comments and stake a position on a project. In many regards, these meetings can be conducted with rules and structures akin to meetings of planning boards and commissions. As stated earlier, during the RFP or RFQ process, it is also not uncommon for cities or towns to create an independent committee of local residents and stakeholders who help advise the artist or guide a project to completion.

On the flip side, public participation in public art projects can be weak and inherently challenging. For most projects, there is usually a need to balance public input with a desire to respect artistic freedom and treat the creative process with a boundary of independence. In her analysis of several New York City public art projects, Rosalyn Deutsche explores whether these projects have, in fact, purposefully excluded or silenced voices of the public as part of a municipal-led effort to revitalize or beautify a public space. In a more far-reaching critique, Deutsche remarks that "public art can actually alienate people from the space," the opposite of its intended effect. Calling for greater inclusion, Sharp, Pollock and Paddison also suggest that the public processes of installing art can influence their public reception.

An issue discussed in great length by Cruikshank and Korza, in addition to Goldstein and other books for program administrators, is how to effectively maintain a city's existing inventory of public art. For permanent or semi-permanent pieces, the cost of maintenance over time can rival the cost of installing new artwork. Many cities address this issue by hiring
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conservators to keep a comprehensive catalogue of artwork and their current condition, while routinely restoring artwork when fallen into disrepair. Similarly, handling incidents of vandalism or conditions when artwork must be removed or “de-accessioned” are related issues that cities and towns continue to grapple with. To minimize these costs, cities and towns often set aside a modest percentage of a project’s cost towards maintenance and conservation.

By nature of public art’s location in parks, public plazas, sidewalks and other city-owned property, municipalities exercise far-reaching authority over projects and their implementation. However, shrinking municipal budgets with limited staff can severely constrain the use of this authority and its full potential. In light of a tighter fiscal environment and political pressures to scale back government services, cities and towns seem to rely more and more on donations of artwork or developing strategic partnerships with the private sector. In many regards, public/private collaborations—in which foundations, companies or individual donors share the costs of larger-scale projects—has become less the exception than the norm. These partnerships regularly occur in the development of larger parks or public spaces situated in especially prominent locations. The construction of Millennium Park in downtown Chicago serves as one of the foremost examples of such partnerships within the past few decades. Flanked by towering skyscrapers on one side and the magnificent Lake Michigan on the other, Millennium Park's sprawling 24.5 acres of land was designed expressly with the intent of developing a space with world-class art, architecture and urban design. Among the several pieces of public art prominently displayed throughout the park is Anish Kapoor’s *Cloud Gate* (Figure 8), a $23 million sculpture that serves as one of the park's centerpieces and main visitor attractions.\(^3\) Despite being located in a public park owned by the city, *Cloud Gate* and other artwork were funded entirely by corporate sponsors and private donors.

\(^3\) Ahmed-Ullah, “Bean’s Gleam Has Creator Beaming.”
The balance between public and private sector involvement in public art can best be described as a spectrum, rather than a neatly categorized system. At the far side of the “privately-driven” end of the spectrum are pieces of art located in privately-owned public spaces. Their location outdoors and similarity in appearance to other works of public art can make them difficult to distinguish from works on city-owned land. Unofficially “public,” the artwork in these spaces are normally just as accessible and viewable, but their “private” location can drastically impact the types of public processes required to install the artwork. The sprawling 32-acre area of Broadgate in London is regarded as a premier location to view public art with pieces from world-renowned sculptors, including Richard Serra and Georges Segal (Figures 9 and 10). Yet, as a completely private development, Selwood notes that London’s planning department maintained a “hands off approach,” while the developers, who were active arts patrons, personally selected artists and managed the whole process without any semblance of public input. Broadgate serves as a case of how private ownership may not affect the type of
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FIGURE 9:
George Segal's *Rush Hour*, a bronze sculpture of six workers near the entrance of an office building in London’s financial district (British Land)

FIGURE 10:
*Fulcrum* by Richard Serra, flanked by Broadgate Centre (Berry Lewis, Corbis, 2009)
artwork being installed and considerably limit opportunities for public participation in the selection of artwork.

A final method of implementation touches upon efforts by municipal governments to view public art more "holistically" as an extension of supporting a thriving arts community. In pursuing this strategy, many cities and towns have established art districts that combine a mix of neighborhood branding with traditional tools of land-use and zoning. Art districts typically include density bonuses or other incentives for designated land-uses that aim to support galleries, arts institutions, businesses in the creative professions, affordable housing, studios, live-work spaces and other uses desired by artists. Arts-based zoning does not necessarily entail publicly displayed artwork, but as Carl Grodach stresses, these spaces serve an essential "community development" purpose in themselves by providing meeting and event spaces made available to the public, in addition to shaping the formation of a community identity that emerges from the interaction of artists and government officials. 34

Recent Theories, Issues & Approaches

Theoretical Approaches

The study of public art incorporates several underlying approaches and theoretical frameworks. Based on a review of existing research on the topic from the past few decades, two general approaches seem to emerge. The first "art-based" approach can be characterized as research conducted by art critics or historians who are chiefly concerned with the aesthetic qualities of the piece and how its audience—the public—reacts to these qualities. This body of research often focuses on cataloguing artwork with polarizing views of success or failure, interspersed with speculative commentary on social, political or economic issues. In the second "policy-based" approach, the aesthetic qualities of an artwork take a backseat to analyzing the policies, regulations and "public" objectives surrounding the artwork. This approach tends to analyze the topic from the lens of a city planner or government official seeking to better understand how and why public art should be

34 Grodach, "Art Spaces, Public Space, and the Link to Community Development," 474.
integrated into a physical space or community. As mentioned in the introductory section, this thesis is concerned with the second type of approach.

A popular topic in the theory of public art is discussing what overall contribution artwork should have in public spaces. Miles contends that art should strive to be a place-making device that “transforms spaces into places, creating areas for people to interact, not margins in which the public scurry.” In William H. Whyte's pioneering study of how people use public spaces, he observed that artwork helps attract visitors to a site. To this end, pieces can be designed with the purpose of commanding a striking and iconic presence, like Kapoor's Cloud Gate or Calder's La Grande Vitesse, and thus seek to draw visitors to an area. As a corollary concept, pieces can also be “site-specific,” woven into the urban fabric in a manner that responds to the physical nature of a public space and its intended uses. In collecting public opinions from intercept surveys and interviews, Selwood concluded that artwork perceived as less challenging and figurative received more positive feedback from the public, while suggesting that public administrators should question the “assumption that art is manifested in objects as opposed to city spaces.” Mary Sara contends that public art should naturally blend in with the surrounding environment:

"The most successful pieces of public art are what the public doesn't see, they walk across or lean up against it. They don't know it's art. If it's appropriately sited, the feeling is that it always should have been there." 38

Another hotly debated topic seeks to identify what elements makes public art “public.” Fundamentally, public art operates under a premise of being physically or visually accessible to viewers in a public domain. Art historian John Beardsley questions this premise, arguing that art becomes public once it has “emotional and intellectual accessibility,” not just physical accessibility. Knight elaborates on this argument by distinguishing art designed for a single audience and art that “speaks to many publics,” which

35 Miles, Art for Public Places, 149.
37 Selwood, The Benefits of Public Art, 249.
38 Ibid., 68.
39 Ibid., x.
connects to a larger segment of the population. Along with being accessible, she also asserts that public art should maintain a degree of approachability because "people usually encounter public art by accident." Conversely, Patricia Phillips claims "public art is ultimately a private experience" and should therefore allow viewers to enjoy a piece in a distinct and personal manner. These arguments raise deeper questions as to what constitutes the public sphere and the degree to which it can be shaped.

Defining the “public” in public art also depends on the level of engagement with the community members where artwork is planning to be installed. Deutsche highlights this issue in arguing that voices of the public can be deliberately shut out of the selection and approval process. Meanwhile, Tim Hall and Iain Robertson identify numerous ways in which public art embodies a tool for community-building. They indicate that it can serve as a “humanizing force,” “a vehicle through which a sense of community can be developed and promoted,” and “a catalyst and conduit for public discourse.” As such, involvement with local residents or stakeholders can also be regarded as a framework for identifying public art as “public.”

The Evolving Meaning of Public Art

The meaning of public art continues to evolve. Since the City Beautiful movement at the turn of the century, the conception of public art has departed significantly from the narrower lens of figurative statues to artwork that combines different artistic styles, disciplines and media. This section attempts to capture a few major shifts as they pertain to the forthcoming case studies. One primary shift is the growing integration of public art with art-related activities. From a conceptual level, the meaning of public art is frequently being expanded to include performance-based art or pieces that aren’t single, freestanding objects. From a practical or procedural level, public art can be interwoven with events and various cultural activities, as demonstrated by Los Angeles’ percent for art scheme. Thus, a greater range of artistic styles and programs are falling under the umbrella of public art.
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Compared with artwork commissioned during the City Beautiful era or the dawn of NEA's Art in Public Places Program, public art installations have become increasingly temporary in nature as opposed to being permanently installed. Some argue that this trend is occurring due to the greater flexibility in funding and siting of temporary artwork. Others hint at the possibility that temporary art is capable of addressing riskier subject matter that broaches controversial social or political issues. Paradoxically, Knight insightfully comments that certain temporary art can have a deeper permanence than regular installations. She suggests that projects such as Christo and Jeanne-Claude's two-week installation The Gates "live on through visual documentation" and actually intensify the involvement of the public by their scale and degree of preparation. As the case studies will show, there are also fewer regulatory barriers linked to temporary artwork, which can speed up the installation process and support a public conversation on whether the artwork should be displayed for a longer period of time.

Just as the style of public art has evolved over the past century, so too has the types of locations deemed suitable for siting artwork. The spaces in which public art can be sited have moved beyond the tradition of siting work near civic institutions or in large public plazas. In developing Public Art Master Plans, municipalities identify strategic locations for the placement of art that often coincide with other planning efforts, such as improving infrastructure, revitalizing a major transportation corridor and renovating public parks. For example, the Master Plan for Arlington, VA proposes a "trifecta" of siting public art in neighborhood gathering spaces, parks and open space, and public infrastructure. Arlington serves as one case in which the designated sites and boundaries of public art are being explored strategically and with greater flexibility.

One unresolved question is whether memorials or monuments fully constitute public art or should be categorized separately. Selwood attempts to untangle some key distinctions based on the aesthetic content of the piece and its intended purpose. Knight and others appear to adopt a more "integrated" approach, explaining that monuments and memorials can celebrate the past and act as an "art of public memory." Similarly, an ongoing debate exists
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over whether street furniture, signs and various streetscape amenities should be included in the realm of public art. This debate can have real implications for policy and regulations. For instance, Los Angeles and a host of other cities with percent ordinances exclude these project categories from tapping into funds from the percent-for-art budget.

Within the past few decades, growing attention has been given to making public art installations participatory and interactive. Recent articles and academic research often treat this "interactive" element as a key attribute defining public art as opposed to a single, standalone characteristic. Knight argues that "sites engender highly proactive relationships with visitors, predicated on participatory interaction, not passive viewership." Unlike the stunning sculptures produced at the turn of the century that were meant to be viewed from afar, modern public art has moved in a direction that embraces the ability for people to be engaged with the artwork. The type of interaction—physical, mental, emotional—can be defined in myriad ways, but there appears to be wide agreement about incorporating audience "interaction" or "participation" into the meaning of public art itself.

Current Issues and Challenges

Besides ongoing theoretical debates over the meaning of public art, there are several current issues and challenges occurring in the field of practice. By and large, the most enduring challenge has been the difficulties in evaluating the “public” value of public art and thus asserting its importance, both real and perceived. In Knight’s 2008 review of public art theory and practice, she notes that Christo and Jean-Claude’s The Gates did not accept public funding, but employed an estimated 1,000 people and generated a quarter of a million dollars in revenue from visitors. The ability to track the number of visitors and employees can help measure the contribution of public art to the local economy and, as a consequence, help serve as a justification for investing in future projects. Unfortunately, quantitative-based measures remain difficult to track, even for high-profile, well-funded projects. Selwood and others have conducted interviews to gauge public opinion of artwork.
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with varying degrees of success, while some private firms, most notably Ixia in Great Britain, offer toolkits for evaluating public art.50

A lot of research articles or reports on public art accentuate the intangible contributions of projects rather than attempting to weigh individual costs or benefits. These contributions can include boosting civic pride, honoring a city’s history and culture, serving as a catalyst for public or private investment, and improving neglected public spaces. Despite these claims, there’s no clear answer on how to properly recognize public art and defend its relevancy as a broadly felt benefit to the public. Even when public art installations are well-funded and well-received by the media, elected officials and the general public, there is a lingering question of whether the public views them as more than an “aesthetic band-aid,” which make small but limited enhancements to a public space.51 Simultaneously, some cities and towns have charted a different path, accelerating efforts to support public art as part of growing recognition to provide cultural amenities and attract members of the “creative class,” as described by Richard Florida.

A second issue worth highlighting is the extent to which artists, as producers of public art, participate in the design process of a new development. In certain instances, artists have been active members of a design team, working alongside architects, planners and developers. When the 92-acre waterfront park and plaza of Battery Park City was being planned in the 1980s, a conscious decision was made to have the artists Scott Burton and Siah Armajani be part of the core design team. Even though public art represented only a small portion of the entire waterfront area, the voice of artists on the design team was viewed as a valuable asset.52 Though generally rare, many researchers of public art call for strengthening the presence of artists on design teams and in other roles shaping the built environment. However, Goldstein balks at the possibility of diluting the artist’s prescribed role, raising a concern about “artists getting lost in the design team.”53

Conversely, there persists a vibrant discussion on the extent to which planners, city officials or private developers should influence artists and their work. On the one hand, it is suggested that planners and developers be more
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involved in the commissioning of art by developing detailed guidelines of content and working collaboratively with artists in shaping the design of their work. On the other hand, there is a widely shared belief that municipalities must respect an artist's creative freedom and provide them with a clear boundary of independence in developing a proposal. Excessively interfering with an artist's creativity, many claim, can hurt the quality of the artwork and conflict with a value of artistic expression. Selwood’s analysis offers some clarity on what responsibilities planners should have in promoting public art:

"Planners must exist with wider responsibilities of public art in their role of improving the quality of public spaces and encouraging good design, but also should receive better training."\textsuperscript{54}

As shown in this chapter, the boundaries of public art are not easily defined and keep evolving. A full analysis of public art must take into account multiple professions and disciplines, as the subject naturally crosses lines of city planning, art and public administration. Nonetheless, it is the interdisciplinary nature of public art that makes the study of the subject dynamic and vibrant. The next chapter continues this discussion with an overview of public art programs and policies within Massachusetts.

\textsuperscript{54} Selwood, \textit{The Benefits of Public Art}, 61.
Chapter 3:
Public Art In Massachusetts

Before discussing the individual case studies, it is necessary to build a bridge between national trends in public art and what's occurring on the regional and statewide level in Massachusetts. The following chapter provides a background on existing programs across the state, as well as funding and regulatory systems that support such efforts. State and local public agencies continue to play a tremendously vital role as the primary funders of local projects. Specifically, efforts driven by local stakeholders are pivotal for setting project agendas and forming collaborations between artists, government officials and local residents.

Massachusetts Arts Council

When the NEA was established in 1965, states were required to form "state arts agencies" to be eligible for federal grants. Under this system, state agencies were meant to leverage funding from the federal government, state appropriations and private grants or donations. Each of the nation's fifty states contains a distinct arts agency, commonly referred to as arts or cultural councils, with the sole exception of Kansas. In 2011, former Governor Sam Brownback proposed to eliminate the Kansas Cultural Council. Advocates were able to stop the measure from being implemented by agreeing to merge the cultural council with the Kansas Creative Arts Industries Commission, a state agency that focuses on supporting all of the creative industries. As quasi-public agencies, these Councils can perform a wide variety of tasks,

---

56 Wilton, "Public Art Under Siege."
57 Ibid.
from serving as a funding intermediary or program coordinator to offering technical assistance to local organizations and arts institutions. Not surprisingly, a state's discretion of what constitutes "arts and culture" can vary significantly. Some statewide councils might direct more resources towards programs involving music than the visual arts. The National Assembly of State Art Agencies (NASAA), a nationwide advocacy group, conducts research on legislative appropriations made to these agencies and collects information on best practices. As the situation in Kansas uncovers, funding for statewide councils are subject to the approval of elected officials and budget-based negotiations, which can put enormous pressure on the implementation of programs.

The Massachusetts Cultural Council (MCC) is an active and pervasive presence in the arts. NASAA ranked Massachusetts tenth in the nation in a recent analysis of funding spent per resident on the arts. MCC’s annual budget averages roughly $1.68 per resident. Minnesota, the state with the highest proportion of council funding, spends approximately $6.44 per resident, while the cumulative average of all statewide councils stands at $0.99 per resident. Though its Fiscal Year 2014 budget of $12.7 million is unquestionably modest compared with other state agencies or programs, this budget enables MCC to act as a funding intermediary for arts projects and cultural institutions, awarding grants as small as a few hundred dollars and as large as tens of thousands of dollars. As a state agency, MCC receives much of its yearly budget as an appropriation from the state legislature, which amounted to just over $8 million in FY 2014. The other third of its budget mainly reflects a $3 million grant from MassDevelopment, the state's finance and development authority, and a $1 million grant from the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). Despite receiving comparatively robust support from the state legislature and Governor Deval Patrick, annual budget reductions remain a chronic threat. In January of 2014, Governor Patrick released his proposed state budget for FY 2015, which calls for reducing MCC’s funding by $1.5 million or 13% of its total budget.

Formed in 1990, MCC manages a few programs that directly and indirectly support public art. The Adams Art Program and Local Cultural
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Council (LCC) Program are two key programs that provide substantial funding for arts and cultural projects led by municipal governments, nonprofit organizations and educational institutions. Beginning in 2005, the Adams Art Program was created with the purpose of nurturing the state's creative sector through projects that "revitalize communities, create jobs, grow creative industries and increase engagement in cultural activities." Since 2005, the Adams Art Program has invested $9.4 million in over 100 projects throughout the state, while leveraging an additional $27 million in matching funds from grant recipients (Figure 13). By awarding one-time grants—ranging from $7,240 to $37,500—the Program aims to get projects off the ground, often framing arts activities as a stimulant of economic development.

The Local Cultural Council (LCC) program started in 1980 under the Massachusetts Arts Lottery Council (MALC), led by arts advocate Jacqueline O'Reilly, who conceived of the idea of tying a portion of lottery profits to funding for the arts. The lottery fund would prove successful, generating around $5 million per year during the 1980s. However, faced with a deep budgetary deficit and a tumultuous political environment, in 1989 the state legislature slashed the $19.5 million budget of the Massachusetts Council on the Arts and Humanities (MCAH) by 50% and required that a greater proportion of money from the lottery fund be used to support arts programs, rather than funds taken from taxpayers. The state legislature's compromise resulted in the merger of MCAH and MALC as MCC, the agency's modern incarnation. MCC continues to receive funding from lottery sales, which are deposited in the State Art Lottery Fund as authorized by Chapter 10, Section 58 of the state's general laws.

Programmatically, the LCC Program is designed to support arts and cultural projects at a more holistic, grassroots level. LCC provides yearly allocations to the state's 329 volunteer-led cultural councils, covering every geographic region of the state. Upon receiving funds from MCC, the cultural councils then distribute funding to individual projects. By nature, these projects tend to be small-scale, providing modest support for hosting single events and temporary art projects, as prioritized by the local cultural council. In FY 2014, LCC's allocation totaled $2.6 million with grants ranging from a
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base of $4,250 to higher levels of funding based on population size. Boston, for instance, receives $152,000.

Aside from the Adams Art Program and the Local Cultural Council Program, MCC operates two programs that indirectly support public art. First, MCC allocates approximately $4 million to 388 nonprofit arts organizations across the state through a Cultural Investment Portfolio. This fund supports museums, arts institutions and community-based organizations. Secondly, MCC has designated 19 cultural districts across the state (Figure 12) in an effort to promote arts and culture along particular streets and pedestrian corridors. Cultural District designations can overlap with coordinated attempts to install public art, as shown by the City of Gloucester. Following the designation of Gloucester's Harbortown Cultural District, the town unveiled a Public Art Challenge RFP in 2013 that coupled a redesign of portions of the harbor with installations of public art. Specifically, Gloucester's Public Art Challenge offered three commission opportunities—both temporary and permanent—for selected sites within the waterfront area.

Lastly, MCC further supports public art by serving as a voice for artists and advocating for various creative industries. When organizations apply for funding through the Cultural Investment Portfolio (CIP) or Cultural Facilities Fund (CFF), MCC requires grantees to report information on employment, revenue, expenses, events and attendance. (See Figure 14 for funding levels). This information is collected as part of MCC's participation in the Cultural Development Project, a partnership with Pew Charitable Trust and private foundations to obtain data on industries connected to arts and culture. Among the purposes of the Cultural Development Project is to continually assess and monitor the economic contribution of arts and culture to the state as a whole. Data collected from FY 2012 found that the arts and culture sector in Massachusetts had total revenues exceeding $1.2 billion, employed 90,953 people and drew more than 23.5 million visitors to museums, galleries and other arts institutions.67
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Municipal-based Arts Councils or Commissions
Source: MCC

Cultural District Locations
Source: MCC

FIGURES 11 & 12:
Municipal-based Arts Councils or Commissions and Locations of Cultural Districts
Locations of Adams Art Program Recipients (excluding planning grants)
Source: MCC

Cultural Investment Portfolio Funding by Municipality
Source: MCC

FIGURES 13 & 14:
Adams Art Program Recipients and Cultural Investment Portfolio by Municipality
Local Governments

As the case studies will show in more depth, local governments in Massachusetts regularly play two roles in the realm of public art. First, they provide a base level of funding to finance arts projects and the municipal staff—full-time, part-time or volunteer-led—who work on projects and installations. Sources of funding from the state or private foundations do make a substantial difference in a project's potential scale and magnitude, but these funding sources are usually a supplement to, or matched by, funding already being allocated by a municipality. Secondly, local governments are primary facilitators of a project in organizing art committees or cultural councils and also by reviewing permits and overseeing other regulatory steps. That being said, as the cases will demonstrate, local governments can be strikingly different in how much attention is given to public art based on the level of interest by residents and support given by a Mayor or elected official.

The jurisdictional boundaries of public spaces also influence the decision-making authority of municipalities. Most public art is displayed on property owned by a city or town, which grants the municipality control over the use of that space. Local governments, therefore, play an inherent regulatory role over the installation of public art, unless artwork is sited on land owned by state or federal governments, such as the state highway and transportation departments. As a result, art commissions and committees are generally sanctioned at the level of local government, like planning commissions or design review boards, with city employees that convene the meetings.

Boston, Cambridge and Somerville appear to be the only municipalities within the state with full-time staff members who support public art. The vast majority of public art programs are operated by a volunteer-led group—officially or unofficially recognized—with city employees assigned to assist with a program in addition to their main responsibilities. At least seventeen municipalities have a cultural council that are engaged with public art projects. The remaining municipalities approve public art projects through an LCC or on an ad-hoc basis. In a few cases, the LCC is regional, rather than local. For example, North Adams doesn't have an LCC, but instead falls under the Local Cultural Council of Northern Berkshire.
Boston is not one of the cases being studied in this thesis, but it is worth noting that the Boston Art Commission has the largest collection of public art of any municipality in the state. The city's 242 installations are predominantly sculptures and memorials located in the downtown area or clustered in the Public Gardens, Boston Common and Commonwealth Avenue Mall. Though Boston doesn't have a percent-for-art program, the Commission has recently partnered with other city agencies in securing funds for public art for the construction of Town Field Park Plaza in Dorchester, the Dudley Municipal Building in Roxbury and the Fairmount Line transit corridor near Upham's Corner.

Private Foundations and Nonprofits

Beyond state and local public agencies, private foundations and nonprofit organizations offer further support for the arts. The New England Foundation for the Arts (NEFA) serves as one of the most influential foundations dedicated to supporting specific arts and cultural projects. Since NEFA operates on a larger geographic scale and awards fewer grants than MCC, their ability to support a broad range of projects across the state is limited. However, NEFA has occasionally partnered with the Cambridge Arts Council and other municipalities to install temporary art projects. And similar to MCC, the foundation helps advocate for the arts and cultural sector by hosting a “public art discussion series” that brings together those working in the field. Other region-based private foundations that have routinely supported arts and cultural projects include the Barr Foundation and the Boston Foundation.

Foundations have been especially active in researching the state's creative industry sectors and the challenges faced by cultural institutions. These studies do not directly discuss public art, but their analysis has been used to support artists and organizations that receive grants from MCC. In 2010, the Boston Foundation, Wallace Foundation and MCC partnered to study how to increase audience participation at 22 Boston area arts organizations. The report examined ways in which institutions can deepen their engagement with communities and more effectively build their
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audience. In 2001, the New England Foundation for the Arts (NEFA) conducted a full analysis of the state’s nonprofit arts and cultural sector. The study found that Massachusetts had 8,125 arts and cultural organizations, while for every $1.00 spent in these sectors, there would be a net result of $2.20 for businesses in the state.\textsuperscript{70}

Founded in 2012 through a coalition of arts institutions and organizations, MASSCreative has rapidly become a leading voice for the state’s arts and cultural sector.\textsuperscript{71} Unlike MCC or NEFA, MassCreative’s primary function is to serve as a statewide advocacy group and coordinate an agenda for advancing these interests. Since its inception, MASSCreative has successfully lobbied for additional state investment for arts programs, spearheaded a voter drive called “Create the Vote,” and developed an

\textbf{FIGURE 15:}
Bars of Colors Within Squares by Sol LeWitt, part of MIT’s Public Art Collection (MIT List Visual Arts Center, 2007)

\textsuperscript{71} Epp, “Massachusetts Arts Leaders Push For Increase In State Funding.”
extensive platform for engaging with state and local political campaigns. Similar to MCC or NEFA, MASSCreative's efforts combine a wide array of programs related to arts and culture rather than one specific field or topic, such as public art or music.

Colleges and universities are another common sponsor of public art by commissioning work located on campuses accessible to the public. Some institutions—most notably the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)—maintain a percent for art guideline for newly constructed buildings. According to the MIT List Visual Arts Center, the university has 87 pieces in its Public Art Collection with artwork from world-renowned artists, including Alexander Calder, Anish Kapoor and Pablo Picasso. Collectively, colleges and universities across the state have installed hundreds of works of art, although no comprehensive statewide list is available.

Strategic Partnerships

The vast majority of public art projects are rarely driven by one governmental body or organization. Virtually every project requires collaboration between a diverse group of stakeholders in the public and private sector. Recent work in Worcester and Arlington provide a glimpse into the intertwined character of these partnerships. In 2012, the City of Worcester launched a Public Art Working Group (PAWG) spearheaded by the Mayor's Executive Office of Economic Development. The working group's first major project, called Arts Alley, sought to commission a mural on a wall space of a privately-owned building undergoing renovation and environmental remediation. Though the city facilitated the process by organizing the working group, the project was also made possible through a partnership between the not-for-profit Worcester Business Development Corporation (WBDC) and the property owners who agreed to donate the wall space.

The Arlington, MA Public Art (APA) initiative represents another form of cross-collaboration between a city and a local non-profit organization. Officially managed and operated by the Arlington Center for
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the Arts, the initiative is meant to contribute to the town’s Vision 2020 Plan by improving the quality of public spaces. Recently, Arlington’s Spy Pond Mural Project involved a collaboration between artists and high school students in designing a mural at a local Boys and Girls Club, while collecting donations from residents and local business sponsors. Meanwhile, in celebration of its 75th anniversary, the Celebrity Series of Boston, a non-profit organization that serves the performing arts, presented *Play Me I’m Yours* in early October of 2013, a project that decorated 75 pianos by local artists and placed them in public spaces across Boston and Cambridge. This project reflected a strategic collaboration between the city of Boston, the Celebrity Series of Boston, which is the organization that donated pianos, and Luke Jerram, the artist who conceived of the first street piano project in Birmingham, England in 2008, which sparked subsequent *Play Me I’m Yours* projects in 43 additional cities worldwide. Collectively, the recent projects in Worcester, Arlington and Boston mentioned above highlight the nature of collaboration underpinning public art projects throughout the state. Accordingly, art projects normally involve public and private partnerships, as well as strategic collaborations with not-for-profit organizations.

### NEA Funding

The NEA serves as a direct and indirect source of funding for public art. Since Fiscal Year 2000, the NEA has awarded $60.9 million to programs across the state with an average grant amount of $52,000. This spans a wide range of arts-related programs, covering a handful of programs that support public art, such as Art Works, a grant that sponsors innovative projects aimed to engage the public. As will be discussed in depth in the sixth chapter, the Salem Art Master Plan was funded through this grant. Of the more than 1,000 grants awarded, only 17 grant descriptions explicitly cite public art in their proposed use of funds. The information provided by the NEA doesn’t discriminate between public art and other artistic fields or disciplines. The overwhelming bulk of NEA funds are distributed to educational and cultural institutions. Among the largest beneficiaries of NEA funding are MCC and NEFA, each receiving grants from $500,000 to $1 million on an annual basis.
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The goal of this chapter was to provide a summary of relevant state-based programs and funding resources that support public art. As the designated state arts agency for Massachusetts, MCC maintains the strongest presence with regards to reaching all municipalities of the state, while NEFA and other organizations intermittently support public art projects or fulfill a more peripheral role in these projects. This chapter concludes the background section of the thesis. The next five chapters will be devoted to individual case studies in the following order: Cambridge, Somerville, Salem, North Adams and Pittsfield.
Chapter 4
Cambridge

Background and Context

Spanning nearly 400 years of history, the City of Cambridge was one of the original towns founded by a group of Puritans as the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The city's history is closely linked with Boston, lying on the other side of the Charles River to the south. One outcome of this proximity is the city's integration with the public transit system of both Boston and the metropolitan area. Cambridge is also home to two world-renowned academic institutions, Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), which continue to have an immense economic, physical and social presence in the city and wider region. In addition, the city maintains a thriving commercial sector, home to the headquarters and satellite offices of major international companies, while serving as a hub for tourists and attracting tens of thousands of monthly visitors. Recent estimates by the U.S. Census indicate a total population of 105,026, making Cambridge the fifth largest municipality in the state.77

Cambridge has a deep and expansive history in the realm of public art. Harvard University and MIT, by themselves, have collectively commissioned hundreds of temporary and permanent installations on publicly accessible spaces throughout their sprawling campuses. The city is also home to the nation's first art in transit collection, beginning in 1967 along the Red Line subway route.78 Managed by the Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority (MBTA), "Arts on the Line" evolved into the Arts in Transit Program, which

77 2008-2012 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.
78 Cruikshank and Korza, Going Public, 11.
continues to commission and maintain artwork on MBTA property, including ten pieces in and around four Cambridge "T" stations.

To guide the implementation of public art in parks, streets, public buildings and other city-owned property, in 1974 the city established the Cambridge Arts Council (CAC) as a public non-profit, a quasi-governmental agency that enables the organization to apply for gifts from foundations, corporations and individuals. Two years later, in 1976, Cambridge passed a law forming a Public Art Commission comprised of seven appointed volunteers who would be responsible for overseeing activities and programs. Then, in 1979, Cambridge became the first and only municipality in the state to establish a percent-for-art ordinance, mandating that at least 1% of the

FIGURE 16:
New England Decorative Arts by Joyce Kozloff in the Harvard Square station, commissioned by the MBTA and the Cambridge Arts Council as part of the Arts on the Line Program (Joyce Kozloff, 1985)
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estimated costs of public construction projects be set-aside in a “Public Art Development Fund.” This percent ordinance has been, and continues to be, the primary tool by which the city raises funds to support individual projects, especially permanent installations. In response to the growing cost of upkeep to its existing collection, in 1996 CAC initiated a program dedicated to conservation and maintenance, while in 1999 the organization developed an educational outreach program through a grant from the NEA. CAC currently has over 200 pieces of artwork in its permanent collection, and since its inception, hosted artist residences, grant competitions and annual events to promote the arts, such as the “Cambridge River Festival” and the more recent performance series “Summer in the City.” Despite its unprecedented level of activity compared with other programs in the New England region, the history of CAC is not without blemishes. Several articles note that, during the 1990s, CAC suffered from a troubled period of mismanagement, culminating in a public scandal in which a former director and staff member were indicted for stealing $275,000 of funds from the Public Art Development Fund.

Strategic Approach

Goals

At a fundamental level, the Cambridge Arts Council serves as a vehicle for enabling the city to administer arts programs and projects. Upon being incorporated, CAC established separate programs for public art and community art. The boundary between these programs appears to reflect a general intent to treat temporary or permanent artwork approved by the art commission as distinct from event-based programs involving artists, such as outdoor performances or open studio events. This distinction may be mostly for administrative purposes, but it also uncovers the dual role of many art councils in managing art installations and simultaneously hosting events that celebrate local or regional artists.

Chapter 2, Section 114 of Cambridge's Municipal Code functions as the statutory backbone of the percent-for-art program and the administration of CAC. The section enshrines core purposes for the ordinance, including the

81 Dezell, “2 Indicted in Theft of Cambridge Arts Funds Ex-Directors Took $275,000, DA Says.”
"enjoyment of the arts by the residents of the City" and "to improve and expand the value and use of public buildings and facilities." Further, in its list of delegated powers and duties, CAC's first responsibility is to work with stakeholders on an annual "plan for the development and creation of arts in public buildings and spaces." The following responsibilities in the statute describe the processes by which artwork will be sited and located in accordance with the Public Art Development Fund.

The framework of the statute underscores CAC's primary goal of administering the percent for art program. In an interview with Lillian Hsu, CAC's Director of Public Art and Exhibitions, she explained that the "primary focus" of her work concerns running the percent program in light of the "capital improvement projects" that trigger compliance with the statute. The work associated with the percent ordinance demand an enormous amount of time and effort, requiring extensive coordination with city agencies and various stakeholders, ensuring proposals adequately meet regulatory standards, and managing the public review process, among other duties. By its regulatory nature, Cambridge's percent ordinance generates a pipeline of prospective public art installations linked to present and future capital improvement projects.

Although much of the work of CAC and its public art programs revolve around percent-for-art projects, a series of secondary goals began to emerge during the interview. CAC aims to form "curatorial partnerships" with other organizations and institutions and devote more resources towards special programs and initiatives, like the "Let the People Play" exhibition in the winter of 2014. In this regard, the goals of CAC and its public art programs reach well beyond the artwork produced through the percent ordinance. Projects that enliven public spaces and engage the public in arts-related activities represent overarching goals for the program, irrespective of the artwork's form or medium. Cambridge's adopted budget for FY 2014 affirms the importance of these goals. It explicitly lists two top goals of CAC for FY 2014: (1) "Promote arts in the neighborhoods of Cambridge by supporting artists, art events and arts organizations" and (2) "build community through art that is reflective of the City's diverse population." Conspicuously, the
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commissioning of public art isn't the first goal on the list, but the fourth, following the goal of advocating for street performers.86

Operational Structure and Financial Resources

Cambridge embraces a classic percent-for-art model where at least 1% of the total construction costs of public infrastructure are set aside for public art. In comparison with percent ordinances in other U.S. cities, Cambridge's ordinance is quite flexible. All capital projects that require bidding under State law fall under the umbrella of eligible projects. The Public Arts Development Fund also permits a diverse range of materials and artistic disciplines, including performance-based art in public buildings or spaces. However, while the ordinance does not prohibit artwork funded above the minimum rate of 1%, the city sets a cap of $100,000 per project, which limits available funds for projects with total costs exceeding $10 million.

The city also adopts two standard models of reviewing proposals and awarding commissions to artists: Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and Request for Proposals (RFP). These two regulatory mechanisms govern the selection process of artwork in the percent program. Under the RFQ process, artists are solicited internationally to participate in a project, then a jury of independent art professionals works to select a group of finalists based on the qualifications of the artist. Once the jury makes its selection, a separate site committee—consisting of residents and local stakeholders, often living near the location of the capital project—convenes to select a finalist to participate in the commission. At this stage the artist is commissioned to develop a full proposal for the site in collaboration with the site committee, who can provide meaningful guidance and raise public concerns. The final stage of the RFQ occurs when the full proposal is presented to the Public Arts Commission, which provides additional review of maintenance, accessibility, materiality and other issues before granting final approval. As can be implied by the multiple steps of an RFQ, this process takes a substantially longer period of time to complete. As a result, it necessitates greater budgetary expenses and can entail an added risk by bringing an artist onto commission without a clearly envisioned proposal. Despite the constraints evident in the process, the RFQ method was suggested to be an ideal form of artist selection because it "gives a lot more time for the artist to develop the project and

86 Ibid.
develop in-depth knowledge of a site.” Hsu said that the ability for the artist to become acquainted with a site and immersed in its history and context would lead to a better outcome for the quality of the art.

Under the RFP process, CAC issues a similar national or international Call for Artists, but instead requires a full proposal at the time of submission. When proposals are submitted, the Public Arts Commission selects a finalist and the artist is then brought onto contract. In the RFP process, a site committee is still formed, giving members of the public an opportunity to get involved and give feedback. To some degree, the RFP method allows the “community to take greater public ownership” because the public can provide both input over the selection of the artists and the actual proposal being submitted. Since artists develop proposals beforehand, the entire process requires considerably less funding and time than an RFQ. In total, the RFP process can take roughly 8 weeks from the time of announcement to receiving submissions. Given the shorter amount of time and resources, the city's trend has been towards using an RFP method, depending on the availability of funding, as well as the size or location of a capital project.

A distinguishing feature of CAC is the organization’s deep commitment of financial support from the municipal government. CAC’s adopted budget for FY 2014 was $558,315, which only represents a little more than 0.1% of the city’s total operating budget of $507 million. Though CAC’s budget is assuredly modest in light of other city departments, this allocation is higher than any other city in the state and actually dwarfs the annual budgets of art councils in some U.S. cities with much greater populations. The FY 2014 budget in Boston allocates $366,347 for “Arts Promotion,” the division of the city’s Office of Arts, Tourism and Special Events responsible for installing public art. The sheer amount of public investment from the municipal budget is significant, yet makes Cambridge somewhat of an anomaly. The base of financial support coming from the city’s budget and the funds generated from the percent ordinance mean that CAC does not need to rely on grant funding from the NEA, MCC, individual donors or private foundations. Although CAC does receive a large share of grant funding from these resources, the public investment made by the city is a remarkable advantage that other cities and towns across the state simply don’t enjoy. What’s more, the city maintains additional pots of funding for community events ($60,000), holiday
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celebrations ($55,750) and the Multicultural Arts Center ($200,000) located in the Middlesex County Courthouse.

One of the biggest challenges faced by CAC is supporting a robust maintenance and conservation program. Within the past ten years, the cost of maintaining its existing collection of permanent installation has grown rapidly due to an increase in vandalism and natural deterioration from weather or material decay. As the material used in public art expands and diversifies, CAC has been confronted with the need for arts professionals with more specialized conservation skills. In response to these issues, CAC hired a full-time conservator to review materials and instituted a conservation and maintenance program that would operate as a dedicated fund. In the past, CAC has addressed this problem by setting aside a portion of the total project cost.

Partnerships and Collaborations

CAC engages in various forms of collaboration, both externally and within city government. By nature of the percent ordinance involving capital projects, CAC frequently interacts with other city agencies—such as the Public Works or Parks Department—that are responsible for implementing these projects. This was identified as a source of tension with a “burden not just on one department but working among many.” Assisting artists in obtaining permits and licenses from other departments was also mentioned as a constant barrier, particularly for temporary installations and events. As a result, CAC developed a one-stop checklist with the purpose of guiding artists through each step of regulatory approval.
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This past year, CAC held a temporary art exhibition called “Let the Public Play,” a project that grew out of a collaboration between the Public Art Commission and the Open Space Committee in 2007. The city then formed a Healthy Parks and Playgrounds Task Force to “determine goals and write recommendations for designing and building public spaces that incorporate the principles of healthy play.” Based on the Task Force’s recommendations, CAC hosted a series of events and an exhibition in the public gallery space of the City Hall Annex. Marrying the concept of play with public art, CAC received a $45,000 grant from the NEA to complete the project, which helped fund the artwork of Adam Simha and other costs related to the exhibition. “Let the Public Play” is also emblematic of a unique collaboration, combining efforts to promote public art with issues of public health and the redevelopment of parks.

Another highly regarded collaboration happened in 2006 when CAC partnered with the New England Foundation for the Arts (NEFA) on the...
“Public Art/Moving Site” project. From January to June 2006, NEFA presented three consecutive art installations and exhibitions in three New England cities: Cambridge, MA, New Haven, CT, and Bellows Falls, VT. CAC was selected as the host for the City of Cambridge. The partnership with NEFA was discussed as an innovative way of collaborating with private foundations and art councils in other municipalities. Moreover, NEFA's idea of a “moving” site challenges some of the traditional expectations of public art being site-specific or attached to a single city.

Project Profile: Fern Street

The Fern Street Streetscape project provides a valuable glimpse into the current work of CAC and the city's efforts to integrate public art with city planning. The Fern Street Streetscape Project arose from a larger sewer

![Figure 19: Photograph of the Fern Street corridor before construction (Cambridge Community Television, 2014)](image-url)
separation project that necessitated the resurfacing of Fern Street between Concord Avenue and Field Street in northwest Cambridge. As a major capital improvement project, it triggered compliance with the city’s percent-for-art ordinance. In the summer of 2013, CAC announced an RFQ soliciting qualifications from artists to produce a “permanent street feature” on Fern Street. As an RFQ project, finalists were selected by an independent jury and then invited to visit the site, where they would also meet the selection committee. The finalist chosen by the site committee will be awarded a commission of $85,000 to cover the full cost of planning and installation.

When the city evaluated the site, there was a growing realization that many children use Fern Street as a way to get to and from the Tobin school. As a response to this observation, the RFQ identifies Fern Street as a “key safe-route-to-school connector,” while suggesting that its redesign incorporate an “interactive playful experience.” Staff from the city also asserted that Fern Street lacked a “sense of place” and that an art installation could “play a key role” in transforming the space. Hsu also indicated that the “artwork will be integrated with the construction and design of the street,” complementing the general streetscape plans to widen the sidewalk and install a new bicycle lane. Overall, the Fern Street project sheds light on how a percent ordinance operates on a project-by-project scale. As the project shows, CAC staff and artists can work alongside architects, planners and engineers in developing a streetscape proposal. At a conceptual level, the Fern Street example demonstrates that public art does not have to be a standalone element or detached from the planning processes of the capital project. On the contrary, public art can be integrated into the planning process and physically woven into the streetscape design itself.

Analysis

Though one installation is temporary and the other permanent, what binds the Fern Street project and the “Let the Public Play” exhibition is their emphasis on being intergenerational and physically interactive. When asked
what makes a project successful, Lillian Hsu said that it should have a "strong component of reaching different generations" and "reach out to a community." 95 Past research on public art normally frames this as speaking to different audience groups, raising questions of "access" about whether the public can physically and emotionally connect to the artwork. CAC's approach suggests that public art should be stimulating to people of all ages, but appeal especially to youth through its playful or interactive qualities.

Cambridge's percent-for-art program serves as both an opportunity and a barrier. On the one hand, it guarantees a steady stream of funding and a means by which public art gets physically embedded in public spaces. On the other hand, strict adherence to the ordinance can favor larger scale, permanent projects over smaller-scale, temporary projects. The ordinance remains a powerful tool, yet if rigidly followed, can also constrain the ability to support newer forms of public art. The intense amount of resources necessary to manage the percent program may limit time and attention given to other programs. Meanwhile, permanently sited installations usually involve more steps of review and approval that must account for maintenance standards. A corresponding issue concerns the choice of using either the RFP or FFQ method for individual projects. As noted, the RFP requires less time and fewer costs, but inherently places a greater burden on the artist to quickly develop a proposal. If the additional time and site review afforded in an RFQ makes a difference, a lingering question is whether the RFP hinders the full potential of the proposal and, even worse, devalues the artist's creative process. The tension between the RFP and RFQ is an issue that CAC faces in its administration of the percent ordinance.

Even though CAC is a well-established organization that benefits from a variety of public and private grants, as well as dedicated resources from the city's annual budget, there remains a "barrier of seeing artists as extra rather than essential." 96 Building adequate respect and recognition for public art is still a constant challenge, both in the eyes of the public and among other city departments. To this end, finding concrete ways for the public to take ownership of a project—such as through site committees and public exhibitions—seems to help uplift the value of public art. And while Cambridge's percent ordinance raises procedural concerns, it also functions

95 Hsu, Director Public Art & Exhibitions, Cambridge Arts Council.
96 Ibid.
as a durable mandate for valuing art in the public realm, a mandate that city residents continue to support, year after year.

Among the recent projects viewed as a success, Hsu discussed the “Let the Public Play” exhibit and how it involved a curatorial partnership with an artist in designing the exhibition space and then hosting a series of public events. Most importantly, the exhibit symbolized how public art can be dynamic and interactive, while raising the public’s consciousness about health and being accessible to children and different generations. Hsu also described the site committee as a procedural aspect that greatly contributes to the success of an installation by allowing more stakeholders to take part in the RFP or RFQ process. This contribution seemed to make public art more “public,” empowering local residents to shape the proposal and build a consensus over the project’s vision. The site committee was regarded as a positive element for all projects, helping complement the review of the Public Arts Commission.

CAC grapples with repeated challenges in pursuing public art projects. The two most pressing challenges were identified as dealing with proverbial red tape in gaining approval for artwork and handling issues related to maintenance and conservation. These challenges are owed to the fact that Cambridge has a much larger population and government than the municipalities in the other case studies, as well as a sizable collection of permanent installations that demand routine maintenance. Increasing costs of conservation is a longer-term problem that percent for art programs across the country are being confronted with more and more as their permanent collection grows. The question this problem begs, then, is if addressing maintenance and conservation cuts into the limited resources for temporary installations and other events that do not demand these efforts. Even with a separate staff member serving as a conservator, it appeared as though efforts to maintain installations were taking time and funding away from completing additional projects.
### Table 3
**Case Summary: Cambridge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>POPULATION</strong></th>
<th>105,026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td>Percent for Art Program established in 1976, which has supported over 200 pieces; temporary and permanent installations; annual events and city hall exhibition space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATIONAL STRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td>Public Arts Commission (7 members for a term of 3 years); Site Selection Committees for projects involving an RFP or RFQ; multiple full-time staff at the Cambridge Arts Council (CAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDING</strong></td>
<td>Percent for Art Ordinance requires 1% of total costs of projects on city-owned land be set aside in the Public Art Development Fund; CAC operating budget of $558,315 for FY 2014; additional grants from MCC, NEA, donors and private foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECENT PARTNERSHIPS</strong></td>
<td>Let the Public Play exhibit with the Health Department; interdepartmental collaboration; traveling installation with the New England Foundation for the Arts (NEFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATED SUCCESSES</strong></td>
<td>Curatorial partnerships; projects that engage audiences of multiple generations; installations that promote themes of interaction and play; site committees that represent interests of local stakeholders;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCEIVED CHALLENGES</strong></td>
<td>Increasing costs and efforts towards maintenance and conservation of permanent collection; overcoming administrative hurdles and streamlining permit process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 5
Somerville

Background and Context

First settled in the 1630s and then incorporated in 1842, Somerville shares a rich history dating back to the colonial era. In fact, many pivotal events of the Revolutionary War took place in various locations of the city. Much like cities across Massachusetts and the rest of the nation, Somerville rapidly developed as part of a wave of industrialization during the nineteenth century. However, since the city's population peaked in 1950 with 102,351 people, its population has steadily declined to 75,754 people in 2010, according to the 2010 U.S. Census. Within the past few decades, the city's population has mostly stabilized, while certain neighborhoods have experienced spurts of revitalization and economic growth. Bordering the City of Cambridge to the south, Somerville remains tightly bound—physically and economically—to the Boston metropolitan region. Specific projects, such as the Red Line extension to Davis Square in the early 1980s, have drastically improved the city's connections to public transit and boosted the local economy, a trend that is expected to continue with the proposed Green Line Extension through Somerville and into Medford. Unlike Cambridge, Somerville is predominantly residential in character, commonly described as a "bedroom" community of Boston. Recent economic growth in the housing market has also raised concerns of gentrification, particularly among the city's large low-income and foreign-born populations.
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Aside from commemorative statues and a handful of artwork peppered on the campus of Tufts University, the city has few permanent installations of public art. When the Red Line expanded to Davis Square, the MBTA included the newly designed train station in its Art on the Line Program, which led to the commissioning of four pieces both inside the station and in the public square itself. One of the projects involved the installation of 249 tiles created by students at the Powderhouse Community School in 1979 in collaboration with the Somerville-based artist Jackson Gregory (Figure 20). In 2009, some residents formed the Davis Square Tiles Project to chronicle the lives of the students who designed the tiles and tell individual stories about the demographic changes which occurred in the neighborhood after the opening of the train station.

FIGURE 20:
The Davis Square Art Project by Somerville-based artist Jackson Gregory (David L. Ryan, Boston Globe, 2009)
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The Somerville Arts Council (SAC), a quasi-public agency, is at the helm of supporting public art throughout the city, along with managing a host of other programs that promote arts and culture. SAC was formed in 1980 as a volunteer-based group and has subsequently grown into an organization with multiple full-time staff. The first major public art project organized by the city was the Windows Art Project which began in 1995. Undertaken by SAC, the Windows Art Project infuses temporary art installations in highly visible public spaces, which can be either public or privately owned. Since its inception, the project has exhibited art from hundreds of local artists,

representing one of SAC's long-standing contributions towards public art. Local arts and cultural institutions have also shaped SAC and its history, most notably the opening of Brickbottom, a large residential, studio and co-working space designed for artists and individuals working in the creative professions. SAC is deeply involved with Brickbottom and the work of artists who live there, many of whom have been an integral part of SAC's programs. Similarly, SAC also maintains a close relationship with newer institutions and spaces used by artists, such as Fringe and the Vernon Street Studios.

### Strategic Approach

#### Goals

In 2008, the Somerville Arts Council (SAC) launched a “re-visioning process” in order “to reflect upon its past, refine its mission and seek a renewal in outlook to further its work in the community.” The outcome of the visioning process led to a revised mission of SAC to “cultivate and celebrate the creative expressions of the Somerville community,” while working to make “art an integral part of life.” The language used in SAC’s mission illuminates many of the organization’s goals and what sets them apart from other municipal-based arts councils within the state. First, built into the mission of SAC is a primary goal of supporting artists who reside in the city. In fulfilling this goal, SAC works to give opportunities to local artists, promote their artwork and nurture their talent. Secondly, the revised mission mentions “creative professions,” not artists per se, as a way to link the work of artists with other occupations in the creative industries, such as architects, graphic designers or musicians. This is an important distinction that speaks to a broader view on public art sharing a bond with other forms of artistic expression and a city’s role in improving access to this larger scope of arts and culture. Third, SAC aims to make arts “integral” to the life of residents not only by installing art in public spaces, but also through events-based programming that engages the public.

On a related note, Somerville’s approach views public art as a close extension of community identity and history. Gregory Jenkins, the Executive
Director of SAC, has a background in folklore and neighborhood documentation projects, which he indicated as being “embedded” in the work of SAC and important for “looking at networks and community assets.” He also stated a belief that public art ought to be “integrated” with existing assets of a city. Another aspect of SAC’s approach is the organization’s embrace of temporary public art as opposed to permanent installations. Jenkins explained that temporary art, in fact, fosters more avenues for community engagement by allowing a greater number of qualified artists to participate in programs and increasing the level of flexibility over where public art can be sited. This is notably different from other towns and cities. Somerville’s strong emphasis on temporary art is not just a pragmatic choice based on limited resources. It’s much more a reflection of the city’s broader approach towards supporting artists based in the city and giving opportunities for them to display their work.

A final goal that distinguishes the work of SAC from other arts and cultural councils is their attention towards integrating public art with events-based programming. For SAC, events become a platform for artists to display their artwork and interact with the public. Further, events help capture an audience seeking out art. Within the past few years, SAC has organized many citywide events that engage local musicians, including Honkfest, a popular festival that celebrates music from around the world, and Porchfest, a citywide event where residents play music in the backyards and porches of their homes. SAC also hosts a biannual Open Studios that takes places at various locations around the city, such as Artisans Asylum, the Center for Arts at the Armory and the Vernon Street Studio. These annual events occur in addition to other SAC-sponsored activities throughout the year.

Operational Structure and Financial Resources

SAC has four full-time administrative staff with four associated staff members who work exclusively on specific programs. Although Somerville doesn’t have a percent-for-arts ordinance, SAC runs several perennial programs dedicated towards public art. These include the Windows Art Program (WAP), a citywide program that mainly presents artwork in storefronts, the Inside-Out Gallery, a revolving art space in the window of the CVS pharmacy store in Davis Square, the Switchbox Project, a program that
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paints switchboxes located on city sidewalks, and the Phone Art Box Project, a project which turns abandoned telephone booths into art installations. Like Cambridge, Somerville also curates art exhibits in its City Hall. Additionally, SAC manages a series of short-term programs, which include ArtBeat, a yearly festival showcasing the work of artists and local craftsmen, and Art in the Garden, a recently launched summer program for children that combines arts and environmental education.

As a quasi-public agency, SAC receives both public and private sources of funding. Like CAC in Cambridge, SAC benefits from a solid foundation of political and economic-based support from the municipal government, which enables the organization to employ several full-time staff members and host a variety of public events. In FY 2013, SAC’s total budget nearly doubled to $213,888 and in the FY 2014 budget, there is a further increase proposed to $334,883.106 On top of municipal-based funding, SAC also receives a strong foundation of support from state-based grants. Jenkins stressed the importance of the Local Cultural Council (LCC) and Adams Art grants from the Massachusetts Cultural Council (MCC). He credited the LCC grant with supporting Judith Klausner’s wildly popular Micro Museum installation in Union Square (Figure 22). Wedged in a nondescript space between a sandwich shop and a pub, the Micro Museum is a small box 16 inches in width and 8 inches in depth depicting artwork in a miniature museum.107 Equally vital is MCC’s Adams Art Grant, a state-based matching grant that helped establish the Somerville ArtsUnion. This initiative consists of a diverse range of projects fitting under the umbrella of economic development that are associated with arts and culture. Since its creation nearly a decade ago, ArtsUnion has organized markets and tours as part of a seasonal event series, while engaging local artists in commission opportunities. More significantly, ArtsUnion has sponsored numerous economic development reports evaluating the city’s creative industries, which led to the rezoning of Union Square with an arts overlay district.108
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There are a few notable distinctions of SAC's operating structure. First, though SAC does have an eight member Arts Council Board appointed by the Mayor, the Board appears to play a relatively minor role in SAC's programs and, for the most part, does not approve the installation of artwork. Except for the LCC grant, which formally mandates artwork to be reviewed by voluntary members of an arts and cultural council, most of the decision-making over public art programs rest squarely in the hands of SAC staff. This contrasts markedly with Cambridge, whose Public Art Commission and site committees play a large role in the siting of artwork, and other municipalities with volunteer-based boards, as will be discussed in the forthcoming chapters.

A second distinction of Somerville and SAC's work is their primary focus on events-based programming as opposed to traditional art installations. SAC devotes an increasing amount of resources towards organizing such events. Meanwhile, SAC's public art programs install artwork that's predominantly short-term in nature, lasting for a season or a few months. Moreover, rather than being located on city-owned property, a significant amount of artwork is shown on privately-owned spaces, reflecting partnerships with local businesses in placing artwork in storefronts or on the walls of private buildings. A third distinction is SAC's strong advocacy role in
promoting opportunities for including public art in private development. Jenkins noted that he has an informal relationship with the Planning Board in regards to encouraging new development to dedicate spaces for public art.

**Partnerships and Collaborations**

In its focus on temporary art, SAC maintains a strong partnership with local businesses. The Windows Art Project exemplifies this form of collaboration, which has been described as “mutually beneficial” for local artists and businesses. Simultaneously, Jenkins found it challenging to work with businesses that don’t appreciate the value of public art and generally lack a willingness to compensate artists for their work. In addition, SAC operates the Phone Art Box Project in partnership with Somerville’s Nave Gallery, which assists SAC in the selection of pieces to be commissioned. Beyond local businesses and galleries, SAC recently collaborated with students and faculty at Northeastern University and the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth in conducting studies on the city’s cultural sector around Union Square.

As described in the previous section, SAC plays an instrumental role in advocating for local artists both inside and outside government. The economic-based studies commissioned through ArtsUnion resulted in detailed recommendations to rezone portions of Union Square to support artists and the creative sectors. Among other features, the Arts Overlay District created guidelines for live/work and studio spaces, while recognizing a variety of creative uses in the zoning code. Protecting the community of artists already living in Somerville, Jenkins explained, is an indirect way that SAC supports public art. More directly, Jenkins sits on an advisory group for the ongoing Green Line Extension project and stated that SAC remains deeply involved with the MBTA in its proposal to have arts programming at each of the newly built transit stations and along the corridor. In the winter of 2013, the MBTA held an RFP process to solicit public art proposals at the Lechmere, Union Square and Washington Street transit stations, which are being designed and constructed during Phase 1 of the Green Line Extension. Adopting a percent-for-art scheme, the MBTA proposes to allocate 0.5% of each station’s total construction cost towards public art—estimated to be
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$225,000 per station—while working jointly with SAC and CAC to commission the artwork.111

Project Profiles: Bloom and Ripple Run

Two art installations commissioned by SAC within the past few years help illustrate the city's approach towards public art. Bevan Weisman's *Ripple Run* was first commissioned in 2010 as part of a temporary sculpture series. The piece, located in a public plaza in Union Square, was designed to be interactive in rainy weather by producing a ripple effect on panes of glass and then allowing water to flow down its central, stainless core.112 Due to its popularity, SAC kept *Ripple Run* in place after the sculpture series ended and, in 2011, SAC received a grant of $11,500 from the New England Foundation for the Arts (NEFA) to purchase and maintain the artwork as a permanent installation. *Ripple Run* also sits in a prominent location in the public plaza of
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Union Square (Figure 23). The installation's success highlights what Jenkins described as Somerville's "trial run" approach to gauge the public input on whether artwork should stay in a site for a longer period of time. This seems to suggest that public feedback is a process that extends well beyond an artwork's installation and, in effect, can help shape what installations or programs become permanent. From a programmatic standpoint, Ripple Run is a useful illustration of how art installations can transition from temporary to permanent.

Hannah Verlin's temporary installation Bloom represents a second example of a recently installed piece that gained widespread popularity. During two days in August of 2010, Verlin placed 4,500 paper flowers near the Prospect Hill monument in Union Square (Figure 24). The paper flowers were delicately arranged in a large circle and inscribed with the words "he loves me, he loves me not" or "she loves me, she loves me not," a concept

FIGURE 24:
Bloom by Hannah Verlin, near the Prospect Hill Monument (Andy Pickering Photography, 2010)
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Verlin poetically describes as a “field of hope and possibilities.”

During the installation, people were also invited to walk through the bed of flowers and encouraged to take one as a memento. Bloom was unveiled on a Saturday morning, and by Sunday evening of the following day, all of the flowers were taken. Bloom is an exceptional case in temporary art for a few reasons. At an administrative level, it required little cost, minimal resources and few steps of approval. The project was also relatively easy and efficient to install and remove. From a broader perspective of public engagement and artistic quality, the piece was intrinsically interactive. Members of the public were not only invited to see, touch and play with the flowers, but also expected to physically take them. Bloom was also designed to engage the public through more intangible forms of interaction that were characteristically psychological or emotional. The words inscribed on the flowers were meant to trigger thoughts and emotions of love and even spur participants to give the flower as a gift to a significant other or secret crush. Lastly, Bloom demonstrates how temporary public art can penetrate spaces where public art would typically be prohibited, such as the park surrounding the historic Prospect Hill monument.

FIGURE 25:
Bloom by Hannah Verlin, with visible inscriptions
(Andy Pickering Photography, 2010)
Analysis

Somerville’s public art programs tell a valuable story about how a municipality can have an ostensibly successful, thriving program without a percent-for-art ordinance or highly active volunteer-led committee that manages the arts or cultural council. In fact, when asked if a percent ordinance would benefit SAC and increase the amount of artwork, Jenkins replied that it would actually be a hindrance to current programs and cause a major “administrative burden.” By concentrating mainly on temporary art, SAC can maintain a strong degree of independence and flexibility in managing its programs and working with artists themselves. Jenkins also indicated that a proposed percent ordinance might clash with competing interests of providing additional units of affordable housing or more open space when the city negotiates with private developers.

A corollary to SAC’s focus on temporary public art is the organization’s drive to support local artists. The sculptural or metal-based materials required in most permanent installations, Jenkins said, dramatically limits the pool of artists eligible to respond to call-for-artists. As an alternative, temporary art installations provide a gateway for artists with different backgrounds to participate in calls for art. Plus, since temporary installations generally cost less, SAC can considerably increase the number of project opportunities for artists to present their work. Partnerships with individual businesses also work towards reaching that goal by giving artists the chance to showcase their work in storefronts and other locations with a high degree of foot traffic. In a sense, the Windows Art Project displays artwork temporarily, but is also permanent by providing a revolving space for artwork to be displayed as an outdoor gallery. As shown by Bloom, temporary artwork can increase the locational options of public art, even allowing artwork in spaces that would otherwise prohibit public art.

SAC also focuses on supporting local artists because the creative sectors are woven into the community’s identity and existing assets. Somerville’s revised mission pays tribute to this goal by seeking to “celebrate” the “creative expressions” of the community. Therefore, the city’s approach towards public art is in line with a strategy of protecting and enhancing the cultural diversity of the community, especially around the Union Square area, which has been
the target of ArtsUnion reports and studies. In this regard, SAC's focus on event-based programs follows logically because they give local artists and residents working in the creative professions an outlet to showcase their work, interact and collaborate with others, and share their form of artistic expression with the public.

SAC shares a common thread with CAC in Cambridge in that they both receive a comparatively strong level of political support from the Mayor and local legislature. In Somerville, SAC maintains a strong relationship with Mayor Joseph Curtatone and various city agencies, which was identified as being crucial for "getting projects moving and off-the-ground." Unlike CAC, SAC did not view permitting as a barrier or mention any difficulties in gaining the approval of other city agencies to install art. Rather, Jenkins intimated that there was a broader acceptance of SAC's work within city government and their valued contribution to residents of Somerville.
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Table 4
Case Summary: Somerville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>75,754</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMS</td>
<td>Windows Art Program, Phone Art Box Project, ArtsUnion, Green Line Extension Call for Artists, Switchbox Project, events-based programs and various private partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL STRUCTURE</td>
<td>Somerville Arts Council (SAC) as the quasi-public agency designated to oversee public art programs with dedicated staff; 7 member Arts Council Board serves 3 year terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING</td>
<td>FY 2013 actual funding of $213,888; recipient of MCC and NEFA grants, including Adams Art Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECENT PARTNERSHIPS</td>
<td>Artwork displayed in storefronts and in privately owned spaces requires collaboration with local businesses; Nava Gallery partnership on Phone Art Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATED SUCCESSES</td>
<td>Advocacy role for artists and people in the creative professions; events-based programming draws local residents and visitors; strong political support and local participation; range of temporary projects that can become permanent depending on funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCEIVED CHALLENGES</td>
<td>Lack of funding and willingness to support permanent installations; concentration on placing artwork in privately owned spaces; development pressure has impacted nature of projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6

Salem

Background and Context

Located in the North Shore of Massachusetts and first settled in 1629, the City of Salem remains one of the nation’s most historic seaports. In 2013, President Barack Obama signed into law a bill designating Salem as the birthplace of the National Guard.116 The city’s history and cultural identity is also greatly tied to the infamous Salem witch trials of 1692, which led to the public execution of nineteen people accused of witchcraft.117 Though certainly a dark event in the history of Salem and the nation’s colonial era, the city embraces this part of its past. Several monuments and houses in the downtown area commemorate the witch trial proceedings, while a handful of shops, galleries and museums cater to visitors eager to experience this “haunted” history firsthand. Each year, hundreds of thousands of tourists visit Salem, with as many as 125,000 in the month of October alone, when the city hosts festivities for the annual celebration of Halloween.118 Many visitors are attracted to other cultural amenities of the city, such as the Peabody Essex Museum, one of New England’s largest art museums, as well as various art galleries, restaurants and historic destinations. Within the past decade, the city has experienced modest levels of redevelopment, including new residential and commercial growth along its harbor and a remodeled commuter rail station that is presently being constructed. Since 1910, the city’s population has hovered between
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approximately 38,000 and 43,000 people, with a current population estimated at 41,641.119

Salem is unique among the rest of the municipalities being studied in that the city is in a transitional state of forming an arts commission. To this end, Salem provides a useful window from which to examine recent processes leading to the creation of the public art commission. Currently, the city is in an embryonic phase of appointing residents to the commission as part of a recently adopted ordinance. The history and context of Salem’s ordinance is important to discuss. The particular details of the ordinance and the city’s public art initiative will be discussed at greater length in the following chapter sections.

Andrew Shapiro, an Economic Development Planner for the City of Salem, explained that the genesis of the “commission ordinance” occurred in 2011, when a resident came to the planning department with an idea to paint utility boxes. After the planning board gave permission to approve the utility box project, “a working group was established to create a more formalized program, agreeing to paint six utility boxes each year through a call-for-artists system.”120 This led the city to officially establish the ArtBox Program and set

![FIGURE 26: Photograph of the Essex Street Pedestrian Mall (24 Norman Street, 2012)]
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Aside funding to commission artwork. Besides that project, the city hosts a biannual sculpture series along the Essex Street Mall and an annual outdoor play in front of the Old Town Hall. Prior to the working group, Shapiro noted that the city would sporadically approve art installations on an ad-hoc basis.

During the same year, the working group, in collaboration with the city's planning department and Planning Board, applied for a grant from the NEA to redesign the Essex Street Mall, a pedestrian corridor and commercial thoroughfare located in the heart of downtown (Figure 26). The submission of the proposal reflected a conscious desire to "activate" the corridor as a destination for residents and visitors alike. Although the NEA rejected the full-scale design proposal, it agreed to fund a citywide planning study to strategize where artwork should be sited and recommend how to manage a public art program. Three partners were selected as recipients of the $25,000 grant: the City of Salem, the Peabody Essex Museum and the Salem Partnership, a local not-for-profit organization. In fulfilling the guidelines of the grant, the city released an RFP to produce a citywide master plan for the arts, which was subsequently awarded to Via Partnership, a St. Louis-based consulting firm that specializes in public art planning. In the late spring and early summer of 2013, Via Partnership held a series of public forums to hear suggestions from local residents and cultivate a strategic vision for public art that could be shared amongst members of the community. Kimberley Driscoll, the Mayor of Salem, underscored the role of the master plan in a recent newspaper article:

"The discussion that led to this master plan began with considering the future of the Essex Street Pedestrian Mall. We have had temporary public art installations there in the past, and people loved them. Now thanks to this grant, we can get community input as part of our long-term planning process."

The Public Art Master Plan for Salem was unveiled in September of 2013. Among the topics discussed in the 81-page plan are various administrative recommendations, ranging from project management and funding options to public sector responsibilities and strategies for education.
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and outreach. Additionally, the plan lists geographic priority areas throughout the city that present “public art opportunities” and a set of criteria to evaluate these priorities. The plan’s first recommendation was a proposal to pass an ordinance establishing an arts commission to “advise the Mayor and Salem Redevelopment Authority” on how to manage city resources and where to site public art. In October of 2013, Mayor Driscoll wrote a letter to City Council Members requesting adoption of the proposed ordinance, as well as a summary of other recommendations laid out in the plan. Then, in anticipation of bill’s adoption, the Mayor began the process of soliciting requests for appointments to the art commission. Finally, in March of 2014, the City Council convened and voted to adopt the recommended ordinance in its entirety.

Strategic Approach

Goals

Though its program is in a nascent stage, the changes that have occurred in Salem within the last few years are dramatic and reveal a host of public art objectives. Until 2011, the City of Salem had commissioned few art installations, temporary or permanent. Before the ArtBox Program, Salem’s Planning Board and planning department would review proposals on a case-by-case basis, generally focusing on statues, plaques or monuments commemorating the city’s history. The advent of the ArtBox Program and the working group’s discussions helped transform Salem’s approach from an amorphous, ad-hoc structure to a well-defined, strategic vision. At a deeper level, the actions of the working group altered the public’s mindset of public art and its potential to improve the quality of public spaces and enhance the city’s identity.
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Similar to Somerville, Salem invests in supporting local artists and temporary art installations. The tendency towards local artists seems to be driven, in part, by the limited availability of funding for individual Call for Artists and the city's self-promotion as a cultural hub of the North Shore. However, there are some notable exceptions, such as the mural painted by internationally renowned artist Kenny Scarf, located on the façade of the New Liberty Street garage (Figure 27). While the content of the mural received a few complaints, the piece was positively received overall and brought media attention to the city's burgeoning public art program. Mayor Driscoll even issued a press release inviting the public to see the mural being painted, affirming her position on "the important role arts play in our community." Shapiro also expressed his personal support for the mural and the "conversation it generated" on public art, which he regarded as a good outcome in and of itself. He also mentioned that the city's preference towards temporary forms of public art was based on elements of practicality and not reflective of a particular ideology, as described in the previous chapter.

FIGURE 27:
Kenny Scarf's Mural at the Museum Place Mall Garage (Kate Fox, Destination Salem, 2012)
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on Somerville. The decision on what types of public art deserve more or less attention, he said, should be left to the newly appointed Public Art Commission.

Salem's goals of public art are closely aligned with its goals of economic revitalization and improving the quality of public spaces. As a case in point, the Public Art Master Plan was sparked by an interest in "activating" the Essex Street Pedestrian Mall. Likewise, in its Call for Artists, the ArtBox statement of purpose expresses a goal of "enhancing the visual experience for residents and visitors in this great walking city." As a consequence, city officials are strategic in determining where to site public art, often viewing art installations as a means to capture foot traffic and lure visitors. The city also maintains a keen awareness of how the content of public art can shift based on its physical context. Shapiro indicated that artwork installed at the new commuter rail station might be more pleasant or accessible to the public, while public art along the Essex Street Pedestrian Mall corridor would strive to be more iconic and a serve as a destination for visitors.

It was also suggested that the city aims to achieve a separate goal of equity, touching upon themes of access to artwork for the larger public. Shapiro explained that:

"A big part of public art is equity. Not everyone has the opportunity to see art in a museum. Having it in public allows everyone to see and experience art."

In line with this statement, Shapiro expressed a principle that the public deserves access to art. Through public art installations, a city helps fulfill an obligation to its residents, a view rooted in the original public art movement of the turn of the century in its motivation to expand the public's appreciation of art. What's also striking in the statement is the remark that the public both see and experience art, a distinction which implies that people not just view art as a mere visual encounter, but also as a multi-faceted experience. To this end, the city aims to support public art that fosters a public dialogue and interactive experience.
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Operational Structure and Financial Resources

In stark contrast with Somerville or Cambridge, Salem's public art program operates on a shoestring budget. The city allocates approximately $20,000 per year towards the ArtBox project and the bi-annual temporary sculpture series. Consequently, artists are generally compensated at lower levels for much smaller scale projects. The ArtBox Call for Artists, for example, provides a $500 stipend for each of the six artists selected to participate. A Local Cultural Council (LCC) grant of $11,230 (FY 2014) from MCC supplements this support. As a result, Salem's total budget for public art comes almost exclusively from the city and a narrow selection of state-based grants.

Unlike the aforementioned cases, Salem does not have a staff member who works full-time on arts and cultural projects or a special division of government for managing programs. Rather, city planners within Salem's Department of Planning and Community Development (DPCD) have been responsible for spearheading the programs and continuing its operations. City planners oversee the projects as a part-time endeavor, splitting this responsibility among other duties. It is also significant that the city designated Andrew Shapiro, an Economic Development Planner, as the primary liaison for the arts program. Putting this responsibility in the scope of the planning department is partly an act of necessity, due to a limited amount of funding, but it's also connected with the city's recognition of public art as an economic driver and tool for revitalization.

Shapiro indicated that an intended goal of the adopted ordinance, once fully implemented, is to relieve pressure on the planning department in managing art programs and let the public take control of the process. At the present time, the ArtBox program is "being run informally" and "just happens" without "providing an opportunity for people to say anything against the artwork." He elaborated further on this matter by stressing how the commission will transform the public process:
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"Now, the commission can get public input to decide what can happen, put biases and tastes aside, and challenge criticism up front, which was only an issue after the fact."\(^{136}\)

To this extent, the Public Art Commission helps raise the voices of the public and facilitate an ongoing dialogue with stakeholders. Shapiro's statement also affirms the valuable role of public processes in installing artwork, as concluded by Sharp, Pollock and Paddison in the second chapter. The planning department's expectation is that the Public Art Commission will fill a gap in delivering a sustainable form of public engagement.

Although the planning department will maintain "formal administrative oversight of the art process," the Public Art Commission would be given a broad range of powers to steer individual programs, projects and installations.\(^{137}\) Specifically, the ordinance enumerates eight powers and duties for the Public Art Commission. These include preparing an annual plan and outline of public art activities; establishing goals and criteria to review proposed projects; convening to solicit, review and approve proposals; reviewing and approving artwork located on private development where there is an agreement with the city; and serving as an advocate for public art in Salem.\(^{138}\) On top of duties typically found in other art commissions—such as reviewing and approving proposals—the ordinance enshrines additional responsibilities of reviewing artwork on private development and advocating for public art more broadly.

**Partnerships and Collaborations**

Salem's effort to promote public art began, in large part, with a strategic partnership between city government, businesses and local institutions through the formation of the working group. In particular, the Salem Partnership, a nonprofit organization that advocates for local businesses, was instrumental in asserting public art as a means of achieving economic development and attracting tourists. The organization was an important force in pushing for the redesign of the Essex Street Pedestrian Mall as a catalyst for economic activity. The working group itself consisted of city staff, a curator from the Peabody Essex Museum and residents from diverse professional

\(^{136}\) Ibid.

\(^{137}\) Ibid.

\(^{138}\) Division 16: Public Art Commission.
backgrounds. As mentioned earlier, the NEA grant that led to the Public Art Master Plan also stipulated a mandatory partnership between the museum, the Salem Partnership and the municipal government.

Partnering with the Peabody Essex Museum, however, was regarded with a degree of caution and mild suspicion, which Shapiro described as a "push and pull relationship" with the city.\textsuperscript{139} He indicated that the museum's recent success in a $2 million fundraising drive raised questions over how the city could benefit from this growth. Shapiro insinuated that the museum could become a partner with the city in future redesign projects surrounding the institution. Although Salem cannot compel private developers to install public art, planners have occasionally requested that artwork be incorporated into an application presented before the Salem Redevelopment Authority. Shapiro notes that many developers or property owners, in fact, are willing to install public art. A notable example occurred when the city worked with a private developer adjacent to Harborwalk, a waterfront walkway near downtown that was constructed in 2010.\textsuperscript{140}

### Project Profile: The Public Art Master Plan

A closer analysis of Salem's Public Art Master Plan ("Master Plan") provides valuable insights into the city's evolving approach towards public art. As mentioned in the second chapter, municipal-based master plans for public art can precede the adoption of ordinances to establish formal arts commissions and percent-for-art programs. Like comprehensive plans that govern zoning or land-use, arts-based plans function as a tool for cultivating public support around a unified vision and then offering concrete steps to realize this vision. For Salem, these themes also ring true. During the period of the NEA grant proposal, there was a growing awareness among city officials, business owners and residents that public art should be a core component of redesigning major corridors and enhancing the character of public spaces. Yet, there was little consensus over where artwork ought to be sited or what policies or procedures were necessary to manage such an endeavor.

\textsuperscript{139} Shapiro, Economic Development Planner, City of Salem.
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The NEA recognized these interests in the grant proposal and responded by suggesting that the city hire a “public art consultant” through a public bidding process to develop a full-fledged master plan. Salem’s Master Plan remains unprecedented in Massachusetts for its level of detail and geographic scale encompassing the whole city. Previous public art master plans across the state—namely the Hamilton Canal Master Plan in Lowell and the Union Crossing Master Plan in Lawrence—have focused on a single district with a smaller boundary. Nationwide, master plans dedicated to public art are usually drafted in medium to large-sized cities. It is rare to find this type of master plan in a city with a total population under 50,000 people.

Four components of Salem’s Master Plan are important to consider. First, the consultant, Via Partnership, organized a series of meetings to engage the public and build a consensus over what role public art can and should play in the community. The public process itself was intrinsically valuable for stimulating public interest and a larger discussion of public art. Second, the Master Plan establishes a vision, mission and guiding principles that underpin
the proposed Public Art Initiative. Holistically, the city's "vision" of public art would rest upon three pillars—culture, community and design—which are linked to the following vision:

"Public art in Salem contributes to the community's identity as the cultural hub of the North Shore and a center for creativity; fosters community pride, ownership and a sense of belonging, and contributes to the quality of Salem's built environment."  

Notably, this section of the Master Plan distinguishes elements of public art associated with design from elements that relate to the community as a whole and its cultural environment. Third, the Master Plan identifies fifteen "public art project opportunities" at targeted locations throughout the city, evaluating the goals for each project, the recommended budget range and the desired method of artist selection. This section even suggests possible dimensions and artistic styles that would best match the surrounding environment and add vibrancy to the designated space. Fourth, the Master Plan presents a comprehensive, though somewhat exhaustive, list of administrative guidelines. These include recommendations on the steps to establish the initiative, the roles and responsibilities of the Public Art Commission and city staff, the sources and uses of funds, the processes for art selection and project management, the rules governing art in private development, the procedures for handling gifts and loans, the process of managing a temporary or permanent collection of artwork, and the strategy for public outreach. The level of detail provided in these guidelines acts as a blueprint for achieving the city's short- and long-term goals of public art. This section also enabled the city to take swift action in creating a Public Art Commission by having a proposal in place for structuring the ordinance's language and content.

Analysis

At first glance, the city appears to endorse most of the Master Plan's recommendations. While Salem moved quickly to establish the Commission, Shapiro indicated that the city does not want to take a position on other recommendations until the Commission meets as a full body. As a result,
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there is a lack of agreement on many impactful proposals, some of which require further legislative action. For example, the funding for the Master Plan’s fifteen art projects would largely hinge upon the city developing a Percent for Art program.\textsuperscript{144} In response to a question about why Salem didn’t adopt a percent ordinance at the time of the commission ordinance, Shapiro explained that the city has a “wait and see approach.”\textsuperscript{145} Establishing a Public Art Commission was viewed as a first step before committing to other proposals. That said, the planning department expressed some hesitation towards a percent ordinance and whether it might dissuade private developers from working in Salem as opposed to neighboring cities and towns. Accordingly, a second aspect that has yet to fleshed out is if performance-based art or arts-related events will be part of the Public Art Commission’s scope of responsibility. This was described as a “grey area” that would depend on the interests of the Commission members.\textsuperscript{146}

The biggest distinction between Salem and the other four municipalities is the unusually deep involvement of the planning department in overseeing the initiatives related to public art. When asked about why the department has taken such a leading role, Shapiro believed that installing public art is consistent with objectives of planning, stating further that the “planning office is familiar with what areas have potential and what areas have foot traffic, the places where public art can be enjoyed and respected.”\textsuperscript{147} For Salem, planners seem to welcome public art as an extension of their work to improve the city’s built environment. Although the Public Art Commission will act independently from the Planning Board and Design Review Board, there is a strong acknowledgement that planning and public art are intertwined. The manner in which the city began its focus on public art—by proposing the redesign of the Essex Street Pedestrian Mall—is an affirmation of this belief, along with the city’s willingness to undertake a Public Art Master Plan.

Salem is also a relevant case for underscoring the value of public processes. The ArtBox Program began with a group of residents calling for public art, which led to a semi-structured working group. Upon receiving the NEA grant, residents became engaged in another round of discussions. Then, the city took an additional leap by giving permanence to this public process process
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by adopting an ordinance. The city's path to adopt the ordinance not only reflects a growing appreciation of public art by city officials and the general public. It also shows how public processes can be essential for setting this agenda in the first place. Having a formally recognized body—who represent various professional backgrounds and hold public meetings—helps legitimize the city's actions towards public art. Salem's experience is likely similar to countless cities across the nation in reinforcing the presence of a Public Art Commission as a necessary condition for managing a public art program.

Despite having a comprehensive plan for art, the city has few programs and a comparatively low number of installations. This raises two questions. First, it remains to be seen what effect the newly appointed arts commission will have on existing and future public art programs. In this regard, Salem could become a test case for the costs and benefits of "formalizing" the public art process. Second, the city's experience demonstrates that problems posed by budgetary limitations shouldn't preclude efforts by residents or city officials to envision a larger role for public art. The ability to "plan" for public art was regarded as an important starting point for the city to achieve its full vision.
## Table 5
### Case Summary: Salem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>41,641</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMS</td>
<td>ArtBox Program and Public Arts Commission overseen by the Salem's Department of Planning and Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL STRUCTURE</td>
<td>Installations reviewed by the Public Art Commission consisting of 7 members serving 2 year terms; projects administered by the Department of Planning and Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING</td>
<td>$20,000 municipal budget with supplemental grants from MCC; NEA provided Art Work grant to conduct planning study with local partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECENT PARTNERSHIPS</td>
<td>Collaborations with the Salem Partnership and the Peabody Essex Museum; interdepartmental work with the Design Review Board, Planning Board and Salem Redevelopment Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATED SUCCESSES</td>
<td>Developing a Public Art Master Plan, which led to the adoption of an ordinance to establish a Public Art Commission; integration of art and economic development planning; efforts to strategically site public art and involve the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCEIVED CHALLENGES</td>
<td>Small budget and limited resources from the city used to commission artwork; hesitancy in fully implementing the recommendations of the Master Plan; early stages of commission process has created a “wait and see approach”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 7

North Adams

Background and Context

North Adams is a small city set amidst the rolling hills of the northern Berkshires, a region of western Massachusetts known for its scenic landscape and cultural heritage. The city was first settled in 1745 during King George's War and grew rapidly in the second half of the nineteenth century as a center for manufacturing and industry. In 1900, the city's total population peaked with 24,200 people. In this industrial boom, many companies thrived due to the hydraulic power provided by the Hoosic River, a tributary of the Hudson River that runs directly through the city. Among the hundreds of manufacturers that prospered during this era was Arnold Print Works, a textile manufacturer that became the city's largest employer with over 3,200 workers. Falling textile prices and the effects of the Great Depression led to the closure of Arnold Print Works in 1942. The site's sprawling 13 acres of land and 26 buildings were then converted into an electronics plant by the Sprague Electric Company, which replaced Arnold Print Works as the city's largest employer. Dropping sales and rising competition forced the plant to end its operations in 1985, a trend that was part of a national decline in the manufacturing industry.

The closure of the plant had a devastating effect on the city, causing a sharp increase in unemployment and a dramatic loss in population. The sudden downturn sparked discussions among local leaders about how to
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revive the city's suffering economy. During that period of time, Thomas Krens, the Director of the Williams College Museum of Art in nearby Williamstown, was appointed to be the Director of the Guggenheim Museum in New York. When the Guggenheim expressed interest in finding a space to exhibit artwork that couldn't fit in its current location, Krens collaborated with Joseph Thompson, a former colleague at Williams College, and North Adams Mayor John Barrett III in developing a proposal to reuse the site as an institution that could house large works of contemporary art.\textsuperscript{152} This proposal led to a successful campaign to complete the project and, after more than a decade of planning and construction, the Massachusetts Museum of Contemporary Art ("MASS MoCA") celebrated its opening in 1999.

The story of MASS MoCA is historically relevant and serves as an important backdrop for the city's existing public art programs. The steady decline of manufacturing in North Adams has left a visible scar on the city's economy through high rates of commercial and residential vacancies. The city's current population of 13,583 is approximately 45\% less than it was a century ago.\textsuperscript{153} It was also estimated that, in the aftermath of the Sprague Electric Company's closure, the city's storefront vacancy rose to a staggering high of 75\%.\textsuperscript{154} In light of these conditions, the opening of MASS MoCA is regarded as a major turning point in the city's recent history by helping stabilize the local economy, attract visitors and spur other revitalization projects. For example, some vacant mills have been repurposed as artist studios or galleries, while many of the historic brick buildings that line Main Street—North Adams main thoroughfare—have been converted into loft-style apartments or studios. These efforts are viewed as a larger strategy to rebrand the city as a regional center for arts and culture. Although MASS MoCA has unquestionably played the greatest role in the city's resurgence, other large institutions in the city and nearby vicinity have also been influential, including the Massachusetts College for Liberal Arts ("MCLA"), Williams College and North Adams Regional Hospital.

In an effort to stimulate economic development through arts and culture, MCLA formed the Berkshire Cultural Resource Center (BCRC) in 2006, a collaborative project between the college, MASS MoCA and the City of North Adams. BCRC is located in the back of Gallery 51, an art gallery
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that's also operated by MCLA, hosting ten exhibitions each year and staffed primarily by students from the college.\textsuperscript{155} Gallery 51 also serves as a community gathering space. Jonathan Secor, the Director of BCRC and an adjunct professor of arts management at MCLA, noted that a variety of groups have meetings or events in the space. Secor also serves as a Board Member of the North Adams Chamber of Commerce, which he said was actually founded inside Gallery 51.

BCRC's program for public art is called DownStreet Art. Since its inception in 2008, the program has held open calls for both temporary and permanent installations, while organizing events for performance-based art, music and dance.\textsuperscript{156} Excluding its annual events and exhibitions, DownStreet Art has commissioned a total of 11 installations, which have been

\textbf{FIGURE 29:}

\textit{Wall of Sound} by David Poppie and Roger Sayre, displayed in a store on Main Street (Sayre and Poppie, 2013)
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predominantly murals with the exception of two pieces: Victoria Palermo's *Bus Stand*, a permanent installation that functions as a bus shelter, and David Poppie and Roger Sayre's *Wall of Sound*, a mixed-media installation that was on view for 24 hours (Figures 29 and 30).157 The entire collection of pieces is catalogued in the DownStreet Art Map, along with a listing of galleries.

One of DownStreet Art's most active programs involves an annual exhibition in which artists apply to display work in the windows of existing businesses and vacant storefronts. In most instances, the vacant commercial spaces are then turned into temporary gallery spaces. Secor explained that DownStreet Art began as “public art in private spaces,” a project that sought to address the city's chronic problem of storefront vacancy and breath life into underutilized spaces.158 When the program first started, storefronts were 60% unoccupied and local officials were interested in finding a short-term solution. Secor and a group of arts administrators approached landlords directly to request permission in using their spaces as pop-up galleries for free or at substantially reduced rental rates. Since many of the storefronts had been vacant for long periods of time—in some cases more than a decade—Secor indicated that landlords welcomed the idea as a way to increase the value of their property and attract future tenants. Another enabling factor was that a

---
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single landlord owned many of Main Street’s buildings, affording BCRC a degree of efficiency in negotiating to implement the project. After the landlords agreed to open up their storefronts, the Mayor issued a decree to waive permits in order to lawfully allow the use of the spaces as galleries and circumvent normal lease requirements.\textsuperscript{159}

The DownStreet Art project, much like the Somerville Arts Council, embraces events-based programming. DownStreet Art holds multiple events per month and its website maintains a detailed calendar of events for arts and cultural activities in and around North Adams. Most of the organization’s programming is concentrated in a four-month season over the summer in which North Adams, in conjunction with BCRC, host indoor and outdoor events designed to attract visitors to Main Street. These events are not solely music, dance or theatre performances. They also consist of exhibition openings in pop-up or regular galleries that BCRC vigorously promotes to residents and visitors. BCRC regards these exhibitions as a form of public art since they’re interconnected with how visitors walk around and experience the city. Between 2008 and 2013, it was estimated that more than 100,000 people attended events or visited galleries organized by DownStreet Art.

Aside from DownStreet Art, BCRC also operates an assistant art gallery manager program, which “teaches the ins and outs of the gallery business and the practical aspects of working with artists and curators, like how to make an exhibition-worthy space.”\textsuperscript{160} Meanwhile, BCRC participates in the Berkshire Hills Internship Program (“BHIP”), a competitive arts management program that pairs a graduate-level course at MCLA with a summer internship at arts organizations and institutions in the northern Berkshires. Secor stressed that the program has developed a strong reputation and “attracts people from around the world.”\textsuperscript{161} These programs are not exactly part of DownStreet Art, yet are deeply intertwined with the program in that participants directly support their projects and learn hands-on skills in how to manage and administer a public art program.
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Strategic Approach

Goals

The main impetus for DownStreet Art is to drive economic development and revitalization. Its mission statement explicitly states this intention:

“DownStreet Art is a public art project designed to revitalize downtown North Adams. By harnessing existing art organizations and events and transforming vacant and open spaces into art destinations, DownStreet Art defines North Adams as a cultural haven, driving tourists and community members.”162

Secor reiterated that the goal of the project is to “ beautify North Adams and attract tourism” by targeting visitors of the Berkshires and MASS MoCA.163 He said that the organization sets a goal of capturing 10% of MASS MoCA’s visitors so they spend more time in the city and thus contribute to the local economy. To achieve this goal, BCRC is tactical in hosting arts and cultural events that maximize the number of visitors and appeal to an audience beyond the local community. For instance, in 2013 DownStreet Art held its June kickoff event to coincide with the Solid Sound Festival at MASS MoCA, an annual music festival organized by the alternative country band Wilco that draws an estimated 5,000 visitors.164

BCRC staff are also strategic in where to site artwork. Murals and pop-up galleries are physically oriented as to increase foot traffic on particular streets and bring customers to nearby businesses. Secor also argued that public art was a crucial tool for improving the city’s image and has been a catalyst for economic growth. Citing the urban theorist Richard Florida, he described public art as part of a web of “amenities” that draw people to North Adams and generates a “better atmosphere” for the creative class.165 As a result of more cultural amenities, he asserted that some landlords have successfully sold, leased or redeveloped their properties within the past few years. In a drastic turnaround, as of 2012, the occupancy rate in downtown
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North Adams was said to have climbed to 85%, the highest rate since 1981. Within the past few years, some pop-up stores have attracted full-time commercial tenants or have become self-sustaining galleries, which was one of the intended goals when the program started. The lower number of pop-up galleries in 2012 was viewed as a sign of success, leading DownStreet Art to shift its goals towards “public art in public spaces” with the launch of the Mural Project.166

A second goal of the DownStreet Art project relates to the content and quality of the art itself. North Adams shares a bond with Cambridge in its vision of bringing high-quality, world-class art into the city’s public spaces. When asked if the city’s program supports local artists, Secor emphasized that its “mission is to show the best art possible, whether they’re local artists or not.”167 Maintaining a high standard of quality was viewed as a principal concern, regardless of the amount of funding available to hold open calls for art. Secor clarified that his approach was based on “creating economic revival through good art.”168 Accepting a lower quality of art, he insisted, could detract from the image of the city and would set a bad precedent. In elaborating this position, he proposed that there exists a “thin boundary between ‘community art’ and ‘good art in the community.’”169 North Adams focus on ‘good art in the community’ was a conscious decision that distinguishes its program from other municipalities in Massachusetts that aim to engage local artists.

Operational Structure and Financial Resources

A distinctive feature of the DownStreet Art project is that all of its programs are officially operated under MCLA, a local educational institution, rather than the city government or a volunteer-led group. BCRC’s three staff members are employed by the college with no municipal-based arts committee or commission overseeing their work. However, in the absence of a municipal-based group, BCRC maintains a curatorial committee as a decision-making body, made up of representatives from nearby institutions, including MASS MoCA, the Clark Art Museum, Mount Holyoke Museum, Williams College Museum of Art, Ferrin Gallery and MCLA Gallery 51. For

166 “DownStreet Art to Feature Murals throughout City.”
167 Secor, Director, Berkshire Cultural Resource Center.
168 Ibid.
169 Ibid.
the most part, the city government has played a basic administrative role in granting permission to use public spaces or vacant storefronts. That being the case, the Mayor was credited as being "extraordinarily supportive" of public art, as well as other public officials.\textsuperscript{170} As to why no committee or dedicated staff member for public art exists, Secor emphasized the small population of North Adams and its limited financial resources as one probable explanation. To illustrate this point, he mentioned that the city only recently hired a full-time city planner, prior to which the Planning Board made all planning-based decisions.

The budgets for BCRC and Gallery 51 are largely funded through MCLA. A few programs and events have been supported through MCC's Local Cultural Council grants—including a Community Art Program at North Adams Regional Hospital and a yearly Open Studios celebration—but these are administered by the Cultural Council of Northern Berkshire, a group that encompasses eleven municipalities and acts independently from DownStreet Art. Nevertheless, MCLA is a recipient of MCC's Adams grant, which helps support the BHIP program through a matching grant from the college. Secor expressed gratitude for the grant, but indicated that, given the scarcity of funding sources, it represents a "marriage of convenience."\textsuperscript{171}

Like Salem's program, DownStreet Art runs on a shoestring budget. The City of North Adams does offer tangible support with respect to streamlining permits, but the backbone of its operations is built upon support from MCLA. Budgetary limitations have forced DownStreet Art to be creative, resourceful and proactive in finding opportunities for public art. Requesting below-market or free rent for gallery spaces is a prime example of how BCRC has worked to achieve this objective. In other cases, the organization has secured donations from the Appelbaum-Kahn Foundation, Berkshire Bank, North Adams Chamber of Commerce and other private resources. Secor commented that, while larger contributions represent the bulk of funding, his proudest achievement was obtaining donations from 23 small businesses in the downtown area.\textsuperscript{172} The wide-ranging support from individual businesses, both large and small, was seen as an indicator of DownStreet Art's contribution to the revitalization of North Adams.
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Partnerships and Collaborations

DownStreet Art is defined as being a partnership between the City of North Adams, MCLA and local businesses. As noted earlier, the city remains a key partner in permitting the use of public spaces and easing its regulations for art installations and other exhibitions. While BCRC’s relationship with the city was described as a “tangible” partnership, the relationship with MASS MoCA was portrayed as more “ephemeral” in allowing the DownStreet Art project to “put the name of a contemporary art museum next to ours.” When BCRC first opened, there was an “us against them” attitude in competing for resources, but this tension has greatly subsided. Despite many overlapping interests in showcasing artwork, BCRC and MASS MoCA seem to keep an intentional degree of separation and independence in their programming and operations.

Due to the fairly isolated location of North Adams, one of the project’s toughest challenges, Secor said, was just getting artists to come to the city. Although DownStreet Art releases call for art notices, it can be difficult to get respondents from outside the Berkshire region or Massachusetts. To overcome this barrier, staff at BCRC directly reach out to artists they believe would be interested in exhibiting work in North Adams. In this sense, they take an unusually proactive role in seeking out opportunities and building relationships, rather than letting artists approach them. When discussing this matter, Secor showed a palpable sense of pride in being able to bring internationally renowned artists to North Adams, citing a June 2013 exhibition of Nicholas Kahn and Richard Selesnick as one recent example.

Project Profiles: Gneiss and Caravan Plus

In September of 2012, DownStreet Art unveiled a public mural at the corner of Holden Street and Main Street as the final installment of that summer’s Mural Project. Titled That’s Gneiss!, the 75 foot long, brightly-colored mural was commissioned by Melissa Matsuki Lillie, a North Adams-based artist (Figures 33, 34 and 35). Earlier that year, Lillie spent time working as a mineral archivist at the Berkshire Museum in Pittsfield, where
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she researched the various types of rock used in constructing the historic buildings along Main Street in North Adams. Inspired by these rocks, Lillie adapted this concept into the design of the public mural:

"I wanted to take something in the community and make it into something approachable... The mural is loosely inspired by them [the rocks]. I just used the form and shapes of them, and then applied my own pallet."174

At the unveiling of the mural, BCRC was joined by the Mayor of North Adams, staff from MCC, business owners and local residents. Accompanying the mural's unveiling was an evening of other exhibition openings and live outdoor performances. In an article published the following year, Mayor Richard J. Alcombright expressed his enthusiastic support for the work: "I smile every time I turn the corner at Main and Holden streets and see that beautiful mural. This sort of thing is what sets our community apart."175

That's Gneiss is a vivid illustration of North Adams approach in combining contemporary art with community-based themes. The artwork's reference to rocks is not site-specific per se, but it does use a feature of the city as a source of inspiration. That's Gneiss also shows how public art can be integrated with public events involving arts and culture.

Another “new and exciting” project lauded for its success was Caravan Plus, an outdoor installation and indoor exhibition by Eiko Otake and Takashi Koma Otake (“Eiko and Koma”), as shown in Figures 31 and 32. Displayed in the summer of 2013, Caravan Plus was part of Eiko and Koma’s ongoing Caravan Project, a mobile installation that transforms a trailer into a performance art space. When the doors of the trailer open, the work reveals a theatrical set in which the duo performs. After the exhibition was shown at New York’s Museum of Modern Art (MOMA) in January of 2013, Secor contacted the artists to see if they would be interested in showing the installation in North Adams. Eiko and Koma were then able to accommodate the request and fit the installation into their schedule at a relatively low cost. BCRC closed off Main Street and slowly moved the trailer through downtown in what Secor defined as a “living installation” with budo dancers.176 After the initial performance, DownStreet Art opened a pop-up gallery in a former Chevy car dealership to feature other “large-scale installations, archival

---

174 Foley, “City to Unveil Final Mural Tonight at DownStreet Art.”
175 “Celebration of All Things Art Returns to North Adams.”
176 Secor, Director, Berkshire Cultural Resource Center.
footage, costumes and sets from the artists.” This installation is emblematic of the proactive approach used by DownStreet Art in helping bring world-class art to the city. Secor seized an opportunity to hold the exhibition in North Adams and coordinated with the city to fully accommodate the artists. Eiko and Koma’s work also highlight the evolving character of public art. Tying back to issues discussed in the second chapter, the installation represents a vibrant example of how performance-based art can be regarded as a form of public art, as opposed to just a standalone installation.

FIGURES 31 & 32: Caravan Plus performances by Eiko Otake and Takashi Koma Otake (BCRC, 2013)
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FIGURES 33, 34 & 35:
That's Gneiss! by Melissa Matsuki Lillie, top, onlookers viewing the unveiling, bottom left, and Mayor Richard J. Alcombright speaking with the artist, bottom right (BCRC, 2012)
Like Salem and other cities, officials in North Adams see a promising link between public art and economic revitalization. However, where other municipalities recognize arts and culture as one strategy among many interventions, North Adams embraces these programs as a stimulant for the local economy. This makes sense because arts and culture are already a central feature of the local economy. MASS MoCA employs hundreds of people and has rapidly become an anchor institution for the city and surrounding region. In evaluating the efforts of DownStreet Art, it would be shortsighted not to acknowledge the extent to which MASS MoCA reshaped this economy and allowed the city to rebrand its image. While the establishment of MASS MoCA laid a foundation for promoting public art, DownStreet Art helped bridge an economic gap between the institution and the city. Rather than being a standalone institution where visitors simply come and go, DownStreet Art works to ensure that visitors stay in the city and support local businesses. BCRC seems to take this approach one step further by marketing North Adams as a haven for arts and culture with its restaurants, cafes, galleries, iconic buildings and affordable studio spaces.

From a basic standpoint of economic development, it is quite astonishing that downtown vacancy rates have plummeted in such a short period of time. Whether or not DownStreet Art can claim full responsibility for this change, there remains an undeniable correlation between its public art projects and the rejuvenation of the local economy. The precise contribution of DownStreet Art is difficult to measure, but the program has certainly been instrumental in capturing many of MASS MoCA’s visitors and attracting artists to live, work and exhibit pieces in the city. Despite the growing attention given to public art by the city, Secor expressed a concern about how it could be more respected in the field of city planning. Echoing the comments of Lillian Hsu in the fourth chapter, he noted that a lingering question is “how do you integrate arts into the strategic plan so that it’s an integral part, rather than an afterthought, so it becomes part of a broader strategy for growth.”

DownStreet Art exemplifies how public art can be manifested in multiple forms. For example, the program started with pop-up galleries that
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were, in effect, public art in private spaces. Some art critics and academic scholars debate whether gallery space can actually constitute a form of public art simply by nature of being located inside a private space. In response to that position, one could argue that the pop-up spaces in North Adams are indeed public art since they were organized with a clearly defined public purpose under an open call system. The city also endorsed the project and its purpose of driving economic revitalization. On a similar note, Gallery 51 serves as a community space, hosting events and meetings that are unrelated to BCRC’s programs. Not surprisingly, the people involved in the DownStreet Art project are not a marginalized group, but highly active, civic-minded residents. Secor is a member of the Chamber of Commerce, while the gallery manager is a member of the Planning Board.

Another essential part of the DownStreet Art program is its focus on collaborating with artists from around the world and maintaining a high standard of artistic quality. Initially, this was difficult to comprehend, in light of the organization’s limited resources and the city’s small population and struggling economy. Nonetheless, these interests seem appropriate due to the presence of MASS MoCA and a curatorial committee comprised of representatives from an array of prestigious institutions, such as the William College Museum of Art and the Clark Institute. Secor’s distinction between ‘community art’ and ‘good art in the community’ is a telling if somewhat provocative statement. This implies a different trajectory from other municipalities. For North Adams, the quality of the artwork matters greatly and, by giving preference to locally-produced artwork, DownStreet Art would be compromising this objective. Secor reflected upon this issue as an ongoing challenge: “How do you maintain a level and quality of artistic value in traditional working class cities and bridge gaps with persistent problems in a way that you’re not dumbing down the art?”

A final question to consider is to what extent DownStreet Art is indeed a true public art program. Although the city fully supports BCRC’s programs, DownStreet Art operates under the umbrella of MCLA. On the one hand, this allows BCRC greater flexibility in advocating for public art and more efficiency in applying for grants and receiving donations. Accordingly, DownStreet Art benefits tremendously from student volunteers and resources provided by the college, while the BHIP and assistant art gallery manager
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programs function as incubators for arts administrators. On the other hand, DownStreet Art and its curatorial committee are completely independent from the city government. In contrast to the other case studies, there exists no art committee or arts commission officially sanctioned by the municipality. The city’s art programs are managed entirely by a nonprofit organization that acts on behalf of North Adams. This organizational arrangement doesn’t appear to cause any conflict of interest nor detract from the strength of the program. Still, it is a unique distinction that sets North Adams apart and raises pertinent questions for the administration of public art.

FIGURE 36: DownStreet Art project’s summer kickoff event, overlooking Main Street and the Mohawk Theater (BCRC, 2012)
### Case Summary: North Adams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>POPULATION</strong></th>
<th>13,583</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td>Downstreet Art, a project sponsored by the Berkshire Cultural Resource Center, which is supported by MCLA; 11 installations with additional pop-up galleries; BHIP and assistant gallery director program; summer event series with ongoing events throughout the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATIONAL STRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td>BCRC staff and volunteers manage the programs with the guidance of a curatorial committee for the annual Call for Artists; nonprofit organization raises funds and completely operates the programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDING</strong></td>
<td>MCLA provides core funding support through BCRC; BHIP program financed partly through MCC's Adams Art grant; donations from businesses and private foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECENT PARTNERSHIPS</strong></td>
<td>Strong partnership between the city and MCLA; BCRC coordinates with businesses and property owners in hosting gallery shows and various events; collaborations with MASS MoCA, Clark Institute and other arts institutions located nearby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATED SUCCESSES</strong></td>
<td>Contributing towards the reduction of commercial vacancy rates; improving the image of the city; serving as an incubator for arts administration; attracting visitors and tourists; identifying opportunities to bring well-known artists to the city; maintaining high standards for the quality of installations; hosting events and reusing vacant storefronts as gallery spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCEIVED CHALLENGES</strong></td>
<td>Operating under a small budget; lacking a city-sanctioned arts commission or committee comprised of residents; barriers to getting artists and visitors interested in North Adams; restoring the city to its historic picture of vibrancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 8
Pittsfield

Background and Context

Originally inhabited by the Mahican Native American tribe, the city of Pittsfield was settled in 1752 after a wealthy landowner from Boston, Col. Jacob Wendell, purchased and subdivided 24,000 acres of land. Over the course of its history, the city has been an industrial center and cultural hub. The earliest written reference to baseball was made in Pittsfield in 1791, while some claim the city to be the birthplace of the sport.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, many famous writers were drawn to the idyllic landscape surrounding the city, including Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Edith Wharton and Herman Melville. Situated at the confluence of the Housatonic River, Pittsfield became an early hub of manufacturing and industry. A massive import of Spanish sheep in 1807 led the city to become the national center for woolen manufacturing, an industry that dominated the city's economy until the end of the century.

In 1890, the Stanley Electric Manufacturing Company, a producer of electric transformers, opened a manufacturing plant within the city. The rapid success of the company prompted General Electric (GE) in 1903 to purchase and consolidate its operations with the plant. The arrival of GE had a transformational effect on Pittsfield. From 1900 to 1920, the city's population of 21,766 roughly doubled to 41,763, rising to a high of 57,879 in 1960. At its peak, the GE plant employed an estimated 13,000 workers, serving as the city's economic base. After World War II, GE unveiled a high voltage laboratory, a state-of-the-art facility that helped advance the field of electronics.
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Due to increasing competition abroad and other economic pressures, in the 1970s GE significantly downsized its operations, culminating in the closure of its transformer division in 1986. In the ensuing years, the company's existing workforce dropped precipitously, shaking the city's economy "to its core." GE still maintains a presence in Pittsfield through the GE Advanced Materials plant owned by SABIC-Innovate Plastics, though the company's current workforce of 700 represents a shell of its former self. GE's downsizing sent ripple effects through the local economy, leading to a sudden rise in unemployment, poverty, crime and outward migration previously unseen in the city's history.

FIGURE 37:
Gregory Crewdson's choreographed picture of North Street in downtown Pittsfield, part of the Beneath the Roses series (Gregory Crewdson, Beneath the Roses, 2008)
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Within the past decade, Pittsfield has experienced modest economic growth and a citywide resurgence. Recent research by Pamela L. Landi and Daniel J. McGrath point to a growing tourism industry, as well as efforts to rebrand the city as a regional center for arts and culture.\textsuperscript{187} An additional sign of Pittsfield’s revitalization has been the stabilization of its population, which was recorded to be 44,542 in a 2012 count by the U.S. Census.\textsuperscript{188} Some have described the changes in Pittsfield as an “arts-driven renaissance.”\textsuperscript{189} In 2006, the Barrington Stage Company, a Tony-award winning theatre company, moved to downtown Pittsfield, while the Colonial Theatre, an architectural landmark, finished its renovations and reopened after a notable visit in 1998 from then-First Lady Hillary Clinton, who declared theatre to be a National Historic Treasure.\textsuperscript{190} In the following year, the Ferrin Gallery, a successful New England gallery known for contemporary ceramics, moved from Lenox to downtown Pittsfield. Meanwhile, new businesses have sprouted along North Street, bringing a greater amount of foot traffic and activity to the city’s historic commercial strip.

Some propose that Richard Florida, an urban theorist known for championing the concept of the ‘creative economy,’ had a direct influence on Pittsfield’s strategy in promoting arts and culture.\textsuperscript{191} In January 2004, Florida gave a public lecture at the Clark Institute in Williamstown, MA, which was attended by Pittsfield Mayor James Ruberto and his wife. Florida’s lecture is credited with influencing the city’s efforts of using arts and cultural-based strategies as tools for uplifting the local economy.\textsuperscript{192} Later that year, the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission released a Community Development Plan for Pittsfield, making several references to the term ‘creative economy.’ In 2009, the city of Pittsfield adopted a new Master Plan that evaluated wages and employment in the creative sectors, expressing a goal to “expand and capitalize on Pittsfield’s diverse cultural institutions” and a number one strategy of promoting these sectors.\textsuperscript{193} Tellingly, this section of the Plan is titled “Economic and Cultural Development.” Since 2007, the Berkshire Creative Economy Council—a coalition of leaders from various
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arts, cultural and private institutions—have produced an annual report on the county’s creative economy, a collaboration with the Berkshire Visitors Bureau and Berkshire Chamber of Commerce.194

Along with pushing for stronger investment in cultural institutions, public art has been an important component of the city’s broader cultural strategy. Multiple planning documents refer to public art as part of this strategy. In its 2010 five-year strategic plan, Downtown Inc.—a nonprofit advocacy group for residents, property owners, organizations and businesses in the downtown area—called for increasing the display of art and pop-up galleries.195 Landi argues that the city’s approach towards public art is not just a recent phenomenon, but a realization of plans initiated by Mayor Charles Smith in the 1980s. Under his administration, Smith appointed a Cultural Affairs Commissioner, opened a community arts center that would evolve into the Lichtenstein Center for the Arts, and organized Artabout, an annual performance and visual arts festival that would serve as an early attempt to showcase contemporary art in public spaces.196 In his 1982 inaugural speech, Smith called for renewing his commitment of “bringing art to the people” and “joining the artistic community with the retail and business community.”197 A second leader from this era was Daniel O’Connell, Pittsfield’s longstanding Cultural Affairs Commissioner, who pushed for the installation of murals during the 1990s and worked to commission two temporary sculptures inside Park Square in 2003.198

The formation of the Storefront Artist Project (“SAP”) in 2001 was a significant turning point that raised awareness of public art and paved the way for Artscape to become a city-sanctioned committee in 2005 (Figure 38). Founded by Maggie Mailer, a local artist and Pittsfield native who is the daughter of the acclaimed writer Norman Mailer, SAP was a nonprofit organization that aimed to revitalize the downtown area by filling every empty storefront on North Street with artwork.199 The project quickly gained popularity amongst residents and business owners and, in 2006, was said to
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have fully achieved its mission.\textsuperscript{200} Though SAP ended its operations in 2011, the organization is regarded as a powerful force that attracted new businesses to North Street, created a downtown atmosphere that celebrates arts and culture, and showed how public art—in public or private spaces—can be a catalyst for economic development.

Since formalizing its structure as an official city committee in 2005, Artscape has been at the forefront of managing public projects throughout the city. Artscape is a twelve member, volunteer-based group who are appointed by the city with the specific responsibility of “sponsoring an annual outdoor juried exhibition of public art.”\textsuperscript{201} According to its website and brochures, the committee’s mission is “to enhance the downtown’s character and attract visitors by installing and promoting works of art in various outdoor locations accessible to the public.”\textsuperscript{202} Although their work concentrates on the downtown area, Artscape has also been involved in projects elsewhere in the city. Artscape meetings are held monthly in City Hall and organized by Rebecca Tefft, a Recreational Activities Coordinator for the city of Pittsfield. Tefft not only serves as the liaison for the city in the meetings, but also the staff member from the city who administers individual projects, manages Calls for Artists and collaborates with artists on the installation of work. She
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was chosen by the city to oversee the Artscape Committee because she worked closely with the Parks Commission, which approves projects for the Department of Parks and Recreation. Previous experience with the management of open spaces was viewed as an asset that allowed for a smooth transition into the administration of public art. Similar to municipal-based arts commissions or committees in other cities, Artscape welcomes members with diverse professional backgrounds. The committee includes an architect, visual artist, graphic designer, nonprofit manager and local historian.

The cornerstone of Artscape’s program has been an annual Call for Artists that supports approximately seven temporary installations in public spaces across downtown. Some of these pieces are strategically clustered in locations with high visibility, such as Park Square, the Intermodal Transportation Center and City Hall. Pittsfield currently does not commission permanent works of art. If an installation is popular, the city extends its contract beyond a year. The 2013-2014 season includes 25 pieces, many of which are installations that have had their contracts renewed for multiple years. To showcase the artwork to residents and visitors, each year Artscape holds five walking tours led by an artist and educator at the Berkshire Museum.

When the Storefront Artist Project ended, there remained a simmering interest in using private spaces to display artwork. In May 2012, Mary McGinnis, a local bakery owner, collaborated with the Department of Cultural Development to develop the First Fridays Artswalk, a partnership with businesses on North Street to stay open from 5 pm to 8 pm on the first Friday of each month in order to serve as exhibition venues for artists. Artswalk functions as a city-sponsored tour of gallery receptions inside businesses willing to participate. The goals of the Artswalk are twofold in bringing economic and social activity to the downtown area, while giving local artists an opportunity to share their work at minimal cost. In the first year of Artswalk, McGinnis described the event as a huge success that resulted in $250,000 in art sales and other business revenue. Even though Artscape doesn’t run Artswalk, the program was regarded as a major contributor to public art and closely aligned with the committee's goals of revitalizing downtown.

---

203 Tefft, Recreation Activities Coordinator, City of Pittsfield.
204 Jermanok, “First Fridays Artswalk Energizes Downtown Pittsfield.”
205 Ibid.
In the past decade, Artscape has helped organize numerous events related to public art. In 2004, the city hosted Sheeptacular, a public art project that celebrated the history of the woolen industry by temporarily displaying seventy fiberglass cast sheep that were each decorated by an artist and dispersed in various public spaces in downtown. When Sheeptacular ended, the city hosted a special event to auction the pieces in order to raise funds for future public art installations. According to Latham, the project was a resounding success, generating more than $100,000 that served as a base of financial support for Artscape and jumpstarted the committee’s yearly projects. Sheeptacular will be discussed more fully in the Project Profile section. Additional events include the Art of the Game from 2007 to 2008, a project that commemorated the city’s baseball heritage with a handful of temporary and permanent installations. During this time, the city also hosted
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Hayman, a temporary exhibition in which the public decorated scarecrows for Halloween and displayed them in various downtown locations. In celebration of Pittsfield's 250th Anniversary of incorporation, in 2011 Artscape hosted Walk On, a temporary installation that superimposed historic photographs of the city on sidewalks in prominent locations (Figure 39).207

As part of a place-based strategy, MCC designated a section of North Street as the Upstreet Cultural District, a label that characterizes downtown Pittsfield as a growing commercial corridor with restaurants, cafes, galleries, businesses and institutions that support arts and culture. In 2008, the city enacted a Downtown Arts Overlay District to “enhance vitality in downtown by fostering a mix of uses through increasing downtown housing opportunities and fostering arts-related development and activities.”208 The statute was written to encourage a diverse range of permitted uses related to the arts (e.g. live/work spaces and arts-related businesses), exclude drive-in
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eating establishments and reduce parking requirements. In 2013, the overlay district was expanded to cover the entire downtown area and require developers to undergo site plan review for all buildings in excess of 5,000 square feet.\textsuperscript{209}

Strategic Approach

Goals

Pittsfield’s public art programs have a range of strategic goals. Similar to North Adams and Salem, the genesis of its programs emerged from a mission of spurring economic development. Public officials and business leaders have spoken in favor of public art as a tool for improving downtown’s image, maintaining a strong commercial corridor, stimulating investment and attracting a greater number of customers to local shops. Based on its central location in Berkshire County, some claim that Pittsfield should capture a larger share of tourists visiting the surrounding region and, as the county’s most populous city, serve as the county’s economic and cultural hub. To this end, previous reports, articles and research frequently lump public art together with other economic development goals, such as bolstering the creative economy.

Even though economic development is widely mentioned in newspaper articles and reports that chronicle Artscape, it would be highly misleading to say that its programs only serve as a tool for economic growth. The city seems to be just as concerned with cultivating an image as an arts and cultural hub. Installations of public art, then, help the city build its identity as a place where artists can thrive and where art can be publicly acknowledged, appreciated and supported. In this regard, the Artscape committee is not preoccupied with the ‘big picture’ of how installations fit into an economic development plan. Rather, the committee is primarily interested in how artwork enhances the character of public spaces, celebrates the city’s history and adds to a general cultural awareness. As such, Megan Whilden, the Director of Cultural Development for the City of Pittsfield, plays a key role in steering programs related to arts and culture.
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Along these lines, a core goal of the committee is using public art as a tool for celebrating Pittsfield’s history. The installations produced by recent events—Sheeptacular, Walk On, Art of the Game and Hayman—were all designed with the purpose of honoring the past in a manner that the community would find fun and engaging. Accordingly, Artscape adopts different themes for its annual call for art submissions. The theme for this year is “art and industry.” Last year’s theme was “Herman Melville,” which resulted in seven installations, including *The Great White Whale* sculpture depicted in the first chapter. To this extent, Artscape attempts to infuse historical themes with contemporary or modern artistic styles, serving a dual role of promoting an aesthetic appreciation for art and raising public awareness of the city’s rich history. Still, there exists an ongoing debate over whether to give preference to abstract, contemporary pieces or to more traditional artwork that residents can relate to. Ron Latham, Director of the Berkshire Athenaeum, indicated that a few contemporary pieces have been “lightning rods.” As a means of contrast, he said that a recent life-size lion sculpture outside City Hall was one of the city’s most popular pieces because “people appreciate traditional art the most.”

In its annual call for art, Artscape remains strategic in siting the location of proposed work. Locations are selected based on how they will “accent the piece and vice-versa.” Committee members make a conscious effort to place installations in visible places along North Street and community gathering spaces, such as Park Square. Tefft’s background in the Parks Commission was suggested to be a valuable asset for bringing experience on how to integrate public art into a streetscape design or site plan for open space. In general, Artscape uses a siting approach that seeks to maximize the degree of visibility of artwork and prioritize areas in front of municipal buildings.

**Operational Structure and Financial Resources**

Artscape is structured as a twelve member, ad hoc body affiliated with the City of Pittsfield’s Department of Community Development. The
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membership consists of four officers, four at large members and four ex officio members, including the Mayor, Director of Cultural Development, Director of Community Development and Director of Downtown Pittsfield Inc., a local nonprofit organization. Unlike Cambridge or Salem, the powers and duties of the committee are not derived from an ordinance. The official guidelines of the committee function as de-facto bylaws and ensure that the committee meets a standard of procedural order and formality. Each meeting is led by the chairperson, accompanied with a written agenda and recorded for meeting minutes to be distributed at the following meeting. To address specific issues, Artscape can assign responsibilities to sub-committees for nominating and membership, marketing and public relations, fundraising and grants, and selections and installations. In response to a question about whether or not the committee would be interested in adopting an ordinance to become an arts commission, Latham warned about giving too much influence to the Mayor, remarking that “Artscape was meant to be independent of politics.” Nonetheless, Latham stressed that the Mayor, Public Works Department and other agencies continue to be supportive of Artscape. Latham and Tefft did mention that different styles of leadership can change the direction of its programs. For example, Megan Whilden was said to have placed a stronger emphasis on programs that partner with businesses, such as Artswalk and the Storefront Artist Project.

The budget for Artscape is heavily reliant on the funds leftover from Sheeptacular from 2004. Over $100,000 was raised from that event, which has been used to cover costs for the annual call for art submissions. As of February 2014, Artscape had a financial balance just above $9,900. Much like Somerville and Cambridge, the city does provide a base of administrative support by incorporating Artscape’s work into the responsibilities of the Department of Community Development and Department of Cultural Development. For instance, Tefft plays a central role in processing artist submissions, managing records and controlling the disbursement of funds. Likewise, the Department of Cultural Development remains an active partner on events that promote art and culture.

In its annual Call for Artists, Artscape normally provides a $500 Honorarium to the artist with further assistance on a project-by-project
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basis. When a proposal is selected, the artist signs a one-year contract with the city, though if an installation is well-received by the public, the contract can be extended. Installations can also be available for sale, but “sales are made with 30% of sale price going back to Artscape and 70% to the artist.”

Tefft noted that installations fluctuate in costs not only on the material used, but also their cost of transport. The cost of moving heavier sculptures, such as C.R. Gray’s two pieces, resulted in unanticipated expenses incurred by the city. A few incidents of vandalism were discussed in the February and March 2014 meetings, a serious problem that often results in the removal of artwork if it cannot be restored. Though the city is not liable for these types of damages, as stipulated in the contract, the destruction of artwork was perceived as having a “chilling effect” by deterring artists from submitting work, especially if there’s an intention to sell the artwork once the contract ends.

To supplement funding provided by the city, the Artscape committee engages in a variety of fundraising efforts. Within the past few years, Artscape has received small grants in the range of a few hundred dollars from MCC’s Local Cultural Council Program. These grants have been used to support the walking tours, as well as printing and designing brochures. In addition, the committee receives small grants from the Berkshire Taconic Community Foundation, the A.R.T. Fund and the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area, Inc. In some circumstances, Artscape has benefitted from donations from local artists, including John Stritch, a well-known sculptor and long-time resident of Pittsfield.

Partnerships and Collaborations

Because Artscape accepts donations and relies on its capacity to fundraise, forming partnerships is an essential component of implementing projects. These partnerships occur between municipal departments (e.g. Department of Cultural Development) and state agencies (e.g. MCC), along with nonprofits (e.g. Downtown, Inc.), local businesses and other private sector actors. During the March 2014 meeting, members discussed a potential collaboration with the Berkshire Eagle, a regional newspaper, to hold a public art-themed scavenger hunt for students at public schools. While outside the
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scope of Artscape, partnerships between the city and arts institutions were seen as vital in guiding the committee's work. Previous Mayor James Ruberto "believed that art is an economic generator," helping to get the Barrington Theatre to move to downtown and supporting the renovation of the Colonial Theatre. Further, he developed a priority for revitalizing downtown Pittsfield as a mecca for arts and culture. These actions were instrumental in changing the perception of the downtown area and creating an atmosphere where public art could thrive.

Project Profile: Sheeptacular

Sheeptacular began with a partnership between the Artscape Committee, then a more informal group, and the Hancock Shaker Village, a "living-history" museum of the Shaker religious movement located in nearby Hancock, MA. The lead organizers were inspired by projects in Chicago and Cincinnati where models of animals were painted and temporarily placed in public spaces. At an initial meeting, the sheep on the museum's grounds were counted, sparking an idea to do a similar project in Pittsfield that would celebrate the history of the woolen industry:

"We set about creating a celebration to draw tourists, educate our kids and our community about its history, and renew our community pride - with the support of local businesses."  

Mary Rentz, the President of the Berkshire Art Association, helped "assemble a flock" of organizers—from Berkshire Artisans, the Berkshire Athenaeum, the Berkshire Museum, the Colonial Theatre, the Berkshire Visitors Bureau, Downtown Inc. and Pittsfield public schools—who would serve on the project's steering committee. To undertake the project, the committee secured $175,000 in private funding from Legacy Banks, Laurin Publishing, the Berkshire Bank Foundation and other donors. Cowpainters, a company based in Chicago that fabricates fiberglass animals, supplied the seventy sheep. The committee then released a Call for Artists, receiving 220 submission proposals, and organized a blind jury to select the winning
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proposals (Figures 41 and 42). Meanwhile, smaller sculptures were given to every public school in Pittsfield so that students could participate in painting the installations.

After months of anticipation, the painted sheep were installed on June 5, 2004 and remained in place for over three months. Over the summer, the city held a series of special events, exhibits and artist talks to complement the installation. On September 18, 2004, Sheeptacular came to a close with an auction of the artwork in the Round Stone Barn at Hancock Shaker Village, an event that was attended by hundreds of people and generated over $114,000 of funding for Artscape. Latham described Sheeptacular as an “unqualified success,” bringing the community together, honoring the city's history, boosting local pride, improving the image of downtown and, perhaps most significant, raising funds for public art. To memorialize the project, the city published a book later that year with a history of Sheeptacular and the woolen industry, as well as a photograph catalogue of all the painted sheep with quotes from selected artists.
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At its core, Sheeptacular is a temporary public art project. Rentz, who also served as the Chair of the steering committee, called it a “zany, fun public art project” that “aims to make visual art more important in our community.” Sheeptacular is a model for public art projects that aspire to serve multiple purposes. First, as Rentz mentioned, it increased an appreciation for the visual arts and reinforced the value of art in the larger community. Second, it served a goal of economic development by reenergizing public spaces, improving the downtown area and attracting residents and visitors to businesses in the vicinity. Third, in partnership with the Berkshire Athenaeum and Shaker museum, the project promoted the city’s cultural heritage and history. Fourth, the project became a crucial “source of funds” for Artscape, which helped formalize the committee and fulfill its mission of installing public art on a consistent basis through an annual Call for Artists. Furthermore, Sheeptacular demonstrates not only how public art can be tied to special events. It also illuminates how such events possess a fundraising potential to support future public art projects.

FIGURE 42:
By Hook or By Crook by Cara Petricca
Carnivale, part of the 2004 Sheeptacular event (Carnivale, 2004)
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Analysis

Pittsfield’s public art programs are unique among the rest of the case studies. The Artscape Committee does get involved in events, but its work is generally limited to the scope of temporary installation of art. That being said, the city hosts many events related to public art, like the Artswalk First Friday’s. These events are mainly organized by other stakeholders or city agencies, particularly the city’s Department of Cultural Development. In this way, Pittsfield separates the management of art installations from other forms of public art, such as performances, pop-up galleries and special events. Artscape also occupies a middle ground with respect to being a full-fledged art commission. The committee is officially recognized by the city and maintains a well-defined organizational framework. Yet the committee is neither granted power through an ordinance nor an extension of a percent program. Committee members find this position of independence and flexibility appealing. Although support from the city is highly regarded, Latham remained hesitant about allowing the Mayor to gain more influence.

A related feature of Artscape is that the committee strikes a balance between being a group led entirely by volunteers—most of whom are local residents in creative professions—and ensuring that the city fulfills its role in administering the program. Accordingly, there appears to be unspoken acceptance that the city should be supportive of public art and that the committee should be given autonomy to make decisions on behalf of the public.

For the most part, Pittsfield’s programs are driven enormously by local residents and businesses. While Tefft and other city employees enable the programs to run, it is truly the participation and enthusiasm of residents that shape their character and success. As such, there seems to be a broader appreciation for public art across the community, with many residents who act as crusaders for certain programs. On the flip side, if volunteers suddenly lose interest in the program, then a major gap would need to be filled. And similar to Salem, the budget for public art in Pittsfield is relatively small, which constrains the amount of funding available for honorariums received by artists. The funds from SheepTacular will eventually dry up and Artscape will either need to host another fundraising event or find a more sustainable system to finance its projects.
Another distinguishing feature of Artscape is that the projects walk a thin line of being temporary and permanent. The committee embraces some of the traditional aspects of public art as commissioning standalone sculptures or installations that last for at least a year, instead of temporary installations that are seasonal or last a shorter period of time. At the same time, based on the popularity of the work, many of Artscape's installations have had their contract renewed. These installations might fall under a different category of being semi-permanent because there's no interest in removing the artwork. Still, it is unclear if the city wishes to incorporate these pieces into a permanent collection and what additional costs that would entail.

As a whole, Pittsfield's programs are quite diverse. While Artscape supports art installations, the city collaborates with arts institutions and local businesses in facilitating pop-up galleries, festivals and other events that promote arts and culture. The city has taken advantage of arts-based zoning as a tool to manage the growth of the downtown area and permit an array of uses associated with the arts. Experimenting with different forms of public art, Pittsfield can be described as adopting a multi-pronged approach. Hovering in the backdrop of its programs, though, is a palpable desire to establish downtown Pittsfield as a community of artists and creative professionals.

However, in contrast to other municipalities, Pittsfield appears to be especially motivated by civic pride. The city is slowly overcoming the scars of job loss and a struggling economy. Unemployment remains a chronic problem across the city. Despite his recent accomplishments, Mayor James Ruberto narrowly won reelection in 2009, partly due to concerns that his arts-based economic development strategy was failing and needed a new direction. In light of these challenges, most of the art installations call attention to the history of Pittsfield and remind residents of its rich past. A unifying theme of Pittsfield’s public art has been restoring pride for the city, its history, its downtown and its public spaces.
Table 7

Case Summary: PittsfieLd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>44,542</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMS</td>
<td>Artscape Committee commissions on average 7 installations per year along with five walking tours of artwork; First Fridays Artswalk; Third Thursday events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL STRUCTURE</td>
<td>Artscape Committee has 12 members including four officers, four at large members and four ex officio members who serve 3 year terms; independent, ad hoc committee officially sanctioned by the Mayor; works separately from Cultural Development Board but partners with Cultural Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING</td>
<td>$9,990 of funds available to support installations; LCC grants help supplement costs of brochures and hosting walking tours; city provides funding for cultural events; private sponsors are sought for larger events and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECENT PARTNERSHIPS</td>
<td>Sheeptacular partnership between Artscape and Hancock Shaker Village, along with the Berkshire Art Association, private donors and other participants in the steering committee; partnerships with local businesses and property owners in hosting First Fridays Artwalk and Third Thursday outdoor festivals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATED SUCCESSES</td>
<td>Holding an auction that raised over $100,000 for public art; forming partnerships with businesses, nonprofits and residents in installing artwork; bringing semi-permanent art to the downtown area at a relatively inexpensive cost; organizing a long-standing, volunteer-led committee to manage arts programming, which is comprised of different professions; improving economic atmosphere of the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCEIVED CHALLENGES</td>
<td>Operating under a dwindling budget; getting high quality proposals in response to Calls for Artists; reaching out to artists beyond the Berkshires region; bringing popular installations into a permanent collection; confronting costs associated with vandalism and the removal of artwork</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 9

Conclusion

Each of the five case studies highlights a set of cross-cutting issues which relate to the practice of public art. This chapter weaves together these findings and presents a list of short and long-term recommendations. The first section groups these findings by general experiences shared by all of the municipalities and then by diverging issues which are specific to only certain cities. Another part of this section discusses financial and procedural challenges, presenting observations about the evolving nature of public art, the movement towards temporary art and the formalization process in administering programs. In the second section of the chapter, a list of recommendations is presented, along with proposed topics for future research. The chapter then ends with a few concluding remarks.

Synthesis of Findings

Shared Experiences

In speaking with arts administrators, an underlying perspective quickly became apparent. Every municipality viewed their public art programs as a duty to bring arts and culture to the people. Andrew Shapiro, the Economic Development Planner from Salem, framed this perspective as an issue of “equity” by which all members of the public deserve access to the arts. Shapiro articulated this concept well by stating that the public has a right to see and experience art. The theme of ‘access’ is mentioned extensively in literature on the subject and statements from the interviews confirmed the relevancy of this theme. Public art was regarded, then, as a means to meet this objective.
Although there was broad agreement about increasing access to arts and culture, it can be difficult for government to fulfill and carry out this responsibility. The municipality of North Adams simply does not have the same resources as Cambridge. It therefore became practical for MCLA, as a nonprofit anchor institution, to step in and manage the DownStreet Art project, albeit with the blessing of the city government.

As the case studies illustrate, most of the pieces classified as public art defy the conventional notion of being permanent sculptures or large, imposing structures. Public art can exist at multiple scales and through an ever-expanding list of artistic mediums. Somerville and North Adams have few permanent installations, but maintain thriving programs by approaching public art as something that can be performance-based or tied to an event. In Somerville, the *Micro Museum* shows how artwork can be made purposefully small-scale and less visible and yet still be popular, giving viewers a more personal interaction with the artwork. The success of *Bloom* indicates how public art can be fleeting in nature in a manner that draws people to the artwork to avoid missing it. As a whole, the cities approached public art with an eye towards temporary installations that could be integrated with events or exhibits. In many regards, performance-based art, such as *Caravan Plus* in North Adams, was valuable for helping measure the success of artwork through the number of visitors or attendees.

Public art projects are reviewed, in large part, on an ad-hoc basis. Artists are typically given enormous freedom to decide the material and design of a piece as long as it meets certain standards of safety and aesthetics. Responses to Calls for Artists can thus be varied and require a necessary degree of flexibility. Tefft stated that projects involve a lot of communication with the artist and, more often than not, adjustments to the original proposal. Pittsfield has also been confronted with proposals that did not work out, in which case the artist can offer an existing work as an alternative. Lack of resources or lower than expected responses to Calls for Artists are certainly important factors that contribute to this ad-hoc nature. But, from a standpoint of the artist, an ad-hoc review process is partly a reflection of respecting artistic freedom. Placing too many restrictions on the review of installations might hold back the potential for creativity and even deter artists from participating altogether.
To a greater or lesser degree, the interviewees found that public art made a valuable, if somewhat unrecognized, contribution to the city. All of the public art programs benefit from a local government that expressly supports arts and culture. In North Adams and Pittsfield, the Mayors have been present at unveilings of installations and spoken enthusiastically about the role of arts in their communities. Still, even in these cases where public art is seemingly flourishing, there remained an uphill battle of helping public art gain a deeper form of respect and admiration. Jonathan Secor from North Adams believed that public art should be part of the conversation of strategic growth and long-term planning. Percent for Art programs help ensure that public art gets incorporated into planning efforts, but even in Cambridge, Lillian Hsu identified a “barrier of seeing artists as extra rather than essential.”

There is no doubt that public officials in these cities support public art as a valuable and necessary feature of the city. Financially, however, these programs are stretched thin and can be led almost exclusively by volunteers. When there exists a blatant mismatch between strong vocal support and low levels of funding allocated in the city budget, a lingering question to consider is whether this actually devalues public art and prevents programs from realizing their full potential.

Diverging Issues

One interesting feature of the case studies was the fact that there were often major arts and cultural institutions located within the city. Not surprisingly, these institutions have a ripple effect on the city’s public art programs. Many artists who participated in the Call for Artists work in nearby museums or were part of exhibitions. Two of the most prominent examples are North Adams, the location of MASS MoCA, and Salem, the location of the Peabody Essex Museum. These institutions boast thousands of visitors each year from New England and beyond, curating exhibits of artists from around the globe. What became a surprise, though, was how little these institutions partnered with local governments in pursuing public art projects. While these institutions possess funding resources and represent anchors in the local economy, the arts administrators interviewed were reluctant to partner with them. They seemed to accept a necessary boundary of independence in running their own programs. Despite these sentiments, the presence of these institutions—along with the Berkshire Museum and Barrington Theatre Company in Pittsfield—have an indisputable relationship with the character of the public art programs. It’s appropriate that the DownStreet Art program
in North Adams strives to support contemporary artists from around the world as the home of MASS MoCA. It's similarly appropriate that Pittsfield's public art touches upon historical themes as the home of the Berkshire Athenaeum and the Berkshire Museum. They may operate separately, but their presence alone can have an influence on the city's public art programs.

Scholarly work on public art discusses how installations can speak to different 'audiences' or groups of people. The case studies display a remarkable contrast in the target audience public art aims to reach. In cities where programs are more closely tied with economic development—Salem, North Adams and Pittsfield—the 'audience' is tilted more heavily on visitors or tourists. This is not to say that local residents don't help manage the programs and take ownership of the projects. But it does reveal a desire to use public art as a tool for drawing in visitors and encouraging them to spend longer periods of time in a downtown area with the goal of patronizing local businesses. In contrast, public art in Somerville and Cambridge are geared much more for the enjoyment of local residents. For Somerville, one could argue that the audience is hyper-local in that programs are directed at giving opportunities to artists living in particular areas of the city, such as Union Square. Meanwhile, in Cambridge, Hsu introduced a concept that public art should be playful and interactive, appealing to children as much as adults. The ability for installations to reach an intergenerational 'audience' was regarded as a sought-after objective.

The case studies also uncover different preferences in supporting community-based art versus artwork that meets a higher standard of quality, which art administrators loosely label as being 'world-class' art. One mission of the Somerville Arts Council is to showcase the talents of locally based artists and form partnerships with residents and students from public schools. The Davis Square Tile Project is symbolic of this preference. For the DownStreet Art project in North Adams, Secor intentionally seeks out well-known artists and places strong emphasis on the aesthetic quality of artwork that should be produced. While the program's budget for art calls is relatively low, DownStreet Art shows how art administrators can be rather savvy in pinpointing opportunities to bring world-class art to communities, as with the case of Caravan Plus. The experience of North Adams imparts an important lesson in that acquiring high quality art can be possible in cities with scant resources to support programs. However, preferences given to artwork perceived as higher quality and produced by artists outside the region
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does beg a question if some legitimacy of the public art gets lost. Deutsche, Hall and Robinson might warn that this belief could lead to excluding members of the public and undemocratic processes. Literature on public art doesn’t seem to conclude that one way is better than another, aside from agreeing that there must be a public process in selecting the artwork. It remains unclear whether giving preferences to local artists contributes to the notion of public art.

All of the municipal governments unquestionably support public art. Nonetheless, when a question on adopting a percent ordinance was asked to interviewees from Salem and Somerville, it became clear that funds for public art could conflict with other development priorities. In Salem, Shapiro said that a percent ordinance could act as a deterrent for developers choosing between building in the city and towns nearby. In Somerville, Jenkins bemoaned the added administrative burden this would cause SAC and the potential conflict with the city’s other development agendas. What Cambridge was able to accomplish in the 1970s was viewed as an anomaly that could not easily be replicated in other cities and towns across the state. As such, it is crucial to highlight potential tensions that can occur between public art and various governmental interests.

Financial Issues

Overall, funding for public art is scarce. The cities either provide a small funding base for a few full-time staff members or hand over the responsibility of overseeing a program to an existing staff member. North Adams is an exception because the program is fully operated by the Berkshire Cultural Resource Center, an affiliate of MCLA. Besides staffing needs, funding for artwork is generally low with a widening disparity between cities with or without a percent for art program. Salem and Pittsfield, for instance, mostly offer $500 contracts for artists, receiving small sums of funding from the municipal budget. Along with North Adams, these cities rely heavily on grants, fundraising and donations to pursue annual art calls or special projects. Though small, the LCC grant from MCC funded the Micro Museum in Somerville and the design and printing of brochures for the Pittsfield Art Map. Similarly, a grant from the New England Foundation for the Arts (NEFA) was pivotal in allowing Somerville to purchase Ripple Run as a permanent installation. Salem’s grant from the NEA funded the Public Art Master Plan, which led to the establishment of an arts commission.
Percent for art programs have an immense impact on the ability for a municipality to financially support public art. The RFQ for Cambridge's Fern Street resurfacing project helped finance an $85,000 art commission. Somerville is currently involved in an RFQ for the Green Line Extension that will allocate $225,000 for up to three artists. The disparity between funding raised by percent programs and funding raised elsewhere is quite striking, touching upon issues of equity. By virtue of being the only municipality with a percent program, Cambridge has the most financially self-sustaining public art program. The constant pipeline of public projects in the city's capital budget keeps the program active and secures funding for new projects. Programs that rely mostly on donations or grants, like Artscape in Pittsfield, are more susceptible to adjustments in state appropriations from MCC and need to think creatively about how to approve projects that require ongoing maintenance. In that regard, auctioning the sheep during Sheeptacular served as an innovative fundraising technique that helped build Artscape's capacity to fund future projects.

Procedural Issues

Installing public art can be an enormous procedural challenge, requiring much patience and coordination between city departments. When posing this question to arts administrators, Cambridge was the only municipality that identified 'red tape' as a major barrier. This might be reflective of the city having a larger government, as well as the nature of a percent for art program demanding interdepartmental work. Even so, for Somerville and Pittsfield—cities that are not much smaller in population than Cambridge—working across departments was not seen as a problem. In general, the other cities had only positive feedback when asked about relationships with the Mayor or other departments. Since Cambridge is considerably larger in population, one question is whether smaller-sized cities have some advantage based on the smaller scale of the local government and fewer hurdles to get projects implemented. This appeared to be the case for Pittsfield. Rebecca Tefft's role as the Recreational Activities Coordinator demonstrates how a staff person from a municipality can be an effective facilitator for public art by being familiar with the dynamics of projects in public spaces.
Another procedural issue relates to the distinction of public art and cultural development. The Art Councils of Somerville and Cambridge both host arts and cultural events. Their public art programs tend to focus on specific installations, while the cultural development programs host events or work on special projects. From an organizational standpoint, these programs normally fall under the same umbrella of a municipal-based arts council. North Adams is an exception in that the practice of public art and cultural development are truly enmeshed. The pop-up galleries are centered around events, often performance-based art. On the flip side, Pittsfield represents a different type of exception in a sense that Artscape is distinct from the city’s Department of Cultural Development. Artscape is mainly responsible for managing art installations and is only loosely connected with the First Friday’s Artswalk or Third Thursday events, even though these events might be similar to Somerville’s Windows Art Project or DownStreet Art’s pop-up galleries. In comparison to the other cities, Pittsfield seems to maintain a more rigid separation between public art (e.g. installations approved for public spaces) and events that promote arts and culture. That being said, all of the cities acknowledged art installations as part of a larger strategy for cultural development.

The Evolving Meaning of Public Art

The quintessential image of public art as a sculpture in a park or public plaza needs to shift. Public art programs, especially in cities without percent for art programs, are becoming more intensely focused on temporary installations. In smaller-sized cities that cannot afford large commissions and greatly depend on small grants, installing temporary artwork is a matter of sheer practicality, a response to dwindling financial resources. For other cities, such as Somerville, temporary works are supported more as an ideology. Jenkins was proud that SAC focused on temporary installations, finding these to be more impactful and innovative. At the more extreme side of temporary-ness are projects such as Bloom, which spanned less than two days. At the other end of the spectrum are installations like The Great White Whale. Though officially temporary, the installation operates under a yearly contract, which can be extended without time restrictions as long as the piece remains in good condition. Except for Cambridge, each of the cities appears satisfied with the focus on temporary installations and do not intend to site permanent artwork in the near future. Goldstein and other guidebooks for the administration of public art have mainly concentrated on cities forming a
percent program or siting permanent installations. The experiences shared in these case studies reveals a noticeable gap in methods of managing temporary art. Public art is becoming more temporary, which has implications for the procedures, regulations and funding mechanisms associated with the artwork.

The case studies also shine a light on how public art can involve strategic partnerships with the private sector. The DownStreet Art program in North Adams was, in fact, built upon a collaboration with local businesses and landlords to host pop-up galleries. Secor emphasized that public art can be in both private and public spaces. The difference between public and private spaces, he alluded, is not as significant as the level of engagement with the public. Pop-up galleries and outdoor events draw visitors and create meaningful ways to engage local residents and tourists, even though the spaces are open to the public for a limited period of time and located on privately owned property. In the eyes of the general public, artwork in private spaces can be just as accessible as artwork in public spaces. For cities with struggling economies and lacking resources to support large-scale installations, temporary installations in private spaces can be a low-cost, efficient way to support public art. What's more, for North Adams, the success of these initial projects can be a necessary steppingstone to the commissioning of "art in public spaces."

Balancing Formality and Flexibility

The five case studies display varying degrees of formality in their operational structure. The structure of the Cambridge Arts Council (CAC) is representative of a fully formalized public art program, a standard model that includes a percent for art program, full-time staff and administrators, a Public Art Commission, and ad hoc committees of local stakeholders established for RFPs and RFQs. On the other side of the spectrum are programs like the Somerville Arts Council (SAC), which approves projects on a mostly project-by-project basis. SAC has a volunteer-based board that oversees their work, but, according to Jenkins, it doesn't play much of a role in siting, reviewing and approving public art projects. The other three cities occupy a middle ground of formalization. DownStreet Art doesn't have an arts committee consisting of local residents, but rather a curatorial committee made up of staff from nearby arts institutions. The curatorial committee does have an influence over Calls for Artists, though Secor and BCRC staff have substantial discretion over the operations of programs. As such, even though DownStreet
Art is privately managed, the organization functions like a municipal Arts Council in hosting events and holding Calls for Artists. On the other hand, Pittsfield’s programs are sort of a hybrid. The Artscape committee has a well-defined structure with monthly meetings and active projects, but remains an entity distinct from the city. One common divide on the spectrum of ‘formality’ is whether or not a public art program is legally authorized by an ordinance. To that end, only Salem and Cambridge have enacted such regulations.

In general, the degree of formalization didn’t seem to impact the level of activity of the public art projects. SAC, DownStreet Art and Artscape have highly active programs on severely constrained budgets. For Somerville and North Adams, more flexibility and fewer restrictions in approving artwork were even identified as assets. That being said, formalization does make a difference in regards to ensuring that public processes are in place. In Cambridge, there are many ways in which local residents can voice their thoughts about a project in front of the commission or participate in a site committee. These public processes are more difficult with a less active oversight board, as in Somerville, or in the complete absence of one altogether, as in North Adams. For these reasons, Salem followed the first recommendation of the Master Plan and passed an ordinance to create an arts commission. Having an arts commission comprised of local stakeholders and community leaders guarantees a public process, adding to the legitimacy of the public art seeking approval. Residents of Salem, Shapiro said, saw this as a crucial step for giving the public more control over shaping the future course of public art. From a procedural standpoint, formalizing an art commission does influence participatory processes and tests whether public art is truly driven by the ‘public.’

**Strengthening the Connection of Public Art and City Planning**

The connection between the subject of city planning and public art needs to be clarified and strengthened. As discussed in chapter two, academic literature on public art frequently make speculative claims on how art installations add vibrancy to public spaces, revitalize areas or become a destination for visitors. Interviewees from Somerville, Salem, North Adams and Pittsfield explicitly identified economic development as a goal of public art. More significant, for Salem, Pittsfield and North Adams, public art programs arose from a desire to spur economic development. In these three
cities, local businesses and nonprofit groups were involved in leading these efforts. For these municipalities, public art was treated as a valuable strategy for improving the local economy, not an inferior add-on to an economic development proposal. Supportive statements from the Mayors were a testament to this fact. For North Adams and Pittsfield, public art was not just an aspirational goal of economic development. Public art projects were cited for helping reduce storefront vacancies and creating an environment where artists can thrive. The experiences of these cities point to tangible economic benefits, which can result from public art projects. What separates these cities apart, however, is that their economic development strategy has been primarily targeted at the tourism industry. Public art is viewed as a tool for attracting visitors who may already be coming to the city for arts or cultural institutions. Nevertheless, economic development remains closely tied to public art programs.

The case studies also highlight other connections between city planning and public art. For Salem and Pittsfield, the siting of artwork was strategically planned. Installations were not just intended for public spaces that were centrally located or had high visibility. They were also sited in public spaces that were a source of pride for the city, such as the Essex Street Pedestrian Mall in Salem or Park Square in Pittsfield. Percent for art programs also alter the connection between city planning and public art by symbolically aligning the goals of public art with capital improvement projects. Whenever there is capital investment in Cambridge public projects, for example, there must be a simultaneous investment in public art. Cities without this mandate maintain a much more ad hoc relationship between public art and planning efforts. However, the experiences of Pittsfield and North Adams prove that it is indeed possible to sustain a strong relationship between public art and city planning without a percent program. These cities fulfill this mandate under the framework of a dynamic temporary art program.

**Connecting Findings to Theory**

The findings from the case studies have connections to the theoretical approaches to public art discussed in the second chapter. One of the goals of public art, Malcolm Miles describes, is to transform spaces into places. The programs and projects from each of the cases strongly support this claim. Salem's Public Art Master Plan openly states that public art will be installed to enliven and spark activity in public spaces, especially with regard to the Essex
Street pedestrian corridor. In Pittsfield and North Adams, public art was sited in locations that administrators felt were neglected and deserved greater attention. Strengthening the identity of these places through art represents a theme that cuts across the cases and confirms ideas stressed in the literature.

Another group of theories tested by the case studies is how public art connects to the “public” itself. John Beardsley emphasizes that public art should maintain a level of emotional and intellectual accessibility. Ron Latham, the Director of the Berkshire Athenaeum, said that the most popular pieces were traditional art that people could more easily connect with and appreciate. Cher Krause Knight and others identify this issue as the “approachability” of artwork. Although the administrators were conscious of the ability for public art to be emotionally and intellectually accessible, they also believed that public art should push against our conventional notions of art. For Salem, Shapiro stated that installations that foster a public dialogue were desirable. For each of the case studies, there was an interest in siting new forms of art that intentionally confront the viewer with a challenging, yet enriching experience. Still, what can be defined as approachable seems to be based on the personal tastes of the ‘public’ involved or the administrative bodies that commission the artwork.

As previously mentioned, the case studies varied with respect to the overall level of engagement with the public. Hall and Robertson discuss at length the value of having public processes in place. The existence of formal mechanisms—art commissions, committees, municipal ordinances—helped ensure that members of the public would be involved in projects. For Cambridge, the creation of site committees for RFQ or RFP projects served as an additional outlet for public involvement, which Hsu found be an important mechanism for bringing together local stakeholders and empowering residents to take ownership of a project. Conversely, in Somerville, a city without rigid regulations, members of the public become involved on a more ad-hoc basis, mostly as volunteers or participants in programs, rather than directing their operations. Knight remarks that public art installations can speak to multiple publics or groups of people. This is not an abstract concept, but a practical reality. In Pittsfield, North Adams and Salem, the administrators expressed a desire to use public art as a tool for attracting visitors and tourists. In Salem, Shapiro indicated that public art should be differentiated by which members of the public view the pieces. The potential
viewers of public art—whether at the regional, local or neighborhood scale—can influence the type of artwork sited.

Table 8: Summary of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHARED EXPERIENCES</th>
<th>Viewing public art as an equity issue that helps ensure the public has access to artwork; valuing temporary or performance-based art; reviewing art on an ad-hoc basis; responsibility of government to support arts and culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIVERGING ISSUES</td>
<td>Partnerships with local institutions; artwork speaking to different audiences (residents vs. visitors); financial stability of programs; tension of supporting local artists and siting world-class artwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL AND PROCEDURAL ISSUES</td>
<td>Gap between percent and non-percent programs, as well as base level of support from municipal government; relationship with other departments and link to various cultural development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVOLVING MEANING OF PUBLIC ART</td>
<td>Movement toward temporary installations and events-based programming; public art in privately owned spaces; strategic partnerships with artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORMALITY VS. FLEXIBILITY</td>
<td>Various manifestations of Calls for Artists (RFP, RFQ, etc.); the choice to enact ordinances or adopt guidelines for municipal-based committees or percent programs; greater formalization can entail stronger public processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICABILITY TO CITY PLANNING</td>
<td>Public art projects often coincide with revitalization efforts of economic development and the refurbishment of parks, plazas and public spaces; public processes involved with siting public art are similar to processes employed in the field of city planning; planners can help lead or manage programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTIONS TO THEORY ON PUBLIC ART</td>
<td>Definition of the &quot;public&quot; can vary with the intention of the program; public engagement can be affected by ordinances and guidelines set by the municipality; tension exists over how &quot;approachable&quot; or &quot;challenging&quot; pieces should be to viewers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

The following section presents a series of recommendations based on observations from the individual case studies. The recommendations are divided into short and long-term proposals. This is not meant to be an exhaustive list, but instead explore possible interventions that could address the successes and challenges reported by arts administrators for new and existing programs.

Short-term

DEVELOP A PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INVENTORY OF PUBLIC ART
Most larger cities, including Boston, maintain a database of public art with information on the title of the piece, location, date of installment, type of artistic style and material, and other background information on the artwork. In many instances, this information is compiled and then put on an interactive map printed on a brochure (e.g. Pittsfield and North Adams) and displayed using web-based mapping tools (e.g. Cambridge and Somerville). However, in cities such as Cambridge and Somerville, the amount of art in privately owned spaces on view to the public is quite substantial. The combined collections of artwork at MIT and Harvard rival the collection on city-owned property. Expanding the inventory to include permanent or semi-permanent artwork in private locations can help cities gain a more comprehensive picture of the role of public art in their communities. Further, if cities and towns report these inventories to MCC or another state-based organization, it will be easier to ascertain the distribution of public art installations statewide.

TIE ARTS-BASED ZONING TO SMART GROWTH INCENTIVES
The cases of North Adams, Pittsfield and Salem illustrate how economic development programs are attached to arts and cultural development. There should be incentives for cities that adopt arts-based rezoning. According to Chapter 40R of the state's general code, Massachusetts provides an “incentive payment” of $3,000 per unit—which can reach a cap of $600,000—for cities that adopt smart growth zoning overlays.228 These payments are made directly to the city government. In light of the economic contribution of arts-based

228 Verilli and Raitt, The Use of Chapter 40R in Massachusetts as a Tool for Smart Growth and Affordable Housing Production.
uses, state legislators should strongly consider a similar incentive-based payment for these categories as well. One option could be creating a separate “incentive payment” for arts overlay zoning or amending Chapter 40R by offering a bonus payment for smart growth zoning that incorporates an arts overlay district. Funding from such payments would be a valuable resource for public art programs, while ensuring that these programs reap the benefits of new development. Therefore, funds allocated to the city could be used to support individual projects and commissions. In cities with growing housing markets, such as Salem, this system would provide a more robust stream of financing for art projects reviewed by the newly appointed commission. From a land-use planning perspective, it also rewards cities for pursuing an arts-based strategy of economic development and recognizes that public art projects can be a tangible force for revitalization.

STRENGTHEN INVESTMENT IN TEMPORARY ART
Cities are gradually acknowledging that temporary art can meet the same objectives as permanently sited artwork. However, without a percent program that redirects funds for other art programs, funding for temporary art is generally ad hoc and, as the case studies show, can be woefully inadequate. Despite their small level of support, MCC’s Adams Art and Local Cultural Council grants serve as essential resources for public art programs. LCC grants fund temporary artwork and enable cities to provide printed brochures, advertise artwork online and support miscellaneous tasks. Adams Art grants serve as a catalyst for arts and cultural projects designed to spur economic growth. The BHIP Program in North Adams and the ArtsUnion project in Somerville were formed as a result of Adams Art grants. LCC grants enable all of the cities to install smaller works of art, including the Micro Museum installation in Somerville. An expansion of these grant programs would permit cities to scale up their programs and give more opportunities to artists. Additionally, investing in temporary art is vital because cities need to more aggressively adapt to this evolving aesthetic of public art. Strengthening investment in temporary art can give more cities and towns the fiscal capability to establish programs, while acknowledging that public art has become more ephemeral in nature.

ALLOCATE GRANTS FOR DESIGNATED CULTURAL DISTRICTS
Presently, MCC does not provide grants directly to cities with Cultural District designations. Grants are allocated through the Local Cultural Council Program, Cultural Facilities Fund, Adams Art Program and ArtsLink, a
program designed to promote affordable art space. For events-based programming, the publication of promotional material or temporary installations, it appears that municipalities would benefit from a more centralized system. Pittsfield has been successful in combining these funding sources into a well-established cultural development program, but for other cities it might be more effective to develop a centralized system through the Cultural District designation. Alternatively, the Adams Art grant could be expanded to become 'program-based' instead of 'project-based' so that cities rely less on LCC grants to support temporary installations or events. The Adams Art Program could therefore grow to become a more stable source of financing that could sustain yearly Calls for Art and other commissions.

**Long-term**

**TAP INTO UNIVERSITY PARTNERHSIPS**

MCLA is a public liberal arts college that funds BCRC and its DownStreet Art Project. The college recognized the need to revitalize downtown North Adams and the transformational effect that could occur by opening a gallery on Main Street. It also recognized the opportunities that this type of partnership could provide to students pursuing degrees in the fine arts or arts management. The contribution of DownStreet Art to North Adams offers a lesson in how educational institutions can play a central role in public art programs. The fact that MCLA is the financial and administrative backbone of the program is significant. MCLA is not a private college with a large endowment. If MCLA is capable of forming such a partnership with the city of North Adams, perhaps other cities with limited budgets should consider following a similar path. At the very least, North Adams shows how local colleges and universities can be key players in implementing public art programs.

**SHARPEN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PUBLIC ART AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT**

The administration of public art often falls under an umbrella of arts and cultural development. Programs such as SAC and CAC act as an umbrella for delivering arts and cultural enrichment programs. For Somerville and North Adams, the line separating public art and other cultural programs can be blurry. For Pittsfield, this line is more well-defined through the guidelines of what projects Artscape reviews or doesn't review. Sharpening the boundaries between what's labeled public art or cultural development does not necessarily
change the substance of a program, but it does impact how one measures the contribution of public art. If First Friday events in Pittsfield attract thousands of visitors each year, whether or not this event is called ‘public art’ can help policymakers better understand its contribution more broadly.

**ENACT FLEXIBLE PERCENT FOR ART PROGRAMS**

The Percent for Art programs in Seattle, Los Angeles and Portland discussed in the second chapter suggest that municipalities can be flexible in how to craft programs. If Pittsfield is already heavily investing in cultural development and devoting resources to semi-permanent art installations, enacting a percent ordinance could be appropriate, especially if new development or infrastructural investments occur in the arts overlay district. Public and private capital development projects could become a source of financing for public art or written with the flexibility to support cultural institutions and programs. In Somerville, a percent ordinance could be written so that capital projects create a stream of funding for arts and cultural programs. These programs do not have a ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach and can be tailored to the needs of the municipality. They can support art installations onsite or offsite and, in certain circumstances, apply to private development approved by a redevelopment agency. Piloting a percent program is one method that can capture a powerful source of funding for public art programs.

**DEVELOP CONSISTENT EVALUATIONS OF PUBLIC ART**

The advent of walking tours and various events to promote public art present an important opportunity for cities. Measuring the amount of visitors who attend these events and the ripple effects on the local economy can serve as valuable indicators for identifying the benefits of public art. North Adams and Pittsfield are diligent in recording these indicators and using them to leverage further investment, but this should be accomplished in other cities as well. These indicators should also be more thoroughly measured and publicized, particularly when public art projects increase sales in local businesses and reduce storefront vacancies. Standardizing the measurements of evaluation can help build legitimacy for these programs and justify stronger forms of investments.
RECOGNIZE PUBLIC ART AS A FORM OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND OPEN SPACE PLANNING

Findings from the case studies explore how public art can share the same tools, processes and goals of city planning. In Salem, public art proposals piggyback on proposals to revitalize public spaces. The Public Art Master Plan for Arlington, Virginia was unveiled as part of an open space plan for the entire city. For Pittsfield, Tefft found her role as a parks and recreation coordinator to be beneficial for siting public art and overseeing programs. In Salem, Pittsfield and North Adams, public art is interconnected with a larger strategy of economic development. Lessons from these cases suggest the expanded role of the municipal planner. Selwood, Goldstein, Cruikshank, Korza and others discuss how planners should be equipped with knowledge of public art, particularly when reviewing proposals related to the design of open spaces. The strong involvement of local businesses in Salem, Pittsfield and North Adams touches on an additional drive of public art for the purpose of economic development. Consequently, public art should not be put in a silo of cultural development or labeled as an isolated artistic discipline. Rather, it should be assertively recognized as a component of open space and economic development planning. Municipal planners should become familiar with public art approaches in their quest to revitalize commercial corridors and improve the quality of public spaces.

Table 9: List of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT-TERM</th>
<th>LONG-TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>» Develop a public and private inventory of public art</td>
<td>» Tap into university partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>» Tie arts-based zoning to smart growth incentives</td>
<td>» Sharpen the relationship between public art and cultural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>» Strengthen investment in temporary art</td>
<td>» Enact flexible percent for art programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>» Allocate grants for designated cultural districts</td>
<td>» Develop consistent evaluations of public art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>» Recognize public art as a form of economic development and open space planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics for Further Research

Research on public art primarily focuses on individual projects rather than programs. Websites, reports and books on public art generally catalogue specific installations, while giving little attention to the policies and programs that enabled such installations to occur in the first place. Future research should attempt to closely examine successes and challenges faced by cities and towns across the country. Constraints on municipal budgets are changing the landscape of public art programs towards an emphasis on temporary projects and collaborations with educational institutions, companies and other private sector actors. The traditional model of the percent for art ordinance is becoming outdated. New strategies that are working effectively need to be shared between towns and cities of all population sizes.

The cases of North Adams, Salem and Pittsfield shed light on how local businesses can help influence the shape and character of programs. Future research should explore the perspectives of these businesses and the perceived contribution of public art. Accordingly, the relationship between public art and cultural development needs to be enhanced and clarified. If cities and towns are making investments in cultural development programs that seek to attract a community of artists and creative professionals, then there should be a better understanding as to how public art fits into this picture. Finally, the boundary of public art itself remains hazy. Future research can more carefully define these boundaries, particularly for performance or event-based programs.

Concluding Remarks

The study of public art is at a thrilling juncture. As cities and towns grapple with shrinking or stagnant budgets, programs are shifting attention to public art that is inherently temporary and linked to events that promote arts and culture more holistically. This approach should be fully acknowledged and embraced for its potential impact on cities of all population sizes. Many smaller-sized cities are awakening to the realization that public art is an effective tool for economic revitalization, the improvement of public spaces and civic pride. Most significant, the emergence of new programs like
DownStreet Art show that innovative public art programs are possible in cities with limited governmental capacity through passionate leadership and strategic partnerships. The perceived success of these programs could be a model for similarly small cities with aspirations for siting public art. The programs in Salem, Pittsfield and North Adams are severely constrained by their budgets, but these programs can still be effective and seem to be just as active as cities with much greater budgets and full-time staff. The case studies show that public art programs are possible regardless of a city's population size or economic strength. This thesis departs from past research in highlighting the fact that public art programs can and do occur at smaller scales, driven by public officials and volunteers who wish to pursue projects.

The findings from the case studies indicate both the limitations of these programs and their potential impact. More often than not, public art projects were interconnected with revitalization efforts. The profession of city planning should be committed to both understanding the effects of public art and acknowledging it as a tool for economic development. Equally important, art committees and commissions should work more closely with planning and public works departments. While the approaches of the case studies vary, these findings should not be misinterpreted as one approach being better or worse than another. No 'one-size-fits-all' approach exists, but it is absolutely critical that cities share their experiences for the benefit of other municipalities forming a new public art program or expand an existing one.

Cities with limited budgets should be aware of what other municipalities across Massachusetts and nationwide are accomplishing with respect to the administration of public art. This is valuable for three separate reasons. First, it is important that cities experiment with new approaches and try different models that have proved successful elsewhere. Second, smaller-sized cities need a more cohesive framework for implementing public art programs, which can emerge only with a better understanding of what programs are working effectively. Third, the emergence of new approaches has implications for the field of public art itself, shining a light on temporary forms of public art and events-based programs.
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