

**Livability and Creativity:
Civic Innovations at the Intersection of Arts, Culture, and
Planning**

A thesis submitted by

Jennifer Sien Erickson

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning

TUFTS UNIVERSITY

August 2016

Advisor: Barbara Parmenter, PhD

Reader: Jonathan Witten, Esq.

ABSTRACT

Arts, and culture is an essential element of what makes our places and communities healthy, connected and vibrant. It provides us with unique opportunities to connect with elements in our past, present, and future and to engage with the people and environments in which we live, work, study, and play. Its fields of practice are well represented in the public, nonprofit, and private sectors and are driving change in various disciplines of planning, including community development, economic development, public health, open space, and transportation. Yet, it has not received its due attention as a core competency and practice area of urban planning within academic and professional spheres.

This thesis positions arts and culture as an essential area of practice for urban planners. Using findings from a literature review of innovations at the intersection of arts, culture, and planning and case studies I compiled during my professional work on an Arts and Planning Toolkit, I document and evaluate the sector's effectiveness in solving complex social, economic, and environmental problems and consider its integral role as a partner in the advancement of smart growth and livability. Through an analysis of academic literature and professional reports, I offer a new framework that provides strategic direction to public sector entities and planners on the steps they can take to both embrace creativity as an asset in planning practice and create the policy and planning conditions that will allow arts and culture to thrive.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the wisdom, enthusiasm, and generosity of many people. First, I'd like to thank my advisor, Barbara Parmenter, for her skillful coaching, guidance, and advice throughout my writing process. I'd also like to thank Jonathan Witten for serving as my reader; his insightful comments and suggestions were very helpful. My thesis advanced tremendously with their expert support.

I would also like to thank the many people who generously took time out of their lives to speak with me as part of the development of the Arts and Planning Toolkit, which this thesis expands upon. Particular thanks to Cath Brunner, Jennifer Cole, Nicole Crutchfield, and Marty Pottenger who reviewed and commented on case studies about their work, which are included in this thesis. Many thanks also to Julie Burros, whose mentorship of me in this arena of work has meant so much, and to F. Javier Torres, whose friendship and encouragement over the years has spurred me to pursue this path of research.

To my friends and family, thank you so much for your unwavering encouragement during my journey to complete this thesis. I am also grateful for my community of clay friends at my cooperative pottery studio, where I spent many nights slinging clay in between marathon writing sessions. And, my deepest thanks to my best friend and partner, Todd Erickson – for his humor, numerous rides to the library, and for always supporting my dream of living a creative life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	1
Overview	2
Chapter 1: Arts and Culture is an Essential Competency/Practice Area for Planners	5
Chapter 2: Review of U.S. Support for Arts and Culture	16
Chapter 3: Review of Trends and Innovations at the Intersection of Arts, Culture, and Planning	28
Chapter 4: Case Studies of Innovations in Arts, Culture, and Planning from the Arts and Planning Toolkit	61
Chapter 5: Conclusion and Areas for Further Research	103
Appendix A: Planning Strategies to Advance Arts, Culture, and Economic Vitality	109
Appendix B: Guidelines for Assessing Zoning Regulations and Permitting Processes to Remove Barriers to Arts and Cultural Uses and Facilities in Smart Growth Locations	112
Appendix C: A Framework for Infusing Arts, Culture, and Creativity into Planning	118
Appendix D: A Public Sector Action Agenda to Incentivize Integration of Arts and Culture into Planning Programs, Projects, and Policies	134
Bibliography	141

OVERVIEW

Urban planners influence and shape the social, physical, and environmental conditions of places through planning and community development. By conducting research, data analysis, public engagement, visioning, and program and policy development, planners are developing and implementing policies and plans that guide the development of vibrant and healthy places and communities (American Planning Association [APA], 2014, 2016). Similarly, actors in the arts and culture fields of practice are influencing and enriching people and places in various ways. Artists and creative entities in the nonprofit and private sector are creating opportunities for people from different walks of life to socialize, learn, and play, to engage with elements in their community's past, present, and future; and to uniquely understand and interact with the public realm and built environments in which they live, work, study, and play (Jackson, Kabwasa-Green, Swenson, Herranz, Jr., Ferryman, Atlas, Wallner, & Rosenstein, 2003). Artists are also engaging arts and culture to generate experiences, products, and services that stimulate innovation and vibrancy in our local and regional economies (United Nations, 2010, 2013).

This thesis positions arts and culture as an essential area of practice within the field of urban planning and utilizes case studies to demonstrate its role in advancing smart growth and livability. It posits that intentional partnerships between arts and culture, government, and community development actors in the public, nonprofit, and private sectors hold promise for infusing innovation and creativity into the development and implementation of city, town, and regional

plans in ways that accelerate smart growth and livability. It contextualizes this theory through a literature review of United States government policies and funding for arts and culture, a survey of scholarly and professional literature examining arts and culture innovations in planning and related public sector disciplines and the impact of these innovations on dimensions of planning and livability, and the presentation and analysis of four original case studies that are exemplary of arts and culture innovations in planning disciplines, which were identified as part of one state agency's initiative to develop an Arts and Planning Toolkit.

The structure of this thesis is as follows:

- Chapter 1 reviews arts and culture as a key driver of smart growth and livability objectives and frames arts and culture as an essential competency area for planners.
- Chapter 2 reviews scholarly and professional literature documenting the United States (U.S.) government's support for arts and culture.
- Chapter 3 review trends and innovations in how arts and culture is being engaged in various disciplines of planning to achieve smart growth and livability goals.
- Chapter 4 profiles four original case studies of policies, programs, or projects that are exemplary of innovations at the intersection of arts, culture, and planning. It also provides an overview of the genesis of the Arts and Planning Toolkit, from which the case studies are derived.

Finally, the chapter debriefs the case studies, examining themes in lessons learned.

- Chapter 5 presents a set of recommendations for integrating arts, culture, and creativity into various arenas of planning, and identifies areas for further research.

The discourse in this thesis may be valuable to practicing planners, planning, urban studies, and arts academia, and artists. Practicing planners who want to develop a more innovative, creative, and inclusive planning and community development practice can reference the content in this thesis and in the Toolkit to help them build support for working with and for arts and culture. Professors of urban policy, planning, and arts administration can reference the case studies in this thesis and in the Toolkit to demonstrate that there are many ways in which arts and culture strategies can be effective in helping to solve complex social, environmental, and economic problems. Artists who want to expand their personal practices to include civic art, social practice, and design can reference content in this thesis and in the Toolkit to rethink how they frame and pitch projects to government in order to generate project proposals that are integrally linked and supportive of broader urban planning and community development initiatives.

**CHAPTER 1: ARTS AND CULTURE IS AN ESSENTIAL
COMPETENCY/PRACTICE AREA FOR PLANNERS**

Arts and Culture Reflects, Shapes, and Strengthens People and Places

Culture is a reflection of the personality of people and places (Grogan, Mercer, & Engwight, 1995). It reveals itself in our physical, intellectual, political, social, spiritual, and recreational lives and is dynamically shaped through human interactions, activities, and built and natural environments (Useem, Useem, & Donoghue, 1963; Grogan et al., 1995). Distinct cultures exist within politically defined geographic boundaries of place and also transcend political boundaries, reflecting the diversity of human life at local, regional, national, and international scales (Lefebvre, 1974).

Culture also actively shapes people and places. Cultures form and evolve through the interplay of tangible and intangible activities and conditions including: social customs/traditions and norms; oral histories; documented/written histories; methods of communication, including print, television, and broadcast media; methods of creative expression, including visual art, literary art, performance art; built infrastructure, including buildings and transit; environmental infrastructure, including rivers, forests, and parks; and activities occurring in public and private realms (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952; Grogan et al., 1995; Ahmad, 2006; Oxford University Press, 2016).

Places are also shaped, contested, and strengthened through constant interactions within and between cultures; it is this very interaction of cultures

combined with planning that can strengthen and revitalize places (Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits, 1936; Lefebvre, 1974). Culture is a leading element that attracts us to the places where we want to live, work, play in, and visit, and the arts – as a creative expression of culture – are powerful expressions of our human diversity and creativity. This chapter examines how arts and culture is an essential competency/practice area for planners and how the material and nonmaterial aspects of arts and culture enrich the livability of places, contributing to social, economic, and environmental revitalization (National Research Council [NRC], 2002; Partnership for Sustainable Communities [PSC], 2013; Woodward, 2013; Partnership for Livable Communities [PLC], 2016; Smart Growth America [SGA], 2016).

Livability is a Cross-Sector Strategy Involving Arts, Culture, and Planning

Together, urban planners and actors in the arts and culture sector are generating activities in public, private, and nonprofit spheres that are shaping cultures and advancing the vision of healthy, connected, and vibrant places, communities, and regions. These collective efforts are directly influencing local, regional, and national cultures, which reflect, shape, and strengthen the personalities of people and places. The interdisciplinary planning approach for promoting vibrant places is also known as “smart growth” or “livability.”

Livability is the notion that people have a right to live in places that provide access to a range of opportunities that advance quality of life – including housing, transportation, job and educational opportunities, social stability, equity, and

cultural, entertainment, and recreational options (NRC, 2002; PSC, 2013; Woodward, 2013; PLC, 2016; SGA, 2016).

The concepts of smart growth and livability have gained traction in government over the last 15 years. Two federally commissioned reports and the launch of several federal initiatives have been instrumental to establishing it as a core concept in the field of urban planning. In 2000, the Clinton-Gore Administration launched the Livable Communities Initiative and issued a report, *Building Livable Communities: Sustaining Prosperity, Improving Quality of Life, Building a Sense of Community*. During the Clinton-Gore Administration, several federal transportation agencies also commissioned the National Research Council (NRC) – under the direction of the National Academy of Sciences – to produce a report titled *Community and Quality of Life: Data Needs for Informed Decision Making*, which was released in 2002 during the Bush-Cheney Administration. The report identified data and performance measures that could “inform local and regional public decisions on transportation, land use planning, and economic development” in ways that would advance broader smart growth and livability objectives (NRC, 2002, p. xiv). In 2009, the Obama Administration launched the Partnership for Sustainable Communities (PSC), an interagency partnership of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Transportation, and the Environmental Protection Agency. The Partnership announced six Livability Principles, which further grounded the implementation of livability as a cross-sector approach to social change and, notably, includes equity as a core element of livability (PSC, 2013, 2015).

Most importantly, these reports and initiatives have 1) defined smart growth and livability; 2) established the interconnections between economic, environmental, and social change; 3) framed livability as a two-sided concept involving both people and places; 4) established a federal commitment to identifying indicators for tracking progress and generating livability guides as implementation resources for involved sectors; and 5) established a theoretical framework for livability as one that involves cross-sector strategy engaging the social, environmental, and economic sectors as mutually interdependent – the same sectors in which arts and culture actors exert their influence and impact.

Arts and Culture Resources for Planners Are Emerging

Two national organizations and agencies have also commissioned several notable studies and professional reports that help to position arts and culture as an essential practice area for planners: the American Planning Association (APA) and the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). The APA commissioned a series of briefing papers that examined arts and culture's impact on several dimensions of livability: cultural heritage and history; community character and sense of place; community engagement and participation; and economic vitality (Hodgson & Beavers, 2011; Jackson, Hodgson, & Beavers, 2011; Soule, Hodgson, & Beavers, 2011; Beavers & Hodgson, 2011; Dwyer & Beavers, 2011). The NEA commissioned the Validating Arts & Livability Indicators (VALI) study, which identifies a set of indicators that could help measure the impact of creative placemaking efforts on four dimensions of community livability: resident attachment to communities; quality of life; local economic conditions; and arts

and cultural activity, including infrastructure supporting artists and arts organizations (Morley, Winkler, Zhang, Brash, & Collazos, 2013). The findings from these studies are unpacked in Chapter 3.

Government production of toolkits and resource guides that position arts and culture fields of practice – such as cultural planning, cultural asset mapping, cultural economic development, and creative placemaking – as core competencies for planners is a relatively new development. Over the last six years, a handful of U.S. government agencies and the national membership organizations that serve them have started to produce resources examining the intersections of arts, culture, and planning that are geared towards planners and other related public sector disciplines. Notable resources include:

- Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)'s *Arts and Culture Planning: A Toolkit for Communities*, a primer on cultural planning that also provides sample regulatory language for defining and allowing arts and cultural uses in zoning (2014);
- Transportation for America (T4America)'s *The Scenic Route: Getting Started with Creative Placemaking in Transportation*, a creative placemaking primer for transportation agencies (2016);
- National Endowment for the Arts (NEA)'s *Our Town* database of creative placemaking project case studies and the 2010 report on *Creative Placemaking*, which was based on a white paper originally commissioned for the Mayor's Institute on City Design (NEA, 2016; Markusen & Gadwa, 2010); and

- National Association of State Arts Agencies (NASAA)'s policy briefs and data snapshots on creative economic development, public art, and public funding for the arts, which are geared towards a government audience. (NASAA, 2005, 2013, 2014, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c, 2015d, 2016a, 2016b, 2016c, 2016d)

Looking outside of the United States, the Creative City Network of Canada (CCNC) has also produced over a dozen toolkits and research reports geared towards local governments and arts organizations that unpack cultural planning, cultural asset mapping, and the management of public art programs and projects (CCNC, 2016a, 2016b, 2016c, 2016d).

These resources are notable because they attempt to unpack arts and culture strategies into a series of approaches that may resonate with government staff who do not work directly in the field of public art, and they present case studies of real projects that are changing the field of government-led and non-government-led planning. However, there are some shortcomings: a focus on profiling select tactics comes at the risk of oversimplifying the diversity of arts and culture interventions that may be possible; messaging may be too broad and therefore fail to convince planners as to why arts and culture should be a core partner in government-led planning; some case studies lack some essential details, such as sources of funding and information on the conditions leading to project start-up – details that of importance to practicing planners. The case studies presented later in this thesis, which are extracted from the new MAPC Arts and Planning Toolkit, are deeper dives into four original case studies that attempt to

build on the aforementioned resources. Chapter 5 reflects on what the next generation of arts and culture resources for planners might include, and appendices A, B, C, and D present a comprehensive framework for planner engagement with arts, culture, and creativity. The framework pushes the envelope by demonstrating the viability of arts and culture to advance livability in ways that go well beyond the few disciplines in which it is readily embraced, i.e., urban design and economic development.

Data on Arts and Culture's Impacts on Livability Exists, but More is Needed

An extensive body of peer-reviewed literature exists regarding the sector's impact on dimensions of livability and planning, including civic participation, community development, economic development, and public health. These sources highlight powerful qualitative and quantitative findings that pertain to key dimensions of planning. The majority of existing scholarship on the impact of arts and culture on livability is published in social sciences journals pertaining to urban studies, education, arts administration, and sociology. A selection of key findings is provided below.

- *Civic Participation:* The arts foster civic participation; arts experiences can spur civic dialogue and provide the opportunity to build empathy by illustrating different viewpoints and social issues (NEA, 2007; Assaf, Korza, & Bacon, 2002; Korza, Bacon, & Assaf, 2005; Reid, 2013)
- *Community Development:* Public art and programming in public spaces have a positive impact on pedestrian activity and can create

bonds between people. Public art creates opportunities for the public to engage in and discuss controversial, difficult subjects that may pertain to the experience of marginalized communities (Whyte, 1980)

- *Community Activism and Empowerment:* A national survey of arts participation administered by the NEA found that readers of literature and arts participants are more than twice as likely to volunteer in their communities – half of all performing arts attendees volunteer or do charity work compared with less than 20% of non-attendees. For literary readers, volunteer rate is 43% - almost three times greater than for nonreaders. Patterns are independent of education level, age, gender, or ethnicity. (NEA, 2007)
- *Economic Development:* In 2010, nonprofit arts and cultural organizations contributed \$61.1 billion to the U.S. economy (AFTA, 2012). According to U.S. Census data, in 2011 the value of arts and cultural production in American as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP) exceeded the estimated value of U.S. travel and tourism in 2011 (NASAA, 2014).
- *Education:* Low-income students engaged in the arts were found to be more likely than non-arts-engaged peers to attend and do well in college, obtain employment, volunteer, and participate in the political process by voting (Catterall, 2009; Catterall, Dumais, & Hampden-Thompson, 2012). Youth participation in arts programs has been shown to increase academic outcomes, decrease delinquent behavior,

and improve self-esteem and attitudes about the future (Morley et al., 2013; Clawson & Coolbaugh, 2001)

- *Public Health:* The arts can be a good treatment tool for improving mental and emotional health. Arts participation can reduce feelings of depression and anxiety, increasing self-esteem, and reduce isolation by facilitating social engagement with others (Stuckey & Nobel, 2010; AFTA, 2013). Three different studies focusing on the participation of older adults in arts activities such as a chorale program, singing, and storytelling reported positive health outcomes compared to control groups in areas such as fewer instances of falls, less medication use, improved word recall, and greater alertness (Cohen, Perlstein, Chapline, Kelly, Firth, & Simmens, 2006; Fritsch, Kwak, Grant, Lang, Montgomery, & Basting, 2009; Noice, Noice, & Staines, 2004).
- *Social Cohesion:* “Participation in cultural activities connects people to one another and to community institutions, which then become pathways to other forms of participation...People motivated to participate in civic life are also prompted to support community and civic organizations — such as arts groups — that support and celebrate community life,” (New England Foundation for the Arts [NEFA], 2000, as cited in Walker, Jackson, & Rosenstein, 2003, p. 8)

Scholarly literature by urban planning academics on arts and culture’s impact on dimensions of planning has tended to focus primarily on the arts and culture sector’s economic impacts and the complex concept of placemaking. But,

there are exceptions: over the last decade, authors with backgrounds in urban planning, cultural policy, and economics, including J. Mark Schuster (1987, 1994, 1995, 2001, 2002), Maria Rosario Jackson (2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2006, 2007, 2011), Florence Kabwasa-Green (2002, 2003, 2006, 2007), Joaquín Herranz, Jr. (2002, 2003, 2006), Ann Markusen (2008, 2010a, 2010b, 2013, 2014) and Ann Gadwa Nicodemus (2010a, 2010b, 2013, 2014) have contributed scholarly literature and professional reports that attempt to frame the impact of the arts and culture sector on dimensions of planning practice and policy. Their contributions have significantly expanded dialogues about the interdependence of art and culture with other dimensions of livability and planning practice. Key findings from this planning literature are explored in greater detail in Chapter 3.

Summary

Arts and culture creates exciting opportunities to infuse innovation and creativity into dimensions of planning; the emergence of resources in the U.S. that frame the impact of the sector in the language of planners is testament to the sector's growing appeal. This fact is also a significant development for the arts and culture sector, which is beginning to enter into more cross-sector collaborations encouraged in large part by federal and philanthropic funding initiatives that are explored in greater detail in Chapter 2. More academic research and professional resources are needed to rectify the dearth of material about the importance of including arts and culture as a core sector in the advancement of planning and livability. While there are a wealth of articles, reports, studies, and case studies of exemplary innovations, few are tailored to speak the language of

Livability and Creativity:
Civic Innovations at the Intersection of Arts, Culture, and Planning

urban planning. Subsequent chapters will explore the context for creating more resources that will stimulate more cross-sector collaborations to advance livability and innovations at the intersection of arts, culture, and planning.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF U.S. SUPPORT FOR ARTS AND CULTURE

This chapter examines patterns of U.S. government support for arts and culture in terms of policies and funding. It also profiles several philanthropic initiatives that are attempting to spur innovations in planning and community development that engage arts, culture, and creativity as a core strategy. In summary, this review indicates that U.S. policy and funding for arts and culture is fragmented and largely dependent on donations from the private and philanthropic sectors. This context is important to understand as a precursor to understanding patterns of arts and culture innovation in the disciplines of planning – many of which were galvanized by research and funding initiatives over the last decade.

Public Policy and Funding for Arts and Culture

Public policies in support of the arts vary between nations; authors Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey performed an informative comparative analysis of models of public policy for the arts, which categorized public support into one of four types: as “facilitators” – primarily stimulate funding for the arts from philanthropy that, in turn, supports the fine arts and community arts; as “patrons” – primarily funding the arts through arm’s length arts councils, with discretion over the appointment of grant-giving councils but with no direct influence over the entities that should receive support; as “architects” – primarily funding the fine arts through a Ministry or Department of Culture, where granting decisions are generally made by government staff, but with a focus on funding community arts and arts initiatives that advance social welfare objectives; and as

“engineers” – the government control and awarding of all funding for the arts, where popular politics may be emphasized over artistic excellence and where creative enterprises are state-owned and operated (1989).

Governments in practice combine some or all of these roles, which the authors acknowledge. Of value, however, is the recognition that while many industrialized countries including Canada, Spain, Australia, and Sweden have Ministries of Culture that act as “architects” – guiding expansive programs in support of arts, culture, and heritage that target support for the arts in ways that also advance social welfare objectives – the United States’ approach to arts policy is primarily that of a “facilitator” and “patron” – arts and culture is not regarded as a top priority in comparison to other federally funded departments and programs (Hillman Chartrand & McCaughey, 1989). U.S. public funding for the federal arts agency remained largely level over the last decade, and state appropriations for state arts agencies has remained 41 percent lower than the all-time high in FY2001 (National Endowment for the Arts [NEA], 2016f; National Association of State Arts Agencies [NASAA], 2016b, 2016c).

U.S. Federal Funding, Programs, and Policies for Arts and Culture

The federal government has a history of connecting arts, culture, and public policy since the earlier part of the 20th century. A series of New Deal programs created by President Roosevelt and a series of Great Society programs created by President Johnson created government jobs for unemployed artists on public buildings and public spaces. These programs included the Section of Painting and Sculpture, which was created in 1934 and administered by the

United State Department of the Treasury, the Federal Art Project (FAP), which was created in 1935 and administered by the Work Projects Administration (WPA); the Comprehensive Education and Training Act (CETA), which was created in 1973; the *Guiding Principles for Federal Architecture (1962)*, which was issued in a report to President Kennedy on the subject of federal office space; and the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, which were created in 1965. The first three programs put artists to work on decorating public buildings; commissioning permanent works of public art in federal buildings and infrastructure construction projects; and provided seed funding for the establishment of public art nonprofits affiliated with local jurisdictions. All of these programs have generated hundreds of thousands of jobs for American artists. (Atlas, 2002; Calderwood-Ginn & Leonard, 2012; Miller, 2012; General Services Administration, 2015; NEA, 2012)

However, unlike some industrialized countries, the U.S. does not have an overarching ministry of arts and culture that oversees all government subsidies for the arts. The NEA serves as the designated arts organization of the federal government. The NEA, together with allied and independent state, regional, and jurisdictional arts agencies and councils, provides public funding for arts and culture. Congress established the NEA as the federal agency tasked with advancing artistic excellence, creativity, and innovation through grantmaking, fellowships, awards, research, and special initiatives that promote the development and preservation of artistic and cultural mediums. Since its

founding, the NEA has awarded over \$5 billion towards projects that aim to “strengthen the creative capacity of our communities” (2015, p.3).

When the NEA was established in 1965, 23 states had already created state arts agencies or councils. The NEA was required to allocate funds to states with established state and regional arts agencies (referred to as NEA Partnership Agreement funds), and as a result of this requirement, within a few years after 1965 nearly every state and jurisdiction had established an arts agency to take advantage of this revenue for arts and culture. A statement of the NEA’s house reauthorizing committee in 1973 encouraged the formation of regional arts organizations, of which state arts agencies are members (Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation, 2016).

Today, approximately 90 percent of the NEA’s state partnership funding is allocated via formulas based on population and equal state proportions; the balance is awarded to states and regions competitively. The NEA is required by law to distribute 40 percent of its annual grants budget to the six Regional Arts Organizations (RAO) and state arts agencies (SAAs). The RAOs receive competitive funding from the NEA, which they re-grant through regional programs and fellowships. The SAAs fund a wide variety of work in the arenas of arts education, artistic heritage, cultural infrastructure, arts accessibility, and arts participation; this work is funded through a range of public funding mechanisms (NASAA, 2005, 2013, 2014, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c, 2016a, 2016b, 2016c, 2016d, 2016e).

The NEA's annual funding is variable and determined annually by Congress. The House and Senate Appropriations Committees are the two subcommittees, which oversee the U.S. Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies (NEA, 2012). Annual appropriations to the NEA over the last five decades have not exceeded \$150 million, lagging behind the state appropriations made by state arts agencies and councils, which have totaled as much as \$349 million within the last decade (NASAA, 2016e). In FY2015, \$146 million was appropriated to the NEA, which has received flat funding for the past four years (NEA, 2016c, 2016d).

Many other federal departments and agencies also strategically employ the arts to advance agency missions and livability objectives pertaining to civic infrastructure, educational and cultural exchange, historical preservation, and economic development. These agencies include the United States Geological Survey, the Department of Defense, the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, the General Service Administration, the National Parks Service, and most recently, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (U.S. HUD) and the U.S. Department of Transportation through the federal Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant (SCRPG) Program (Calderwood-Ginn & Leonard, 2012; Miller, 2012).

The SCRPG Program awarded grants to collaborative teams of municipalities and jurisdictions in FY2010 and FY2011 that advanced the six HUD Partnership for Sustainability's six livability principles. The Program explicitly invited non-traditional partnerships involving arts and culture,

recreation, public health, food systems, regional planning agencies, and public education entities. The Program funded several innovative government-led planning projects involving arts and culture, including a partnership between the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments and the Cultural Alliance of Southeastern Michigan, which engaged the arts in a sustainability education initiative; the New River Valley Planning District Commission's funding of original plays and artists as part of its Livability Initiative, engaging youth through digital storytelling and the creation of an original board game; (Calderwood-Ginn & Leonard, 2012; NEA, 2012; U.S. HUD, 2011).

State Funding, Programs, and Policies for Arts and Culture

Funding for individual artists and arts organizations is primarily generated at the state level. The majority of public funding for the arts is generated from state, county, and municipal appropriations and expenditures (NEA, 2012). Within this mix, the largest source of funding for state arts agencies (SAAs) is state general funds. In FY2015 and in FY2016, 89% of SAA funding came from legislative appropriations, line items, and other state funds (NASAA, 2016d, 2016e). Analysis of per capita spending on SAAs by states through the aforementioned mechanisms found that per capita spending in FY2016 ranged anywhere from \$25.22 (District of Columbia) and \$16.16 (Rhode Island) to 0.20 (Arizona) (NASAA, 2016e). Accounting for inflation, per capital spending has actually decreased 22.3% in nominal dollar terms since 2001. (NASAA, 2016e).

In the 2015 legislative session, NASAA reported that there were nearly 100 pieces of legislation that had failed or were under consideration in state

legislatures, which pertained to cultural policy. NASAA tracks legislation nationally for relevance to SAAs – examining proposals that meet any of the following criteria: could strengthen the arts, inhibit support for the arts, or have a neutral or difficult-to-predict impact. Bills tracked fell into five major categories: SAA revenue; public art; cultural districts; arts education; and the creation or alteration of arts commissions. The top four topics that were most prevalent in 2015 pertained to cultural districts (20 bills), taxes and other financial mechanisms that would generate funds for the arts (14 bills), public art (10 bills) and arts education (10 bills). A vast majority of the bills filed in 2015 were stalled, tabled, or did not progress. An analysis of the bills filed by RAO regions indicates that states in the western part of the U.S. filed the most bills. New England has the second highest number of bills filed. (NASAA, 2015a)

Other mechanisms utilized by states included taxes and fees. Funds generated through these mechanisms are often used to fund the activities of SAAs and other government-affiliated arts organizations, such as Arts and Tourism Commissions. Pressures on state budgets have increased state reliance on taxes and fees; nine SAAs report that these mechanisms supplied more than 50 percent of their annual funding (NASAA, 2015b). It is important to note the differences between taxes and fees. As Henchman (2013) notes, taxes are sometimes referred to as special assessments, fines, surcharges, or fees, but the distinctions are more than semantics. The primary test for identifying a mechanism as a tax is through an examination of purpose – if it is collected for a specific service provided to an individual or entity and if the government does not collect it, it is a fee and not a

tax (Henchman, 2013). States impose taxes to raise revenue that will be spent on government services of direct or indirect benefit to the general public, whereas fees are imposed for the primary purpose of recouping costs for services that will directly benefit an individual or entity, i.e., the beneficiary (Henchman, 2013). While state law does not limit fees, most states have statutes stipulating procedures and limitations applying specifically to tax increases (Henchman, 2013).

Some of the creative ways in which states have used fees to secure funds for arts services provided to individuals or entities and used taxes to generate revenue for arts and culture services of benefit to the general public include:

- designation of a portion of hotel/motel fees;
- designation of a percentage of room taxes, tourism taxes, sales taxes, and/or conservation taxes;
- designation of a percentage of corporate filing fees and recordation fees from documents filed with county recorders;
- allocation of a portion of funds from gaming revenues;
- allocation of a portion of proceeds from the sale of special license plates;
- income tax check-offs permitting residents to earmark dollars to SAAs; and
- bond issues associated with capital improvement programs for cultural facilities for a limited duration of time.

(NASAA 2015a, 2016a, 2016b, 2016c)

Many states have also adopted legislation pertaining to the establishment of cultural districts. Cultural districts are areas designated or certified by state governments that aim to foster a thriving arts and cultural sector through what can be viewed as a primarily economic development lens. As of 2015, 13 states have established active cultural districts programs; one additional state has enacted a policy to support cultural districts but has not yet launched a program (NASAA, 2015c). Through these programs, approximately 250 cultural districts have been designated across the country. Cultural district programs strive to advance a variety of planning goals including tourism, historic preservation, business and job development, and the clustering of arts and cultural activity. Many states have also established criteria for certifying or designating cultural districts; assistance offered to districts by state arts agencies ranges from planning and technical assistance to tax incentives. (NASAA, 2015b; Eger, 2014) These incentives are described in greater detail in the Chapter 3 section on local planning policies and incentives pertaining to arts and culture.

Funding and Programs for Arts and Culture in Massachusetts

Federal and state dollars appropriated from the federal government and from the Commonwealth are disseminated to cities, towns, and individual artists through two agencies: The Massachusetts Cultural Council (MCC) and the New England Foundation for the Arts (NEFA), the Regional Arts Organization serving Massachusetts.

The Massachusetts Cultural Council (MCC) is the state arts agency in Massachusetts. The MCC “promotes excellence, access, education, and diversity

in the arts, humanities, and interpretive sciences to improve the quality of life for all Massachusetts residents and contribute to the economic vitality of our communities” (2016a). The majority of the MCC’s funding is derived from an annual state appropriation; in 2015, the appropriation was \$12 million (2016d). Major initiatives administered by the MCC include the Local Cultural Council program, which distributes funds to Local Cultural Councils (LCCs) in each city and town that, in turn, regrant funds through a local process; the Cultural Facilities Fund, which funds the planning and development of cultural facilities in Massachusetts in partnership with other private and public sector entities, including MassDevelopment; and the Cultural Districts Designation program (MCC, 2016b, 2016c, 2016e).

NEFA is the RAO serving the New England states: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. NEFA was founded in 1976 and its grants and programs strive to support artists, fuel creative exchange and public discourse, and strengthen the creative economy. According to NEFA’s 2015 annual report, 74.2 percent of its revenue was raised from foundations, corporations, and federal sources not including the NEA; 16.1 percent was an appropriation from the NEA; 1.6 percent was from State Arts Agencies; and 8.1 percent was from individual donors, earned income, and interest and dividend income. NEFA’s programs and initiatives include creative economy research and data collection, and grant awards to individual artists in the visual, music, and performing arts (2015).

Philanthropic Initiatives Linking Arts, Culture, and Planning

Within the last seven years, innovations at the intersection of arts and culture and public and nonprofit sector planning and community development have been stimulated in large part through funding initiatives like the NEA Our Town Creative Placemaking Program and the ArtPlace America funding collaborative (NEA, 2016b; ArtPlace America, 2016). The emergence of these initiatives is spurring new, community-driven planning and community development initiatives that directly engage actors in the arts and culture sector, including individual artists with practices in civic art, social practice art, and activism and community-based organizations including nonprofit arts organizations, advocacy organizations, and community development corporations. A significant portion of these projects are driven by nonprofit entities, whose projects have also indirectly spurred government agencies and the associations and organizations that serve them to develop toolkits and guides to boost the arts and culture competencies of government staff and planners.

Summary and Analysis of Findings

In summary, state arts agencies, artists, and arts organizations rely on an array of disparate funding sources to raise revenue for arts and culture projects and programs. The four main sources for this funding are 1) funds distributed by federal, state, county, and municipal arts agencies; 2) funds from federal agencies and departments other than the NEA; 3) contributions from the private sector, including individuals, foundations, and corporations; and 4) fee-for-service

programs, productions, events, sales, and consulting services (NEA, 2012). The challenges facing the sector are numerous:

- Federal levels of funding for the NEA and therefore state arts agencies, fluctuate, as the arts must compete with other government priorities. NEA's funding has not increased over the last four years.
- State-level funding is often at the mercy of legislatures' annual budget process, and few states have been successful in securing steady streams of funding for public art, cultural facilities, state arts agencies' programming through other mechanisms such as taxes.
- Artists and arts organizations face many stressors in securing funding. For instance, artists newer to public art are often competing against those who have received a degree of national or international acclaim, making entry into the field extremely challenging.
- In the absence of a Ministry of Culture, federal coordination to support the growth of the arts and culture sector is sporadic. There is no national, federal stream of funding for the development and maintenance of cultural facilities and public art, nor a national professional development program geared towards individual artists and creative industries.

CHAPTER 3: REVIEW OF TRENDS AND INNOVATIONS AT THE INTERSECTION OF ARTS, CULTURE, AND PLANNING

This chapter provides a broad understanding of arts and culture planning, policy, and programming approaches that are infusing innovation and creativity into the practice of urban planning. It highlights some of the concepts and approaches that are quickly becoming a part of planners' lexicon and examines current trends and innovations in several areas: the core disciplines of planning, including housing, economic development, transportation, open space, public health, and public safety; community development; local regulations, standards, and incentives pertaining to arts and culture, with a focus on zoning and permitting; and the inclusion of art in the public realm and public infrastructure.

Historical and Theoretical Context

Innovations in arts, culture, and planning can be traced back to U.S. traditions and movements that emerged during the late 19th and early 20st centuries (Peterson, 1976; Reys, 1992; Miller, 2012; Talen, 2015). In fact, the origins of the practice of public art, also referred to as civic art, had its origins in the same trends and movements that led to the birth of modern city planning.

Research by Peterson (1976) and Talen (2015) has examined the many ways in which the creative and entrepreneurial activities of individuals and civic groups have shaped the urban form. In the earlier part of the 19th century, rapid and unregulated development spurred citizen-driven and public sector initiatives in the arenas of municipal art, civic improvement, and outdoor/public art

(Peterson, 1976). Some of these initiatives were bottom-up, citizen driven initiatives whereas others were backed by wealthy elites. Municipal arts movements focused on architectural and public art amenities in public spaces like murals, sculptures, and fountains as a response to perceptions of urban decay. Many public art commissions were established as part of municipal urban planning initiatives surrounding the production of the World's Fairs, which took place in major American cities. Commissions created during this "City Beautiful" movement generated public funding for cultural facilities and innovative architecture for public buildings, which planner Charles Mulford Robinson called "civic art...[which] exists not for its own sake, but mainly for the good of the community" (Robinson, as cited in Peterson, 1976). Civic improvement initiatives focused on small-scale beautification efforts on a "block-by-block, lot-by-lot basis and led to the creation of entities like the *National League of Improvement Associations*, which was later renamed the *American League for Civic Improvement*. City planner Charles Mulford Robinson reported in 1906 that over 2,400 improvement societies had emerged in the U.S. Robinson also authored a book on the topic, *Modern Civic Art*, which made the case for organizing small-scale improvements into general plans. (Robinson, 1901, as cited in Talen, 2015, p. 139)

Literature by authors such as Jane Jacobs (1961), Henri Lefebvre (1974), William H. Whyte (1980), Sharon Zukin (1996), Jan Gehl (2010) and others on the topics of social vitality, urban life, art, culture, creativity, urban design, public spaces, and placemaking have contributed significantly to modern discourses

about the interconnections between the disciplines of art, culture, and planning. Jacobs (1961) critiqued the impacts of traditional urban planning in society and created space for a new discourse focused on the elements, activities, and design considerations that contribute to social diversity, social cohesion, and urban vitality. Both Jacobs and Whyte (as cited in Stern, 2014, p. 3) have “called on architects and planners to abandon grandiose ideas about urban design and to focus on how residents actually use space” – issuing a call for planners to emphasize the social elements of planning as strongly the physical and technical dimensions of planning are emphasized. Lefebvre (1974) has examined the physical and social spheres in which we live and popularized the term “the right to the city”; he theorized that space and place is a contested process and his discourses have examined the role of art, architecture, literature, and other disciplines for their role in shaping the spaces and places we inhabit. Zukin has written extensively on the cultures of cities and has recognized public art, cultural facilities, and festivals as “a pervasive part of cities’ toolkit to encourage entrepreneurial innovation and creativity” in ways that revitalize public spaces and add value to the economy (Zukin, 1996 and as cited in Stern, 2014, p. 3). Gehl (2010) as both an architect and writer has elevated the importance of designing and developing places and spaces through a central focus on human issues, needs, and experiences and the impact of the urban landscape on all five human senses.

Together, these authors have contributed theories and philosophies about the elements that make the spaces and places in which we spend our lives

dynamic and vibrant. Their scholarship asserts that the practice of urban planning is multidimensional, and generates tangible impacts in the physical (built environment), physiological (human/individual), and social/psychological (human interactions) domains. The arts and culture sector's fields of practice engage each of these domains, and the following sections explore some of the ways in which the sector's fields of practice are engaging with the field of urban planning.

Arts, Culture, and Planning

Planners and others who are undertaking community planning and community development processes at the neighborhood, city/town, and regional scales are using a variety of techniques to infuse creativity into planning. These tools and techniques include public art planning, cultural asset mapping, and cultural planning.

Public Art Planning

Public art plans create an opportunity to generate a community-supported vision and action plan for integrating public art into the planning and development of public spaces and public infrastructure. A public art plan provides the opportunity to do the following:

- Identify community interests and priorities for public art
- Facilitate information exchange and buy-in from various municipal staff and partners, including planners, designers, engineers, architects, and the creative community
- Build knowledge of and support for current public art assets

- Educate the public about innovations in public art, challenging conventional ideas about art and demonstrating its potential for advancing broader community development and planning goals
- Identify priority locations for public art
- Identify a plan for raising sufficient financial resources for public art

(Creative City Network of Canada [CCNC], 2010d)

Cultural Asset Mapping

Cultural asset mapping is a foundational step in cultural planning. It identifies a community's strengths and resources through the process of inventorying tangible and intangible cultural assets. Tangible assets include arts and natural heritage resources on public and private land — including urban design and public art, cultural facilities, cultural industries, artist networks, cultural festivals and events, cultural occupations, and cultural organizations. Intangible assets include stories and traditions that contribute to defining a community's unique identity and sense of place. Asset mapping can be categorized into three types (Canadian National Rural Conference, 2002; Community Partnership for Arts and Culture, 2009; CCNC, 2010b)

- A comprehensive asset mapping approach takes a broad view of the social, economic, natural, and organizational arts and cultural conditions in a study area and examines tangible and intangible arts and culture assets. It utilizes qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection.
- A storytelling asset mapping approach utilizes interviews and focus groups to collect qualitative data on tangible and intangible cultural assets.

- A public realm and natural resources-focused asset mapping approach focuses on assessing resources in the built environment and public realm, including public art, natural and historic resources, and other physical features that are regarded as assets.

Cultural Planning

Cultural planning is perhaps the most comprehensive planning approach to creating the policy and programmatic conditions that can help the arts and culture sector thrive. Cultural planning is a place-based planning process that creates an action plan for growing arts and cultural assets (CCNC, 2016c). Dreeszen (1997) has categorized cultural plans into seven types:

- **Comprehensive Cultural Plan:** Defines a broad set of goals and strategies that may align with other defined community needs and opportunities in other topic areas (e.g., economic development) and provides a framework for more specific cultural planning work that will occur in the future
- **Discipline-Focused Cultural Plan:** Defines a set of goals and strategies focused on a specific arts sector, e.g., the visual arts
- **Cultural Asset Mapping:** An inventory and analysis of a community artistic and cultural resources and needs; this is typically the first phase of any cultural planning processes
- **Specialized Arts or Cultural Assessment:** An assessment with a specific focus, e.g., a feasibility study, an economic impact assessment, a market study pertaining to cultural tourism potential

Livability and Creativity:
Civic Innovations at the Intersection of Arts, Culture, and Planning

- Specialized Arts and Culture Issue Plan or Study: Defines goals and strategies pertaining to a specific issue, such as audience development
- Cultural District Plan: Defines a set of goals and strategies pertaining to a specific geographic area within a community, e.g., a neighborhood or town center
- Arts and Culture Component of a Municipal or Regional Plan: Defines a set of arts and culture goals and strategies as part of a broader comprehensive or master plan; embedded as a section or chapter (vertical integration) and/or integrated as a strategy supportive of other plan priorities, e.g., land use, transportation, environment (horizontal integration)

Some scholars have critiqued the implementation challenges and focus of some cultural plans. One major issue is plan implementation: some cultural plans fail to reach implementation due to a lack of adequate resource planning to develop the human infrastructure needed to sustain the cultural planning work, including the identification of a lead coordinating individual or entity and contacts at various departments and agencies charged with ownership over implementation of specific elements (Dreeszen, 1999). Another issue is regarding cultural equity: some plans focus on strengthening anchor cultural institutions such as museums and orchestras, and include fewer strategies that serve the needs of the broader creative community, such as individual artists' needs for performance, gallery, work, and live/work space (Jackson et al., 2003). On the point of cultural equity, Americans for the Arts (AFTA) – the national advocacy agency for the sector –

released a powerful statement on cultural equity in spring 2016, that called for championing policies and practices that advance justice and inclusion in order to ensure that historically underrepresented population are adequately supported through the arts and have fair access to opportunities for creative expression (AFTA, 2016). Similarly, U.S. jurisdictions are beginning to enhance cultural planning efforts through a focus on cultural equity – Los Angeles County released a comprehensive study on cultural equity this year (Mauldin, Ruskin, Agustin, & Kidd, 2016) and the City of Boston, Massachusetts is following up on its recently created Boston Creates Cultural Plan with a cultural equity study (City of Boston, 2016).

Arts, Culture, and Community Development

Community development is a discipline of planning practiced by government and nonprofit, community-based organizations (CBOs). Arts and culture provides unique approaches to infusing creativity into the arena of community development. The most popular arts-based tools and techniques employed by CBOs working within and outside of the field of planning are creative placemaking and tactical urbanism. Before delving into these two popular processes, it is important to understand the strands of community development practice that exist in the U.S. and why creative community development has historically been embraced by CBOs versus the community development departments and agencies that exist within government.

Community development is broadly defined as a process where community members come together to vision, plan, take collective action, and generate solutions to common problems (United Nations, 2016; National Alliance of Community Economic Development Associations [NACEDA], 2016). While a planner may consider this definition to accurately define the practice of urban planning, in the U.S., the practice of community development is one that is commonly led by CBOs such as community development corporations (CDCs), which emphasize the engagement and empowerment of individuals in the local community. Many of these CDCs emerged in response to the top-down government-led planning efforts of the 20th century, including urban renewal and the approach to public housing program that was spurred by the 1949 Housing Act (von Hoffman, 2012). Today, some jurisdictions' planning departments also include a community development practice within their charge or have established separate community development agencies (CDAs); these departments and agencies are often responsible for the planning, grantwriting and coordinated distribution of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from the federal government, which also drives a certain type of community development activity.

Creative Community Development

CBO-led community development has more readily engaged arts and culture as part of its practice in comparison to government-led community development due to differences in missions, values, and funding. CBOs rely on a broader array of funding sources than government-led and CDA-led community

development efforts. CBOs also often have a mission focus on community organizing and empowerment that concentrates on building social capital. This focus on social capital is one that also values the engagement of people across cultures and other dimensions of difference --“bridging social capital” as Putnam (2000) called it. This mission focus has paved the way for creative community development practices. Creative community development is one that examines where the economic, social, physical, and civic dimensions of community intersect in ways that also engage with arts and culture. In the practice of creative community building, art and culture is engaged as a sector that is inclusive of our expressions of who we are, our creative labor, the cultures we are from, and how we intentionally and unintentionally communicate and exist as ourselves within society. Arts and culture, is therefore a form of essential expression and communication that community developers can tap to build up the social, economic, environmental, and cultural dimensions of place (Borrup, 2007, 2016).

Creative Placemaking

Creative placemaking is a planning and community development process that places arts at the center of shaping the character and vitality of neighborhoods, cities, towns, and regions. It is an innovative approach to advancing the planning objectives of livability, sustainability, and equity. Creative placemaking occurs when planners, community development practitioners, artists, and others deliberately integrate art and culture into community revitalization work – placing arts at the table with land use, transportation, economic development, education, housing, infrastructure, and public safety strategies

(Markusen & Gadwa, 2010). Creative placemaking can be considered under the planning discipline of community development because it is a transformative process that can be embedded in a wide variety of planning projects and initiatives in the form of short-term or long-term interventions and actions. Projects typically take place in public spaces and in the public realm and are generally concentrated over a longer time frame (e.g., 1-2 years). Examples of creative placemaking include:

- Artist-led community engagement. Development of a neighborhood plan using a community engagement process led in partnership with artists and arts organizations. Possible outcomes: Documented increase in diversity of participants in the planning process through arts engagement activities that created greater interest in and understanding of the community planning process.
- Temporary art. Activation of an a town center through a schedule of cultural programming in public and private spaces that tests different creative activities and uses, such as festivals, markets, creative makerspace or gallery-performance space. Possible outcomes: Documented increase in patronage to local businesses and documented demand for the space by local residents and artists.

Successful creative placemaking projects are initiated by individuals or organizations that have a vision and drive for innovation, are able to tailor the creative placemaking strategy to appropriately engage with features of place, can mobilize both public will and private sector buy-in, and create opportunities to

build partnerships across sectors (Markusen & Gadwa, 2010). Some of the persistent challenges in the creative placemaking field stem from two problems, which planners can help rectify: 1) a lack of understanding about the professional practice of land use planning and 2) a lack of access to power to public sector leaders who can be allies in accelerating change. Many creative placemaking projects are led by community-based organizations and artists who may not have full knowledge of the framework in which land use planning and development decisions are made, and well-funded projects that model land use and development or preservation alternatives may not gain traction and lead to long-term change due to a lack of strong public support and buy-in from individuals within government. The innovation and creativity that artists, organizers, and the public instigate is a necessary and essential element of social change, but it is also essential that the sectors – arts and culture, nonprofit, and public – identify some shared values and common ground. Planners, who also share a commitment to the principles of livability and positive changes for people and places, can become versed in the language of creative placemaking and become allies and facilitators of creative placemaking projects that spur innovation and creativity in the community development discipline of planning.

Tactical Urbanism

Tactical urbanism refers to the approach of implementing short-term, low-cost, and scalable demonstration projects that test alternatives to infrastructure, design, and uses in the public realm. This term was coined by planner Mike Lydon and is grounded in the same values articulated in the *Lighter, Quicker,*

Cheaper (LQC) approach that was developed by Eric Reynolds, Founding Director of Urban Space Management over 40 years ago. The concepts are endorsed by proponents of placemaking and new urbanism as nimble techniques for improving the quality and design of public spaces.

The tactical urbanism and LQC approaches emphasize an iterative and fast-paced design, construction, and installation process that shares similarities to the processes of implementing temporary public art and social practice art. These approaches are important additions to the menu of approaches that planners can use when conducting planning projects. Planners traditionally utilize a standard set of visual materials to help people envision alternatives in public spaces, e.g., photos, maps, hand-drawn or architectural renderings and plans, and computer-generated visualizations. Tactical urbanism and LQC promotes a more creative and engaging approach to visioning the potential for change. Examples of projects that can be identified as examples of tactical urbanism and the LQC approach:

- prototyping and installation of temporary street furniture, which may inform the design of future permanent installations;
- installation of temporary bicycle lanes using temporary paint, plantings, and/or traffic cones, which may inform future changes in greater alignment with complete streets principles; and
- closing of vehicle lanes and/or reclaiming of some parking spaces and programming those spaces with temporary arts and culture activities and places for people to sit and congregate, which may inform future changes to reclaim portion of areas as dedicated recreation space

(Project for Public Spaces, 2016; Lydon & Garcia, 2012, 2013, 2014).

Scholars have both celebrated and criticized tactical urbanism as an effective tool for facilitating the development of more just and democratic spaces and communities. Iveson, citing the works of Lefebvre (1974) and Rancière (2006) noted that the emergence of tactical urbanism (also referred to as ‘do-it-yourself’ DIY urbanism, guerrilla, participatory, and grassroots urbanism) is an act of democracy in which people seeking better communities are creating and demonstrating the changes they want to see without having to wait for permission to do so, and that by doing so, they are challenging the rights that they may feel they are denied and are creating alternative spaces within those spaces (Rancière, 2006 and 2009, as cited in Iveson, 2013). However, such experiments run the risk of being marginalized and dismissed as projects staged by younger, privileged generations of “inner-city creatives’ or ‘hipsters’ if they lack the grassroots organizing support needed to politicize the efforts in order to confront the communities in which they have no political power (Iveson, 2013). Another critique of tactical urbanism is that it is increasingly co-opted by prevailing neoliberal development agendas and that the element of creativity exemplified by such tactics is “vacuous and merely a justification for existing government-led redevelopment strategies” which may actually have a negative effect by spurring processes of gentrification (Peck, 2005 and O’Callaghan, 2010 as cited in Mould, 2014, p. 530). Mould warns that the grouping of such disparate arenas of practice under a tactical urbanism frame belies the political and aesthetic nuances of the practice, since the diverse practices under this umbrella concept may actually be

ideologically opposed even if they can be framed as advancing the overall concept of livability; further, that tactical urbanism is a neoliberal development framework that, at its worst, “co-opts the reactionary and tactical moments of creativity that might actually occur through interventions led through a different organizing frame, and by other sectors (2014).

Arts, Culture, and Local Zoning Regulations and Incentives

Chapter 2 provided an overview of federal and state policies that shape the arts and culture sector. However, policies at the city, town, and county levels also play a major role in regulating, incentivizing, and permitting arts and cultural uses and facilities. This section broadly reviews some of the local planning policies, processes, and incentives in the realm of urban planning that are facilitating innovation and creativity and creating conditions for the arts and culture sector to thrive. Policies pertaining to the inclusion of public art in infrastructure are included in the next section on art in the public realm and infrastructure.

Cultural District Incentives

Chapter 2 provided an overview of cultural district programs and policies at the state level. However, arts and cultural districts can also be city-designated as a defined zoning district in the absence of state legislation and programs guiding their certification or designation. State, regional, and local cultural district programs are being supported through a variety of tax incentives that may be implemented at the city, town, county, or state levels. This includes exemptions and credits offered to creative sole proprietors and creative industries operating

within a district. NASAA has identified the following six types of incentives offered to established cultural districts:

- Sales tax credits or exemptions for goods produced or sold within the district.
- Property tax credits or exemptions for qualified renovations or construction.
- Income tax credits or exemptions for artists living and working within the district.
- Preservation tax credits for historic property renovations and rehabilitation.
- Amusement/Admission tax waivers for events within the District.
- Eligibility for special loan funds.

(NASAA, 2015b, p. 5)

The city of Providence, Rhode Island has pioneered innovative tax incentives for arts districts. City staffers, artists, and private developers have also worked together to reclaim underutilized space for artist spaces. Artists living in the ten designated arts districts have the sales tax waived on purchases of their original artwork and pay no state income tax on income from their art. The City's planning department also provides below-market loans and technical assistance for the acquisition of spaces for artist studios and live/work space. (Markusen & Gadwa, 2010)

Zoning and Permitting

Zoning policies can have provisions that enable the inclusion of arts and cultural uses and cultural facilities in smart growth locations. Permitting processes can also be streamlined to simplify the process for the production and installation of temporary and permanent public art. A handful of professional reports and case studies document such efforts in the U.S., however there is a scarcity of academic literature unpacking these topics. Below is an overview of key examples of planning policies and processes that remove barriers to arts and cultural uses, incentivize adaptive reuse for arts and cultural facilities, and remove barriers in zoning and permitting processes that may make it difficult for the arts and culture sector to thrive.

Zoning districts that incentivize arts and cultural uses. In Lowell, Massachusetts, where the city seal bears the inscription “Art is the Handmaid of Human Good,” the city adopted provisions in Article IX, Section 9.2 of the Zoning Ordinance that defines the Artist Overlay District (AOD) in the downtown, which aims to encourage artist live/work space (City of Lowell, 2004; City of Lowell, 2016). The AOD provides density bonuses to developments in the downtown district as a developer incentive for the provision of artist live/work space; however, the adaptive reuse of a building or structure for such uses requires a special permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The City of Somerville, Massachusetts produced a zoning handbook for citizens, businesses, and city agencies that documented the efforts of the Somerville Arts Council and the Mayor’s Office of Strategic Planning and Community Development (2009).

As of June 2016, the Somerville zoning code is undergoing an overhaul and the draft zoning includes several provisions that pertain to arts and cultural uses. The provisions include: a density bonus for artist housing in an article pertaining to community benefits for inclusionary housing (i.e., inclusion of affordable housing in residential developments of a certain size); creation of a new fabrication district that will accommodate a range of building types and mix of uses supporting the local arts & creative economy; and revisions to the zoning pertaining to the Brickbottom District, to facilitate a diverse mix of uses including fabrication, production, performing arts, and other non-arts commercial (e.g., office and research and development) and residential uses (City of Somerville, 2015, 2016). A detailed case study on Metro Nashville Arts Commission's work on the passage of Artisan Manufacturing Zoning Ordinance is also provided in Chapter 4.

Zoning regulations and programs in support of artist housing. Chapter 575, Article V of the City of Peekskill, New York's Zoning Code includes language in its C-2 Central Commercial District that permits the inclusion of accessory living spaces to individuals certified as artists. Chapter 169 of the Zoning Code, which was adopted in 2000 and amended in 2008, also created an Artist Loft Program, which is managed by the Department of Planning and Development (City of Peekskill, 2000). The program has helped to spur the revitalization of what was once a largely vacant downtown (Borup, 2006).

Language that defines and promotes the inclusion of cultural facilities in smart growth locations. The Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) produced a toolkit on arts and cultural planning that prompts municipalities to

consider the needs of arts disciplines and industries and to consider including use definitions and provisions that can support the sector. CMAP has developed sample definitions of arts and cultural uses that can be include in the list of terms and definitions in zoning ordinances and bylaws. CMAP also recommends two regulatory tools: 1) adaptive reuse provisions that can incentivize the reuse and partial redevelopment of underutilized structures for arts and cultural uses, and 2) arts districts, which can be integrated as an overlay district or as a part of base zoning; CMAP provides a checklist of important components to consider when developing the provisions rather than a template, as such zoning is not one size fits all (2014).

Reviews of zoning regulations and permitting processes to remove barriers to the inclusion of arts and cultural uses and facilities in smart growth locations. Arts and culture in the built environment is regulated in zoning code through several ways: by-right zoning, overlay zoning, and a series of permits and relevant documentation that comprise the menu of approvals needed for temporary and permanent arts and cultural activities and public art to happen. A thorough review and assessment on zoning regulations and permitting processes allows jurisdictions to identify various opportunities to remove barriers that may prohibit certain types of arts and cultural uses from locating in appropriate zoning districts. For instance, the institution of certain standards and requests for informational documents that accompany the submission of permit requests for temporary or permanent public art installations and activities may streamline the review and approval process. *The CMAP Arts and Culture Toolkit (2014)*

recommends that jurisdictions consider asking artists to submit impact management plans and/or operations plans prior to the release of permits for events and activities as one measure for ensuring that the proposed activities do not generate adverse impacts on the built environment as well as businesses and residents. However, the CMAP Toolkit provides no examples of such plans in action and their efficacy in reducing burdens on both artists and government and streamlining approval processes (2014).

There is a dearth of both professional and academic literature examining the potential for this type of review to generate changes to lead to revisions of zoning regulations and streamlined permitting in ways that directly facilitate the growth of the arts and culture sector. The exception to this is the work of Amanda Johnson (2006). While serving as a graduate student and intern with the Minneapolis Department of Community Planning & Economic Development, Johnson conducted a comparative analysis of zoning and regulatory solutions pertaining to artist live/work development in the ordinances and bylaws of major U.S. cities. Her analysis found that while Minneapolis' code did not prevent artist live/work developments, it provided roadblocks by referencing artist live/work only under home occupation standards "which conflicts with the purpose and ideology of mixed use developments" (2006, p. 2). Her analysis stands out as a great example of what a zoning review may uncover. More case studies and academic analysis is needed to pinpoint model zoning provisions and permitting processes that can assist municipalities with conducting an assessment of zoning to remove barriers to the growth and development of the sector. Please see

Chapter 6 for an overview of a new tool for conducting this assessment of zoning regulations and permitting processes to remove barriers to arts and cultural uses.

Arts, Culture, and the Public Realm and Public Infrastructure

This section reviews public art policies and programs that facilitate the production and integration of arts, culture, and creativity in the public realm and in public infrastructure. These policies and programs promote the integration of temporary and permanent public art into the planning, design, development, and preservation of places.

Private Development Percent-for-Art

A private sector percent-for-art policy and program allows the jurisdiction to secure resources for public art from developers in exchange for negotiated benefits, such as height and density bonuses. A private sector public art policy helps ensure that developers recognize standards for selecting and commissioning site-specific projects, and identifies a role for the jurisdiction's public art program to work with developers on the selection process for public art in public areas of development sites. Through this type of program, government may work with developers in the following ways:

- work with the public art program to commission public art for public areas on development sites; or
- pay into a special fund for public art that is managed by the jurisdiction; this fund may be used for covering the cost of commissioning, constructing, and/or maintaining public art in a designated area.

(NASAA, 2013)

Public Development Percent-for-Art

A public development percent-for-art policy and program dedicates funds from a jurisdiction's capital budget towards the development of public art projects as part of publicly funded capital improvements (also referred to as civic art).

While a majority of civic art programs operate within government agencies at the municipal, regional, county, or state levels, some are operated by external nonprofit organizations. This model may be advantageous as it may strengthen fundraising from non-government sources and may minimize political interference in the creative decision-making process. Funding for public development public art can be generated in a number of ways, including:

- levying a percentage against hard and soft capital project construction budgets;
- allocating a fixed amount of the municipality's capital budget for public art (typically one percent or more);
- partnering with other government departments, such as planning, public works, and parks and recreation to maximize funding by integrate public art into public infrastructure such as streetscape improvements, public seating, and public transit improvements; and
- partnering with regional partners, such as a business improvement district, main street association, regional transit authority, or academic institution to secure matching funds and to integrate the public art into projects in public spaces. (NASAA, 2013)

Arts and Culture Innovations in Planning Disciplines

A series of briefing papers and professional reports have been commissioned by foundations, research, and membership institutions over the last six years that aim to frame the value-add of arts and culture to dimensions of planning (Markusen & Gadwa, 2010; Hodgson & Beavers, 2011; Jackson, Hodgson, & Beavers, 2011; Soule, Hodgson, & Beavers, 2011; Beavers & Hodgson, 2011; Dwyer & Beavers, 2011; Sherman, 2016; Ross, 2016). Below is a synthesis of findings from these documents, which aim to demonstrate the ways in which the arts and culture sector adds value to various dimensions of planning.

Housing

ArtPlace commissioned a field scan to identify examples of creative placemaking projects involving housing, which revealed that organizations have engaged arts and culture in several ways: revealing invisible housing challenges; nourishing and stabilizing individuals and communities who have experienced trauma through unstable housing; lending creativity to the organizing of housing campaigns, including the bridging of disparate segments of the population in housing campaigns; and generating housing and economic development (Sherman, 2016). Sherman's research identified case examples of artist-led activities that have enhanced programs and initiatives serving individuals impacted by housing instability and supported the implementation of housing campaigns. Markusen and Gadwa's research (2010) identified case examples of arts and culture as a way of revitalizing vacant properties and parcels. They highlighted the success of the non-profit artist space developer Artspace in

securing secure low-income housing tax credits and flexibility in state design standards to construct affordable housing for artists (Buffalo, New York), and one municipality's changes to zoning in order to permit inclusion of artist live and work spaces in both residential and commercial areas (Paducah, Kentucky).

Sherman and Markusen and Gadwa's research to pinpoint case examples of arts and culture enhancement of housing initiatives that fill a gap in literature about the intersections of arts, culture, and housing. However, more examples are needed of arts and culture strategies that facilitate concrete changes in housing policy, such as inclusionary housing policies and community benefits negotiations pertaining to the construction of affordable housing (including affordable artist housing) in exchange for approvals of higher density major development projects. Such case examples may not yet exist, but are greatly needed in order to explore the sector's potential in advancing housing planning and policy beyond creative community development and creative placemaking.

Economic Development

Producers of arts and culture are worthy of as much as investment as other sectors of economic development and the tourism industries, such as restaurants. There is a plethora of literature and data about the impact of the arts and cultural sector in terms of gross domestic product and jobs; a national Cultural Research Network is devoted to its study. For instance, 2016 data indicates that the arts and culture sector produced more than some other key sections, such as construction and utilities. Top industries include arts-related retail (art galleries, book stores); performing arts; independent artists, writers, and performers; publishing; and

creative advertising services (NEA, 2016a). The APA's briefing paper on economic vitality underscores the significance of the sector as a component of broad-based economic development strategies. The APA calls for the recognition and marketing of a community's arts and culture assets, investing in it to build both social and economic capital, and promoting mutually-beneficial collaboration between creative industries and other industry types located in the same geographic area. (Dwyer & Beavers, 2011) Please see Appendix A for a reframing and reinterpretation of creative planning strategies to improve economic vitality, which is based on the matrix of strategies presented in the APA's arts and economic vitality briefing paper.

An important area of planning and policymaking is nurturing the economic development of the sector, which includes small, mid-sized, and large arts organizations and small individual artists/producers. A study commissioned by the Urban Institute examined the economic benefits of cooperation among artists, arts organizations, and economic development agencies, with a special focus on traditional artists, i.e., artists working with material objects (Walker et al., 2003). It unearthed recommendations that are broadly applicable to traditional and nontraditional arts microentrepreneurs, i.e., individuals that cobble together a variety of part-time jobs to make ends meet. It found that regional economic development planning initiatives are best suited to help artists build markets for their work; economic development agencies can offer tailored business development services geared towards artist microentrepreneurs to provide the support they need in order to scale up and to fully take advantage of potential

market opportunities. It also noted a particular barrier to structuring economic incentives for arts – finding that economic development agencies most frequently offered discounted loans or other “shallow subsidies,” which are most beneficial to more mature businesses, and noting a lack of programs that respond to the concerns of very small businesses, e.g., those formed by people without a history of attachment to formal labor market, which typifies many traditional artists (Walker et al., 2003). Markusen and Gadwa ‘s research has also highlighted the work of jurisdictions to promote cultural economic development. Model initiatives include the West Hollywood Community Development Agency’s launch of an Arts Retention Program, which helps small arts organizations secure long-term leases and provides technical assistance, seed grants, and planning support to mitigate displacement, and Providence, Rhode Island’s development of arts-friendly tax incentives to facilitate redevelopment and adaptive reuse of properties to development into artist work and live/work spaces (2010). Also, in Massachusetts the state operates a Cultural Facilities Fund (CFF), which is implemented through a partnership between the Massachusetts Cultural Council (MCC), MassDevelopment, and partnering financiers of community development projects such as the Massachusetts Housing Investment Corporation. The CFF funds development feasibility studies and funds for cultural facilities involving adaptive reuse and new construction (MCC, 2016).

Transportation

Over the last several decades, the field of public art and the field of creative placemaking have facilitated the integration of art into civic infrastructure including bus stations, high-speed rail infrastructure, and highway overpasses. Perhaps one of the earliest examples of the inclusion of art into transit infrastructure is the Arts on the Line initiative of the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), which facilitated the inclusion of public art in subways along the red line of the MBTA (Kleespies & MacDonald, n.d.). The initiative emerged around the time the U.S. Secretary of Transportation had instituted a federal spending policy pertaining to art through the advocacy of local artists and community advocates. The initiative was the first time in the U.S. that public art was integrated into mass transportation and it engaged several local, state, and federal agencies including the U.S. Department of Transportation, the MBTA, and the Cambridge Arts Council, which wrote grants to raise additional funding for the inclusion of contemporary works of public art into the subways (Kleespies & McDonald, n.d.).

The importance of art and design in transit has been recognized in a number of high-profile policy statements and resources from national agencies including the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the American Public Transportation Association (APTA). The FTA released a circular in 1995 that provides guidance to FTA-funded transit projects on the incorporation of quality design and art into transit projects. This guidance included a policy statement acknowledging the impact of including art into public infrastructure as an action

that advances livability (1995). However, it does not go so far as to require inclusion of art and design elements – leaving the allocation of such funds at the discretion of local transit agencies (FTA, 1995). The APTA released best practices for integrating art into capital projects in 2013 that provides detailed guidance on the development, management, funding, selection, fabrication, installation, and maintenance of art in transit projects. This document was produced as an implementation resource building upon the policy statement of the FTA circular of 1995, aiming to further establish “how aesthetics, function and durability combine to enhance the transportation experience” (2013, p. 3).

Analysis of the impact of art into the design and construction of transit infrastructure is also beginning to appear in academic literature. Literature has examined the importance of public art in providing visual relief in the public realm and contributing to placemaking and respect for place-specificity through the integration of elements that highlight and present the cultures and histories of the places in which the transit assets are situated (Cartiere, 2009). In Portland, Oregon, the Tri-Met light rail MAX system has incorporated art into every station consisting of artist-design canopies, seating, sculpture, and arts elements in railings and paving (Cartiere, 2009). The Los Angeles County Metro system, which consists of elevated light-rail service, street-level bus service, and a subterranean rail system – engages art in dynamic ways that are appropriate to the environmental context. On the street level, living-room style seating helps creates a sense of intimacy in the environment, and sculptures direct the eyes upwards and help to serve as wayfinding markers; underground, taller sculptures

emphasize the cavernous aspects of the space and counter potential feelings of claustrophobia (Cartiere, 2009). Literature in professional transportation journals, such as the Institute of Transportation Engineers, are also including articles on topics like design and tactical urbanism, framing the importance of these arts and culture-based interventions in fostering a new approach to civic engagement in transportation planning and other dimensions of planning (Howard & McLaughlin, 2015).

Public Safety and Community Health

ArtPlace commissioned a field scan to identify examples of creative placemaking projects impacting experiences and perceptions of public safety and, hence, community health. The scan identified five arenas in which arts and culture strategies add value: 1) promotion of empathy and understanding in ways that promote social cohesion, mitigate violence, strengthen community and police relations, support reflection and learning, 2) influencing law and policy in support of social change efforts, and systems reform; 3) provision of creative career opportunities for justice-involved populations; 4) promotion of personal and social health and well-being; and 5) support for quality of place, through techniques like crime prevention through environmental design. (Ross, 2016)

Ross notes that the field of public safety has long considered place to be an important element of safety, as evidenced by the popularity of the broken windows theory, which asserts that immediate policing responses to incidents like unwanted graffiti art or minor misconduct is effective in deterring serious offenses (Kelling & Wilson, 1982, as cited in Ross, 2016). Ross's research makes

important connections between creative placemaking, public safety, and community health. However, an omission in the research is reference to the planning intervention of crime prevention through environmental design, or CPTED, which is the theory that good urban design (which may include art) can mitigate instances of crime and perceptions of lack of safety in public spaces (Crowe & Fennelly, 2013; Armitage & Pascoe, 2016). The concept has its roots in the theory of defensible space by city planner and architect Oscar Newman, who theorizes that community design, including building layout and site plans, can have a role in facilitating safety in residential environments (Newman, 1972). Scholars in the fields of criminal justice, environmental psychology, and urban affairs have examined CPTED as a crime prevention theory (Mawby, 1977; Merry, 1981; Poyner, 1983). However, a major limitation of the theory is the fact that fragmented social fabrics can leave even well designed, “architecturally defensible” spaces undefended (Merry, 1981).

Case studies that examine the role of art in CPTED strategies are needed in order to advance understanding of the sector’s potential in advancing urban design and related community health and public safety initiatives.

Summary and Analysis of Findings

Arts and culture’s potential in planning goes well beyond urban design and economic development. Arts and culture actors are embedded in the public, nonprofit, and private sectors and they are impacting livability in a variety of ways. While this literature review demonstrates there are a wealth of examples of the ways in which the practice of planning is engaging arts, culture, and creativity,

there are several arenas in need of further research and documentation. One area in need of further study is the cultural competency practices of planners and policymakers. As individuals in positions of influence, planners and policymakers bring their own cultural frames to the practice of planning and policymaking. How do planners, policymakers, and creative practitioners interact with one another and how do their cultural frames impact the implementation of creative processes and outcomes at the local, regional, and national planning scales (Boren & Young, 2013)? Another area in need of further research is the arts and culture sector's impacts on dimensions of livability. The impacts of arts and culture fields of practice on dimensions of livability has not been sufficiently examined using longitudinal qualitative and quantitative studies, and what research does exist is typically within the fields of sociology and public health; there is a scarcity of attention to the sector within the professional field of planning and within planning academia. More research, documentation, and case-making from the lens of planning is needed in order to soften the ground for more planning-facilitated projects and policies that embrace and integrate arts and culture and create conditions for the sector to thrive.

Similarly, the public sector and philanthropic sector can take steps to prepare artists for collaborations with government. The learning curve for understanding the language and framework of planning is steep. Scholars studying the work of artists who engage in social practice art have found that the skills necessary to design and execute arts interventions as part of community development work is generally not a part of the training that artists receive in art

school; furthermore, artists receive little validation and recognition for their work at the intersection of arts and disciplines of planning, such as community development, education, health and justice (Jackson et al., 2003).

A review of available resources on AFTA's Public Art Network database of tools and resources for public art administrators show a collection of sample public art ordinances, calls for artists, and general best practices on how to manage the public art selection process (2016). However, noticeably missing are resources that unpack the ways in which public art administrators can enter into collaborations with other departments within government that also focus on the quality of spaces and experiences in the public realm and in the built and natural environment. A set of practical resources that facilitate public art administrators' familiarity with the language and practice of planning and civic infrastructure development are needed. One of the case studies presented in Chapter 4 is a contribution to this specific need, as it identifies the experiences of one public art agency in infusing public art and placemaking elements into a water infrastructure project.

Lastly, a reflection on the purpose and practice of public art may indeed be the best opportunity for considering the parallel interests of artists and planners. Public artists might see the tactical urbanism interventions staged by architects, urban designers, and planners as government attempts at creativity and innovation through a method that is not unlike the practice of public art. Planners might see sanctioned and unsanctioned public art like performances, graffiti, sculptural installations, and festivals as enhancements or impositions to the human

experience in the public realm. Yet, both sectors strive for a degree of innovation and creativity. Although the motivations vary, both sectors pursue these projects from a place that values vitality and livability. The literature review demonstrates the opportunity for planners to move more confidently into the arena of arts, culture, and planning, and to pursue cross-sector collaborations to bridge established arts, culture, and planning fields of practice in ways that are mutually beneficial to both sectors – invigorating the practice of planning and creating opportunities for artists to venture into civic and social change work.

CHAPTER 4: CASE STUDIES OF INNOVATIONS IN ARTS, CULTURE, AND PLANNING FROM THE ARTS AND PLANNING TOOLKIT

This chapter dives into four case studies from the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC)'s Arts and Planning Toolkit. The first section provides a synopsis of the context leading to the development of the Toolkit, which presents an innovative and comprehensive framework for planners to engage arts, culture, and the creative community in ways that advance smart growth and livability goals. The second section presents four case studies from different parts of the U.S. that exemplify quality collaboration between artists and government and demonstrate a process and/or deliverables will have a documented impact on the advancement of planning and community development objectives. The case studies offer an in-depth opportunity to examine conditions for success, challenges, and lessons learned in four core planning areas: land use planning and policy; community development; environmental planning and infrastructure design.

Context and Impetus for the MAPC Arts and Planning Toolkit

Arts and Culture is a Regional Planning Priority

MAPC is a regional planning agency serving 101 cities and towns in the Metropolitan Boston region with a mission to promote smart growth and regional collaboration. *MetroFuture*, a 30-year regional plan, guides its mission and articulates a vision for a Greater Boston Region (MAPC, 2008a, 2008b); the vision includes identification of the region as one that "comprises a constellation

of unique cities and towns, full of character and rich in culture." *MetroFuture* identifies goals and objectives in support of arts and culture and the creative economy. Goal #43 states that "More people will take advantage of the region's artistic and cultural resources" and identifies several strategies for accomplishing this goal (strategies 6E, 11B, and 11c): fostering urban vitality through support for arts districts; supporting arts and culture as a way to build community and civic engagement; supporting the coordination of creative economy initiatives; and supporting live/work spaces and creative incubator spaces (MAPC, 2008a, 2008b).

Innovation and Experimentation in Arts, Culture, and Creativity

MAPC has experimented with arts and culture engagement strategies in a variety of projects over the last four years. The Data Services Division has piloted the use of web-based games to facilitate civic engagement in three projects, one of which was funded by the HUD Sustainable Communities Program (MAPC, 2015b). The Public Health Division has piloted the use of the Photovoice engagement technique in several projects, which engages young people in analyzing the built environment through photography; these projects were funded by a grant from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control Community Transformation Grant (MAPC, 2015a). The Transportation Division has also implemented tactical urbanism projects that demonstrate the potential for transportation infrastructure changes to enhance transportation safety and transportation choices in alignment with Complete Streets principles. The Land Use Division has hired a local artist to engage residents in temporary public art as part of a neighborhood revitalization

project, worked with a municipality to issue and fund a call to artists for a economic development corridor branding project, and organized forums and webinars on the topics of arts, culture, and creativity as they pertain to planning and community development (MAPC, 2016a). These previous efforts paved the way for a more robust arts and culture project, the *Arts and Planning Toolkit*, which was initiated in August 2015 (MAPC, 2016b).

Modeling Regional Collaboration

Regional collaboration with municipal, regional, and state partners was crucial to building support and demonstrating demand. The project concept was developed by Inner Core Committee Subregional Coordinator Jennifer Erickson, the author of this thesis, who proposed the formation of an Arts and Planning Working Group that could advise the agency on the development of a resource guide or toolkit of municipal strategies for engaging arts, culture, and the creative community in the advancement of planning and community development objectives. A cohort of 12 municipalities from the Inner Core subregion of MAPC partnered to submit a project concept, which was funded in June 2015. The Toolkit was funded with a \$30,000 grant in FY2016 through agency resources generated from the annual assessment of cities and towns and an award from the Executive Director's Discretionary Fund – an annual call for proposals that invites staff ideas for projects that will spur innovation in agency work. This funding was made possible due to demonstrated demand from member municipalities, who submitted letters of support to the Executive Director. Upon the award of funding, MAPC established the Working Group to guide the

development of the Toolkit, which consisted of planners and other designated municipal staff from the twelve municipalities in addition to three state and regional advisors representing the Commonwealth's Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development, the Massachusetts Cultural Council, and the Regional Arts Agency (RAO) serving the New England region, the New England Foundation for the Arts. The establishment of the Working Group also created a unique opportunity to facilitate regional collaboration among some of the most populous municipalities in the MAPC region, which possess a wealth of the Commonwealth's creative assets and talent.

The Toolkit as a Framework on Arts and Culture for Planners

The Arts and Planning Toolkit is MAPC's first comprehensive effort to provide municipalities with the tools needed to advance arts and culture goals and objectives in *MetroFuture*. The Toolkit presents urban planners with a comprehensive framework for identifying opportunities to engage arts, culture, and the creative community in ways that advance smart growth and livability goals. It presents a menu of strategies grounded in over 25 case studies of real projects within and outside of Massachusetts that are exemplary of how arts and culture can be an effective component of planning, land use, transportation, economic development, housing, infrastructure, public health, and public safety projects and initiatives.

The Toolkit development process consisted of the following steps:

- *Resource scan*. Identification of relevant reports, case studies, and toolkits on the topics of creative placemaking; tactical urbanism;

temporary and permanent public art; cultural planning; cultural asset mapping; public art planning; policies and regulations pertaining to arts and culture; arts and culture-based community engagement; and the cultural economic development.

- *Identification of experts leading successful projects, policies, or programs.* Consultation with staff at the National Endowment for the Arts, Americans for the Arts, and ArtPlace America to identify municipal staff working in a planning, community development, public art, or cultural affairs capacity and artists and nonprofit staff working to executive arts projects with public sector planners and other government staff.
- *Interviews.* Development of interview questions, with one set geared towards municipal staff, one set geared towards artists and arts organizations. Hour-long interviews were conducted with each interviewee and recorded with permission. A consistent set of questions was asked of each interviewee that examined six arenas: the political and policy context for the work; the programmatic context for the work; sources of funding; the quality of interdisciplinary collaboration; project cost, duration, and management; successes, challenges, and lessons learned/advice to other municipalities seeking to undertake similar programs or projects.
- *Writing and website development.* Purchase of a Wordpress theme to enable build-out of the toolkit with functionality to browse by category

and search by topic. Each topical page is augmented by compact, case study profiles; pro-tips/best practices are dispersed throughout the website platform.

- *Toolkit roadshow.* MAPC is working with advisors from the Arts and Planning Working Group is working to develop a series of workshops to unpack sections of content in the Toolkit. The Toolkit will also be presented to each of the MAPC subregions and at local and regional planning conferences.

Initial Successes in Toolkit Implementation

As of June 2016, two municipalities have requested and received awards of MAPC technical assistance to undertake cultural planning. Several additional municipalities have also requested MAPC technical assistance to pilot creative approaches to public engagement. Looking at the next five years, MAPC's priority is to create opportunities to advance creative placemaking as part of planning projects to assist municipalities in their efforts to strengthen designated and naturally occurring cultural districts, and to adopt policy and permitting changes that can increase development opportunities for creative businesses and individuals.

The next section presents four model case studies selected from over 25 interviews that were conducted for the production of the Arts and Planning Toolkit. Each case study reviews the context for the policy, program, or project, reviews the process through which it emerged, and reviews the major successes.

**Arts, Culture, and Zoning: Metro Nashville Arts Commission’s Work on the
Artisan Manufacturing Zoning Ordinance**

Introduction

The city of Nashville and Davidson County have a consolidated city-county government (Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee [TN], 2016). The combined region has a population of 601,122 residents (Census 2010). Nashville is home to the greatest concentration of songwriters in the United States and has an established cultural heritage and history. The radio and live music production industry, particularly in country, gospel, and bluegrass music has played an important role in reinforcing the city’s identity as Music City over the last 95 years (Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, TN, 2015a). In recognition of the importance of arts and culture to the community, the city-county government enacted a statute (Metropolitan Code of Laws Section 2.112.010) establishing the creation of a Metro Nashville Arts Commission (Metro Arts) and establishing a percent-for-art program allocating 1 percent of generated by general obligation bonds which go towards the restoration or acquisition of public art (Jennifer Cole, personal communication, February 1, 2016).

Metro Arts functions as the arts and cultural division of Nashville and Davidson County and is led by 15 appointed members and staffed by a team of nine. Metro Arts’ work is largely funded by an allocation from the city’s general operating fund and through the percent for art program; the Commission can also directly apply for federal and private grants. I interviewed Metro Arts Executive

Director Jennifer Cole on February 1, 2016 to learn more about the work of the Commission and their recent success in passing zoning amendments in support of the creative community. The following narrative on Content, Process, Successes, and Lessons Learned synthesizes content from the interview.

Context

Metro Arts operates programs and engages in policy and planning initiatives that support the growth and development of arts, culture, and the creative community in the city-county region. According to Cole (personal communication, February 1, 2016), in 2014 Metro Arts was assigned to facilitate the community process to develop the arts, culture, and creativity section of the *NashvilleNext* (Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, TN, 2015a). The planning process generated many arts and culture planning priorities, including a policy goal to “create or streamline land use, zoning, and permitting tools to encourage the creation and enhancement of creative neighborhoods and cultural districts.” One notable policy success championed by Metro Arts was the creation and adoption of an Artisan Manufacturing Zoning Amendment in August 2015 (Jennifer Cole, personal communication, February 1, 2016).

Process

Cole noted that the need for this zoning amendment emerged from the dialogues that took place during the general planning process. Cole noted that artists were facing constraints with finding suitable and affordable work and live/work spaces in the urban core due to limited availability in the context of gentrification and zoning barriers, with few spaces amenable to light

manufacturing (such as the small batch production of textiles and other material goods as well as food). Artists reported encountering major restrictions with zoning in terms of where this type of manufacturing was permitted and the retail footprint allowable for these types of uses in existing mixed use, commercial and industrial areas. Zoning barriers included the fact that industrial areas did not include a mechanism for allowing some retail co-located with production space. These barriers existed in context of the fact that a significant portion of industrial land was identified as underutilized – land that could be suitable for small manufacturing and co-working space (personal communication, February 1, 2016).

Successes

Following the adoption of *NashvilleNext*, Metro Arts worked closely with zoning staff to prepare an Artisan Manufacturing Zoning Amendment/Ordinance, which was subsequently adopted by the Metropolitan Planning Commission. The Amendment created clearer categories for arts and culture-related uses and removed some barriers and special permit requirements for artisan and small micro businesses (Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee [TN], 2015b). The adopted Ordinance included:

- the creation of a new use definitions for Artisan Manufacturing and allowing this use – with conditions – in most mixed-use, commercial, and industrial zoned areas of Nashville Davidson County;

Livability and Creativity:
Civic Innovations at the Intersection of Arts, Culture, and Planning

- the clarification of existing definitions for Rehearsal Hall, Theatre, Commercial Amusement (indoor), and Cultural Center and designation as allowable – with conditions – within artisan manufacturing;
- new allowances for parking for arts uses within Artisan Manufacturing; and
- new allowances for multi-family live/work housing within Artisan Manufacturing, i.e., a maximum of two live/work units on the same industrial parcel with exceptions around storage to protect health and safety.

Metro Arts' success with the planning process and the zoning amendment are just two examples of their ongoing work to strengthen conditions in the city and county that can help the arts and culture community thrive. There were several conditions that were crucial to Metro Arts' ongoing work with other government departments: the competencies of the arts team in acting as educators and translators to government staff in other departments and to artists in the community, and the willingness of the planning and zoning administrator and staff in other departments to proactively reach out to Metro Arts for advice and education on emerging arts uses.

Cole and her team often act as internal consultants to colleagues in other departments that seek expertise on arts and culture. The Metro Arts staff team that understands terminology in the arts and planning fields and is able to act as educators and translators to increase the knowledge base of zoning staff and to help artists articulate their needs to government and to navigate the permitting

process. Metro Arts is called upon to provide expertise on needs as diverse as: basic education on arts and culture industries; the facilities needs of certain types of arts uses; emerging issues, such as considerations for approving major art installations on private property and the inclusion of art on wayfinding signage in the downtown. Cole sees this provision of expertise as generating better policy in regards to arts and culture, with a focus on ensuring that emerging uses fit into current zoning and finding ways to streamline permitting to enable more public art experiences to occur and more creative industries to locate and grow in Nashville (personal communication, February 1, 2016).

Cole also noted that zoning staff were able to research how other jurisdictions in the country regulate artisan manufacturing and reflect on ways that such an amendment would have streamlined past cases and address further situations where creative businesses may come before the government for approval in commercial and industrial areas. Zoning staff also produced maps of current zoning overlays to identify areas the new use could apply and reviewed zoning to identify specific language that would benefit from amendment.

Lessons Learned

Cole offered the following advice to other jurisdictions seeking to undertake the type of arts and culture planning and policy work that Metro Arts has facilitated:

- Understand the schedules of working artists and creative businesses.
The typical planning meeting tends to attract the usual suspects because the charrettes and meetings are scheduled to occur at the start

of the morning or in the late evening. This tends to attract mostly white people. Working artists (e.g., singers, actors) also function at different times of the day and often make their living very late into the evening, leading them to have a later start time in the morning. The ways we structure public process can eliminate artists from participating. Artists are often unable to participate with timing and the lack of cultural competency in the delivery of most charrettes. Look at alternate meeting locations, meeting times, and physical gathering spaces to improve diversity and inclusion. How you gather the community is important. Metro Arts considered this when it facilitated the arts, culture, and creativity discussions for the *NashvilleNext* general planning process.

- Consider how to support cultural clusters without gentrification and displacement. Think about how artists live and how they produce and sell their art – it is often very clustered. People often think of constructing giant blocks of artist housing, but with no studios attached. What about people who need production/studio shops that are not attached to housing? Artists are not monolithic and, like everyone else, need housing suitable to different mediums and appropriate to their needs at all stages of their lives. Metro Arts is currently working with several foundations and a community development financial institution (CDFI) to administer the Make a

Mark program, which is providing loans to finance artists and creative businesses to develop live/work or production spaces.

(Jennifer Cole, personal communication, February 1, 2016)

Following the completion of this project, Metro Arts Commission has continued to build on its relationships with planning and zoning staff to explore updates to zoning and planning processes with a focus on supporting the creative workforce and promoting affordability in artist housing and production space. Cole shares:

- We have also begun a bi-monthly meeting with workforce, ECD, planning/zoning, mayor's office of affordable housing to discuss how we might alter zoning and/or planning processes to be mindful of creative workforce. Currently we are looking at better capturing info on home business permits to understand clustering and looking at improvements we can make in the permits data base to help us track uses of DADU's that may be used for home studios and or other home business use.
- We are also working with our affordable housing trust fund (city agency) to pilot/study the impact of affordable artist housing/production in suburban communities. The city will be granting up to 50 seized residential parcels (back taxes, codes violations) and regranting to housing developers for innovations in affordable infill development; at least six will be specifically for artists

so we can identify what works in terms of incentives, deed restrictions to support artist live/work in different density contexts.

(Jennifer Cole, personal communication, June 22, 2016)

Arts, Culture, and Community Development: Marty Pottenger's Art at Work Placemaking Projects in Portland, Maine

Portland, Maine is a city of 66,194 residents (Census 2010) that exists in the southern section of the state. Once a trading and fishing settlement, its working waterfront is home to a fishing industry and is a redevelopment and preservation priority. According to the Portland Convention and Visitors Bureau the city is identified as the “creative and cultural hub of Maine” (2016). The City’s organizational assets for the arts include Creative Portland, a nonprofit organization created in 2008 to receive donations and grants in support of the city’s economic development efforts in the areas of the creative economy, arts district development, and arts and culture employment that is funded through a Tax Increment Finance Fund; a Public Art Committee that was established in 2000; and a Percent-for-Art Program established through a percent-for-art ordinance, in which the city allocates ½ of 1 percent of the annual Capital Improvement Project (CIP) budget for the restoration or acquisition of permanent public art. The Public Art Program is managed by the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) and a comprehensive catalogue of current works in the city’s collection are catalogued and mapped on a website produced by the DPD (City of Portland, 2016).

I interviewed artist Marty Pottenger, who completed a long-term residency with the City of Portland on December 3, 2015 to learn more about her work with various government departments, including the Portland Police Department, the Department of Public Services, municipal union Local 481 and Neighborhood Services. The following narrative on Content, Process, Successes, and Lessons Learned synthesizes content from the interview.

Context

Marty Pottenger is a playwright, performance artist, and director of Terra Moto, Inc., a multidisciplinary nonprofit arts organization. In 2003, Pottenger established Art at Work, a creative placemaking initiative that aims to “improve municipal government through strategic arts projects with municipal employees, elected officials, and local artists” (Art at Work, 2016). The initiative commenced with a multi-year project with the New York City Department of Environmental Protection and Sandhogs union Local 147, about NYC’s a 60 year long project to build a third - 64 mile long - water delivery tunnel. A three year, quarter million dollar arts & civic engagement project - City Water Tunnel #3 – goals included improving workplace safety, DEP labor relations, and community understanding about water infrastructure and the vital role local government plays in residents lives (Marty Pottenger, personal communication, December 3, 2015). At a time when creative placemaking is gaining traction with various civic disciplines, Pottenger’s track record of work with various municipal departments and nonprofit groups within Portland demonstrates how arts and culture is a viable strategy for improving public understanding and participation in government.

Process

Pottenger's partnership with the City of Portland started with an invitation in 2005 by an arts organization in Portland to create a community performance in response to a surprise raid of immigrant and refugees by Border Patrol, which left many immigrants and refugees fearful and hesitant to leave their homes and access basic social services. Local and regional outrage had already resulted in City Council resolutions and a Governor Executive Order. With funding from the NEA and private foundations, 'home land security' premiered with a cast that included Portland's Mayor, Fire Chief, president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored Professionals, the State Senate President, members of Portland's Somali, Sudanese, Iranian, Cambodian, Mexican immigrant/refugee communities and others. As part of the project goals of addressing the immediate and lasting impacts of the raid, performance project design included a year of community-building elements/interviews/story exchanges with immigrants, refugees, community leaders, elected officials and staff with enforcement agencies. With Pottenger facilitating, participants shared stories and deepened relationships, generating bonds and insights that made the performances possible.

The positive impact of the project on government and community relations led to the City Manager agreeing to put Pottenger on staff with the city. The City provided health insurance and administrative resources; Pottenger also raised significant additional resources from national private foundations. The availability of private funding and support from the City Manager enabled the production of

11 additional creative placemaking projects in Portland over the term of her residency from 2005 to 2015.

Pottenger's creative placemaking project approach can be distilled as a nine-part process:

1. Documentation and evaluation
2. Identification of a partnering municipal department
3. Defining of key issues and opportunities
4. Selection of the artist(s)
5. Convening of a support team
6. Setting of goals and objectives
7. Designing of the project(s) and affiliated community dialogues
8. Beginning art making working
9. Publishing, printing, performing and/or exhibition the works

Successes

During her residency, Pottenger executed 11 creative placemaking projects dealing with civic issues including racial discrimination, immigrant and refugee integration, civic engagement, gentrification and homelessness, violence, and public safety. Pottenger's work has created the space for government to advance social equity in a creative, personal, and effective way. The arts, according to Pottenger (2012), "dramatically increases our ability to access our flexible intelligence, function collaboratively, analyze complex challenges, integrate contradictory perspectives, envision a positive outcome and take

inspired risks that lead to innovative solutions.” Below are profiles of two projects that advanced equity and social cohesion goals.

Forest City Times. In 2010, the Chief of the Portland Police Department reached out to Pottenger after an armed confrontation resulted in the death of a Sudanese man. The circumstances surrounding his death and the handling of his body created animosity between youth of color and police and city workers and tension between youth and city staff were escalating, with youth throwing rocks and bottles at city staff. The Police Chief expressed interest in an arts intervention to reduce tensions and asked if Pottenger would write and produce a play.

Working with a local arts organization Maine Inside Out to implement the Forest City Times project, Art At Work produced two original performances involving police officers and a group of African-born youth from Portland High School.

None of the police officers involved had theatre experience. Pottenger negotiated the selection of police officers to include a mix of those open and less open to participation. The workshops as well as individual ride-alongs that led to the performances helped open lines of communication on relations within the police department as well as between police and immigrants and refugees. Each performance ended with a facilitated dialogue between performers and the audience. Data on the months following the production showed a reduction in reports of youth and police conflict and police reported more positive engagements with young people. (Art At Work, 2016)

Portland Works. In 2011, community residents were reporting many instances of racial discrimination, along with documented discrimination issues

between municipal staff. Pottenger commenced Portland Works, a project to increase cultural literacy, decrease racial stereotyping and foster lasting relationships between civic, municipal and community leaders. The series of workshops were designed to decrease tensions within and between immigrant/refugee communities and city departments and establish a process for communication and relationship building between municipal and community leaders. The project engaged city councilors, Portland's Police Chief, Fire Chief, presidents of municipal unions, along with the Directors of Public Services, Health and Human Services, the Housing Authority, and grassroots community leaders including the leader of Occupy Maine. Monthly meetings were convened where there was facilitated discussion on civic and social tensions combined with art making, which led to the creation of temporary and permanent art in the form of poetry, benches, murals, painted light poles, and other temporary and permanent projects. (Art at Work, 2016)

Lessons Learned

Pottenger offered the following advice to other jurisdictions seeking to work with artists on creative placemaking projects in government:

- Work with artists so they can learn the culture of government. Create opportunities for artists to spend time observing and listening, so they can design and implement an integrated project with that culture in mind. Certain environments can be very challenging to work within; it takes time to figure out how to negotiate the relationships to make the projects operate effectively.

Livability and Creativity:
Civic Innovations at the Intersection of Arts, Culture, and Planning

- Identify trusted partners within and outside of government to establish credibility. Recognize that art is not in everyone's comfortable territory. Build enough support at the higher levels, with the understanding that not everyone will be on board at the outset. For example, Pottenger had the support of the Chief of Police, although levels of support varied with individual police officers.
- Build comfort levels by showing what you are talking about instead of explaining it. Provide visual examples of what a project might involve to help build knowledge and understanding of the project. For example, Pottenger provided examples of existing poems written by police and veterans as an example of the type of poetry that could emerge from the partnership with the Police Department.
- Define the community from the beginning to establish a culture of respect and inclusivity. Identifying all of the key partners in a project early will increase buy-in.
- Design project opportunities for everyone to be at the table. Creative engagement presents a major opportunity to build understanding and address racism – individual, cultural, or institutional.
- Communicate goals and objectives in ways that appeal to various segments of the community. Also, be strategic in communications with the media – it can be a powerful partner that can help drive objectives but can also wreck a project.

- Evaluation is your friend. By identifying indicators for measuring success, you can turn critics into converts to the idea that art-making and creative engagement can be, at times, the more cost-effective, sustainable and potentially successful way to tackle non-arts-based challenges in government.
- Be open to taking risks. Aim high in the expectation that high quality art will get created and that tangible significant objectives can be reached. People respond to real, meaningful challenges.

(Marty Pottenger, personal communication, December 3, 2015)

Art, Culture, Neighborhood Planning, and Design: The Fargo Project in Fargo, North Dakota

Introduction

The City of Fargo, North Dakota is a city of 105,549 residents (Census 2010) that is located on the Red River in a floodplain with a 0 percent slope that experiences frequent flooding from snow and rain events. In response to ongoing drainage issues, the city commenced a broader scope of work to construct additional drainage basins in 2000. City staff recognized an opportunity to consider aesthetics and uses in the drainage basins, and realized that the geographic areas facing the greatest risk from flooding events also happened to be located in urban neighborhoods occupied by primarily low- and moderate-income households and immigrant and refugee populations. Through a fortuitous introduction and funding from several sources, the city partnered with renowned

ecological artist Jackie Brookner in 2010 to implement a creative placemaking project in one of the basins, Rabanus Park, which became known as the Word Garden Commons, a pilot project of The Fargo Project. The project is entering its fourth year.

I interviewed City of Fargo Planning Administrator and Landscape Architect Nicole Crutchfield on November 25, 2015 to learn more about the genesis of the Fargo Project and the impacts of the project to-date. The following narrative on Content, Process, Successes, and Lessons Learned synthesizes content from the interview.

Context

In 2009 the city of Fargo experienced a catastrophic flood; additional weather events led to continued flooding in 2010 and 2011. A resident of the city was friends with renowned ecological artist Jackie Brookner and contacted the City Administrator to suggest that the city explore a partnership with her. Within the same timeframe, the City was engaged in finalizing the Go2030 Comprehensive Plan that included a dynamic public engagement process facilitated using *MindMixer*, a virtual tool that provides a “town hall” style discussion forum for residents to share their planning-related ideas for the future. The Comprehensive Plan identified public art as a major priority. The City Administrator expressed interest in hosting Brookner for a visit to talk about her ecological art practice and asked several staff to explore reaching out to the artist. When he spoke with Crutchfield, who liked the artist’s work, Crutchfield agreed to reach out. Crutchfield stated “I had been working in this field for 20 years and

creative opportunities like this rarely come around, so I took it. We immediately hit it off and shared similar interests” (personal communication, November 25, 2015).

Fargo is home to three universities. In 2010, Crutchfield worked with the schools to organize a program of speaking events for Brookner to talk about her practice, which is focused on water resources, people, and land. The city paid for Brookner’s flight and hotel, and Crutchfield put together a steering committee of university staff, arts institution staff, and local residents to oversee the program for the speaking tour.

At the time of Brookner’s visit, the Red River of the North was cresting at flood stage and the community was in emergency management mode. Brookner experienced the situation firsthand. During her visit, she accompanied Crutchfield to planning meetings and had multiple opportunities to meet with other city staff including the City Administrator. Crutchfield stayed in touch with Brookner and they began to brainstorm project ideas. In 2011, the NEA announced its Our Town grants program, and Crutchfield and Brookner partnered on a submission for a project that would test the transition of stormwater detention basins into multifunctional spaces. The project became known as the Fargo Project.

Process

Brookner was an established artist from New York and did not want the project to be an example of a big city artist telling locals what to do. Brookner created a train the trainer model where she worked with local artists who would amplify the project and replicate it. The City released a Request for Qualifications

for an artist team to work with Brookner to implement the creative placemaking process and selected a team of five artists to work with Brookner on initial outreach and engagement from 2011-2013. The first 12 months of the project consisted of understanding existing conditions, meetings with community leaders and experts and establishing an advisory group of these individuals, and conducting a series of targeted engagement activities and events in the community – led by the artist team working as community liaisons. After the initial consultation, the project team selected a pilot site – Rabanus Park, an 18-acre dry basin that is centrally located and disconnected from surrounding residents. Over the course of the project, lead artist Jackie Brookner traveled to Fargo every two months for a total of six trips, with more visits occurring at the beginning of the project. She also participated in weekly conference calls in the interim.

Next, the artist team led by Brookner conducted six months of intensive outreach to artists, residents, and businesses to build interest in the first community workshop, titled *WeDesign*, a visioning workshop to imagine the potential uses of the space. According to Crutchfield, “Jackie's leadership [enabled the artist team] to reach a component of community we have not been able to reach before in really unique ways...making planning proceed in a dynamic way more than a city agency would have ever been able to do. It made for a more "whole" project.” Crutchfield states that the artist team were the connectors – they knew that the only way they were going to reach diverse populations was to intercept them in daily business and activities – so they went to the nonprofits, luncheons, rode the bus, went to apartment complexes, and

worked with nonprofits and schools. Examples of unique arts engagement activities included:

- doing puppet shows in parking lots of apartment buildings to entice people and creating boards with colorful pictures and thought-provoking questions to describe the project and the goal of the upcoming workshop in non-planner ways; and
- making placemats with third graders who completed an exercise to imagine a neighborhood and to draw what it might look like; the placemats and an invitation were included inside a handmade ceramic bowl, made during an organized “bowl-a-thon,” which were brought home by the children to their families.

Fargo also has a significant immigrant and refugee population; 20-30 percent are resettled, recent immigrants speaking over 20 different African and Spanish languages. The artist team was concerned about barriers to participation so they also reached out to other community partners to provide interpretation and translation assistance at the workshop.

The outreach and engagement attracted over 200 people to the WeDesign workshop/design charrette in April 2012, which was an iterative and participatory design process that augmented the standard planning process for the detention basin. The artists used interactive elements including a sandbox exercise to show how the basin’s design could change. Participants used props to test model making, and worked in small groups with a facilitator with expertise as an artist,

architect, or landscape architect. Brookner called this sketch and test approach that was developed by the organizers “slow design” (NEA, 2016d).

Between 2012 and 2013, the artists and Crutchfield condensed the themes from the WeDesign workshop/charrette to come up with a design for the pilot site and involved leaders from previous public meetings who wished to stay engaged in the design process. In 2014, the City hired a landscape architect to translate the community vision into actual plans, which is under construction as of February 2016.

Successes

The Fargo Project is recognized as one of the first and most successful creative placemaking projects funded by the NEA Our Town program. The project demonstrates an artist-led process for doing infrastructure design and neighborhood planning with the community through the facilitative leadership of a municipality and an artist team. The project team has been invited to apply for additional funding that will permit it to keep working on this project and to expand the community engagement and design process to include additional detention basins in the community.

Crutchfield’s training and experience in landscape architecture, her project management skills, and her working relationship with Brookner was crucial in allowing the project to evolve through experimentation. Crutchfield noted “the Fargo Project was social engaged art in the creative placemaking realm; we didn’t know we were entering into this space until we were doing it” (personal communication, November 25, 2015). Crutchfield noted that they each brought

the other person's best skills forward, with Brookner sometimes asking Crutchfield to do the "planning speak" whereas Brookner would be the ideas generator. Crutchfield notes that many people, including the Arts and Culture Commission, don't recognize the Fargo Project as public art, as they have a traditional way of looking at art as an object versus as process. According to Crutchfield, "That's the beauty of the project. It could morph into so many things – stormwater, environmental restoration, neighborhood planning...that is community development. It can morph into different disciplines dependent on who is at the table."

The NEA has also produced a case study profiling the project, where Crutchfield shared that the project has generated spin-off projects that advance environmental restoration and workforce development goals through the creation of a "new job training and environmental science lab that will help determine seed mixes, erosion control, and sediment" which will be considered in the construction for the pilot project (NEA, 2016d).

Crutchfield notes that prior to this project, the city's experience with integrating arts and culture into planning and infrastructure was limited to the addition of public art to parking garages and bus depots, but not as an integrated element of the design of those places. These projects are funded through an \$70,000-90,000 annual allocation from the City Administrator's Social and Arts Fund that is provided to the Arts Partnership, which grants the funds to artists or arts organizations as small awards ranging from \$500 to \$2,000. The allocation of funding for these projects is not a written policy but a practice.

Lessons Learned

Crutchfield offered the following advice to other jurisdictions seeking to work with artists on creative placemaking projects in government:

- Anticipate that a creative placemaking project needs a fine balance of both structured and iterative/organic process, i.e., flexibility and comfort with some ambiguity, because a creative and inclusive design process takes time. Crutchfield noted that an artist may be okay with an iterative process and not knowing where something may end up, but municipal staff need to manage the process and both give space to artists to have creative freedom but to also work within the constraints of a budget and construction timeline. Everyone involved may have a different set of metrics for measuring progress, so it is important to have tough conversations to manage expectations.
- Manage the scope of the project. Sometimes, the planning process could generate opportunities for artists to ask real social questions that Crutchfield didn't have the capacity to engage in or the influence to engage other city leadership in addressing. A personal commitment to the project can lead to the work sometimes going above and beyond the actual scope, so take care to manage boundaries. Crutchfield and Brookner both gave more of their time than they were paid to do.
- Recognize your role as a facilitator, enabler, and connector for creative placemaking project, but not as the artist or creator. Recognize the importance of designing *with* versus designing *for* a community. For

example, a government official proposed the idea of placing art on garbage trucks. Crutchfield questioned whether it was a good use of resources and how it would advance the public good. Enable artists to participate and inform the process, not just to come in to execute art. Work with them to engage art as social practice and not just as an installation.

Arts, Culture, Water Infrastructure, and Public Art: 4Culture's Brightwater Project

Introduction

King County, Washington consists of 39 cities and towns and is home to 1.9 million residents (Census 2010). Seattle, the state's largest city, is the county seat. Since the 1960s, the County has adopted numerous pieces of significant legislation that have established leadership and funding for public art. The County's public art projects have been recognized with awards from the Americans for the Arts Public Art Network, the Seattle Chapter American Institute of Architects, the Washington Chapter American Society of Landscape Architects, the County's Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Humanitarian Award, the Washington State Chapter of the American Public Works Association, the American Society of Civil Engineers, the State's Historic Preservation Office, the Washington State Convention and Trade Center, and others.

4Culture is chartered by King County as a public development authority and was established as the County's Cultural Development Authority (CDA) in

2003. 4Culture works with four program-specific advisory committees and its creation built on the 35-year history of the King County Arts Commission, Public Art Commission, and the heritage programs of the Landmarks Commission¹. 4Culture’s public art program is widely recognized as one of the strongest in the country. 4Culture’s mission is to “bring artists’ work and thinking to the design and culture of the built environment.” The agency works with County departments and agencies, community stakeholders, and artists to achieve this mission. The County also consults with private sector clients seeking to bring art into the public realm.

I interviewed 4Culture Director of Public Art Cath Brunner on October 22, 2015 to learn more about 4Culture’s Public Art Program and its work to integrate public art into municipal planning and infrastructure projects. The following narrative synthesizes content from the interview and additional information that was requested on June 22, 2016.

Context

According to a historical paper about 4Culture’s history (Taylor, 2009) there is a long list of significant arts policy developments in the County that provide important context for understanding events relating to the evolution of 4Culture and its predecessor agencies include:

- a resolution in 1966 to establish the King County Art Commission;

¹ The Arts Commission and the Public Art Commissions ceased to exist in 2003 with the creation of 4Culture as the CDA for the County.

Livability and Creativity:
Civic Innovations at the Intersection of Arts, Culture, and Planning

- a resolution in 1973 to establish a county 1% for Art Program – the first such policy to be adopted by a county in the United States; this policy was modified in 1989 to allow the pooling of funds for projects;
- an ordinance in 1980 that established a King County Landmarks Commission;
- an ordinance in 1986 that established a Cultural Resources Division within the Department of Parks, Planning, and Resources and merged the Arts Commission with the Office of Historic Preservation and Landmarks Commission;
- an ordinance in 1989 that established the Metro 1% for Art program;
- an ordinance in 1990 authorizing usage of Hotel-Motel tax revenues for cultural education, cultural facilities, cultural enhancement, heritage, and opportunity grants, which was also modified in 1992 and 2001
- an ordinance in 1996 that consolidated the county and Metro 1% for Art programs
- ordinances in 1996 and 1997 that reorganized parks, planning, and cultural resources, leading to the separate creation of an Office of Cultural Resources (OCR)

Between 2001 and 2004, in the midst of a County budget crisis the OCR developed a proposal to transfer most of its staff, programs, and functions to a tax-exempt Public Development Authority (PDA), a public corporation of King County via ordinance 14482. Public art, technical assistance, grants, and non-

regulatory historic preservation functions were transferred to the new CDA. The authority began operations in 2003 and rebranded itself in 2004 as 4Culture to emphasize four programmatic priorities: arts, heritage, historic preservation, and public art. The new structure permitted access to other revenues, including grants and income earned through consulting services.

Process

I spoke with Brunner about 4Culture’s process for working with other county departments to integrate public art into planning and infrastructure projects. Brunner noted that 4Culture’s work is strengthened by the fact the county’s legislation over the last several decades has consistently enabled a collaborative relationship for 4Culture and its predecessor agencies to work with departments and agencies that plan and build things (e.g., public facilities and infrastructure including public buildings, parks, transit, wastewater treatment facilities, solid waste facilities) as well as social service agencies and the county’s preservation program. Brunner noted that there is no centralized planning entity in the county, although within each of the county divisions there is a planning department; 4Culture works with the planning departments in the different jurisdictions.

I asked Brunner to describe 4Culture’s relationships with other county departments and agencies. Brunner described the relationships as collegial, and that the agency takes the approach of being very proactive in supporting those department’s missions: “their mission is 4Culture’s mission, and vice versa” (personal communication, October 22, 2015). Brunner noted that the conditions

for this collaborative atmosphere are rooted in the relationships the program has established with senior level staff and department directors. Sometimes staff in other departments and agencies take the initiative to reach out if they have a project where they think integrating an artist would be great, and sometimes 4Culture is proactive and reaches out to the departments to propose opportunities for collaboration.

Brunner notes that the Public Art Program's values are in elevating not just the importance of artists' work, but in artists' thinking – creative problem solving. She notes that artists bring a different kind of thinking and creative experience to project teams, to working with the community, and to project outcomes. She described the department's values around public participation in particular, and noted that “we do more and more art work designed to be ephemeral...social engagement. It is a great intersection with the work of our client agencies. They have a need for public outreach, engagement and awareness and to describe very complex systems and public investments. Artists can be hugely effective.”

Brunner described one project as exemplary of successful collaboration involving arts, culture, planning, and the built environment: the Brightwater Wastewater Treatment Project. The arts component of the project was largely funded through the county's percent for art. In 1999, a sewage treatment facility was slated for construction on the border of two counties – Snohomish and King County. The manager of the project, Architectural Design and Mitigation Manager Michael Popiwny in the Department of Natural Resources and Parks,

was supportive of including public art and proactively sought to include an artist in the site selection process – earlier than any other prior project.

The Wastewater Treatment Division and 4Culture developed a process to select a lead planning artist, requiring all firms interviewing for the project to add an artist to their team. 4Culture used a new method to select the lead artist in this project. All firms that submitted a proposal to lead the siting phase of the project were required to add an artist to their team. The teams were multidisciplinary – engineering, architecture, landscape architecture, marine biology and water experts, real estate experts, etc. 4Culture engaged its public art advisory committee, which is composed of artists, architects, engineers, and cultural activists, in the site selection process. The artist team members of the public art advisory committee were a part of the interviews of the three short-listed firms. CH2MHill was selected as the winning firm; Ellen Sollod was their artist. Ellen worked during site selection phase.

Ellen joined the project during the siting analysis stage. There were multiple project teams consisting of engineers, biologists, and outreach staff, and each team was asked to include Sollod and to work with her at each stage. 4Culture also released a call for artists to secure two additional artists to work with Sollod. Once the site was selected, 4Culture added two additional planning artists – Simpson and Rosen-Queralt to create the Art Master Plan and to interact with the design team. 4Culture’s individual and independent selection panels chose the additional artists for the project. The 4Culture Public Art Advisory Committee (PAAC) approves panelists and oversees all design review and had

final authority to approve artists' proposals and concepts. The team of artists, along with 4Culture, worked together to create a Brightwater Art Master Plan that was completed in 2003. The arts element was established with a central focus on "making Brightwater a community amenity and to maximize opportunities to engage the public about the importance and function of wastewater management." The Art Master Plan identified Brightwater as an opportunity for artists to "develop sensory reminders of our region's ethic of environmental stewardship and sustainability."(Sollod, Rosen-Queralt, & Simpson, 2003)

The Plan identified thematic zones for integrated artwork that guided the creation of permanent and temporary artworks throughout the 114-acre site – including the plant zone as well as the 70-acres of publicly accessible open space. The artists and 4Culture also prepared a companion Brightwater Art Concept Workbook that described the thematic ideas and artists' conceptual research in greater detail for future artists to reference when creating works. (King County, 2016) 4Culture selected artists to implement temporary and permanent artworks consistent with the principles outlined in the Plan and Workbook using both open call and invitational selection processes.

To inform the development of the Plan, the artist team conducted creative community education and engagement to engage the public in documenting and conducting storytelling on the working processes of the wastewater system. One example was the use of pinhole and disposable cameras during the site selection phase. According to Brunner, Ellen was instrumental in engaging the community in imagining what Brightwater could be beyond it's function as a treatment plant

and to begin creative engagement designed to anchor the design of the project within the context of the community. Some of the photos, as well as other drawings and concept photos are included in a small chapbook entitled “Finding Brightwater” published by the project as part of the site analysis documentation (personal communication, June 22, 2016).

Successes

The Plan led to the commissioning of 11 artists to do temporary and permanent interpretive and conceptual projects and guided the inclusion of temporary events organized with the Brightwater Center, an environmental and community learning center that has become a community gathering space, exhibit hall, and learning laboratory on the lifecycle of water, the treatment process, and the geography of the area. The projects commissioned focused on environmental issues or the treatment plant itself. After the three lead artists produced the Master Plan, they were kept on as lead artists to serve as mentors to the other artists who were implementing artwork. The project duration was a long-term engagement for the artists and the project team – lasting 11 years from start to completion.

The Brightwater design team consisted of people from five different disciplines – art, architecture, engineering, landscape architecture, and education. Brunner noted that this project was successful because 4Culture and the Department of Natural Resources and Parks (Wastewater Treatment Division) had a good working relationship. Popiwny was very open to what the artists wanted to do, and was willing to allow a lot of exploration during the process. A strong

element of the project that facilitated the collaboration was the early identification of design values by the interdisciplinary project team.

An excerpt of the design values, as outlined in the Master Plan:

- Transparent, exposed: We will endeavor to make the process readable and understandable to the public. This means finding ways to reveal the mystery behind how things work.
- Integrated: We will strive to reflect an integration of the natural water cycle with intervention of the treatment cycle.
- Concentrated, collective: We will concentrate on creating cohesive experiences that will provide a focus for public attention.
- Multiple experiences: We will recognize that many voices can make a richer chorus and that there is room for distinctive elements within the whole.
- Active, not static: We will embrace the seeds of change as the landscape matures, technology becomes more advanced and site requirements shift over time.

(Sollod et al., p.5, 2003)

Lessons Learned

Brunner offered the following advice to other jurisdictions seeking to partner with artists on the integration of art into infrastructure projects:

- Develop an understanding and genuine respect and appreciation for arts and culture, and a desire for nurturing work at a high level of quality. Many jurisdictions think they need arts and culture to be a

classy city, but they do it in a way that tortures the creative community. If it harms the creative industries and artists, why do it at all? Ask yourself the honest questions: what are your motivations? Listen to artists and to your community.

- Be ready to fully engage with the creative process when you decide to include art in an infrastructure or planning project. Have a high tolerance for creative ambiguities and listen to your cultural practitioners. Public art initiatives give people permission to be creative and take risks. Great public art that is iconic and meaningful is the result of people working through a process, trying new things, and, at times, failing and going back to the drawing board. Commit to thinking creatively and be willing to take risks and try new things. Taking risks lead to remarkable rewards.
- Anticipate partners who bring a different type of thinking and experimentation. There is a perception sometimes that the toughest part of integrating public art is the actual process of having to work with artists. Some municipalities want an artist that doesn't give them any trouble. Know that someone else's working method may be different from your own, and strive to understand that process.
- Put your money where your mouth is and have the will to fund high quality art. Have the will to succeed at implementing an excellent public art project. Be cautious of paying lip service. Make sure you have an adequate, dedicated funding stream that is sufficient to meet

expectations for the work. Create dedicated sources of revenue, have a paid staff dedicated to managing a public art program or project, and listen to what is most relevant to the community so you can grow arts and culture capacity in a sustainable way. The demand doesn't just emerge when a website is created.

- Create space in a project to allow artists to change and adapt their ideas and approaches. When artists are working on long-term, complex infrastructure projects, their ideas will mature and change. The meaningful inclusion of a creative process requires time, and this time can be a tough process for government to accommodate. Give artists sufficient time and demand (and support) the best work.
- Create a great public art design review process. Design review for infrastructure projects is often overlooked. Identify and recruit people with relevant expertise, such as artists, architects, engineers, and arts and culture advocates. In a good design review and critique process, sometimes things do go back to the drawing board.
- When selecting artists, consider the context in which the work will need to occur and be selective in choosing an artist who demonstrates the best ability to be successful in that particular context. What type of culture would they be coming into? Consider their expertise with permanent versus temporary art. Things flourish when an artist is matched with a project that suits their overall interests and style.

- Develop contracts that are fair and watch out for both parties – for the artist and the agency.
- Do fewer projects of greater quality. Too many projects at once result in bad outcomes. Start where there is enthusiasm and momentum.

(Personal communication, October 22, 2015)

Case Study Themes

The four case studies demonstrate that arts and culture fields of practice offer powerful options for infusing innovation and creativity into planning disciplines like environmental planning, community development, zoning, and neighborhood planning and design. The examples show that successful arts and planning collaborations involved the talents of people within and outside of government, and working together – including working artists, planners, engineers, architects, and public art administrators.

- The Nashville case study demonstrated that zoning can be a tool for promoting cultural equity and facilitating development opportunities that support the sustainability and growth of the arts and culture sector.
- The Portland case study demonstrated that arts and culture creates the space for government to advance social equity in a creative, personal, and effective way – building empathy between people in government and the general public.
- The Fargo case study demonstrated that artists can develop a participatory art practice that advances social and civic aims, and that

this deep community engagement in the planning, development, and design of places has equity values at the core.

- The Seattle case study demonstrated that it is possible to executive an ambitious planning and infrastructure development project with artists at the table at the earliest stages, and that creative interdisciplinary collaboration can lead to excellence in planning and design.

The lessons learned from each case study also prompt consideration of two important things: 1) the appropriate role of the planner in such projects and initiatives, and 2) the values case for what arts and culture-focused techniques can offer to the field of planning itself and not just to the outcomes of planning.

The Role of the Planner in Engaging the Arts and Culture Sector

Regarding the role and competencies of the planners and other government staff, interviewees emphasized the importance for planners to cultivate openness, flexibility, and risk-tolerance when managing these projects, and learning to listen and learn from the methods of artists. To engage with arts and culture is to become more open and curious – shifting status quo perspectives about proper and acceptable ways for government to plan communities. Planners are well suited to engage as skilled facilitators and as translators – learning the language of the arts and culture sector and working with the creative community to unpack and understand planning issues and concepts and to plug into planning process.

The Role of the Arts and Culture Sector in Transforming Planning Process of and Outcomes

Regarding the values case for engaging the sector in planning, arts and culture provides ways to share power in planning – making the concepts of planning more dynamic and accessible, building empathy through creative opportunities for reflection and dialogue, and advancing cultural equity and inclusion by attracting diverse segments of human society. The arts can enrich the process and outcomes of planning when it is engaged both as a process tool and as an outcome of planning (Calderwood-Ginn & Leonard, 2012, p. 4).

Towards a New Set of Arts and Cultural Competencies for Planners

The lessons learned from each case example also drive home the idea that certain competencies must be cultivated by planners in order to create the environments and strategic opportunities for this creativity to emerge and succeed. The next chapter introduces a set of tools that aim to meet this opportunity and need.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Planning is one of the most influential professions in society. A multitude of disciplines fall under planning's purview, which pertain to the development and preservation of places and the segregation and integration of uses and, therefore, people. Yet, the prevailing perspective is that the practice of planning is primarily a technical one. As a regional urban planner working with cities and towns at local and regional scales, I know from experience that planning is as much a social and political exercise as it is a technical one. The development and implementation of plans and policies is realized through collaboration and negotiations between people with varying degrees of power, esteem, and influence. The acknowledgement of the social dimensions and equity implications of planning is extremely important, and underscores the need for planners to develop a new set of competencies that enable us to inject innovation and creativity into the practical advancement of livability through both planning process and outcomes.

The following recommendations and supplemental appendices form the framework for implementing a cross-sector, cross-discipline strategy for integrating arts, culture, and creativity into various arenas of planning. These new resources acknowledge three things:

1. Planners need to cultivate certain competencies in order to effectively integrate creativity into their practice.
2. Planners need access to practical case examples of innovations at the intersection of arts, culture, and planning in order to make the case that

the additional process and collaboration is effective in advancing a variety of livability objectives.

3. Federal, state, regional, and local governments have a role to play in creating the conditions that are conducive to this innovation and creativity in the advancement of livability.

To address the aforementioned needs, three categories of action are needed, and appendices B, C, and D provide the practical tools and frameworks to advance these recommendations. A summary of each resource created to advance each recommendation is provided below. These resources were generated through a synthesis of knowledge and reflections from three sources: the literature review prepared for this thesis; the in-depth analysis of the four case studies profiled in this thesis; and my professional work in preparing the MAPC Arts and Planning Toolkit for planners, which included conducting over 28 interviews with experienced practitioners working at the exciting intersection of arts, culture, and planning: planners, public art administrators, and artists.

Recommendation #1: Build the Capacity of Planners to Be Expert

Facilitators of Innovations at the Intersection of Arts, Culture, and Planning

Planners have a responsibility to develop cultural competencies that enable them to engage with diverse demographics and sectors, which will inevitably emerge in projects at the intersection on arts, culture, and planning. The first task in readying planners to become capable facilitators by building up their cultural competencies – the base of essential knowledge and awareness, skills,

behaviors, and practices that are essential to develop when learning to engage with the culture of individuals and entities in the arts and culture sector (Agyeman & Erickson, 2010; Vasquez, 2012).

Some of the relevant competencies that have been articulated by the American Planning Association include the “ability to solve problems using a balance of technical competency, creativity, and hardheaded pragmatism” and “mastery of techniques for involving a wide range of people in making decisions” (APA, 2016b). Vasquez (2012) has defined the cultural competencies of planners as including creativity, cultural competency, recognition of awareness and beliefs and values, and the ability to promote the value of creative processes and creators. I would add to this list the following competencies: inclusion, curiosity, risk tolerance, an ability to find common ground through shared values regarding livability, the ability to act as a translator and communicator of planning concepts in non-jargon ways.

Recommendation #2: Identify Suitable Methods for Integrating Arts, Culture, and Creativity into the Core Disciplines of Planning

Planners need specific examples of the ways in which arts and culture can enhance core disciplines of planning, such as zoning, permitting, community development, economic development, comprehensive planning, environmental planning, and historic preservation. Appendix B provides a set of questions that serve as prompts for reviewing zoning regulations and evaluating permitting processes to remove barriers to arts and cultural uses and facilities. This is a

practical tool that is also a framework for understanding how zoning can create regulatory barriers that limit the development of the arts and culture sector and create regulatory conditions and incentives that help the sector grow and thrive. Appendix C presents a framework for considering how arts and culture approaches and strategies can advance the fourteen planner competencies that are identified by the AICP Commission (APA, 2014). It identifies the primary and secondary sectors that are best suited to lead and support work in each area and provides specific examples of identifies well used and less-common options for engaging with arts, culture, and creativity to drive innovation.

Recommendation #3: Incentivize Public Sector Innovations at the Intersection of Arts, Culture, and Planning

Planners work within a political context that is largely driven by policies and funding programs established by changing political administrations at the local, regional, and national levels. Therefore, it is essential to incentivize public sector innovation by implementing a tiered strategy. Appendix D proposes an action agenda for federal, state, regional, and local governments to create the policy conditions and funding and incentives that will stimulate cross-sector collaboration and a broad-based strategy for infusing arts, culture, and creativity into the disciplines of planning. The emphasis of this strategy is the creation of policy (zoning, funding) and planning conditions that will allow the arts and culture sector to thrive.

Recommendations for the Implementation of the Arts and Planning Toolkit

The development of the *Arts and Planning Toolkit* (MAPC, 2016) was the original impetus for this thesis, and the literature review and deep dive into four of the 28 case studies compiled for the Toolkit created a valuable opportunity for reflection. Broader findings from the larger batch of case studies are consistent with the challenges and growth areas that were identified by the interviewees of the four case studies profiled in this thesis. A review of the full slate of case studies also suggests three emergent topics in need of further research and case study development: 1) innovations in zoning policy and streamlined permitting to remove barriers to arts and cultural uses, facilities, and activities; 2) coordinated initiatives to mitigate displacement in naturally occurring cultural districts; and 3) arts and planning initiatives led by government that are explicitly rooted in an objective to advance cultural equity, diversity, and inclusion.

The production of additional case studies will continue to be helpful to planners, and the case studies should continue to focus on five pieces of information that are essential details for planners: the political context leading to the pursuit of each policy, project, or program; involved partners; sources of funding; details on the planning process; and initial successes from the lens of planning and livability. The implementation of the Toolkit will require not only strategic messaging to reinforce the idea that it is a broad-based framework, but should be paired with the deployment of curriculum-based workshops for planners that unpack each category of the content in the Toolkit, which mirrors the categories of content outlined in the literature review in this thesis.

Conclusion

The power and potential of the arts and culture sector is frequently marginalized in society. While the reasons for this certainly do not rest solely on the disciplines of urban planning, the role and influence of land use policies and planning processes in inhibiting and nurturing the growth of the sector are unquestionable. That being said, the prospects for fruitful collaboration between the arts and culture and planning fields of practice are extremely bright. We are entering an exciting time where interests are beginning to merge and overlap, as evidenced by the creation of a new American Planning Association (APA) Arts and Planning Interest Group (APA, 2016a) and the awarding of a first-ever National Endowment for the Arts Knowledge Building grant to Forecast Public Art and the APA for a collaboration to develop a series of learning tools on public art for urban planners (NEA, 2016e).

This thesis has attempted to contribute to the emergence of cross-sector arts, culture, and planning collaborations by presenting a historical overview and framework for understanding how arts and culture is and can be an integral component of urban planning. It is hoped that the literature review, case studies, recommendations, and frameworks for practice will strengthen the integration of arts and culture into professional planning practice and pave the way for exciting innovations and collaborations that advance shared planning and livability goals.

**APPENDIX A: PLANNING STRATEGIES TO ADVANCE ARTS, CULTURE,
AND ECONOMIC VITALITY**

The following table represents the author’s reframing and expanded description of planning strategies to improve economic vitality that were originally outlined in the APA’s Arts and Culture Briefing Paper on Economic Vitality (Dwyer and Beavers, 2011)

Matrix of Planning Strategies to Advance Arts, Culture, and Economic Vitality

ECONOMIC VITALITY GOAL	PLANNING STRATEGY
<i>Community Development and Revitalization</i>	
Promote the development of arts/cultural/creative entrepreneurs	Provide professional development, networking, and other educational opportunities that support the development of arts/cultural/creative entrepreneurs
Promoting community and neighborhood revitalization	Create opportunities to integrate artistic strategies into planning and community development processes in ways that emphasize arts, culture, and creative expression
<i>Planning and Zoning</i>	
Facilitate the adoption of arts, cultural, entertainment, historic, or heritage districts	Conduct planning to facilitate the identification of areas with a concentration of arts, cultural, entertainment, historic, and heritage assets that would be strengthened through formal recognition

Livability and Creativity:
Civic Innovations at the Intersection of Arts, Culture, and Planning

ECONOMIC VITALITY GOAL	PLANNING STRATEGY
	as a district; assist with the assembly of materials that would grant official certification or designation of the identified area as a district
Facilitate live/work and live/work/sell mixed use spaces for arts and creative industries	Provide and advocate for economic or regulatory support for combined residential and commercial space for artists and adaptive reuse for arts and cultural uses
Facilitate the development of spaces and facilities that can serve as arts incubators	Amend zoning and offer incentives that can stimulate production of low-cost space and services to support artistic, cultural, and creative professionals and arts-specific business incubators
<i>Marketing and Branding</i>	
Facilitate branding and urban design in ways that celebrate community culture and character	Facilitate visual branding and design elements that communicate and reinforce a community’s culture and character using logo development, graphic design, advertising, marketing, and urban design
Promote cultural assets in ways that attract economic investment and workers	Amend zoning, streamline permitting, and facilitate public and private funding to support the development and provision of cultural amenities, e.g., permanent and temporary public art,

Livability and Creativity:
Civic Innovations at the Intersection of Arts, Culture, and Planning

ECONOMIC VITALITY GOAL	PLANNING STRATEGY
	marketplaces, bazaars, arcades, parks, festivals, community centers, and other public spaces for the public that could accommodate cultural uses
Create economic clusters that include and engage creative businesses	Work with developers and property owners to market and promote commercial spaces that meet the needs of creative businesses and other businesses in order to facilitate co-location and collaboration

APPENDIX B: GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSING ZONING REGULATIONS AND PERMITTING PROCESSES TO REMOVE BARRIERS TO ARTS AND CULTURAL USES AND FACILITIES IN SMART GROWTH LOCATIONS

The following list of questions aims to serve as guidance for conducting a review and assessment of zoning regulations and permitting processes to determine opportunities for better defining, enabling, and regulating arts and cultural uses and facilities. This list was developed based on the author’s review of zoning provisions from various local jurisdictions and city and state-supported cultural districts, including the zoning ordinance and other zoning-related materials prepared by the City of Somerville, Massachusetts (2009, 2015, 2016); the zoning ordinance of the City of Lowell, Massachusetts (2004); an ordinance in the zoning code of the metropolitan government of Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee (2015); an analysis of the zoning code of the city of Baltimore, Maryland (Baltimore Office of Promotion and the Arts, n.d.); the city and county of San Francisco, California (2015); and the city and state incentives provided to artists and developers in arts districts by the State of Maryland and the City of Providence, Rhode Island (Markusen & Gadwa, 2010).

Guidelines for Reviewing Zoning Regulations and Permitting Processes

TOPIC	REVIEW QUESTIONS
<i>Terms and</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the zoning ordinance or bylaw include specific definitions of arts and cultural uses as

TOPIC	REVIEW QUESTIONS
<i>Definitions</i>	<p>allowable uses? This may include definitions of the visual arts, music and performing arts, jewelry, clothing/apparel, furniture, ceramic production, printmaking, metalwork, woodwork, live/work uses, work-only studios, galleries, artisan manufacturing, design, and fabrication, food and bakery products, and others.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the zoning ordinance or bylaw include specific definitions of arts and cultural facilities? • Does the zoning ordinance or bylaw lack specific definitions of arts and cultural uses but contains other definitions that are determined to be broad enough to encompass different arts and cultural disciplines?
<i>Base Zoning and Overlay Zoning</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are artist live/work spaces, artist work/studio spaces, and/or arts and cultural facilities permitted in commercial – retail/office and commercial – light industrial zones? If permitted, is it by-right or by special permit? • Are artist live/work spaces, artist work/studio spaces, and/or arts and cultural facilities permitted in mixed-use zones? If permitted, is it by-right or by special permit?

TOPIC	REVIEW QUESTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are artist work/studio spaces and/or artist housing units permitted as an accessory use? If permitted, is it by-right or by special permit? • Are artist live/work spaces or work/studio spaces allowed as home occupation/home offices in residential zones and districts? If permitted, is it by-right or by special permit? • Are small-scale production and manufacturing permitted in commercial retail/office and commercial – light industrial zones? If permitted, is it by-right or by special permit? • Are small-scale production and manufacturing uses permitted in mixed use zones? If permitted, is it by-right or by special permit? • For arts and cultural production, manufacturing, and fabrication, are there regulations pertaining to: outdoor storage, loading docks, etc.? Do regulations vary depending on the zone, e.g., commercial – retail/office versus commercial – light industrial? • Are arts districts, cultural districts, and/or historic districts designated as base zones or overlay districts in the zoning ordinance or bylaw?

TOPIC	REVIEW QUESTIONS
<p>Site Plan Approval or Administrative Review</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If artist live/work, work/studio space, and other arts and cultural facilities are permitted in the base zoning or overlay zoning by-right or by special permit, do the development plans (i.e., projects that require a building permit) require site plan approval? • If artist live/work, work/studio space, and other arts and cultural facilities are permitted in the base zoning or overlay zoning by-right or by special permit, do the development plans (i.e., projects that require a building permit) require administrative review? • If site plan approval or administrative review is required, what types of development activity trigger the provisions? This may include: new structures, additions, or extensions to existing structures; façade alterations; mechanical enclosures and horizontal improvements; changes in use that do not increase building footprint; and subdivisions.
<p>Intensity of Uses</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If zoning regulations permit arts and cultural uses in commercial – retail/office and commercial – light industrial zones, do provisions limit the intensity of the associated uses? This may include floor area ratio (FAR) limits, minimum and/or maximum number of dwelling units per acre, and

TOPIC	REVIEW QUESTIONS
	height restrictions.
Adaptive Reuse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the base zoning or overlay zoning permit adaptive reuse of structures for arts and cultural uses or arts and cultural facilities? If permitted, is it by-right or by special permit?
Design Guidelines or Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the base zoning or overlay zoning include design guidelines or standards? Do design guidelines or standards reference architectural, historic, and/or arts and cultural design elements or details?
Incentives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If your base zoning or overlay zoning permits artist live/work spaces, artist work spaces, and/or arts and cultural facilities, does it offer incentives for artists? Incentives can include: density bonuses, reduced parking requirements, income tax credits for artists, building rehabilitation credits for developers, property tax credits for qualifying renovations for adaptive reuse for arts and cultural uses and facilities, etc.
Public Art	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the city or town permit temporary or intermittent use of public rights-of-way?

TOPIC	REVIEW QUESTIONS
<p>Ordinances and Permitting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the zoning ordinance or bylaw include a public art ordinance? • Does the city or town have a streamlined permitting process for public art projects, which combines all required permits into one single permit? • Does the zoning ordinance or bylaw’s public art ordinance identify different uses or encroachments that will trigger a single permit or permits? Such uses or encroachments may include: street furniture; landscaping; traffic calming; lane striping; bicycle parking; wayfinding signage; roadway and curb painting. • Does the permitting process for temporary or permanent uses, encroachments, and public art structures, installations, or activities require the submission of addendum materials, such as operations and/or management strategies? • Does the city or town administer a different permit process depending upon the project sponsor, e.g., individuals, nonprofit organizations, businesses, private developers, or city or town-sponsored projects?

APPENDIX C: A FRAMEWORK FOR INFUSING ARTS, CULTURE, AND CREATIVITY INTO PLANNING

The following matrix is a new framework for envisioning the various ways that planners can partner with individuals and entities in the arts and culture sector to infuse innovation, creativity, and equity into various dimensions of planning.

- Each competency/practice area is categorized according to the primary and secondary sectors that lead and drive change. Primary sectors are those that are determined to have the strongest qualifications to lead work in the focus areas. Secondary sectors are those that may be engaged in a contract/consultant role by the contact in the primary sector. While public sector planners often undertake many of these tasks, the sector often engages private and public sector consultants to complete distinct elements of work on complex planning and infrastructure projects.
- Examples of arts and culture interventions and strategies that can be engaged to advance planner's practices in each focus area are also provided. The matrix identifies well used and less-common options for engaging with arts, culture, and the creative community in both the nonprofit and private sectors to drive innovation.
- The matrix is based on the fourteen specialty competencies for planners that have been identified by the AICP Commission as of March 10, 2014. Note that "Clean Energy" has been added to Sustainability and "Arts and Culture" has been added to "Design".

Matrix of Arts and Culture Strategies Complimentary to AICP Planner Specialty Competencies and Dimensions of Livability

AICP PLANNER SPECIALTY COMPETENCIES / PRACTICE AREAS	PRIMARY SECTOR	SECONDARY SECTORS	FOCUS AREAS (AUTHOR'S ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE AREAS THAT CAN BE ENHANCED THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE INTERVENTIONS AND STRATEGIES IN BOLD)	EXAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTARY ARTS AND CULTURE APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
Community Activism and Empowerment	Nonprofit sector	Public sector, private sector	Planning Dispute Resolution; Collaborative Governance; Community Engagement and Citizen Participation; Social Media tools; Alternative Public Forums; Neighborhood Planning and Community Leadership Forums; Social Equity Concepts [added]	Temporary public art led by social practice artists; web-based applications and games that foster civic engagement; participatory design charrettes led by artists and designers
Community Development	Nonprofit sector	Public sector, private	Asset Mapping; Strategic Planning; Community Empowerment; Grants and Funding; Income and Credit Building;	Participatory, visual asset mapping led by artists; social practice artist-led engagement activities, such as

AICP PLANNER SPECIALTY COMPETENCIES / PRACTICE AREAS	PRIMARY SECTOR	SECONDARY SECTORS	FOCUS AREAS (AUTHOR'S ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE AREAS THAT CAN BE ENHANCED THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE INTERVENTIONS AND STRATEGIES IN BOLD)	EXAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTARY ARTS AND CULTURE APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
		sector	Business District Revitalization; Neighborhood Revitalization; Social Service Delivery; Public Facilities; Civic, Cultural, Social Vitality; Recreation and Public Health; Historic Preservation; Quality of Life Planning	storytelling, that are experiential and focused on a specific geographic area, facility, park or other space in the public realm; design charrettes
Comprehensive Planning	Public sector	Private sector, nonprofit	Project Scoping; Visioning; Issue Identification; Community Facilities and Infrastructure; Forecasting and Modeling;	Artist-led graphic facilitation or graphic recording; integration of permanent public art in transportation

AICP PLANNER SPECIALTY COMPETENCIES / PRACTICE AREAS	PRIMARY SECTOR	SECONDARY SECTORS	FOCUS AREAS (AUTHOR'S ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE AREAS THAT CAN BE ENHANCED THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE INTERVENTIONS AND STRATEGIES IN BOLD)	EXAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTARY ARTS AND CULTURE APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
		sector	Transportation and Land Use; Economic Development Planning; Housing and Community Development; Neighborhood and Special Area Planning; Alternatives articulation and Analysis; Consensus Building and Public Engagement; Adoption and Public Approval	infrastructure; integration of temporary or permanent art as part of placemaking efforts to promote community and economic development; social practice artist-led engagement activities that are experiential and focused on a neighborhood or other defined geographic area; usage of arts-based physical models to demonstrate

AICP PLANNER SPECIALTY COMPETENCIES / PRACTICE AREAS	PRIMARY SECTOR	SECONDARY SECTORS	FOCUS AREAS (AUTHOR'S ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE AREAS THAT CAN BE ENHANCED THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE INTERVENTIONS AND STRATEGIES IN BOLD)	EXAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTARY ARTS AND CULTURE APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
				redevelopment alternatives and development potential
Economic Development	Private sector	Public sector, Nonprofit sector	Economic Base Theory; SWOT Analysis; Asset Analysis; Labor Force Analysis ; Economic Development Strategy ; TIF, BID, SSA's and other incentives; Development Approval Processes; Tourism and Hospitality	Participatory data collection of workforce and other economic development data augmented by creative arts engagement activities; creative economy strategy development
Environmental	Public	Public	Earth Science, Biology, Environmental	Temporary or permanent public art led

AICP PLANNER SPECIALTY COMPETENCIES / PRACTICE AREAS	PRIMARY SECTOR	SECONDARY SECTORS	FOCUS AREAS (AUTHOR'S ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE AREAS THAT CAN BE ENHANCED THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE INTERVENTIONS AND STRATEGIES IN BOLD)	EXAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTARY ARTS AND CULTURE APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
and Natural Resources	sector	Sector, Private sector	Chemistry and Natural Systems ; Natural Resources and Environmental Analysis; Environmental Legislation and Policy; River Basin Planning and Management; Coastal Zone Planning; Climate Change; Air Pollution Control; Waste Water Reclamation ; Environmental Impact Analysis; Conflict and Economic Development	by social practice artists that integrates art and design into the structural execution of environmental protection, pollution control, and reclamation solutions

AICP PLANNER SPECIALTY COMPETENCIES / PRACTICE AREAS	PRIMARY SECTOR	SECONDARY SECTORS	FOCUS AREAS (AUTHOR'S ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE AREAS THAT CAN BE ENHANCED THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE INTERVENTIONS AND STRATEGIES IN BOLD)	EXAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTARY ARTS AND CULTURE APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
Historic Preservation	Nonprofit sector	Public sector, Private sector	Defining Historic Context; Secretary of Interior State and Local Historic Preservation Designation; Historic Building Protection and Regulation; Architectural Surveys; Historic Events, Pioneers, and Local History; Historic Conservation Districts	Oral history documentation led by artist-ethnographers; production of history-inspired events to engage the public in historic preservation and data collection efforts

AICP PLANNER SPECIALTY COMPETENCIES / PRACTICE AREAS	PRIMARY SECTOR	SECONDARY SECTORS	FOCUS AREAS (AUTHOR'S ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE AREAS THAT CAN BE ENHANCED THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE INTERVENTIONS AND STRATEGIES IN BOLD)	EXAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTARY ARTS AND CULTURE APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
Housing	Public sector	Private sector	<p>Poverty, Planning, History and Housing Policy; Housing Needs Assessment; Real Estate Economics and Market Differentiation; Federal and State Housing Law; Public Health and Minimum Housing Standards; Housing Maintenance Regulations; Affordable Housing Finance; Non-Profit Housing Development and Management</p>	Temporary or permanent public art commissioned on themes pertaining to housing topics including housing supply, affordable housing, and healthy housing as part of outreach and engagement efforts for the planning process

AICP PLANNER SPECIALTY COMPETENCIES / PRACTICE AREAS	PRIMARY SECTOR	SECONDARY SECTORS	FOCUS AREAS (AUTHOR'S ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE AREAS THAT CAN BE ENHANCED THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE INTERVENTIONS AND STRATEGIES IN BOLD)	EXAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTARY ARTS AND CULTURE APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
Land Use and Codes	Public sector	Private sector	Regulatory authority and limits; Conventional zoning standards; Performance standards; State enabling legislation and case law; Site Design and Land Use Analysis; Building code review; Housing Maintenance code review; Site and building inspection; Documentation and tracking; Appeals and adjudication; Form- Based regulation	Amendment of zoning to remove barriers to temporary and permanent arts and culture uses and activities including tactical urbanism and placemaking and public art events, installations, and performances and arts and artisan manufacturing uses in mixed use, commercial and light industrial zones and districts

AICP PLANNER SPECIALTY COMPETENCIES / PRACTICE AREAS	PRIMARY SECTOR	SECONDARY SECTORS	FOCUS AREAS (AUTHOR'S ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE AREAS THAT CAN BE ENHANCED THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE INTERVENTIONS AND STRATEGIES IN BOLD)	EXAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTARY ARTS AND CULTURE APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
Natural Hazards and Mitigation; Disaster Preparedness Planning	Public sector	Private sector	Local Resilience; Earth Science; History and Natural Hazards; Climate Change; Floodplain and Hazard Mapping; Storm Water Management; Flood and Wind Proofing; Design Standards; System Strength; Autonomy and Redundancy; Communications and Emergency Response Protocols; Natural Systems; Capacity/Wetlands/Conservation; Slope	Temporary or permanent public art led by social practice artists that integrates art and design into the structural execution of environmental management, treatment and remediation solutions; arts-based engagement and communications strategies in support of hazard mitigation and disaster preparedness,

AICP PLANNER SPECIALTY COMPETENCIES / PRACTICE AREAS	PRIMARY SECTOR	SECONDARY SECTORS	FOCUS AREAS (AUTHOR'S ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE AREAS THAT CAN BE ENHANCED THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE INTERVENTIONS AND STRATEGIES IN BOLD)	EXAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTARY ARTS AND CULTURE APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
			Stabilization/Erosion Management; Active Early Warning systems; Sustainable Development; Anti-Terror Design	with a focus on hard-to-reach populations
Parks and Recreation	Public sector	Private sector	Parks and Open Space Planning and Site Design; Recreation Programming; Park System Master Plans; Grants, Funding; Facilities Management; Healthy Communities Planning; Scenic Resources; Greenways, Pathways, and Trails;	Temporary or permanent public art; Integration of innovative art and design in park and open space infrastructure; integration of art and design into signage and wayfinding; integration of art and design into

AICP PLANNER SPECIALTY COMPETENCIES / PRACTICE AREAS	PRIMARY SECTOR	SECONDARY SECTORS	FOCUS AREAS (AUTHOR'S ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE AREAS THAT CAN BE ENHANCED THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE INTERVENTIONS AND STRATEGIES IN BOLD)	EXAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTARY ARTS AND CULTURE APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
			Environmental Planning and Conservation; Stormwater Management	stormwater management infrastructure
Planning Management	Public sector	Private sector, Nonprofit sector	Program Evaluation; Budgeting and Financial Administration; Performance Assessment; Strategic Planning; Property and Resource Management; Recruiting and Personnel Management; Vendor Solicitation, Selection and Management; Professional Development , Planning and Monitoring;	Professional development in public art, arts-based civic engagement, cultural economic development, cultural districts, and civic art and design; procurement of vendors with specific competencies in arts and culture fields of practice, such as creative

AICP PLANNER SPECIALTY COMPETENCIES / PRACTICE AREAS	PRIMARY SECTOR	SECONDARY SECTORS	FOCUS AREAS (AUTHOR'S ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE AREAS THAT CAN BE ENHANCED THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE INTERVENTIONS AND STRATEGIES IN BOLD)	EXAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTARY ARTS AND CULTURE APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
			Training and Managing Elected and Appointed Officials	placemaking and social practice public art
Sustainability Planning	Public sector	Private sector	Environment and ecological systems; Economic Analysis; Social Equity Concepts; Public engagement; Food Systems Planning; Growth Management; Clean Energy [added]	Please see examples listed under Natural Hazards and Mitigation; Disaster Preparedness Planning, Environmental Planning, Parks and Recreation, Environment and Natural Resources, and Community Activism and Empowerment

AICP PLANNER SPECIALTY COMPETENCIES / PRACTICE AREAS	PRIMARY SECTOR	SECONDARY SECTORS	FOCUS AREAS (AUTHOR'S ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE AREAS THAT CAN BE ENHANCED THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE INTERVENTIONS AND STRATEGIES IN BOLD)	EXAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTARY ARTS AND CULTURE APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
Transportation	Public sector	Private sector, Nonprofit sector	Land Use and Transportation Demand; Road Hierarchy, Access and Property Value; Transportation Modes; Capacity Analysis; Demand Analysis; Transit-Oriented Development; Rail, Freight and Industry; Ports, Airports, Intermodal Facilities; Pathways and Pedestrian interconnection; Bicycle and Non-Motorized Routes	Integration of public art as a component of the placemaking strategy in Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) areas; temporary and permanent public art in ports, airports, and intermodal facilities and bicycles, trails, and paths as part of signage and wayfinding

AICP PLANNER SPECIALTY COMPETENCIES / PRACTICE AREAS	PRIMARY SECTOR	SECONDARY SECTORS	FOCUS AREAS (AUTHOR'S ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE AREAS THAT CAN BE ENHANCED THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE INTERVENTIONS AND STRATEGIES IN BOLD)	EXAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTARY ARTS AND CULTURE APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
Arts, Culture, and Design [Expanded from 'Design']	Public sector	Private sector, Nonprofit sector	Analysis of Urban Form and Fabric; Districts, Corridors, Interconnections, and Edges; Wayfinding and Legibility; Views, movement and transitions; Density, Intensity, Building Height; Human Scale and Comfort; Image, Identity and Sense of Place; Public Places and Streetscape; Climate Sensitive Design; Public Safety; Aesthetics, Emotion, Psychological, and Social Context; Public	Integration of temporary and permanent public art into public spaces and the design of public infrastructure, signage and wayfinding; arts engagement activities and programming to promote creative placemaking and public safety; inclusion of artists as part of design and development teams for

AICP PLANNER SPECIALTY COMPETENCIES / PRACTICE AREAS	PRIMARY SECTOR	SECONDARY SECTORS	FOCUS AREAS (AUTHOR'S ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE AREAS THAT CAN BE ENHANCED THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE INTERVENTIONS AND STRATEGIES IN BOLD)	EXAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTARY ARTS AND CULTURE APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
			Art	transportation, housing, open space, water resources, and other public infrastructure projects

**APPENDIX D: A PUBLIC SECTOR ACTION AGENDA TO INCENTIVIZE INTEGRATION OF ARTS AND CULTURE INTO
PLANNING PROGRAMS, PROJECTS, AND POLICIES**

The public sector can exhibit leadership in promoting cross-sector arts, culture, and planning collaborations to creatively advance livability. The following matrix is a public sector action agenda outlining recommended interventions at the national, state, regional, and local levels to incentivize innovations at the intersection of arts, culture, and planning.

Matrix of Public Sector Actions to Create Policy and Planning Conditions for Arts, Culture, and Creativity to Thrive

LEVEL OF INTERVENTION	STRATEGY	LEAD ENTITIES	INVOLVED ENTITIES	DESCRIPTION
National	Create opportunities for artists to learn the language and processes of planning and for planners to learn the language and processes of artists	Federal Agencies; Philanthropy	Planning departments, artists	Award grants to local and regional governments to establish artist residencies that place artists within local planning departments and regional planning agencies (Example: St. Paul, Minnesota City Artist Program, 2016)

LEVEL OF INTERVENTION	STRATEGY	LEAD ENTITIES	INVOLVED ENTITIES	DESCRIPTION
National	Develop an American Planning Association (APA) policy and planning guide on arts and culture for planners	American Planning Association	APA Arts and Planning Interest Group members	Submit a proposal to the APA Legislative and Policy Committee to Develop an Arts, Culture, and Planning Policy Guide
National	Develop a menu of professional development resources on arts, culture, and planning topics for planners	American Planning Association	Philanthropy; APA Arts and Planning Interest Group members	Develop professional development offerings in partnership with a team of arts practitioners and planners with experience in areas such as cultural planning, creative placemaking, public art, arts considerations in zoning and permitting, and creative economic development. Expand on existing resources to include webinars and additional case studies. Hire a visiting fellow in the Research Division who can spearhead the

LEVEL OF INTERVENTION	STRATEGY	LEAD ENTITIES	INVOLVED ENTITIES	DESCRIPTION
				development of these resources and engage the APA Arts and Planning Interest Group in the development of these resources. (Example: APA Arts and Culture Briefing Papers, 1-5, 2011)
State	Create resources that facilitate relationships and collaboration on arts and culture within local government	Regional Arts Organizations, State Arts Agencies	Public art programs, local cultural councils, local government departments, divisions, boards, councils, commissions	Issue best practices guidance and case examples of the ways in which local cultural councils and public art programs are working with planning departments to embed arts and culture as part of government planning and infrastructure initiatives

Livability and Creativity:
Civic Innovations at the Intersection of Arts, Culture, and Planning

LEVEL OF INTERVENTION	STRATEGY	LEAD ENTITIES	INVOLVED ENTITIES	DESCRIPTION
State	Create incentives for local and regional government to pilot integration of arts and culture in planning	State offices of planning, including housing, transportation, and the environment	Regional planning agencies (RPAs), councils of government (COGs), metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs)	Award additional grants to local and regional governments who are recipients of state grants pertaining to planning to encourage integration of arts and culture as part of planning projects, with a focus on community engagement (Example: MassDevelopment Transformative Development TDI Places Placemaking Grant, 2016)
Regional	Convene partners in local planning to spearhead a statewide arts, culture, and	RPAs, COGs, MPOs	Planners working in the public, nonprofit, and private	Convene planners and other local government leaders around the development and implementation of an arts, culture, and planning policy agenda that focuses on identifying and

Livability and Creativity:
Civic Innovations at the Intersection of Arts, Culture, and Planning

LEVEL OF INTERVENTION	STRATEGY	LEAD ENTITIES	INVOLVED ENTITIES	DESCRIPTION
	planning policy agenda		sectors	removing zoning and permitting barriers to arts and culture uses, facilities, and programming and activities in the public realm. Work with state arts agencies and local, state, and national arts advocacy organizations as appropriate.
Regional	Create incentives for local governments to pilot integration of arts and culture into planning programs, projects, and policies	RPAs, COGs, MPOs	Cities, towns, county jurisdictions	Allocate funding to RPAs, COGs, and MPOs to re-grant to member jurisdictions - cities, towns, and counties - for projects at the intersection of arts, culture, and planning, e.g., cultural planning and creative placemaking. Consider releasing funding in rounds targeted to specific disciplines of planning, such as land use, housing, economic development, transportation, environment, open space, energy, public health, and public safety.

Livability and Creativity:
Civic Innovations at the Intersection of Arts, Culture, and Planning

LEVEL OF INTERVENTION	STRATEGY	LEAD ENTITIES	INVOLVED ENTITIES	DESCRIPTION
Regional	Create opportunities for regional agencies to pilot arts and culture approaches in planning	RPAs, COGs, MPOs	Cities, towns, county jurisdictions	Release competitive funding to enable regional planners to develop competencies in arts and culture, and who can, in turn, develop resources, best practice, and trainings for jurisdictions in their service areas.
Local	Pursue local planning to create the local planning frameworks and policy conditions that can help arts, culture, creativity to thrive	Cities, towns, county jurisdictions	Arts and culture individuals and organizations in the public and private sector; general public	Conduct cultural asset mapping and cultural planning to develop local action plans for supporting the growth and preservation of arts and cultural assets in the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. Action plans may identify strategies to support naturally occurring and designated cultural districts and clusters of arts and cultural agencies, spaces, and facilities. (Example: Denver IMAGINE 2020 Cultural Plan)

LEVEL OF INTERVENTION	STRATEGY	LEAD ENTITIES	INVOLVED ENTITIES	DESCRIPTION
Local	Launch a cultural equity and inclusion initiative to promote fair access to arts and cultural opportunities and modes of creative expression	Cities, towns, county jurisdictions	Arts and cultural institutions, facilities, and programs	Conduct a cultural equity study to examine diversity in arts and cultural participation and diversity of populations served by existing arts and cultural institutions, facilities, and programs to identify gaps in arts and cultural opportunity (Example: Los Angeles County Arts Commission Cultural Equity and Inclusion Initiative, 2016)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agyeman, Julian and Jennifer Sien Erickson. 2012. "Culture, Recognition, and the Negotiation of Difference: Some Thoughts on Cultural Competency in Planning Education." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 32 (3): 358-366. doi:10.1177/0739456X12441213. <http://jpe.sagepub.com/content/32/3/358.full.pdf+html>.
- Ahmad, Yahaya. 2006. "The Scope and Definitions of Heritage: From Tangible to Intangible." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12 (3): 292-300. doi:10.1080/13527250600604639. <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.library.tufts.edu/10.1080/13527250600604639>.
- American Planning Association. 2014. "American Institute for Certified Planners (AICP) Planning Core Competencies Exercises DRAFT as of 2/10/2014." Accessed on March 7, 2016, https://planning-org-uploaded-media.s3.amazonaws.com/legacy_resources/aicp/commoncore/pdf/matrix.pdf.
- American Planning Association. 2016a. "APA Interest Groups." Accessed June 20, 2016, <https://www.planning.org/divisions/interestgroups/>.
- American Planning Association. 2016b. "What Skills do Planners Need?" Accessed on June 20, 2016, <https://www.planning.org/onthejob/skills.htm>.
- Americans for the Arts. 2012. *Arts and Economic Prosperity IV: The Economic Impact of Nonprofit Arts and Culture Organizations and their Audiences*. Washington, D.C. http://www.americansforthearts.org/sites/default/files/pdf/information_services/research/services/economic_impact/aepiv//AEP4_NationalSummaryReport.pdf.
- Americans for the Arts. 2016. "Statement on Cultural Equity." Accessed on June 20, 2016, <http://www.americansforthearts.org/about-americans-for-the-arts/statement-on-cultural-equity>.
- Armitage, Rachel and Tim Pascoe. 2016. *Crime Prevention through Environmental Design*. Handbook of Crime Prevention and Citizen Security for Latin America. Ediciones Didot.
- Art at Work: A Terra Moto Initiative. 2016. "Homepage." Accessed on November 11, 2015, <http://www.artatwork.us/portland.php>.
- ArtPlace America. "National Creative Placemaking Fund." Accessed on March 7, 2016, <http://www.artplaceamerica.org/our-work/national-creative-placemaking-fund/introduction>.
- Assaf, Andrea, Korza, Pam and Schaffer Bacon, Barbara. 2002. "INROADS: The Intersection of Art & Civic Dialogue." Accessed on September 5, 2015, http://wayback.archive-it.org/2077/20100906195312/http://www.communityarts.net/readingroom/archivefiles/2002/08/inroadsthe_inte.php.
- Atlas, Caron. 2002. "Cultural Policy: In the Board Rooms and on the Streets." Accessed on September 5, 2015, http://wayback.archive-it.org/2077/20100906195303/http://www.communityarts.net/readingroom/archivefiles/2002/08/cultural_policy.php.
- Baltimore Office of Promotion & the Arts. n.d. "New Zoning Code Benefits Arts Enterprises." Accessed on March 7, 2016, <http://www.baltimorearts.org/how-to/new-zoning-code-benefits-arts-enterprises/>.
- Beavers, Kelly Ann and Kimberley Hodgson. 2011. *How Arts and Cultural Strategies Enhance Community Engagement and Participation*. Chicago, IL: American Planning Association. <https://www.planning.org/research/arts/briefingpapers/engagement.htm>.

- Borén, Thomas and Craig Young. 2013. "Getting Creative with the 'Creative City'?: Towards New Perspectives on Creativity in Urban Policy." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37 (5): 1799-1815. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2012.01132.x. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2012.01132.x>.
- Borup, Thomas C. 2007. *The Creative Community Builder's Handbook: How to Transform Communities using Local Assets, Art, and Culture*. Vol. 22. St. Paul, MN: Fieldstone Alliance.
- Borup, Thomas C. 2016. "Creative Placemaking: Arts and Culture as a Partner in Community Revitalization." In *Fundamentals of Arts Management*. 6th ed. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Arts Extension Service.
- Calderwood-Ginn, Jon and Bob Leonard. 2012. *Playing for the Public Good: The Arts in Planning and Government*. Washington, D.C.: Americans for the Arts. <http://animatingdemocracy.org/sites/default/files/LCrane%20Trend%20Paper.pdf>.
- Canadian National Rural Conference. 2002. *Asset Mapping: A Handbook*. North Bay, ON. https://ccednet-rcdec.ca/sites/ccednet-rcdec.ca/files/asset_mapping_handbook.pdf.
- Cartiere, Cameron. 2009. "Exploring the Impact of Public Art in Light-Rail Systems Above and Below Ground." 2 (2): 172. <https://trid.trb.org/view/913250>.
- Catterall, James S. 2009. *Doing Well and Doing Good by Doing Art: A 12-Year Longitudinal Study of Arts Education—Effects on the Achievements and Values of Young Adults*. Los Angeles, CA: I-Group Books.
- Catterall, James S., Susan A. Dumais, and Gillian Hampden-Thompson. 2012. *The Arts and Achievement in at-Risk Youth: Findings from Four Longitudinal Studies*. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts. <https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/Arts-At-Risk-Youth.pdf>.
- Chartrand, Harry Hillman and McCaughey, Claire. 1989. "The Arm's Length Principle and the Arts: An International Perspective - Past, Present and Future." In *Who's to Pay? for the Arts: The International Search for Models of Support*, edited by M. C. Cummings Jr. and J. Mark Davidson Schuster. New York, NY: American Council for the Arts. <http://www.compilerpress.ca/Cultural%20Economics/Works/Arm%201%201989.htm>
- Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP). 2014. *Arts and Culture Planning: A Toolkit for Communities*. Chicago, IL. <http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/76006/FY14-0006+ARTS+AND+CULTURE+TOOLKIT+lowres.pdf/f276849a-f363-44d4-89e1-8c1f2b11332f>.
- City and County of San Francisco, California. 2015. "Permit Process Overview." City and County of San Francisco, accessed May 4, 2016, <http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/learn-the-process/permit-process/>.
- City of Boston, Massachusetts. 2016. *Boston Creates Cultural Plan*. Boston, MA. <http://plan.bostoncreates.org/plan/>.
- City of Lowell, Massachusetts. 2004. *Zoning Book*. <http://www.lowellma.gov/dpd/devservices/Documents/Land%20Board%20Regulations/Zoning%20Code.pdf>.
- City of Lowell, Massachusetts. 2016. "Origin and Significance of Design." Accessed on May 4, 2016, <http://www.lowellma.gov/cityclerk/Pages/General/City-Seal.aspx>.

- City of Peekskill, New York. 2000. Adopted by the Common Council of the City of Peekskill 12-11-2000 (Ch. 109 of the 1984 Code). *Zoning Code Chapter 169: Artist Lofts*.
<http://ecode360.com/6428771?highlight=arts#6428771>.
- City of Portland, Maine. 2016. "Public Art Portland.", <http://www.publicartportland.org>.
- City of Somerville, Massachusetts. 2015. *Somerville Zoning Ordinance Board of Aldermen Submittal*
January 22, 2015. <http://www.somervillema.gov/zoning/resources/2015-01-22-BOA-Submittal.pdf>.
- City of Somerville, Massachusetts. 2016. "City of Somerville Zoning Overhaul: Key Changes in the New Code." Accessed on May 4, 2016, <http://somervillema.gov/zoning/key-changes.html>.
- City of Somerville, Massachusetts. 2009. *Rezoning Union Square: The Arts Perspective*. Somerville, MA: City of Somerville Mayor's Office of Strategic Planning and Community Development.
<http://somervilleartscouncil.org/sacfiles/imce/editor/artsunion/Rezoning%20Union%20Square%20The%20Arts%20Perspective.pdf>.
- Clawson, Heather and Kathleen Coolbaugh. 2001. "The YouthARTS Development Project." *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention: Juvenile Justice Bulletin*.
<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojdp/186668.pdf>.
- Cohen, Gene D., Susan Perlstein, Jeff Chapline, Jeanne Kelly, Kimberly M. Firth, and Samuel Simmens. 2006. "The Impact of Professionally Conducted Cultural Programs on the Physical Health, Mental Health, and Social Functioning of Older Adults." *The Gerontologist* 46 (6): 726-734. doi:10.1093/geront/46.6.726.
<http://gerontologist.oxfordjournals.org/content/46/6/726.abstract>.
- Community Partnership for Arts and Culture. 2009. *A Guide to Mapping Neighborhood Arts and Cultural Assets*. Cleveland, OH.
<http://www.cultureforward.org/content/download/772/8943/file/Asset%20Mapping%20Guide.pdf>.
- Creative City Network of Canada. 2016a. "CNCC Toolkits." Accessed on January 20, 2016,
<http://www.creativecity.ca/publications/ccnc-toolkits.php>.
- Creative City Network of Canada. 2016b. *Cultural Mapping Toolkit*. Vancouver, BC.
http://www.creativecity.ca/database/files/library/cultural_mapping_toolkit.pdf.
- Creative City Network of Canada. 2016c. *Cultural Planning Toolkit*. Vancouver, BC.
http://www.creativecity.ca/database/files/library/cultural_planning_toolkit.pdf.
- Creative City Network of Canada. 2016d. *Public Art Toolkit*. Vancouver, BC.
[http://www.creativecity.ca/database/files/library/Public_Art_Toolkit\(2\).pdf](http://www.creativecity.ca/database/files/library/Public_Art_Toolkit(2).pdf).
- Crowe, Timothy D. and Lawrence J. Fennelly. 2013. *Crime Prevention through Environmental Design*, edited by Brian Romer. Third Edition ed. Waltham, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann, an Imprint of Elsevier.
- Dreeszen, Craig. 1997. "Community Cultural Planning: Development and Design to Meet Local Needs.".
[http://www.americansforthearts.org/sites/default/files/Community%20Cultural%20Planning%20\('98\)_0.pdf](http://www.americansforthearts.org/sites/default/files/Community%20Cultural%20Planning%20('98)_0.pdf).

- Dreeszen, Craig. 1999. *Who's on First? Resolving Problems of Implementation in Public-Sector Planning*. <https://4good.org/morrie-warshawski-consultant/who-s-on-first-resolving-problems-of-implementation-in-public-sector-planning-by-craig-dreeszen>.
- Dwyer, M. Christine and Kelly Ann Beavers. 2011. *How the Arts and Culture Sector Catalyzes Economic Vitality*. Chicago, IL: American Planning Association. <https://www.planning.org/research/arts/briefingpapers/vitality.htm>.
- Eger, John. 2014. *Arts and Culture Districts: Financing, Funding, and Sustaining Them*. Washington, D.C.: Americans for the Arts National Cultural Districts Exchange. http://www.americansforthearts.org/sites/default/files/pdf/2014/by_program/reports_and_data/toolkits/cultural_districts/issue_briefs/Art-and-Culture-Districts-Financing-Funding-and-Sustaining-Them.pdf.
- Federal Transit Administration. 1995. "Federal Transit Administration Design and Art in Transit Projects." Accessed on April 4, 2016, http://www.fta.dot.gov/13094_4129.html.
- Gadwa Nicodemus, Anne. 2013. "Fuzzy Vibrancy: Creative Placemaking as Ascendant US Cultural Policy." 22 (3-4): 213. doi:10.1080/09548963.2013.817653. <http://metrisarts.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/GadwaNicodemusFuzzyVibrancyManuscript.pdf>.
- Gehl, Jan. 2010. *Cities for People*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- General Services Administration. 2015. *Guiding Principles for Federal Architecture*. Washington, D.C. <http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/136543>.
- Grogan, David, Colin Mercer, and David Engwicht. 1995. *The Cultural Planning Handbook: An Essential Australian Guide* Allen & Unwin.
- Henchman, Joseph. 2013. *How is the Money used? Federal and State Cases Distinguishing Taxes and Fees*. Washington, D.C.: The Tax Foundation. <http://taxfoundation.org/sites/default/files/docs/TaxesandFeesBook.pdf>.
- Hodgson, Kimberley and Kelly Ann Beavers. 2011. *The Role of the Arts and Culture in Planning Practice*. Chicago, IL: American Planning Association. <https://www.planning.org.ezproxy.library.tufts.edu/research/arts/briefingpapers/overview.html>.
- Iveson, Kurt. 2013. "Cities within the City: Do-it-Yourself Urbanism and the Right to the City." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37 (3): 941-956. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12053. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12053>.
- Jackson, Maria Rosario and Joaquin Herranz Jr. 2002. *Culture Counts in Communities: A Framework for Measurement*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute. http://www.urban.org/research/publication/culture-counts-communities/view/full_report.
- Jackson, Maria Rosario, Kimberley Hodgson, and Kelly Ann Beavers. 2011. *How the Arts and Cultural Sector Strengthen Cultural Values and Preserve Heritage and History*. Chicago, IL: American Planning Association. <https://www.planning.org/research/arts/briefingpapers/values.htm>.
- Jackson, Maria Rosario and Florence Kabwasa-Green. 2007. *Artist Space Development: Making the Case*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/research/publication/artist-space-development-making-case>.
- Jackson, Maria Rosario, Florence Kabwasa-Green, and Joaquin Herranz Jr. 2006. *Cultural Vitality in Communities: Interpretation and Indicators*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute. http://www.urban.org/research/publication/cultural-vitality-communities-interpretation-and-indicators/view/full_report.

- Jackson, Maria Rosario, Florence Kabwasa-Green, Daniel Swenson, Joaquin Herranz Jr., Kadija Ferryman, Caron Atlas, Eric Wallner, and Carole Rosenstein. 2003. *Investing in Creativity: A Study of the Support Structure for U.S. Artists*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/411311-Investing-in-Creativity.PDF>.
- Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Johnson, Amanda G. 2006. "Minneapolis Zoning Code: Artist Live/Work Recommendations." Master of Urban and Regional Planning, The University of Minnesota, https://works.bepress.com/amanda_johnson1/16/ (accessed February 24, 2016).
- Kelling, George L. and James Q. Wilson. 1982. "Broken Windows: The Police and Neighborhood Safety." *Atlantic Monthly*. <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1982/03/broken-windows/304465/>.
- Kleespies, Gavin W. and MacDonald, Katie. n.d. "Arts on the Line." Accessed on October 20, 2015, <http://www.harvardsquare.com/history/historical-sites/arts-on-the-line>.
- Kroeber, A. L. and Clyde Kluckhohn. 1952. *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Peabody Museum of American Archeology and Ethnology Papers.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1974. *The Production of Space* [Production de l'espace. English]. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. English Translation First Published in 1991 ed. Oxford, OX, UK; Cambridge, Mass., USA: Blackwell.
- Lydon, Mike and Anthony Garcia. 2012, 2013, 2014. *Tactical Urbanism Guide Volumes 1, 2, 3 and 4*. Washington, D.C.: Street Plans Collaborative. <http://www.tacticalurbanismguide.com/existing-resources-2/>.
- Markusen, Ann. 2013. *How Cities can Nurture Cultural Entrepreneurs*. Kansas City, MO: Ewing Marion Kaufmann Foundation. http://papers.ssrn.com.ezproxy.library.tufts.edu/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID2357724_code_861608.pdf?abstractid=2357724&mirid=1.
- Markusen, Ann and Anne Gadwa. 2010. "Arts and Culture in Urban or Regional Planning: A Review and Research Agenda." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 29 (3): 379. <http://jpe.sagepub.com.ezproxy.library.tufts.edu/content/29/3/379.refs>.
- Markusen, Ann and Anne Gadwa. 2014. "Creative Placemaking: How to do it Well." *Community Development Investment Review* 10 (2): 35.
- Markusen, Ann, Gregory H. Wassall, Douglas DeNatale, and Randy Cohen. 2008. "Defining the Creative Economy: Industry and Occupational Approaches." *Economic Development Quarterly* 22 (1): 24. doi:10.1177/0891242407311862. <http://edq.sagepub.com.ezproxy.library.tufts.edu/content/22/1/24.full.pdf+html>.
- Massachusetts Cultural Council. 2016a. "About Us." Accessed on March 4, 2016, <http://www.massculturalcouncil.org/about/about.asp>.
- Massachusetts Cultural Council. 2016b. "Cultural Districts Designation Guidelines." Accessed on March 4, 2016, http://www.massculturalcouncil.org/applications/culturaldistricts_guidelines.asp.
- Massachusetts Cultural Council. 2016c. "Massachusetts Cultural Facilities Fund." Accessed on March 4, 2016, <http://www.massculturalcouncil.org/facilities/facilities.htm>.

- Massachusetts Cultural Council. 2016d. "MCC Approves \$12M for Public Programs in the Arts, Sciences & Humanities." Accessed on March 4, 2016, http://www.massculturalcouncil.org/news/FY16_spending_plan.asp.
- Massachusetts Cultural Council. 2016e. "Online Toolkit for Local Cultural Councils." Accessed on March 4, 2016, https://www.mass-culture.org/lcc_public_applicant_about.aspx.
- Mauldin, Bronwyn, Jessie Ruskin, Matthew Agustin, and Susannah Laramee Kidd. 2016. *Los Angeles County Arts Commission Cultural Equity and Inclusion Initiative Literature Review*.
http://www.issuelab.org/resource/los_angeles_county_arts_commission_cultural_equity_and_inclusion_initiative_literature_review.
- Mawby, R. I. 1977. "Defensible Space: A Theoretical and Empirical Appraisal." *Urban Studies* 14 (2): 169-179. doi:10.1080/00420987720080321.
<http://usj.sagepub.com/content/14/2/169.abstract>.
- Merry, Sally E. 1981. "Defensible Space Undefended: Social Factors in Crime Control through Environmental Design." *Urban Affairs Review* 16 (4): 397-422.
doi:10.1177/107808748101600401. <http://uar.sagepub.com/content/16/4/397.abstract>.
- Metropolitan Area Planning Council. 2008a. *MetroFuture Regional Plan Goals and Objectives*. Boston, MA.
http://www.mapc.org/sites/default/files/MetroFuture_Goals_and_Objectives_1_Dec_2008.pdf.
- Metropolitan Area Planning Council. 2008b. *MetroFuture Regional Plan Implementation Strategies*. Boston, MA.
http://www.mapc.org/sites/default/files/MetroFuture_Implementation_Strategies_outline.pdf.
- Metropolitan Area Planning Council. 2015a. "Photovoice.",
<http://www.mapc.org/photovoiceprojects>.
- Metropolitan Area Planning Council. 2015b. "Salem Point Neighborhood Vision and Action Plan.", <http://www.mapc.org/salempointvision>.
- Metropolitan Area Planning Council. 2016a. "Arts and Culture." <http://www.mapc.org/art>.
- Metropolitan Area Planning Council. 2016b. "Arts and Planning Toolkit.",
<http://www.artsandplanning.org>.
- Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee. 2015a. *NashvilleNext: A General Plan for Nashville and Davidson County. Volume IV: Actions*.
<http://www.nashville.gov/Portals/0/SiteContent/Planning/docs/NashvilleNext/PlanVolumes/next-volume4-Actions.pdf>.
- Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee. 2015b. *ORDINANCE NO. BL2015-1121. An Ordinance to Amend Various Sections of Title 17 of the Metropolitan Zoning Code Related to Artisan Manufacturing and Associated Uses. (Proposal no. 2015Z-009TX-001)*. http://www.nashville.gov/mc/ordinances/term_2011_2015/bl2015_1121.pdf.
- Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee. 2016. "Metropolitan Government." Accessed on January 5, 2016, <https://www.nashville.gov/Government.aspx>.
- Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation. "United States Regional Arts Organizations: History." Accessed on December 4, 2015, <http://usregionalarts.org/about-the-regionals/>.

- Miller, Stephen R. 2012. "Percent-for-Art Programs at Public Art's Frontier." *Zoning and Planning Law Report* 35 (5): February 24, 2016.
http://papers.ssrn.com.ezproxy.library.tufts.edu/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID2110341_code1475204.pdf?abstractid=2110341&mirid=1.
- Morley, Elaine, Mary K. Winkler, Simone Zhang, Rachel Brash, and Juan Collazos. 2014. *The Validating Arts and Livability Indicators (VALI) Study: Results and Recommendations*. Washington, DC: Prepared by the Urban Institute for the National Endowment for the Arts.
<https://www.arts.gov/publications/validating-arts-livability-indicators-vali-study-results-and-recommendations>.
- Mould, Oli. 2014. "Tactical Urbanism: The New Vernacular of the Creative City." *Geography Compass* 8 (8): 529-539. doi:10.1111/gec3.12146. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12146>.
- National Alliance of Community Development Associations (NACEDA). 2016. "What is Community Development?" Accessed on February 7, 2016, <http://www.naceda.org/what-is-community-development>.
- National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. 2005. *States and the Creative Economy*. Washington, D.C. http://www.nasaa-arts.org/Research/Key-Topics/Creative-Economic-Development/creative_econ_brief.pdf.
- National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. 2013. *Percent for Art Policy Brief*. Washington, DC. www.nasaa-arts.org/Research/Key-Topics/Public-Art/NASAAPercentforArtPolicyBrief.pdf.
- National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. 2014. *State Policy Briefs: Why Should Government Support the Arts?* Washington, DC. <http://www.nasaa-arts.org/Advocacy/Advocacy-Tools/Why-Government-Support/WhyGovSupport.pdf>.
- National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. 2015a. *State Legislative Roundup: October 2015*. Washington, D.C. <http://www.nasaa-arts.org/Research/Funding/2015StateLegislativeRoundup.php>.
- National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. 2015b. *State Policy Briefs: State Arts Agency Dedicated Revenue Strategies*. Washington, DC. <http://www.nasaa-arts.org/Research/Funding/PolicyBrief-DedicatedRevenues.pdf>.
- National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. 2015c. *State Policy Briefs: State Cultural Districts*. Washington, DC. <http://www.nasaa-arts.org/Research/Key-Topics/Creative-Economic-Development/StateCulturalDistrictsPolicyBrief.pdf>.
- National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. 2016a. *Income Tax Checkoffs*. Washington, DC. <http://www.nasaa-arts.org/Research/Funding/Income-Tax-Checkoffs.php>.
- National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. 2016b. *Special Taxes and Fees*. Washington, DC. <http://www.nasaa-arts.org/Research/Funding/Special-Taxes-and-Fees.php>.
- National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. 2016c. *Specialty Plates Overview*. Washington, DC. <http://www.nasaa-arts.org/Research/Funding/Specialty-Arts-License-Plates.php>.
- National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. 2016d. *State Arts Agency Grantmaking and Funding*. Washington, DC. http://www.nasaa-arts.org/Research/Grant-Making/2016_grant_making_and_funding.pdf.
- National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. 2016e. *State Arts Agency Revenues Fiscal Year 2016*. Washington, D.C. <http://www.nasaa-arts.org/Research/Funding/State-Revenues-Center/NASAAFY2016SAAREvenuesPressRelease.pdf>.

- National Endowment for the Arts. 2007, Second Reprint. *The Arts and Civic Engagement: Involved in Arts, Involved in Life*. Washington, D.C.
<https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/CivicEngagement.pdf>.
- National Endowment for the Arts. 2012. *How the United States Funds the Arts, Third Edition*. Washington, D.C. <https://www.arts.gov/publications/how-united-states-funds-arts>.
- National Endowment for the Arts. 2016a. "Arts and Cultural Production Contributed \$704.2 Billion to the U.S. Economy in 2013." Accessed on March 1, 2016,
<https://www.arts.gov/news/2016/arts-and-cultural-production-contributed-7042-billion-us-economy-2013>.
- National Endowment for the Arts. 2016b. "Exploring our Town." Accessed on February 8, 2016,
<https://www.arts.gov/exploring-our-town/>.
- National Endowment for the Arts. 2016c. *National Endowment for the Arts 2015 Annual Report*. Washington, D.C. <https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/2015%20Annual%20Report.pdf>.
- National Endowment for the Arts. 2016d. "Exploring our Town: The Fargo Project." National Endowment for the Arts, accessed February 8, 2016, <https://www.arts.gov/exploring-our-town/fargo-project>.
- National Endowment for the Arts. 2016e. "FY 2016 our Town – Knowledge-Building Projects." Accessed on February 8, 2016, <https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/2016-and-2015-our-town-knowledge-building-grants.pdf>.
- National Endowment for the Arts. 2016f. "National Endowment for the Arts Appropriations History." Accessed on February 8, 2016, <https://www.arts.gov/open-government/national-endowment-arts-appropriations-history>.
- National Research Council. 2002. *Community and Quality of Life: Data Needs for Informed Decision Making*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- New England Foundation for the Arts. 2015. *New England Foundation for the Arts 2015 Annual Report*. http://www.nefa.org/sites/default/files/NEFA_2015_annualreport_final_web.pdf.
- Newman, Oscar. 1972. *Defensible Space* Macmillan New York.
- Noice, Helga, Tony Noice, and Graham Staines. 2004. "A Short-Term Intervention to Enhance Cognitive and Affective Functioning in Older Adults." *Journal of Aging and Health* 16 (4): 562. doi:10.1177/0898264304265819. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15271270>.
- O'Callaghan, Cian. 2010. "Let's Audit Bohemia: A Review of Richard Florida's 'Creative Class' Thesis and its Impact on Urban Policy." *Geography Compass* 4 (11): 1606. doi:10.1111/j.1749-8198.2010.00397.x.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229917420_Let's_Audit_Bohemia_A_Review_of_Richard_Florida's_'Creative_Class'_Thesis_and_Its_Impact_on_Urban_Policy.
- Partnership for Livable Communities. "What is Livability?" Accessed on February 4, 2016,
<http://www.livable.org/about-us/what-is-livability>.
- Partnership for Sustainable Communities. "About Us." Accessed on January 5, 2016,
<https://www.sustainablecommunities.gov/mission/about-us>.
- . "Livability Principles." Accessed on January 2, 2016,
<https://www.sustainablecommunities.gov/mission/livability-principles>.
- Peck Jamie. 2005. "Struggling with the Creative Class." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29 (4): 740-770. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2005.00620.x.
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2005.00620.x/full>.

- Peterson, Jon A. 1976. "The City Beautiful Movement: "Forgotten Origins and Lost Meanings"." *Journal of Urban History* 2 (4): 415-415.
<http://search.proquest.com/openview/69194925b7f5d893c9fe6f7e7f63e80e/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=1818658>.
- Portland Convention and Visitors Bureau. 2016. "The Creative and Cultural Hub of Maine.",
<https://www.visitportland.com/where-to-stay/hotels-motels-inns/downtown-old-port/cultural-hub>.
- Pottenger, Marty. 2012. *Creating Social Change through Community Connections & Shared Arts Experiences*. <http://blog.americansforthearts.org/2012/05/02/creating-social-change-through-community-connections-shared-arts-experiences>.
- Poyner, Barry. 1983. *Design Against Crime: Beyond Defensible Space* Butterworths London. Project for Public Spaces. "The Lighter Quicker Cheaper Transformation of Public Spaces." Accessed on January 7, 2016, <http://www.pps.org/reference/lighter-quicker-cheaper/>.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Rancière, Jacques. 2006. *Hatred of Democracy*. Translated by Steve Corcoran. London, UK: Verso.
- Rancière, Jacques. 2009. *History, Politics, Aesthetics*, edited by Gabriel Rockhill, Philip Watts Duke University Press.
- Redfield, Robert, Ralph Linton, and Melville J. Herskovits. 1936. "Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation." *American Anthropologist* 38 (1): 149-152.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/662563>.
- Reid, Daniel. 2009. "An American Vision of Federal Arts Subsidies: Why and how the U.S. Government should Support Artistic Expression." *Yale Journal of Law & the Humanities* 21 (2): 361.
<http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1352&context=yjlh>.
- Reps, John W. 1992. *The Making of Urban America. A History of City Planning in the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Robinson, Charles Mulford. 1901. *The Improvement of Towns and Cities; Or, the Practical Basis of Civic Aesthetics*. New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Ross, Caroline. 2016. *A Creative Placemaking Field Scan: Exploring the Ways Arts and Culture Intersects with Public Safety*. New York, NY: ArtPlace America.
http://www.artplaceamerica.org/view/pdf?f=public://pictures/artplace_field_scan_safety_ross_apr_2016_updated.pdf.
- Schuster, J. Mark. 1987. "Issues in Supporting the Arts through Tax Incentives." *Journal of Arts Management and Law* 16 (4): 31-50. doi:10.1080/07335113.1987.9943085.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07335113.1987.9943085>.
- Schuster, J. Mark. 1994. "Funding the Arts and Culture through Dedicated State lotteries—part I: The Twin Issues of Additionality and Substitution." *The European Journal of Cultural Policy* 1 (1): 21-41. doi:10.1080/10286639409357967.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10286639409357967>.
- Schuster, J. Mark. 1995. "Funding the Arts and Culture through Dedicated State lotteries—Part II: Opening the Way for Alternative Decision Making and Funding Structures." *The European Journal of Cultural Policy* 1 (2): 329-354. doi:10.1080/10286639509357990.
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10286639509357990>.

- Schuster, J. Mark. 2001. In *Imaging the City: Continuing Struggles and New Directions*, edited by Lawrence J. Vale and Sam Bass Warner Jr. New Brunswick, NJ: CUPR Books.
<http://culturalpolicy.uchicago.edu/sites/culturalpolicy.uchicago.edu/files/schuster-ephemera.pdf>.
- Schuster, J. Mark. 2002. "Sub-National Cultural Policy--Where the Action is: Mapping State Cultural Policy in the United States." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 8 (2): 181-196. doi:10.1080/1028663022000009623.
<http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.library.tufts.edu/10.1080/1028663022000009623>.
- Schuster, J. Mark. 2006. "Chapter 36 Tax Incentives in Cultural Policy." In *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture*. Vol. Volume 1, 1253-1298: Elsevier. doi: 10.1016/S1574-0676(06)01036-2. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1574067606010362>.
- Sherman, Danya. 2016. *A Creative Placemaking Field Scan: Exploring the Ways Arts and Culture Intersects with Housing*. New York, NY: ArtPlace America.
http://www.artplaceamerica.org/view/pdf?f=public://pictures/artplace_field_scan_housing_sherman_apr_2016.pdf.
- Smart Growth America. 2016. "Livability Principles." Accessed on March 3, 2016,
<http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/partnership/livability-principles>.
- Sollod, Ellen, Jann Rosen-Queralt, and Buster Simpson. 2003. *Brightwater Treatment System Art Master Plan: Prepared for the King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks and the Cultural Development Authority of King County*.
http://www.4culture.org/publicart/threads/learn/media/print/art_plans/brightwater/Brightwater_ArtMasterPlan.pdf.
- Soule, Jeff, Kimberley Hodgson, and Kelly Ann Beavers. 2011. *How Arts and Cultural Strategies Create, Reinforce, and Enhance Sense of Place*. Chicago, IL: American Planning Association. <https://www.planning.org/research/arts/briefingpapers/character.htm>.
- Stern, Mark J. 2014. "Measuring the Outcomes of Creative Placemaking." Baltimore, MD.
<http://impact.sp2.upenn.edu/siap/docs/Stern.BaltimoreTalk.10aug2014.v4revisions.pdf>.
- Talen, Emily. 2015. "Do-it-Yourself Urbanism: A History." *Journal of Planning History* 14 (2): 135. doi:10.1177/1538513214549325.
<http://jph.sagepub.com.ezproxy.library.tufts.edu/content/14/2/135.full.pdf+html>.
- Taylor, Eric. 2009. *The Evolution of 4Culture: A Chronology*. Seattle, WA: Heritage 4Culture Publications Program.
http://www.4culture.org/research/documents/EVOLUTION_OF_4CULTURE_CHRONOLOGY.pdf.
- Transportation for America. 2016. "The Scenic Route: Getting Started with Creative Placemaking in Transportation." Accessed on February 4, 2016,
<http://creativeplacemaking.t4america.org/>.
- United Nations. 2010. *Creative Economy Report 2010 -- the Creative Economy: A Feasible Development Option*. Geneva, CH: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the United Nations Development Programme.
http://unctad.org/en/Docs/ditctab20103_en.pdf.
- United Nations. 2013. *Creative Economy Report 2013 Special Edition: Widening Local Development Pathways*. New York, NY: United Nations Development Programme.
<http://www.unesco.org/culture/pdf/creative-economy-report-2013.pdf>.

- United Nations Terminology Database. 2016. "Community Development." Accessed on March 10, 2016, <https://unterm.un.org/UNTERM/search?urlQuery=community+development>.
- United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2011. *A Look at FY2010 Grantees: Grant Summaries*. Washington, D.C.
<http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=FY10RegPlanGrntSum.pdf>.
- Useem, John, Ruth Useem, and John Donoghue. 1963. "Men in the Middle of the Third Culture: The Roles of American and Non-Western People in Cross-Cultural Administration." *Human Organization* 22 (3): 169-179. doi:10.17730/humo.22.3.5470n44338kk6733.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.17730/humo.22.3.5470n44338kk6733>.
- Vasquez, Leonardo. 2012. *Creative Placemaking: Integrating Community, Cultural, and Economic Development*. Montclair, NJ: The National Consortium for Creative Placemaking.
<http://togethernorthjersey.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Creative-placemaking-integrating-CCED.pdf>.
- von Hoffman, Alexander. 2012. "The Past, Present, and Future of Community Development in the United States." In *Investing in what Works for America's Communities*: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco and the Low Income Investment Fund.
- Walker, Chris, Maria Rosario Jackson, and Carole Rosenstein. 2003. *Culture and Commerce: Traditional Arts in Economic Development*. Santa Fe, NM: The Fund for Folk Culture.
http://www.urban.org/research/publication/culture-and-commerce/view/full_report.
- Whyte, William H. 1980; Reprinted in 2001. *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces*. New York, NY: Project for Public Spaces.
- Woodward, Sophie. 2013. *Material Culture*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Bibliographies in Anthropology. doi:10.1093/obo/9780199766567-0085.
<http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199766567/obo-9780199766567-0085.xml?rskey=4SS1k3&result=3&q=material+culture#firstMatch>.
- Zukin, Sharon. 1996. *The Cultures of Cities*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.