MPA/MPP Capstone Projects   Martin School for Public Policy Administration

2011

Public Art Master Planning for Municipal Governments: Core Components and Common Practices

Jonathan Hollinger
University of Kentucky

Public Art Master Planning for Municipal Governments
Core Components and Common Practices

Jonathan Hollinger

Martin School of Public Policy and Administration
Spring 2011

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Executive Summary

Public art master planning for municipal government is the process of strategically planning the placement of public art objects, and the processes used to administer a public art program. It is a broad process that combines urban design and planning, artistic practice, public policy, local government management, and many other elements.

Due to this broad background, the master plan of a public art program is a complex document with many requirements. This analysis attempts to answer the following research questions:

- What is the common process for developing a public art master plan?

- What are the core components of a public art master plan?

- What are the recommended practices in those core components?

These questions were explored by reviewing the public art master plans of ten selected cities in three population groups, and consulting data and literature on public art programs. The number of plans in each population group were weighted based on the amount of public art programs in population ranges according to data provided in *A Detailed Statistical Report on the Budgets and Programming of the Nation's Public Art Programs During Fiscal Year 2001* published by Americans for the Arts. Three plans were selected from small cities (<100,000), two from medium cities (100,000 – 500,000), and five from large cities (>500,000).

From the review of the plans and relevant literature on the topic, the most common process for developing a public art master plan is through a broad taskforce or commission of community representatives. This group typically has members from local arts community groups, political leaders, city staff, artists, engineers and design professionals, and other stakeholders. Literature recommends that this body be composed of seven to nine members and employ the use of expert consultants to assist in the creation of the plan.

Twelve core components of public art master plans were also identified from this analysis. These components are:

1. Goals and Vision

2. Integration with other planning

3. Creating a Public Art Authority

4. Funding

5. Site Selection

6. Artist Selection

7. Staffing or Contracting Program Administration

8. Documentation of Public Art

9. Maintenance or Public Art

10. Acquisition and Removal of Public Art

11. The Receipt of Public Art Gifts

12. Educational Opportunities

The common practices for these components have been researched in public art literature and through their inclusion in actual public art master plans. Additional and more current research on the behavior and activities of public art programs is needed in order to better understand how public art master planning affects outcomes in the community.

Background and Methodology

Public art master planning for municipal government brings together a broad collection of elements. These include urban planning, public policy, local government management, arts administration, and a variety of others. To begin to analyze the idea of public art master planning, it is first necessary to define what public art is. Public art can only be broadly defined as any work of art placed in a public space. Expanding on this idea, public art programs are created to provide administration of public art in a community. This may include commissioning artwork for permanent or temporary display, purchasing existing artwork for permanent or temporary display, maintaining a public art collection, developing educational programming, creating public art informational materials, seeking out partnerships with public and private entities, as well as many other activities (Americans for the Arts, 2003).

These programs can be housed within government or in private, nonprofit organizations. The publication *A Detailed Statistical Report on the Budgets and Programming of the Nation's Public Art Programs During Fiscal Year 2001* indicated that, at the time of surveying, 81% of public art programs were within a government agency and that only 31% of public art programs had undertaken a master planning process. The majority (62%) of these plans had been completed since 1995, and 41% of those communities had updated their plan since creation (Americans for the Arts, 2003).

In fiscal year 2001, the majority of government public art programs were funded by a percent-for-art program. This system allocates a specified percentage of capital projects to be spent on public art. This percentage generally ranges from one-half to two percent and is typically codified in an ordinance. The previously mentioned survey found that 58% of government public art programs received their funding from a percent-for-art mechanism, also finding that 86% of public art programs that were established by ordinance allocated funding to the program (Americans for the Arts, 2003).

There are a variety of considerations that must be accounted for in a public art program. These include artist and site selection for public art projects, maintenance, funding, staffing, administration, and other elements. This analysis will review the master plans of cities in three population categories, weighted based on the distribution of public art programs by population range, and survey literature and statistical information on public art. From this methodology, this report will outline the typical creation process for a public art master plan, components found in a public art master plan, and the practical implications for cities looking to undertake this process.

Literature Review

Understanding the benefits of public art is a key consideration in setting the goals for a public art master plan. *Civic dialogue, arts & culture: Findings from Animating Democracy* reports findings about 36 art projects in the United States with the goal of promoting civic dialogue through the arts. While the projects are not limited to those of traditional public art, the discussion from the cases presented provides a critical link between what are perceived as two very different worlds, governmental policy and the arts. The authors present practical evidence that the arts can be used to illuminate public issues and bring about dialogue, supporting governmental efforts at community and consensus building. One particularly relevant example to this analysis is the Social Public Art Resource Center in Los Angeles. This ongoing project brought together artists, scholars, students, and local residents to design and create a public mural that illuminates the often forgotten history of minority communities. Its goal is to use art to tackle the sensitive subjects of demographic shifts and race relations that are prevalent in Los Angeles. Feedback was sought via the internet and traditional public forums to help decide what should be depicted in the mural. Other projects used similar artistic approaches to tackle issues such as the holocaust, human genomics, and poverty (Korza, Bacon, & Assaf, 2005). The direct visualization of these issues inspired controversy and media attention, which brought

about public discourse on the issues. These projects show that public art can be used by municipal government to address social problems and contentious issues in the community.

Expanding on the idea of collaboration and community building, John McCarthy's 2006 article *Regeneration of Cultural Quarters: public art for place image or place identity?* examines at the idea of placemaking and local identity through public art. The idea of placemaking can be inferred to be defined as creating an attraction based on some sort of amenity. In many cases this amenity is public art. The author examines two public art projects in England and the motivation for creating what he terms as "cultural quarters" through public art, essentially identifying two methods. First, some form of external identity, an amenity that has no real tie to the local community, in other words an attempt at place image. An example may be a purchased piece of completed art placed in a public area. Second, the author finds that a project can be based on something with which the community identifies, or place identity. An example may be a sculpture or mural depicting the history or cultural significance of the local area. The difference in these projects is the level of collaboration used (McCarthy, 2006). The author argues that project with a greater local identity was created with broad public input and led to far more success in creating new cultural endeavors after its completion, including a large growth in arts and cultural organizations. The case analysis provided in this article highlights the importance of collaboration and the potential for success when broad input is sought.

Arts are also argued to have benefits for the economy. The National Governors Association published a report titled *Arts and the Economy*: *Using Arts and Culture to Stimulate State Economic Development* which explores the benefits of arts economically. The publications provides guidelines for understanding the arts and cultural economy and its value, strategies for implementing arts and culture in community development plans and tourism strategies, as well as ways to support the arts and culture sector. The value of this report for public art master planning is the development of goals for the plan. Strategies such as reclaiming industrial space for the arts, and creating cultural enterprise zones are

valuable and show the link between arts planning and other forms of development. Economic development and tourism are two key areas which are argued to be particularly pertinent to public art planning (Hayter & Pierce, 2009).

The most significant quantitative analysis of public art in the United States is *A Detailed Statistical Report on the Budgets and Programming of the Nation's Public Art Programs During Fiscal Year 2001.* This study gives the results of a survey of 350 public art programs in the US. Not all of these programs are directly related to planning for municipal governments, as it includes private programs that are managed by nonprofit organizations, campus public art programs at universities, and state wide policies. The survey had a response rate of 38% with 132 programs responding.

The results of this survey provide information on public art programs that are suggestive of their activities in fiscal year 2001. Findings include that the largest and most highly funded programs are those within a government agency. Additionally, 58% of government programs surveyed receive funding from percent-for-art programs. About three quarters (74%) of the programs were bound by some form of public art ordinance or law, and the majority those (86%) provided for funding in some way.

Additional statistics are provided about the method of artist selection, the size and composition of the board or commission that has oversight over the program, staffing levels, the utilization of consultants, and the breakdown of public art programs in rural and urban areas.

In regard to public art master planning, 31% of the respondents had a public art master plan. It should also be noted that programs that have a public art master plan grow significantly faster and have higher budgets. The study also states that most master plans (62%) were created since 1995 and almost all (92%) are publicly available in their area (Americans for the Arts, 2003).

A 2004 publication by Americans for the Arts focuses specifically on best practices for artist selection, a component of public art master plans. In the *Public Art Network Issue Paper, Methods of Artist Selection* the author presents multiple methods of artist selection, with the two most common

being a request for proposals or a request for qualifications. The author also mentions lesser used

methods such as nomination, direct selection, and slide registry. The article then goes on to compare

the advantages and disadvantages of these methods. A request for qualifications tends to favor more

experienced artists, while a request for proposals favors those with less experience. The recommended

method is a five step process that starts with an open call to artists for qualifications, followed by a

narrowing of the artist pool, removing those who do not meet the qualification criteria. The next step is

the solicitation of proposals from the artists, followed by artist interviews. This process is completed

with a design contract with the selected artist. The author acknowledges that the goals of the project

have an impact on the process and states that if a goal is to bring a new artist into the program, the rigor

of the five step process is not suitable (Esser, 2004).

Marc Pally's article on public art planning for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA)

provides background information on public art planning and identifies key elements in the planning

process. In summary, Pally looks at defining the scope of public art in a particular community, the role of

government officials in this process, the establishment of oversight committees, how an interdisciplinary

approach to art planning can be incorporated into other areas such tourism and economic development,

inclusion and dialogue, and the identification of community resources and preferences. He suggests the

following nine elements as needing to be included in a public art plan: public art context, current

practices, program directions and opportunities, administration operation, funding sources, community

involvement, artist selection and project review, maintenance, and program review (Pally, n.d.).

Of particular relevance is the author's focus on establishing oversight committees to develop a

plan. Pally states that oversight committees that are too large may make planning cumbersome,

suggesting a diverse group of seven to nine members. Public input is also argued to be important in

order to define the scope of public art that is desired and where it should be located. After the plan is

formed, decisions on the implementation of the plan are recommended to be directed to a formal

public art approval authority. Pally also encourages a clear link between art planning and other aspects of the community including a reference to a small town that created a public art plan as part of its cultural tourism efforts. This integration could take many forms for a municipal government; including consideration of art in capital improvement plans, urban planning, public works, and parks and recreation (Pally, n.d.).

The link to other government activities and planning is further discussed in the 2010 article *Embedding Public Art: Practice, Policy and Problems.* The authors raised many interesting points on how public art has been embedded into planning process in Great Britain and identified three major problems with public art planning. Those problems being funding, how integrated the process is, and the interaction between the actual process, the policy, and the general public. The main thesis argues for a more structured way to frame the process and support public art programs (Pollock & Paddison, 2010). Municipal governments have the ability to tackle these challenges through funding, integration with other planning initiatives, and public input. The public art master planning process itself offers this recommended structure and the means to overcome these obstacles. However, government funding may depend on the political will in the community to use public money for the arts.

Public Art Master Plan Selection

For this analysis, ten public art master plans were selected from a variety of locations throughout the United States. These plans were classified into three groups based on population. The groups include cities under 100,000 (Small Cities), cities from 100,000 to 500,000 (Medium Cities), and cities greater than 500,000 (Large Cities). All population figures were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2005-2009 American Community Survey. The previously mentioned survey of public art programs in fiscal year 2001 reported the breakdown of programs by population. When adapted to the three population groups in this analysis, it shows small cities have 31% of public art programs, medium cities have 23%, and large cities have 46% (Americans for the Arts, 2003). Based on these percentages,

three plans (30% of sample) were selected from small cities, two plans from medium cities (20% of sample), and five plans from large cities (50% of sample). It should be noted that the distribution of plans among population groups may have changed since fiscal year 2001, this is however the most recent data available on public art programs in the United States.

Small Cities Population < 100,000	Medium Cities Population 100,000 – 500,000	Large Cities Population > 500,000
Algonquin Village, Illinois	Arlington, Virginia	Atlanta, Georgia
Chesterfield, Missouri	Eugene, Oregon	Austin, Texas
Hickory, North Carolina		Louisville, Kentucky
		San Diego, California
		Washington, DC

As previously stated, a survey of public art programs showed that 31% have a master plan. Following that survey's identification of 283 government programs in the US, it can be assumed that approximately 88 programs had a master plan in fiscal year 2001 (Americans for the Arts, 2003). This would include non-municipal government agencies, such as state government, transit authorities, and state universities.

This classification by population allows cities of similar size to be compared, and attempts to account for differences in planning caused by resource availability, due to population size, and a greater perceived capacity to support the arts in larger cities. This is not a perfect measure, as political propensity to support public art master planning is not necessarily a reflection of population and could be tied to a number of other factors. This will be discussed in the limitations section of this analysis. Additionally, due to the unavailability of a comprehensive list of municipalities who have undertaken public art master planning, the plans were not selected randomly, another limitation of this study.

Review of Public Art Master Plans

Understanding the components adopted in each of the public art master plans to be reviewed is important when analyzing the scope of public art master planning. Critically reviewing all ten plans

clarifies what is typically included in an actual public art master plan. The following is a brief summary of

the each plan; further analysis of the components included in the plans and observations based on

relevant literature will be discussed in the common practices section.

Group	City	Population	Summary of Plan
Small Cities	Algonquin Village, Illinois	*30,464*	**Algonquin Village, Illinois** is a suburban town that undertook its public art master planning process in 2004. The city is geographically located approximately 50 miles from the large urban area of Chicago, Illinois. This plan was created by staff within the local government at the direction of the governing body of the township, the Algonquin Village Board. The plan is limited in scope, with the staff being given the direction of looking at three topics; the identification of areas throughout the Village that would be appropriate for the display of public art, the investigation and creation of various funding sources including developer donations, grants and private donations, and the consideration of the creation of an Algonquin Public Arts Commission that would identify contributing artists and evaluate the appropriateness of individual pieces of art. The plan also identified five goals; creating a sense of place, celebrating art and artists, improving property values, providing educational opportunities, and establishing a planning framework for public art. The plan itself outlined locations for artwork and location criteria, methods for funding a public art collection, and the creation and responsibility of a municipal art commission. (Village of Algonquin, 2005)
	Chesterfield, Missouri	46,332	**Chesterfield, Missouri** began its public art planning process in 2008 with final submission in 2009. The city is located approximately 30 miles from St. Louis, Missouri. The plan was created through collaborative workshops with the city, community organizations, and artists. It includes a list of recommendations for the city regarding public art master planning. These items include creating a public art ordinance, program administration via contracting, and the maintenance and inventory of public art in the city. There are also recommendations for the organization that contracts with the city to manage the program and suggestions for public input in the process. This plan does recommend that a designated arts organization be contracted and the city itself will not manage the administration of the plan. However, it also recommends that the city seek to help support a public art fund and establish an arts committee to make planning recommendations and decisions on acquisition of public art. Educational opportunities are also mentioned, including using the proposed public art collection as an element of educational curriculum. (City of Chesterfield, 2009)

	Hickory, North Carolina	40,590	**Hickory, North Carolina** began its process of public art master planning in 2000 with the creation of a public art commission comprised of citizens from the community at-large. A consultant was also contracted to assist in the process of developing this plan. Hickory is located 50 miles from Charlotte, North Carolina. The plan includes both the process of creating the plan and also more specific components. These components include the selection process for artworks, site selection, funding, documentation of the collection, and maintenance. One particularly interesting aspect of this plan is that it specifically states that public monies should only be used for planning consultants and that private funds will be funding actual artworks.(City of Hickory, 2003)

	Arlington, Virginia	206,406	**Arlington, Virginia's** public art master plan is a supporting document to the city's larger open space master plan and was adopted in 2004. Arlington is directly adjacent to Washington, DC. It specifically addresses priorities, civic placemaking, funding, program management, site selection, partners, and other resources in the community. Money from the city's capital budget is dedicated to the program and it is administered under the city's Department of Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources. Consultants were also employed in the development of this plan. Staffing is outlined for the city to manage this program and maintenance of public artwork is addressed as well. (Arlington County, 2004)
Medium Cities	Eugene, Oregon	149,525	**Eugene, Oregon** adopted its public art master plan in 2009. The plan is specific in its approach, identifying several key elements. Those elements are building a high quality public art collection, appraisal and inventory of current public art, the extension of public art beyond the downtown area, the development of partnerships with other major organizations, the integration of art planning into other community planning efforts, the expansion of percent-for-art programs, the assignment of professional staff to manage the program, the dedication of resources to ongoing maintenance, the inclusion of dialogue with citizens, and the improvement of accessibility to art in the city. (City of Eugene, 2009)

	Atlanta, Georgia	515,843	**Atlanta, Georgia** adopted its plan in 2001 and used consultants in conjunction with a task force of community members in its creation process. The plan is comprehensive in nature and covers goals, a percent-for-art ordinance, the structure of the program, artist selection, the review process, the process for receiving gifts, contracting, maintenance, and program administration. Funding is included in the percent-for-art ordinance that dedicates a percentage of capital project funds to public art and also establishes a public art fund to allow private partners to support public art. (City of Atlanta, 2001)
Large Cities	Austin, Texas	747,984	**Austin, Texas** took a different approach when completing its public art master plan. Rather than create a city-wide plan, they segmented the process into different areas and identified site selection and goals. This plan did not address the specific implementation strategies needed, but shows a different approach to public art planning. It was developed by consultants and community members. It specifically outlines four categories of public art opportunities; those being natural environment systems, built environment systems, connectivity systems, and cultural systems. These approaches essentially relate respectively to parks and open spaces, civic gathering places, connections between built and natural areas, and opportunities to highlight history and culture in a community. Additionally, specific sites are identified in the plan. (City of Austin, 2004)
	Louisville, Kentucky	693,604	**Louisville, Kentucky** completed its master plan in 2009 and took a comprehensive approach. Louisville used consultants and an advisory committee to create the plan. The major elements of Louisville's plan include the structure of the Mayor's advisory board, the inventory of public art and the means to achieve it, funding sources, administration of the program, site identification, partnerships, and a specific five year plan. Specifically, staffing at the city government to oversee the project is proposed as well as a modified percent-for-art funding that allows developers to contribute to a public art fund in lieu of actual public art production. Additionally, the plan recommends a commission on public art be established to review works, and the creation of a private nonprofit organization which serves to raise private dollars for public art and commission new works in public places. This organization will not be funded by the city, but will be eligible for grants from the city to create public art. (Louisville Metro Government, 2009)

	San Diego, California	1,297,618	**San Diego, California's** plan includes a specific list of elements and was created in 2004. This list includes a percent-for art program for public and non-residential private developments, new guidelines for the city's revised public art program, the maintenance of the art collection, support for local artists in the program, using art to promote "community identity", the use of a broad range of art projects, integration with other planning initiatives, and using art as a method of cultural tourism. Funding in this plan goes further than many other plans and recommends a percent-for-art program for private developments that meet certain financial requirements. Placemaking and other methods of creating community identity are also considered to be important goals in this plan. (City of San Diego, 2004)
	Washington, DC	588,433	**Washington, DC** created its public art master plan in 2009. It focuses specifically on priorities, site and artist selection, partnerships, funding and resources, the structure of the process, and documentation and maintenance. The partnerships outlined in this plan create connections between public agencies such as school systems, public transit agencies, and city government with regard to the arts. Exploration of funding opportunities is recommended as well as specific methods of artist selection, maintenance, and additional implementation procedures. (Washington, District of Columbia, 2009)

Summary of Population Groups

The structure of the plans reviewed was very similar, typically including the same components and little outside of those components. It does not appear that population size has an impact on the sophistication of the plan. However, one plan diverged from the others. The plan of Austin, TX focused very specifically on site identification. This plan is not for Austin in its entirety, but rather for just the downtown area. Drilling down even further, it segmented the downtown area into neighborhoods, or districts, and then looked at specific geographic locations within those districts. The plan also identified four types of sites for public art; natural environment systems, built environment systems, connectivity systems, and cultural systems (City of Austin, 2004). While all ten plans mentioned site identification, Austin focused almost exclusively on this topic, and was thus less comparable to the other plans.

There were other specific anomalies amongst the plans. Hickory, North Carolina specified that no public funds would be used for public art, but rather an effort would be made to raise private funds. Along the same lines, Louisville proposed the creation of a private, nonprofit organization, in addition to its publicly funded program, which would seek to raise private funds. Most plans mentioned the idea of leveraging public money with private money, but these plans provided a specific strategy for doing so.

Motivations for Public Art Master Planning

Cities undertake public art master planning for a variety of reasons. These are usually expressed in the goals of the plan, but reasons for strategic planning at the municipal government in general can also be found in literature. Broadly, strategic planning can be defined "a disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization is, what it does, and why it does it" (Bryson, 1995). Planning for public art can serve to allocate resources for public art, or simply provide a plan should resources or opportunities become available. Based on a survey of cities which have undertaken strategic planning efforts, Poister and Streib (2005) conclude that "municipal managers tend to see numerous beneficial impacts of their strategic planning efforts, with very few of them citing

harmful impacts." This provides evidence that strategic planning in general is perceived as effective in municipal government.

Additionally, the review of the plans shows that cities have a number of goals for their public art master plans. These are generally related to open space or parks planning, economic development, cultural tourism, and quality of life. There is typically some acknowledgment that the municipal government recognizes the benefit of public art to the community either economically or culturally as well.

Plan Development Process

The use of consultants was seen in nine of ten plans with regard to the process of creation. The survey of public art programs in fiscal year 2001 also found that 69% of programs had employed consultants at one time. The most common use of consultants was for master planning (Americans for the Arts, 2003). In addition, all ten plans employed either an existing commission or task force on the arts, made of community volunteers, or a newly created commission on public art to inspire community involvement and create a collaborative process.

While the process of plan creation is not necessarily part of the public art master plan itself, the importance placed on inclusion and community involvement is an important aspect of this process. This is supported in the examples provided in *Civic Dialogue: Arts and Culture* (Korza, Bacon, & Assaf, 2005), as well as in the recommendations provided by Marc Pally in his article for the NEA. Pally suggested a diverse group of seven to nine individuals be employed for the plan development process (Pally, n.d.). Additionally, McCarthy's (2010) article suggests that broad local collaboration can influence the growth arts and culture in a community. The public commissions charged with creating the plans had varying compositions, but typically included local arts community groups, political leaders, city staff, artists, engineers, and design professionals. The interaction of experts in the field and community leaders in a local area is believed to be important when developing a plan, this is evidenced by the unanimous

agreement that the master plans reviewed had on this subject. The common practice for plan development is a combination of a broad a community coalition in the form of a taskforce or commission, and expert consultants hired to work with the commission to identify goals, processes, and implementation policies.

Identification of Core Components

The ten plans reviewed had much in common and the components were largely the same, with the exception of Austin, TX which proved to be less comparable with the other plans. From the review, 12 core components of a public art master plan have been identified. These components are:

1. Goals and Vision

2. Integration with other planning

3. Creating a Public Art Authority

4. Funding

5. Site Selection

6. Artist Selection

7. Staffing or Contracting Program Administration

8. Documentation of Public Art

9. Maintenance or Public Art

10. Acquisition and Removal of Public Art

11. The Receipt of Public Art Gifts

12. Educational Opportunities

These elements can be found in nearly all plans in some form, ranging from brief discussion to fully developed policies. The matrix below shows the inclusion of each component in the plans reviewed.

	Small Cities			Medium Cities		Large Cities				
	Algonquin Village, IL	Chesterfield, MO	Hickory, NC	Arlington, VA	Eugene, OR	Atlanta, GA	Austin, TX	Louisville, KY	San Diego, CA	Washington, DC
Goals and Vision	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Integration with other planning		✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Creating a Public Art Authority	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Funding	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Site Selection	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Artist Selection	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Staffing or Contracting & Program Administration	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Documentation of Public Art	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Maintenance of Public Art	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Acquisition and Removal of Public Art	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
The Receipt of Public Art Gifts	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
Educational Opportunities	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓

Common Practices in Core Components

The core components identified are typically found in public art master plans for municipal governments. The following will outline common practices for each of these components and background from literature for cities wishing to undertake the public art master planning process. While each can be considered individually, many components are highly dependent on one another. Decisions made with regard to funding, educational opportunities, documentation, and general administration of the public art program directly affect staffing needs, integration with other planning, and many other areas as well. Considering these connections is important when designing a public art master plan. Additionally, local needs and constraints, as well as the scale of the program are recommended to be considered when creating the guidelines in each of the components.

Goals and Vision

Goals and vision are a typical component for public art master plans. Poister and Streib (2005) found the development of goals to be the most common form of strategic planning, in general, for local governments, with 92% of survey respondents reporting this as part of their planning process. Additionally, 89% cited developing a vision as an element of strategic planning. The goals for a public art master plan will be different for every community, but certain core elements have been identified as common among public art master plans. The most common goals were placemaking, economic development, tourism, and quality of life considerations. Placemaking with regard to public art is essentially the process of using an artistic amenity to create an attraction of some sort. Chicago's Millennium Park is a frequently cited example of placemaking and economic development efforts. The park contains large scale public art and cultural facilities which have become a tourism destination and landmark in the downtown Chicago area. Chicago Business ranks Millennium Park as the second largest tourist attraction in the city, with 2010 annual attendance estimated at 4.5 million people (Riggio, 2011). This effort at placemaking via modern public art is seen as a great success, despite its $475 million price

tag (Kamin, 2005). Millenium Park is also seen as a success in economic development. An Economic

Impact Study delivered to the City of Chicago in 2005 estimated that Millennium Park would create

$240.2 million in tax revenues from 2005-2015, and 740 – 1,070 full time equivalent jobs over the same

time period (Goodman Williams Group, 2005). Additionally, the publication *Arts and the Economy*: *Using

Arts and Culture to Stimulate State Economic Development* by the National Governors Association

concludes that "states can use the arts to boost their economies in a variety of ways, from incorporating

arts into economic development and community development plans to supporting arts education and

promoting arts assets as boosts to cultural tourism (Hayter and Pierce, 2009, p.33)." Other goals include

promoting a sense of community through public art, making a local area a cultural destination, and

illuminating the historical significance of a community. The common practice for this component is goal

identification by a broad coalition of community leaders as outlined in the plan development process.

The relevant literature mentioned above recommends that specific attention be given to the arts role in

placemaking, economic development, tourism, and quality of life.

Integration with other planning

Integration with other planning and capital projects was found in seven of ten public art master

plans. Pollock and Paddison (2010) argue that embedding public art and artist participation into the

planning process in a city strengthens the practice. Integration is also logical, as the majority of public

art programs are funded through a percentage of capital expenditures, or percent-for-art program

(Americans for the Arts, 2003). Thus, including the public art planning process in capital project

management would be necessary. The common practice for this component is to explore the

connections between capital improvements, city planning, public/private partnerships, and other

municipal government activities, to find opportunities for integration of public art into these processes.

Creating a Public Art Authority

The creation of a public art review authority was included in every plan reviewed. The role of this body was mainly to review and approve public art projects. Other duties were assigned to this authority as necessary in accordance with other elements outlined in the plans. The authority itself is argued to be important for any public art program. The 2001 survey of public art programs found that 71% of public art programs were governed by a board or commission with the average number of members in a government program being nine people (Americans for the Arts, 2003). The composition, by profession, of the responding government programs' approval authority is seen in the chart below.

Profession	% of Government Programs
Architects/Design Professionals	71%
Artists (not related to the project)	86%
Arts Professionals (not related to the project)	65%
Business Leaders	37%
Commissioning Agency Representatives	79%
Community Representatives	71%
Public Art Program Representatives	18%
Other	25%

Source: *A detailed statistical analysis of public art programs in 2001*

The composition of this authority is an important consideration for this component. From the review of public art master plans and the data seen above, representatives from several key stakeholder groups have been identified as being included in this body. These stakeholder groups should include public art administrators, elected officials representing the community at-large, artists with public art experience, representatives from community arts organizations, city planning officials, city parks officials, architecture and design professionals, and several members from the community.

The goal of this body is to have the widest possible representation from the community, while also utilizing the technical expertise needed from planners, architects, and other professionals. Inclusion and community involvement is argued to be important to this process, as public art is self-defining as

belonging to the public, it thus must represent the public's interest. Reinforcing this idea, Fleming and

Goldman (2005) summarize the outcomes of two federal public art programs stating "The National

Endowment for the Arts' Art in Public Places Program collapsed because it remained stubbornly out of

touch with this reality. The General Services Administration's Art in Architecture Program, on the other

hand, has thrived under a new model that recognizes the difference between gallery art and public art,

and that takes account of the sensibilities of the people who will have to see the artwork every day."

The common practice for this component is to have a public art review authority which represents

broad community interests and technical expertise related to the creation of public art. This body is

typically responsible for the approval of public art projects, artist selection, and the selection of sites for

public art.

Funding

Funding is an important component of any public program and is recommended to be addressed

in the master plan. Seven of ten public art programs reviewed are funded by a percent-for-art program

that dedicates somewhere between one-half to two percent of the value of capital construction

projects, and private developments in some instances, over a certain dollar amount to public art. This

money is typically placed in a public art fund and covers administration, acquisition and construction, as

well as maintenance, insurance, and other costs. Percent-for-art programs often provide that a

developer may contribute to a public art fund, in lieu of actually commissioning public art. The survey of

public art programs found that programs housed in government agencies received 91% of their funding

from government sources, with 58% receiving their funding from a dedicated percent-for-art revenue

source, at an average budget in fiscal year 2001 of $911,594 (Americans for the Arts, 2003). In many

cases, this fund is designed to be a public and private partnership to encourage private firms to donate

to public art initiatives. This fund was also commonly used to provide grant funding for public art

projects. The common practice for this component is the establishment of a percent-for-art program,

the creation of a public art fund, and public/private partnerships that leverage public money with

private funds. Additional methods of raising private funds through required developer contributions or a

nonprofit fundraising body have also been employed by local governments. These options may be more

suitable for locations where it is not feasible for public funds to be allocated to public art.

Site Selection

Site selection is recommended to be part of any public art master plan and it was included in all

ten plans reviewed. From reviewing the plans, two approaches are generally taken for site selection.

First, broad community identification can be done where neighborhoods and geographic regions that

may be well-suited for public art are identified. For example, a focus may be put on public art in a

downtown area. This can, and was in many master plans, refined further with the second method of

identifying sites, which is specifying individual public sites. Following the previous example, this would

identify a specific park or public site in the downtown area. These specific sites could be public parks, as

used in the example, or other civic gathering places and publically accessible areas, such as pavilions,

pedestrian malls, or areas adjacent to public buildings. Cartiere (2009) discusses the inclusion of public

art in light-rail transit systems sites, concluding "utilizing place-specificity serves as a means to highlight,

preserve and present the unique social aspects of a specific location — the history, memories, stories,

uses, people, nature — which might otherwise have been displaced by transit development, urban

sprawl or general neglect." The common practice for this component is to give the responsibility of site

identification to the public art review authority. This authority was found to be charged with evaluating

sites and creating priorities based on criteria including: public access, visibility, ability to create a sense

of community, historical significance, public safety, engineering concerns, and other factors that may be

locally relevant.

Artist Selection

Artist selection is a logical component of public art master planning, if artwork is being commissioned, artists will need to be selected to complete the projects. Nine out of ten plans outlined some form of artist selection methodology, or a set of practices to be used. The plans reviewed tended to prefer a request for proposals or artist competition model. Literature on this topic would suggest that a request for qualifications is more appropriate. A publication from Americans for the Arts establishing suggested methods for artist selection provides very practical guidance for this component. The author presents the two major processes for selecting an artist, a request for proposals and a request for qualifications. A request for proposals tends to favor inexperienced artists, while a request for qualifications has the opposite effect. The author states that "most experienced artists will not submit proposals in response to an open call (Esser, 2004, p. 7)." Because of the concern of limiting the artist pool, the author suggests a multi-step process that starts with a request for qualifications, the field of artists will then be narrowed by the approval authority. At this point proposals will be solicited from selected artists, followed by artist interviews. The process is completed with a design contract.

While the process outlined above is rigorous, it favors experienced artists. Due to this bias it is recommended that alternate selection methods be used if the specific project has a goal of bringing new artists into the program. It is also appropriate if a local artist is preferred, as the pool of local artists that have previous qualifications in public art may be limited. The alternate process is typically a request for proposals, rather than a request for qualifications, and has three steps; publishing an RFP, artist interviews, and then a design contract.

The selection method is recommended to also be tied to the scale of the project and engineering concerns. Large sculptural projects and installations in public places have serious concerns with regard to both maintenance and public safety. Due to the complexity of these structures, a request for qualifications would be best. Community murals and highly local projects that do not have these

concerns will be better suited by a request for proposals. It was most common to use an open, public

call to artists, rather than a nomination system or direct selection of an artist in order to receive the

largest number of potential artists or proposals. The survey of public art programs in 2001 found that

86% of public art programs used an open call for artists and that the programs often used multiple

methods of selection. Seventy two percent had used a request for qualifications, and 68% had used a

request for proposals. (Americans for the Arts, 2003)

Based on the literature, it was found that two major categories of artist selection are

recommended to be used. For works where new or local artist selection is not a concern, or where the

scale of the project is large and has engineering issues, the multi-step request for qualifications system

outlined above was recommended. For projects that have a goal of bringing a new artist into the

program, or specify local preference, a request for proposals was recommended to be used as designed

above. While the most common practice was a request for proposal or artist competition, literature

would suggest municipalities should revisit the design of this process, establishing multiple methods of

selection based on project goals and characteristics.

Staffing and Administration

Management of a public art program is an important consideration when undertaking public art

master planning. Nine of ten plans reviewed included staffing in the plan. The master plans reviewed

made a distinction between administration by the municipal government or via contracting with an

existing, or newly created private, nonprofit organization. The funding mechanism used for public art

was a consideration for this component. Additionally, the other elements outlined in the plan affect

staffing and administration. Documentation, maintenance and educational opportunities have a direct

impact on staffing needs, and it is recommended that these be considered in the design of this

component. Most plans which designate city staffing place this program under the department that

manages parks, recreation, and cultural affairs. In addition, the local arts council or commission is

usually the organization that is charged with managing the program privately when contracting is preferred.

The survey of public art programs found that 81% of public art programs were housed within a government agency in fiscal year 2001. The survey also found the average number of employees dedicated to staffing a government public art program was two, with each person managing an average of 9.8 projects. (Americans for the Arts, 2003) The resources government offers and their authority over public space seems to make government administration of public art programs more popular. This is evidenced by the fact that the majority of public art programs that were surveyed in fiscal year 2001 were housed in government. Additionally, only one of ten plans opted to contract administration of the plan to a private, nonprofit organization (City of Chesterfield, 2009). The common practice for this component is to locate the public art program within the government and to provide adequate staffing to manage the number of projects that are anticipated based on the funding mechanism utilized for public art. Additional consideration was given to maintenance, documentation, and educational programming when setting the staffing level.

Documentation of Public Art

Documentation is also a core component of public art master planning. The first step in this process is the assessment and documentation of existing public art, essentially creating an inventory of public art projects. Documentation is included of nine of ten public art plans reviewed. This is argued to be linked to both maintenance and education. Providing documentation helps citizens, educators, and students know what public art is available in the community, and also helps administrators track projects and funding needs over time. The most common practice is to delegate documentation to permanent or contracted staff.

Maintenance of Public Art

Like any other infrastructure, public art requires maintenance. Understanding the maintenance needs of particular pieces of art is argued to be very important and was also considered in the acquisition and removal process. Maintenance, as a concept, was included in nine of ten plans reviewed in this analysis. Additionally, of public art programs that allocate funding via an ordinance, 41% allocated funds for conservation or maintenance (Americans for the Arts, 2003). Funding of maintenance was found in several public art master plans reviewed, but many neglected to provide this. Pally's article for the NEA suggested that maintenance be included in arts and cultural planning (Pally, n.d). In addition, research has been done on the economic effects of maintenance of public infrastructure in general. Agenor (2009), Jin-Wen (2009) and Rioja (2003) present economic models showing a balance of maintenance and new investment increases the amount and efficiency of public infrastructure. Relating this to public art, maintenance of existing work is recommended to coexist with the commissioning or acquisition of new works in order to efficiently build a public art collection. The common practice is to include maintenance in the public art master plan, but dedicated funding is not common. It is recommended that this be addressed by the plan creation authority to provide the necessary resources for maintaining public art, balancing maintenance with new public art commissions and acquisitions.

Acquisition and Removal of Public Art

The decision to purchase public art or remove an artwork from a city's collection was frequently left to the public art authority established in the plan. Acquisition and removal of works was included in nine of ten plans reviewed. Decisions regarding acquisition were found to account for the public interest with regard to cost, scale, subject matter, artistic style, ongoing maintenance cost, and general adherence to program policies. Similar guidelines were suggested when the public art authority is considering the removal of a particular piece. The most common reasoning for removal is deterioration

beyond reasonable repair. This process does not apply to commissioned works, as they would follow the artist selection guidelines; it refers only to the purchase of completed works for placement in public areas. The common practice for this component is to have the public art review authority establish guidelines for acquisition and removal, paying specific attention to cost, scale, subject matter, artistic style, ongoing maintenance cost, and general adherence to program policies.

The Receipt of Public Art Gifts

The receipt of public art gifts is included in eight of ten plans reviewed and is recommended to be outlined in the public art master plan. Gifts of public art are common, including famous pieces such as Detroit's Joe Louis' Fist, gifted by Sports Illustrated magazine to the City of Detroit 1987 (Nawrocki & Clements, 1999). It is logical to provide a standard process for the receipt of these gifts in the public art master plan, as it is a form of art acquisition. The common practice for this component is that gifts be reviewed and approved by the public art authority, in accordance with acquisition and removal guidelines included in the plan.

Educational Opportunities

Education was included in nine of ten public art master plans reviewed. Documentation was found to be a part of this component as public art documentation can serve as an educational tool in itself. Additionally, curriculum kits which correspond with local and state curriculum requirements were also developed for various educational groups in several plans. Stephens (2006) explores community-based learning and participatory public art, concluding that "placing participatory public art at the center of community-based learning helps students tap into their imaginations and turn that curiosity into useable knowledge." Additionally, 44 % of the responding public art programs surveyed in 2001 stated that they provided educational opportunities, with the most common methods being open meetings and lectures on public art. The survey also showed that of public art programs that had an ordinance which provided funding, 21% allocated funding for education (Americans for the Arts, 2003).

The common practice for this component is to develop educational materials based on the public art collection.

Limitations

There are several limitations of this study which need to be addressed. These include the lack of current empirical research and literature on the topic, the selection of the plans reviewed in this analysis, and also the relationship between political propensity to support the arts and the sophistication of the public art master plan.

There is a lack of relevant literature on the specific topic of public art master planning for municipal government. *A Detailed Statistical Report on the Budgets and Programming of the Nation's Public Art Programs During Fiscal Year 2001* is the most significant research done on this topic but may not reflect current trends, as it was conducted in 2001. Additionally, while this study did differentiate between government run programs and those in nonprofit organizations, it did not specify whether the programs were municipal governments. Some were government transit authorities, public universities, and state agencies. In addition, some of the literature reviewed for this analysis, including the survey of public art programs was produced by Americans for the Arts, an arts advocacy group. While the methodology was sound, some bias may exist in this work. Additional research is needed on this topic to form a better model of best practices in municipal government master planning for public art.

The sample of plans selected for this analysis was weighted based on the existence of public art programs in different population groups, but they were not selected randomly. Due to a lack of an authoritative source on the cities that have undertaken public art master planning, these plans were selected based on availability. This study would be improved if the plans were selected randomly from a sample of cities that have public art master plans. In addition, a larger sample would benefit this analysis.

The complexity and sophistication of a public art master plan may also depend on the political propensity to support the arts in a particular community. While this was not the focus of this analysis, the possibility exists that the selected plans come from cities which have a high appreciation of the arts, and thus a more sophisticated plan than other communities which do not value art as highly. However, the creation of a public art master plan itself is indicative of some political propensity to support the arts. Population was the only factor accounted for in this study that may affect support for the arts. A random sample would attempt to account for this difference in municipal government support of the arts.

Practical Implications and Conclusion

This analysis has practical implications for cities which chose to undertake the public art master planning process. The review of ten selected public art master plans and relevant literature provides cities with a guide to forming a plan in their community. It is recommended that a public art master plan include, but not necessarily be limited to, the 12 core components identified in this analysis. The common practices and recommendations are based on their inclusion in the plans and literature on public art and municipal government practices.

While the components are recommended for inclusion, different communities may have to adjust common practices to meet their local needs and constraints. This is particularly relevant to funding. A percent-for-art program is the national model for funding public art, and seven of ten plans used this system. This does, however, require a contribution of public funds, which may not be feasible for a community depending on its fiscal situation. An adjustment may also need to be made for staffing and administration, maintenance, and several other components that have financial implications.

A key tenet of this analysis is the local, collaborative process that typically takes place to create a public art master plan. It is the common practice that a commission or task force with wide community representation be utilized, along with consultants to provide expert advice. This body is responsible for

the contents of the plan. A high level of local specificity with regard to many of the components will strengthen the plan. This is particularly relevant to site selection and goals and vision. Identifying criteria for public art sites is recommended, but some plans have gone further to include specific sites in the plan itself. This level of specificity could be applied to other core components as well and would benefit the plan. Additionally, creating specific local goals with regard to economic development, placemaking, cultural tourism, and quality of life is recommended to create a more meaningful plan for a specific community.

Public art master planning for municipal government is a relatively new practice, with the majority of plans in 2001 being created since 1995 (Americans for the Arts, 2003). Additionally, a number of plans have likely been created since the time of this survey. The common practices and recommendations found in this analysis are valuable to municipal government, but a more complete data set that identifies the characteristics of public art programs in municipal government settings would be beneficial for future research on this topic. Additionally, continued research on this topic is needed to understand the impact of the core components on the practical outcomes of public art in the community.

References

Agenor, P. (2009). Infrastructure Investment and Maintenance Expenditure: Optimal Allocation Rules in a Growing Economy. *Journal of Public Economic Theory*, 11(2), 233-250.

Americans for the Arts, Public Art Network. (2003). *Public art programs fiscal year 2001: a detailed statistical report on the budgets and programming of the nation's public art programs* Washington, DC: Retrieved from http://www.artsUsa.org/pdf/networks/pan/PublicArtReport.pdf

Arlington County, Virginia (2004). *Public art, public places: a public art master plan for Arlington, Virginia* Arlington, VA: Retrieved from http://www.arlingtonva.Us/Departments/ParksRecreation/scripts/planning/ComprehensivePlanning/PAMP/PublicArtMasterPlan.pdf

Bryson, John M. (1995) *Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations: A Guide to Strengthening and Sustaining Organizational Achievement*. Rev. ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cartiere, C. (2009). Exploring the impact of public art in light-rail systems above and below ground. *Journal of Public Works & Infrastructure*, 2(2), 172-180.

City of Atlanta, Georgia (2001). *City of Atlanta public art master plan* Atlanta, GA: Retrieved from http://ocaatlanta.com/sites/ocaatlanta.com/files/ATLPublic_Art_Master_Plan.pdf

City of Austin, Texas (2004). *Austin alive: a downtown arts development study for Austin, Texas* Austin, TX: Retrieved from http://www.ci.aUstin.tx.Us/aipp/downloads/aipp_about_masterplan_downtown.pdf

City of Chesterfield, Missouri (2009). *A public art master plan for the City of Chesterfield, Missouri* Chesterfield, MO: Retrieved from http://www.chesterfield.mo.Us/webcontent/ced/docs/Art%20Master%20Plan/Art%20Master%20Plan.pdf

City of Eugene, Oregon (2009). *Eugene public art plan* Eugene, OR: Retrieved from http://www.eugene-or.gov/portal/server.pt/gateway/PTARGS_0_228_356290_0_0_18/Eugene%20Public%20Art%20Plan%201%2011%202010.pdf

City of Hickory, North Carolina (2003). *City of Hickory public art master plan* City of Hickory, NC: Retrieved from http://www.hickorygov.com/egov/docs/1232650916_923919.pdf

City of San Diego, California (2004). *City of San Diego public art master plan* San Diego: CA Retrieved from http://www.sandiego.gov/arts-culture/pdf/pubartmasterplan.pdf

Esser, Greg. Americans for the Arts, Public Art Network. (2004). *Public art network issue paper: methods of artist selection* Washington, DC: Retrieved from http://www.artsUsa.org/pdf/networks/pan/issue_paper.pdf

Fleming, R., & Goldman, M. (2005). Public art for the public. *Public Interest*, (159), 55-76.

Goodman Williams Group, URS Corportation. City of Chicago, Department of Planning and Development. (2005). *Millennium park: economic impact study* Chicago, IL: Retrieved from http://www.chicagoloopalliance.com/db_images/includes/227Millennium%20Park%20Economic%20Impact%20Study%2020050503.pdf

Hayter, C., & Pierce, S.C. National Governors Association, National Governors Association Center for Best Practices. (2009). *Arts and the economy: Using arts and culture to stimulate state economic development* Washington, DC: Retrieved from http://www.nga.org/Files/pdf/0901ARTSANDECONOMY.pdf

Jin-wen, L. (2009). Public Spending on Maintenance and Imperfect Competition. *American Economist*, 53(2), 28-37.

Kamin, B. (2005). Jay Pritzker Pavilion: Chicago. *Architectural Record*, 193(1), 136-145.

Korza, P., Bacon, B. S., Assaf, A., Americans for the Arts (Organization), & Animating Democracy (Initiative). (2005). *Civic dialogue, arts & culture: Findings from Animating Democracy*. Washington, DC: Americans for the Arts.

Louisville Metro Government (2009). *Louisville public art master plan* Louisville, KY: Retrieved from http://www.louisvilleky.gov/NR/rdonlyres/6679C445-41E9-4A8A-9272-3C195740761E/0/PublicArtMasterPlanoptimized.pdf

Nawrocki, D. A., & Clements, D. (1999). *Art in Detroit public places*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

McCarthy, John. (2006). Regeneration of cultural quarters: public art for place image or place identity?. *Journal of Urban Design*, *11*(2), 243-262.

Pally, Marc. National Endowment for the Arts, (n.d.). *The enterprise of process: notes on planning for public art* Washington, DC: Retrieved from http://www.nea.gov/resources/lessons/PALLY.HTML

Poister, T. H., & Streib, G. (2005). Elements of Strategic Planning and Management in Municipal Government: Status after Two Decades. *Public Administration Review*, 65(1), 45-56.

Pollock, V., & Paddison, R. (2010). Embedding Public Art: Practice, Policy and Problems. *Journal of Urban Design*, 15(3), 335-356.

Riggio, A.J. (2011, March 28). Crain's lists: Chicago's largest hotels and tourist attractions. *Chicago Business*, Retrieved from http://www.chicagobusiness.com/section/lists?djoPage=product_details&djoPid=22594&djoTry=1301883327

Rioja, F. K. (2003). Filling potholes: macroeconomic effects of maintenance versus new investments in public infrastructure. *Journal of Public Economics*, 87(9/10),

Stephens, P. (2006). A Real Community Bridge: Informing Community-Based Learning through a Model of Participatory Public Art. *Art Education*, *59*(2), 40-6.

Village of Algonquin, Illinois (2005). *Village of Algonquin public art master plan* Village of Algonquin, IL: Retrieved from http://www.algonquin.org/egov/docs/1144250826_381683.pdf

Washington, District of Columbia (2009). *DC creates! public art master plan* Washington, DC: retrieved from http://dcarts.dc.gov/DC/DCARTS/Publication%20Files/Public%20Art%20Master%20Plan.pdf