

SUSTAINING URBAN CULTURE:
THE DESIGN AND OPERATION OF PUBLIC ART PLANNING PROGRAMS

By

KEXIN CHEN

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ARCHITECTURAL STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2011

© 2011 Kexin Chen

To my beloved parents and husband

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to thank Professors Bradley Walters and William L. Tilson for their patience and guidance. They have both provided an abundant amount of advice and encouragement throughout the thesis-writing process and my time in the College of Design, Construction and Planning.

Next, I would like thank my parents and husband for their love and support. Because of them, I can keep on in spite of every difficulty when I am far away from my homeland.

I would like to thank my fellow classmates and friends. Dixue Li, Yun Cao. Miaomiao He, Pui Hoong Wan, Dan Zhu, Xuan Wang, Samantha Payne, Rui He, Chen Chen, Tingting Huang. Scott Reamy. Yibo Zhang, Jonathan Roncek, Tut Chuan Guan and Doreen Poh. Their opinions and support have been invaluable. This master's degree could only be completed because of this cooperation.

Lastly, I would like to thank the University of Florida and the entire College of Design, Construction and Planning for a great graduate school experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	4
LIST OF FIGURES.....	7
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	8
ABSTRACT	9
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	11
Research Background	11
What Is Public Art.....	11
What Is Public Art Planning	13
The Relationship between Public Art and Urban Planning	15
Research Purpose and Significance.....	16
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	18
The Definition of “Public” in Public art.....	18
The Development History of Public Art Planning in the United States	19
Contemporary Public Art Programs	21
Federal Organization.....	21
State Organization.....	22
Private Organization	23
3 METHODOLOGY	24
Selection of Case Studies.....	24
Analysis Methodology	25
Case Study Research Design	25
Data Collection.....	26
4 CASE STUDIES	27
Spatial Distribution of Artworks	27
Distributing Artworks in the City Spaces.....	27
The General Status of Artwork Distribution Plans in the United State	27
Case Study: Washington D.C. Public Art Master Plan	28
Goals and priorities for public artwork distribution.....	28
Public artwork distribution in Washington D.C.	28
Government –Based Funding.....	29
Government Policy Support for Public Art	29
The General Status of “Percent for Art” in the United States.....	29

Case Study: Funding Mechanism of Los Angeles	29
Private developer obligation.....	30
Cultural Trust Fund	30
Public Funds	30
Selection Procedure for Public Art Program	31
Selection Processes for a Successful Public Art Program.....	31
The General Selection for Art Programs in the United State	31
Case Study: Selection Procedure of Chicago Department of Cultural Affairs...	31
Artist registry	32
Four forums selection	32
Exhibiting	33
Generating City Culture by Exhibiting Artworks.....	33
The General Status of Exhibiting Art Program in the United State	33
Case Study: Private Organization “Creative Time” in New York.....	33
Diversity materials for exhibiting	34
The interaction with public in the exhibiting process	34
Maintenance and Review.....	35
The Important Elements for Maintenance.....	35
The General Status of Public Artworks Maintenance in the United State	35
Case Study: Portland Regional Arts and Culture Council.....	35
Funding.....	36
Tracking artworks’ condition.....	36
Conservation with city department assistance	36
5 FINDINGS.....	39
Strengthening the Connection and Correspondence with Urban Planning	39
Multi-Modal Funding Methods.....	40
Taking Percent of Art policy as the basic way for funding	41
Earmarking the Government Program Fund for Its Specified Purposes	42
Establishing the Specialized Foundation	42
The Importance of Public Participation and Its Form	42
Diversity Forms of Exhibiting Artworks.....	45
Systematization of Artworks Maintenance	46
Tracking Method of the Status of Artworks.....	46
Cooperation with Government Departments during Maintenance Works	47
Periodic Review and Assessment	47
6 CONCLUSION.....	48
LIST OF REFERENCES	51
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	57

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>page</u>
4-1 DCA Selection procedure for public art program	38

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CA	California
CRA	Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency
DC	District of Columbia
DCCA	D.C. Commission on the Arts and Humanities
DCA	Chicago Department of Cultural Affairs
IL	Illinois
NEA	National Endowment for the Arts
NY	New York
OR	Oregon
PP&R	Portland Parks and Recreation
RACC	Regional Arts and Culture Council

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science in Architectural Studies

SUSTAINING URBAN CULTURE:
THE DESIGN AND OPERATION OF PUBLIC ART PLANNING PROGRAMS

By

Kexin Chen

December 2011

Chair: Bradley Walters
Major: Architecture

As a component of public space, public art has two attributes, “public” and “art”. Public art connects immediate experiences of life, but on the other hand it is related with art works which are transcendent. Public art contributes to the enhancement of our cities, and it also embodies a diversity of interests, cultures and values. In the 1930s Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal cultural programs began a federally funded, comprehensive development of public art. Since then, public art has had the opportunity to develop in a number of different forms to respond to changing social, cultural, and artistic condition. Public art is not an isolated entity, but rather a factor which is related with urban environment.

Public art planning strives for a reasonable disposition of art works in public space. And it also provides the guidelines of public art administration. The operation mechanisms of public art planning in the U.S. is maturing with the large number of cities, over 300, that have implemented a public art master plan. This thesis will analyze the operation mechanism of public art planning in United States.

The research will be used to evaluate five cities that serve as case studies and best practices for public art planning in the United States: Washington DC, Los Angeles CA, Chicago IL, City of New York NY and Portland OR. These five cities have different kinds of policy and operation procedures for public art programs. Each case study involves a major aspect of public art planning in order to analyze the existing operation mechanisms including organizational structures, fund raising, procedures for the selection of artwork, display technologies and planning for long-term maintenance. The most useful policies from these cities will be integrated into proposals and operational recommendations for the planning and implementation of new public art programs.

The results of case study research presents guidelines for the planning and implementation of new public art program in five aspects including: 1) the distribution of public art, 2) funding methods, 3) public participation, 4) diversity of works exhibited, and 5) long-term maintenance planning.

On the faith of such a mature and perfect operation mechanism, public art in America will, in its own way, present the cultural characteristics of the cities, enhance the city's individuality, and lead urban cultures to a virtuous cycle of sustainable development. This becomes an effective and sustainable way for people to improve their quality of life.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Research Background

Under the impact of continuing social and economic globalization, unique cultural differences and the particularities of a given place are threatened by a creeping homogeneity in architecture and urban development. It has become critical for cities to identify, preserve, develop, and celebrate their unique cultural characteristics while also nurturing the virtuous cycle and continuous development of urban cultures that are unique to a place. These have become the main goals of urban development

The planning and implementation of public art programs provide important means for sustaining the historical, social, and cultural aspects of place over time. Public art allows the city to present itself individually and with a unique artistic perspective. It creates and defines both the forms and the cultural characteristics of cities. As an important carrier of urban culture, public art plays an important role in urban life. It can lead to a well-organized integration of urban culture and a development process of relentless innovation. As a tool for sustaining urban cultures, public art improves cultural life and enhances the citizens' sense of belonging in their own cities.

What Is Public Art?

Opinions about public art are widely divided, which also vary in different times. Public art has undergone three principal phases in terms of the evolution of the concept, from an artistic concept in the 1960s to a percent policy in the beginning of the 20th century, and then to a planning system. The definition and forms of public art keep on changing. At different historical moments, public art has shifted from representing highly individual artistic ideologies, to implementation of national programs, and more

recently to becoming a principal vehicle through which designers and administrators plan the future cultural prospects and action agenda of the city. The forms of public art are no longer limited to traditional media and artifacts that occupy physical space. Increasingly, public art is being presented in new forms, including electronic media (Goldstein, 2005).

The locations of public artworks also shifts from works placed indoors, to single-piece artworks placed in public spaces, and finally to works that extend to encompass a public domain of some area. Accordingly, the scale of the artistic works also extends. During this process, the ways in which the public engages public art also changes from a remote artistic appreciation, to regarding it as the major policy to realize the political objectives, and finally to the enhancement of the public's participation in the policy-making and shaping of urban development.

Public artwork programs highlight the city's individuality and help to sustain the culture of a place. Public art is seen.

From very different perspectives, in the eyes of the artists, art serves expressive, ideological, and formal goals. In the eyes of planners and program managers, it is a means of space management. In the eyes of the public, it can serve to beautify and diminish a space, depending on an individual's response to the work.

In the 1960s, the rise of the postmodern culture and the birth of a new attitude towards the public domain provided public art with the living urban space; Western art began to undergo the transformation from aestheticism to culture. Public art itself developed greatly. The rise of popular culture changed the relationship between art and life, with art blending more deeply into people's daily life. Artists paid more attention to

the everyday life of the public. The speech styles of artists changed as well, with more individualistic and elitist forms of communication being replaced by the life-oriented, popularized, and common forms of speech.

The action mode of public art has also shifted from a sense of classical sacredness to a pursuit of efficient expression and communication. In this way, the relationship between artists and the public has become interactive, which illustrates precisely the idea of public art as the art of dialogue (Barnett, 2001).

For planners, the artistic qualities of public art include the formal qualities of the art as well as the activities of people in the public space, such as performance, behavior art, square art, etc. In addition, public art is the art of “publicity.” It reflects the right of a populace to share and participate in public affairs. With the right political and cultural frameworks, artworks can be abundant material carriers of cultural meaning and significance. Public art emphasizes the extensive participation and interaction with the public, directly engages social issues of concern to the populace, and creates a dialogue with the local conditions of place and the environment.

What Is Public Art Planning?

We can investigate the meaning of public art planning by defining the concept of “planning” and “public art”. “Planning” is called by governments as “operational decision”. In the related literature about research of public art planning, because of different perspectives, the definitions of planning are not necessarily the same, but typically it requires three elements. 1)Planning is a kind of policy choice; 2)Planning is goal-oriented; 3)Planning is a political process. (Webber, 1964) In illustrating these three aspects of planning, Weber suggests that “planning is a rational decision-making process for future goals, a course of action that has value judgment and can respond to

the reality, which needs to be chosen from a series of actions that can achieve the goals and give us clear comments as well as judgments” (Webber, 1964, p14).

Public art, as the prefix of the words “public art planning”, has determined the goals and content of planning. As public art space, from the space perspective, Public art is different from others; it is located in urban public space, such as city squares, streets, park green lands, parks along river, roadsides of urban traffic arteries. As to the planning management, public art planning involves Public art Commission, Department of Urban planning, Community Development Commission and City Council. It involves the entire process of urban planning and management from the perspective of implementation.

We can directly regard public art planning as a practical from serving public artistically through summarizing and concluding the above meanings. It focuses on the development of the “noneconomic” and contributes to realizing the social development goals of art as well as the welfare and rights that the members of society shall possess, which is a policy-making process of culture and art in which people actively engage. Public art planning is a planning mechanism that leads urban cultures to a well-organized integration and development of a virtuous cycle. It is a response to real urban cultures and also a course of action leading the cities to form unique cultures of their own. It is an important tool for cities to realize the sustainable development of their social cultures. Besides, it is also a significant means to enhance the citizens’ sense of belonging in the process of urban development and lead them to devote themselves to the sustainable development of their cities. To be specific, public art planning can be described as an action contributing to meeting the artistic needs of the individual and

group in the urban public space. It is the planning of the future urban cultural prospect and the guideline that respond to the sedimentation of the urban culture and realize the sustainment of the urban culture.

The Relationship between Public Art and Urban Planning

Public art is one special planning of the series of urban planning. If you want to study the operational mechanism of the public art, you shall make it clear the relationship between public art and urban planning. In his book "Principles and Practices of Town and Country Planning," Keeble (1952) writes that "urban planning can be described as a kind of science and art." Urban planning involves the design of urban spaces, defined by material objects, such as buildings, roads, public infrastructure, etc. Moreover, at the beginning of the birth of urban planning, such as the famous Paris planning, the urban beautification movement in America in the 19th century, etc, the setting of public crafts in modern urban design like sculptures and monuments were closely related to urban planning. From the perspective of the planning of the urban material shape, public art has become the major content of planning.

Therefore, art planning of urban public space is part of the entire urban planning process, deepening and supplementing current approaches. Public art involves the individual creations of the artists, the artistic pursuit of the minority, and the process of planning the prospect of the future urban culture, a course of action policy that responds to the reality and leads cities to form their own unique cultures. It is chosen from a series of actions that can achieve the sustainability goals of social culture and give us clear comments as well as judgments. In this process, public art planning integrates the cultural characteristics of the cities in a well-organized way, enhances the city's individuality, and leads urban cultures to a virtuous cycle of sustainable development.

Research Purpose and Significance

A powerful implementation of planning requires a mature operation mechanism as to guaranty outcomes. The related literature in America tends towards the ontological what is public art and methodologies about how to design to achieve this goal; the related literature about studying the operation mechanism of public art which is currently evolving.

At present, more than 300 cities in America has implemented public art planning, in the process of these practices; public art planning in America has developed a mature operation mechanism of public art. But with various public art implemented in each city, each city has independent policy support and mechanism that guides to develop itself. (City of San Deigo, 2004)

This text through several perspectives of the operation mechanism of public art, such as institutional setting, funding, ways of exhibiting and maintenance management, etc, analyzes different perspectives of policies and mechanisms of the five representative cities in America for developing public art program and concludes the guideline of public art program that implemented successfully. Thus, this thesis offers a beneficial reference for the planning and implementation of new public art program that yet to be developed in United State.

This paper is divided into six parts, continuing the overview of the research of this chapter; Chapter 2 will, by following the course of historical perspectives, describe the development process of public art planning and public art on how to change in the form and function, which gradually becomes significant part of public space; Chapter 3 will describe different perspectives of special policies and mechanisms of the representative cities in America for developing public art program and conclude the guideline of public

art program that implemented successfully; Chapter 4 will summarize guidelines of public art program that implemented successfully. Chapter 5 shall offer beneficial reference for the planning and implementation of new public art program.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

The Definition of “Public” in Public art

The reason why public art is different from arts of other kinds is mainly due to its “public” attribute. While based on different public perspectives, disputes about the public attribute of public art have never ceased during various historical periods of development.

A dispute over “whether the Public Art is an independent object or an element integrated into the public environment” prevailed from the 1970s through the 1980s. Such a dispute focused mainly on whether the public attribute of the Public Art presented the inner spirit of the work or the surroundings of the works. From the end of 1980s through the 1990s, disputes around the Public Art have focused not only on the works itself, but also extended to the artists creating the works. In some discourses, members of the community share in the act of creating public art. Temporary exhibitions and moveable works placed in the public sphere emerged as public art. Contemporary ideas do not limit public art to physical space but also engage electronic media. “The 59th Minutes,” for example, is a work by Creative Time Corporation that utilizes illuminated LED panels to incorporate moving, changing images in public art (Goldstein , 2005).

Just due to its publicity, the artistic independence of public art is limited to some extent. Public art cannot simply follow the media for the inner thinking and expression of the artist. Generally speaking, there are no criteria for the success or the failure of the works. Instead, comments of various kinds may occur due to different interpretation. However, based on its peculiar publicity, opinions by the public become a key standard

to judge the success or the failure of the public artistic works. Whether to keep or remove the works depends directly on the decision of the public. For example, the public artistic works, "Tilted Arc" is deemed as a scar of the city, and finally removed for the sake of tremendous criticism from the public (Senie, 1989). This process is right a reflection of public's participation in public art, showing the contradictoriness of the Public Art that is different from other arts.

The Development History of Public Art Planning in the United States

The definition of public art has been constantly evolving since the earliest monument was installed in the U.S. President Roosevelt established Works Progress Administration during his term of office and comprehensively implemented art program throughout the country. In the 1930s, sponsoring the art became a national policy; and in the 1950s, Philadelphia became the first city passing the Percent for Art Policy propelled by these art policies (Goldstein, 2005).

Compare private art and public art, artists would be more interested in creating the art in public domain rather than that in private space, while public art resource played a broader role in social life.

During the period from 1963 to 1972, some budgets under the government building plan were used to sponsor art programs (Senie, 1989). The government considered the necessary part of art buildings to be the extension of buildings environment, and allocated 1% to 2% of government building budget to sponsor the works of art every year.

As precedent of federal government to support public art, it guided the ethos of supporting the works of art across the U.S. regardless of public budgeting or private

sponsoring. Deutshe (1992) looked into public art from the perspective of a link in land use and urban development strategy in his *Public art and Its Uses*.

Since the 1960s, the works of art has greatly increased in getting the opportunities of being supported by funds, and meanwhile, the contemporary artists have also gained more experience in public domain (Senie, 1989). Therefore, public art has experienced tremendous changes no matter in the forms or functions, and instead of just an art entity, it has commenced to melt into the whole metropolis environment, and has manifested the loving care from residents.

In 1972, Robert Smithson, the artist once said that art should be deemed as more than just a luxury, and should be melted in manufacturing local landscaping and land reforming. Smithson failed to realize any land reforming plan; however, from 1973 to 1974, Robert Morris completed the first public fund-sponsored plan with land reforming function, which was located in Grand Rapids, Michigan, was the first program of public domain plan sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts. (as cited in Senie, 1989)

In the 1980s, the public sculpture and facilities arouse another concern from the new generation of public artists, who defined their works as urban designers. Public artworks of Bolton, which could be described as the pioneer of this generation, adopted a fusion form of sculpture and furniture to offer seats in many cities for ornament and rest. For instance, in the landscaping design for Wiesner Building of MIT in 1985, Bolton designed the shape of seats and banister inside the building, Richard Fleischner designed the peripheral space of the building, and while Kenneth Noland decided the color and floral pattern of interior and exterior walls. (Senie, 1989)

In addition, these artists also deemed the design of city channels access to public art as the unified work. Therefore, they started to design sculpture works with various forms and functions, and various works which were in conformity with the urban demand, and even on-street seats which were previously designed by engineers or metropolis designers were incorporated into their design scope.

After the artists gave new consideration to the characteristics of public domain and local residents, they gradually tended to develop a democracy of Public art. And the artists also attempted to extend the scope of meaning of Public art and building, just as indicated in *An American Sense of Place* by Dolores Hayden (1989).

In the course of ceaseless development of public art, with unceasing evolution of forms and functions, public art is becoming closer and closer linked to the cities, and urban space design has been a key factor to be considered in combination with their works of art. And the works of art in public domain has become a factor which should not be ignored in urban design.

Contemporary Public Art Programs

In 1935, President Roosevelt established the Works Progress Administration during his term of office and comprehensively implemented an art program throughout the country (Goldstein, 2005). Since then, there are over 300 public art programs subsidized by the American Government. Moreover, mass public art has come into being in public space full cooperation between government and individual or in the form of development by independent individuals.

Federal Organization

Specialized public art constitutes a part of both urban environment construction and public culture undertaking construction, and requires the establishment of

organizations with a similarly specialized nature, whether from the administrative perspective or capital operation and management perspectives.

The administrative system of the USA is divided into three levels as federal, state, county and municipal zones. The federal government specially established the National Endowment for the Arts(NEA) and the National Public Art Commission(NPARC); the variegated tasks of both these official bodies include promoting the development and construction of visual arts, judging and subsidizing public art programs approved by the federal government, nourishing creative artists, publishing art theory, etc (National Endowment for the Arts [NEA], 2011).

Since the 1960s, the Works Progress Administration has played a model role in sponsoring public art, and the government has always reserved some budget allocated to sponsor public art programs (Senie, 1989). Accordingly, sponsorship for various approved art forms has remained stable and steady ever since.

While NEA has implemented the program “Art in Public Space” in manifold ways, providing sponsorship funds to local organizations which intend to establish public art in specified locations. It is projected that public artworks will eventually become the asset subsidized by local places instead of the federal government (NEA, 2011).

State Organization

The lesser management departments of various states and government organizations, such as the Department of Cultural Affairs, established the Public Art Commission, which generally consists of the representatives of planning organizations, public works organizations, cultural affairs organizations and, not least, art circles. It organizes, presides over and promotes the affairs of the domain, and organizes and entrusts the domain representatives and government organization representatives with

specific affairs. For consultations in individual cases of public art, the commission consists of architects, artists and representatives of relevant communities, who will select the creative artists.

Private Organization

Due to special right of autonomy in public art programs, private organizations encourage more art experimentation and innovation. As non-profit private organizations of public art, they are ideally equipped with a competent curator to be in charge of public art programs, and their board of directors tend to have influence in cultural and administrative domains. The members of the board of directors, who serve in these domains, have abundant social resources in the favor of public art's implementation. The artists who are in charge of the program generally come from private organizations that initiate the program (Goldstein, 2005). There are two approaches to select the artists in charge of relevant programs: invitation and competitive bidding.

Each private organization cooperates with both the junior and senior artists, who do not lacking frequent international cooperation. The private organizations have many supportive member groups, who form the expanding foundation that communicate with the public at large, and also support and promote public art proposed by private organizations.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

Chapter 3 describes a methodology for describing and analyzing the existing operation mechanisms of U.S. cities and the useful policies which can be used as references. The main methodology utilized is a case study research design, with some units and dimensions of analysis, which are conducted to complete the case study findings.

Selection of Case Studies

The five case studies discussed in this research are Washington D.C., Los Angeles, California, Chicago, Illinois, the City of New York and Portland, Oregon. At the most basic level, these five cases were selected because each city represented public art planning in five distinct areas of the U.S. and implemented various public art policies and organizations. In addition, research regarding policy and procedure for art programs was conducted. Beyond that, the cases were selected for their unique combination of similarities and differences and, furthermore, the high quality of these cities' practices,

Many public artworks have been commissioned after the Percent for Art Policy was established (Senie, 1989). And certain cities have special policies that can be used as a reference for other cities. Washington D.C. has established a framework for new art programs over the next five years, especially planning policies regarding priority locations for projects. Washington D.C. plays a leading role among these cities in planning the distribution of artworks (D.C. Commission on the Arts and Humanities [DCCA], 2009). And Los Angeles has three different ways to raise funds for art programs, depending on the types of funding source. The funding mechanism is flexible and resilient in keeping a stable funding source to develop public art. The third case,

Chicago, has implemented a disciplined process for artwork selection, which involves the participation of three major roles: governments, artists and community representatives.

The City of New York is the location of the most private public art organizations. The means by which the artists of private organizations present artworks is decidedly innovative and adventurous. In the final case, Portland's government has implemented a comprehensive plan for art's maintenance, which constitutes financial support, artworks' information and partnership with city department.

Analysis Methodology

Case Study Research Design

The research utilizes multiple case studies research designs, which “much depends on an investigator’s own style of rigorous thinking, along with the sufficient presentation of evidence and careful consideration of alternative interpretations” (Yin, 2003, p. 110).

The major aspects of the operation mechanism for public art planning will be addressed, such as organization setting, raising fund, display technology and maintenance planning. The cities which represented public art development have different kinds of policy and operation procedure for the cultivation of public art programs. Useful policies will be integrated from these cities as the reference, which develops operation recommendations for the future planning and implementation of a new public art program.

The following aspects of analysis were considered:

- The relevant documents of a public art master plan
- The art forms that public art program displayed.

- The responsibilities of artists, local community and government
- The organization for public art programs' management and improvement.
- The mechanism of fund raising
- The influence of public art on cities in the U.S.
- The portion of urban planning that provides the reference for a planning public art program.
- The analysis documents regarding art programs from several agencies in different fields of the city development.

Data Collection

The method of data collection for case studies' research is reviewing city websites concerned with public art programs, Charters, codes and public policies. Documents regarding art program from several agencies in different fields of the city development were collected, such as the Department of Parks and Recreation, the District Department of the Environment and the Community Redevelopment Agency. A summary of findings will then be presented.

CHAPTER 4 CASE STUDIES

Public art plans implemented in U.S. cities are various, because they are prepared by different city entities. Chapter 4 studies the major procedures and aspects of public art planning: artworks' spatial distribution, government-based funding, selection procedure for public art programs, exhibiting, review and maintenance, private organization and sustainability are all important factors to consider. In addition, Chapter 4 presents five specific cases from U. S. cities. Chapter 4 will analyze the ordinances, policies and principles which relate to these aspects of public art planning, and also analyze how these policies lead U.S. cities to cultural sustainability.

Spatial Distribution of Artworks

Distributing Artworks in the City Spaces

City public spaces are the medium and connection between public artworks and citizens; they provide a platform for communication between public art and people. Effective communication sometimes depends on a location of artwork; whether it could attract and convene people from elsewhere. Considering the aforementioned factor, artwork distribution is an important tool for the systemic organization of vitalizing the city and stimulating the way public art interacts with people.

The General Status of Artwork Distribution Plans in the United State

With regard to the general status of artwork distribution plan, most official government websites provide a map for public artworks' walking tour and illustrate the location of existing artworks for travelers and citizens. A few maps are divided into the district size, according to the type of attraction. However, there are few specific guidelines and principles for artworks' distribution for artist and organization.

Case Study: Washington D.C. Public Art Master Plan

Public art program plans provide a vision for what public art in a city will be. D.C. Creates! Public Art Master Plan is the guideline for the developmental direction of public art over the next five years. The plan explains how public artworks play a role in the process of urban construction in the future (DCCA, 2009). The way public artworks are integrated within city spaces is one of the main directions which the plan will focus on.

Goals and priorities for public artwork distribution

Washington D.C is creating a number of artistic places set into the urban fabric to enhance vitality and shape the city character. The public art program will be evaluated according to the criteria. The important and core principle is that artwork should be located in sites that are essential for city environment and citizen. DCCA (2009) established three criteria for meeting these principles:

- **VISIBILITY.** Places where people convene are much more attractive and accessible. This could include an important facility for a city, such as parks, recreation center and river fronts, metro station areas and street corridors.
- **SITE COMPATIBILITY.** Places have a close relationship with arts. Site should be chosen where conditions are suitable to integrate arts, including background, scale and surrounding environment.
- **RELATION TO CITY PATTERN.** Places are shared spaces or road networks that connect different civic areas. This could include main arteries and plaza.

Public artwork distribution in Washington D.C.

Selection of artwork location by Washington D.C. government depends on various plans, such as transportation planning, parks and recreation, such as D.C.

Comprehensive plan. Meaningful places that could be considered for public art projects are identified through these plans. Urban planning, to some degree, determines the

distribution of artwork in a city, because of city spaces whose attributes are determined by urban planning are mediums between artworks and citizens.

Government –Based Funding

Government Policy Support for Public Art

Art value is increasingly being recognized by many states, cities and organizations. Governments establish legal system to ensure the placement of public artworks in the process of urban construction. Finance support is an essential means to ensure the operation of public art. The funding policy which most governments have adapted is 1% or 2% of construction cost for city improvement project will be set aside for design, installation and maintenance of artworks. (Berkowitz, 2005) “Percent for art program”, this policy is an effective method to support public art basing on government administration.

The General Status of “Percent for Art” in the United States

Ever since Franklin D. Roosevelt's implementation of the New Deal Cultural Program in the 1930s, the U.S. has carried out and sponsored art programs on the federal level. The administration system for the implementation processes of art programs was established subsequently. Of all American cities, Philadelphia was the first to pass the legislation of “percent for art” in the 1950s; This legislation has been widely implemented throughout U.S. cities (Goldstein, 2005). As a result, increasing number of public artworks have appeared in the public realm to revitalized city life.

Case Study: Funding Mechanism of Los Angeles

Art programs in Los Angeles are under the supervision of the Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA). With regard to public art funding, CRA adopts “percent for arts” legislation as one of the major funding methods. In addition,

the CRA has three different ways to raise funds for art programs, which depends on the types of funding sources, e.g. private developers, Cultural Trust Funds and public funds. The resiliency of the funding mechanism keeps funding sources sufficiently stable to develop public art.

Private developer obligation

“Private development projects with CRA participation must obligate at least 1% of development cost to developing a project plan” (Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency [CRA], 2005). Based on this stipulation, there are three options for private developers to satisfy the obligation: on-site public art, cultural facility and cultural trust fund. If a developer chooses the first and second, which plans investments as artistic entities, up to 60% of the development cost may be set aside to cultivate a public art site; up to 100% of the development cost may be spent for a cultural facility(Goldstein, 2005).

Cultural Trust Fund

The Cultural Trust Fund is managed by the Community Redevelopment Agency to develop public art construction. At least 40% of the obligation must contribute to the Cultural Trust Fund. As another option, the developer could also contribute the full obligation to Cultural Trust Fund to develop other public art projects (CRA, 2005).

Public Funds

Projects which receives their funding public funds, such as transportation grants, community development block grants, and other public funding (CRA, 2005).

Selection Procedure for Public Art Program

Selection Processes for a Successful Public Art Program

The success of a public art programs greatly depend on what constitutes design conception and whether it generates a response from the public. Government, artists and the public play their roles in the public art program and help determine the final and best artwork most suitable for the project site. Government organizations play a leading role to ensure that the selecting process is carried on smoothly towards the right direction.

The General Selection for Art Programs in the United State

The Public art commissions of U.S cities have focused primarily artist selection, neglecting artworks. The selection process identifies a suitable artist for a particular art program by a panel composed of a combination of arts and design professionals, and community representatives or stakeholders (Goldstein, 2005). The final work depends on which artist they have chosen. In fact, a successful art program is dependent on the artwork, not the artist. The content of artwork perhaps requires more discussion. In contrast, the City of Chicago has an unusual and specific selection procedure.

Case Study: Selection Procedure of Chicago Department of Cultural Affairs

The public art program is administered by the Department of Cultural Affairs (DCA). Artwork which is considered to be the work of a public art program should pass the appropriate consultation process as prescribed (Chicago Department of Cultural Affairs [DCA], 2007). The Chicago Department of Cultural Affairs has implemented a disciplined process on artwork selection with the aim of making public art programs more attractive and suitable.

Artist registry

The DCA will chose artists who have applied to the Public Art Program Artist Registry which is a list of artist information for art projects in Chicago. Artist could submit their personal information, including their artwork in any format to DCA. An objective evaluation of artist' submission will be carried on among the consultants in the process of selection. The program staff notifies the artist in the registry who has done work that may be suitable for the location of public art program, then the artist' submissions are selected by the community representatives and art experts (DCA, 2007).

Four forums selection

Project less than \$10,000 are directly commissioned. In contrast, the project whose budget exceeds \$10,000 is commissioned through a competitive process as specified below (DCA, 2007).

There are four forums within the selection process of especial relevance are the perspectives of art professors and governmental units and communities who may be involved in the project (Figure 4-1). The first forum consists of the program staff presenting information about the art project to the representatives of community to receive advice. The second forum will present additional information about the changes in design conceptions, constructions and installations after the staff received the submitted work from the artists. The third forum consists of art experts selecting the number of submitted works from artists who are the finalists. Finally, the fourth forums will be convened to discuss the final work with representatives of community, negotiate changes based on community advices and make recommendations to the Commissioner of Cultural Affairs. (DCA, 2007)

Exhibiting

Generating City Culture by Exhibiting Artworks

As an important element in public art programs, exhibiting artworks provides a platform for the direct communication between public art and citizens. In the course of communication, responses of people who have viewed artworks are generated; because people's resonance with artwork reflects the common culture background. Then the responses develop into a particular behavior, which becomes a new base for the evolution of original culture. For example, the famous sculpture "Red Love" in New York City displays the unique city culture of advocating love. The sculpture generates empathy, which results in a various versions being recreated based on the original sculpture design (Wikis, 2011). These behaviors are becoming a new cultural font for New York City.

The General Status of Exhibiting Art Program in the United State

According to exhibition time, there are two types of public art projects: permanent and temporary. A permanent artwork is invariably a gift from another city or country or a memorial for commemorating a significant event or figure. In contrast, temporary artworks are usually an exhibition for a particular topic; after a period of time, the artworks will be replaced. With regard to other elements for exhibiting artwork, materials and forms are indispensable for a successful exhibition. Most American artists still adopt traditional materials to display their work, such as steel, copper and stone. A stationary object is commonly used for the display.

Case Study: Private Organization "Creative Time" in New York

Creative Time, a private and nonprofit organization in New York City, has engaged public art projects over 30 years. For the sake of vitality and experimentation, they

usually explore the means to present artwork in adventurous ways and encourage artists to experiment. This organization redefines the notion of what art is by these means (Creative Time, 2011).

Diversity materials for exhibiting

To commemorate the victims of the September 11 attacks, Creative Time set the art installation “Tribute in Light” at the site of World Trade Center. Since 2003, the 88 searchlights have created two vertical columns of light every year on September 11(Creative Time, 2011). As a temporary memorial, the organization selected searchlights which could be easily moved away. Furthermore, the lights express the image of the destroyed building to honor memories. Traditionally, light represents the feeling of warmth and hope, an inspires the viewer with hope. Creative Time chose the specific material to display according to the objective of the art programs. To support artists’ creative ideas, Creative Time offered technical expertise to realize the goal of using diversity materials.

The interaction with public in the exhibiting process

The Freedom of Expression National Monument is a public art program based on the interaction with public participation. People are invited to stand at an elevation and speak out what they want to say (Creative Time, 2011). The whole process of public participation is a homage to free expression. Being different from other artworks, this art program is not a complete work without involvement. The program displays design conception by interaction with people, offering a speaking platform for society to vent limitless subjects. This participation process has deepened both public impressions and cognition about this artwork (Creative Time, 2011).

Maintenance and Review

The Important Elements for Maintenance

Maintenance of public art programs can protect artworks from damage and corrosion for the long term, reflecting the city's desire for sustainability by rationally utilizing resources. The ideal maintenance involves three elements: a financial guarantee to support the operation, an information system which can track the situation of artworks and a reasonable working arrangement for major and routine maintenance (Goldstein, 2005). An ideal planning maintenance program will lead public art systems towards sustainable development.

The General Status of Public Artworks Maintenance in the United State

Planning for maintenance should be prepared at the same time the public art program is established. The means of funding way and a roster for the works' maintenance should be also confirmed at the beginning of the program; this can be a apt preparation for a possible damage. In the actual situation, planning for maintenance in most of American cities always begins with the realization that a public work is in a damaged state; then maintenance work will be carried out to restore the artworks.

Case Study: Portland Regional Arts and Culture Council

Portland Regional Arts and Culture Council (RACC) contributes to vibrant city space by public artworks. RACC manages Percent for Art program for the city of Portland (Regional Arts and Culture Council [RACC], 2008). As an necessary part of the public art program, planning for Portland artworks maintenance is established at the beginning of preparing a public art master plan. There are three indispensable and interdependent aspects which constitute the maintenance plan: funding, tracking artworks situation and conservation with city department assistance.

Funding

The funds pursuant to the Percent for Art policy of Portland shall be deposited into the Public Art Trust Fund, a special fund maintained by the Regional Arts and Culture Council. Excepting the funds used for fabrication, installation and administration of public art, 10% of the funds should be used for the maintenance and conservation of the public art program of Portland (City of Portland, 2011). This policy is a strong financial guarantee to support public art program's maintenance activities.

Tracking artworks' condition

The physical characteristics and maintenance requirements of artworks is stored to establish an information database for city artworks collection. The database also includes the assessment of artwork condition in every period. RACC conservators will check and report the condition of the pieces. Excepting technical conservators, citizens are encouraged to engage this work. They volunteer to report vandalism or graffiti damage through a specific connection (RACC, 2011). This well-organized tracking system is established by collaboration with government and citizens.

Conservation with city department assistance

Public artwork rests in a place which belongs within city departments' property. The city department shall assume some routine maintenance. Considering this factor, a formal maintenance agreement which lists the responsibility of each other will be signed by RACC and the city department. Establishing a partnership with city departments will provide a better maintenance system for public art program.

For instance, to preserve and enhance sculpture in Portland, RACC signed a maintenance agreement with Portland Parks and Recreation (PP&R). RACC is seeking a way to establish a partnership with PP&R to share the obligation of artworks'

maintenance. All major maintenance work of the sculptures is the responsibility of RACC, PP&R will provide the routine maintenance of certain parts of the sculpture in consultation with RACC. If necessary, RACC will provide a brochure which list the guidelines of maintenance to PP&R (RACC, 2011).

CHAPTER 5 FINDINGS

Public art planning varies from city to city in the U.S. The current study begins with major aspects of the operating mechanisms for public art programs, including organizational establishment, funding, exhibition strategies, maintenance, and management. By analyzing the operating mechanisms for the public art planning of five representative cities in the U.S., we can select the best practices developed and implemented in these cities, and use these to develop a set of proposed guiding principles for the cultivation of a new public art program

Strengthening the Connection and Correspondence with Urban Planning

Overall planning demonstrates the long-term development objectives of public art from the perspective of urban strategy. The content of urban planning mainly includes the management of spatial patterns of urban man made environment and public art, which exists in entity form as a component of urban space and is in conformity with relevant content of urban planning. Public art planning has a close and interactive relationship with urban planning, and the former strengthens its correspondence with the content of the latter in the aspects of spatial pattern, level and procedure.

Understanding urban spatial pattern and functional division will contribute to the planning for overall layout of public art, and is also an important reference factor for the selecting position of public art programs. From the spatial perspective, urban space manifests various patterns in light of various functions and forms. The most basic pattern units are point, line and face. Moreover, the functional divisions of urban space are also important reference factors for the density degree of crowd conglomeration and human flow rate of a unit time. In the Washington D.C public art master plan, the

selection of artwork locations incorporates a number of plans including those for the form of urban space, transportation planning, parks and recreation, and the Washington D.C. Comprehensive Plan. Meaningful places that could be considered for public art projects are identified in this way, working across numerous specialized plans (DCCA, 2009).

One way that the distribution of works of art in urban space can be considered is in terms of point, line and face. The term “point” refers to both vital intersections and pivots of traffic routes in traffic planning. Public facilities with dense crowds are reference places selected for the public artworks. “Line” refers to vital vehicle traffic routes and pedestrian trails in traffic planning. Examples of these may include a green landscape trail, key commercial and/or recreational streets, sightseeing routes, and/or main traffic corridors. “Face” considers green landscapes and recreational areas of cities. These are divided by the District Department of the Environment and the Department of Parks and Recreation in light of relevant urban zoning, and are taken as the sites for public art programs. And in light of cultural tourism planning, the location of an important cultural heritage is also the reference area selected for of public artworks. Moreover, in light of the functional division of urban land plots, special artistic neighborhoods with intensive development are also a development priority for the distribution of public artworks..

Multi-Modal Funding Methods

Since the implementation of the Percent for Art Policy, some program construction expenses are taken as a stationary source of funding for public art, which enables resources to expand and develop in an unprecedented way (Goldstein, 2005). Firstly, from the national policy level, the Percent for Art, as a cultural welfare policy which

represents the American ideal art pattern, assumes the social function of "cultural aesthetics welfare". Then from the percent perspective, the policies vary in different cities, ranging from 1% to 2% as a whole. Objectively, their percent floating shall refer to local economic prosperity and awareness of social culture.

Fund operation is the entire foundation of the operating mechanism for public art planning, and ensuring sound turnover and steady resources of funding is the objective of policy formulated to collect funds. In the case study of public art planning in Los Angeles, the CRA has three different ways to raise fund for art program depending on the types of funding source, such as private developer, Cultural Trust Fund, and public funds (CRA, 2005). Multi-models for funding: Divide the funding methods in light of various program categories, form diversified funding models, develop elastic policies targeting to various development subjects (private, government, Public Art Commission) and various program objectives (developing targeted position, public cultural facilities, establishing cultural trust funds), and provide flexible implementation measures and steady fund resources for the operation of public art programs.

Taking Percent of Art policy as the basic way for funding

Adopt the mode of cooperation between individual and government, which establishes policies to supervise and urge the Percent of Art in individual programs and its universal application in development program. The Percent of Art, as the main resource for collecting funds of public art programs, provides multiple flexible choices for development plans of art programs and large platforms for the developers in implementing the plans.

Earmarking the Government Program Fund for Its Specified Purposes

Establish art plans specific to the municipal construction program developed by the government. Alternately, the development of plans led by the art commission, involved in the fields of government program fund, may also apply for the government program fund as a resource for the art program.

Establishing the Specialized Foundation

To ensure that the Public Art Commission yearly completes quantitative art programs and operates sudden artistic planning programs smoothly, the establishment of foundation contributes to stabilize the resource of funding for developing art programs; an elastic plan for funding is therefore established to ensure sustainable development and operation of the art program. The establishment of foundation has three advantages as follows:

- Ensure an uninterrupted supply of funding for the long term. Not subject to the limitation of development program in respect of scale and quantity in certain time section.
- Ensure the appreciation of fund. The fund placed in the foundation may be used to invest and create extra profit income when no art program is underway.
- Expand the using channels of fund and the scope of public art program. The development of art programs is not be subject to the program direction and developers category, and diversified art directions is to be encouraged.

The Importance of Public Participation and Its Form

Distinct from general art, public art, is characterized by its “publicity,” and its inseparable relationship with public space, and city space user – the public in general, to whom it “speaks.” It obviously manifests the importance of public participation to the public art program. Public art loses public participation has lost its original attributes of “publicity”, and is “put on a high shelf,” and is beyond the tangible, real life world.

Public participation plays various roles in the operation process of public art planning:

Firstly, in the preliminary phase, fully understand the rich cultural deposits of local cities, and recognize the demands and aesthetic preferences of citizens. Appoint experts who are familiar with local particular contexts, and select community representatives from the project place to form a public advisory body, which enables the artists and program staff to gain in-depth knowledge of local background, contexts and aesthetic preferences; this provides solid preliminary work and reference documentation for art programs. In the selection process of Chicago public art program, the first forum consists of the program staff presenting information about the art project to the representatives of community to receive advice (DCA, 2007). During the process, public participation facilitates citizens' appreciation with pieces reflecting local culture, and thereby promoting a sense of identity in terms of the urban common cultural ideal and collective culture.

Secondly, in the works-selection phase, the selected community representatives, as part of the judging commission, actively participate in communication and feedback with artists, government and relevant program participators, so as to decide the finalist works, and, based on local citizen's demands and cultural backgrounds, make suggestions on to the program staff. In the selection process of Chicago public art program, the fourth forums will be convened to discuss the final work with representatives of community, negotiate changes based on community advices and make recommendations to the Commissioner of Cultural Affairs (DCA, 2007). During the process, the development of an art program gains more understanding and support

from local citizens. During the process of selecting public art, the representatives of both the citizenry and experts, as the supervisory personnel of government, ensure that the government protects public interest on a wide range, thereby enhancing the trust of citizens.

Thirdly, in the works-exhibition phase, establish the link of interaction between public art programs and citizens, which will contribute to the engagement of the public with works of art, thereby creating more profound understanding on motives and meanings of art programs. As for the art program of “The Freedom of Expression National Monument”, it is based on the interaction with public participation. Being different from other artworks, this art program is not a complete work without involvement. The art program displays design conception by interaction with people (Creative Time, 2011). Such an approach deepens the public's impression of art and attracts more citizens and visitors to participate in it.

Fourthly, in the maintenance, review and assessment phase, we encourage citizens to actively participate in the maintenance of works of art, and assist the government in establishing a citizen supervisory system on a wide range, which is characterized by both high efficiency and low cost. With respect to the maintenance plan of Portland City, excepting technical conservators, citizens are encouraged to engage this work. They volunteer to report vandalism or graffiti damage through a specific connection. This well-organized tracking system is established by collaboration with government and citizens (RACC, 2011).

Thus, it is demonstrated that the public participates in the primary link of public art planning and operation, and assists governments in understanding the practical

demand of citizens, thereby ensuring the publicity of public art programs, obtaining wider support from the common people and promoting a sense of identity for distinctive urban culture.

Diversity Forms of Exhibiting Artworks

Exhibition is arguably the most direct and extensive part of the exchange between art work and the public, while expression is, as the most important part of exhibition, directly related to the concept of an art project; its success rests on whether it can be expressed and demonstrated through corresponding expression. For the sake of vitality and experimentation, Creative Time Corporation usually explores the means to present artwork in adventurous ways and encourage artists to experiment in various artistic forms (Creative Time, 2011). From another perspective, if the idea within is genuine, it needs external exhibition to attract the attention of the public. The current trend of the expressing form of public art can be divided into the following three categories:

- Use dynamic expressing forms, which attract the attention of the public by moving pictures, such as electronic screen, video, etc,
- Use advanced scientific materials, pursue changes and innovations in form and express inner meaning more appropriately, e.g. LEDs, searchlights with anti-aircraft light, etc. For example, "Tribute in Light" which art program has created two vertical columns of lights by the 88 searchlights (Creative Time, 2011).
- During the exhibition, emphasize the interaction between people and artworks, and increase the sections of interaction to help the public better understand the meaning of artwork.

During the design of the expressing forms of artwork, encourage artists to be audacious. Combined with objectives, as well as the design requirements, the inner meaning of artworks are better reflected.

Systematization of Artworks Maintenance

Due to natural erosion and manmade affects such as vandalism and graffiti, the destruction and marring of artwork not only affects appearance, but results in a waste of resources. Large amounts of artwork in city space require regular maintenance. As an necessary part of the public art program, planning for Portland artworks maintenance is established at the beginning of preparing a public art master plan (RACC, 2008). Because of the numerous and jumbled numbers, as well as the diversification in styles and material qualities, artworks must have an orderly public art project maintenance system to sustain the art for future generations.

Tracking Method of the Status of Artworks

Firstly, establish an information database of the public art project: at the beginning record the relevant information and characteristics, and register maintenance records of related artworks in detail. Portland City artworks collection is established as an information database which stores the physical characteristics and maintenance requirements of artworks (RACC, 2008). Later, establish an information. This allows for the implementation of future maintenance program.

Secondly, establish cooperation relationships between governments and citizens: encourage citizens to supervise and maintain consciously public art projects around them, report to the relevant authorities if there are any damages, and also provide citizens with a specific connection channel. For instance, Portland government provides a specific email address for citizens to report vandalism or graffiti damage to any piece of Portland public art (RACC, 2008).

Cooperation with Government Departments during Maintenance Works

During maintenance work, seek the possibility of cooperating with the governments at the place where art projects are located, share the expenses needed during the maintenance work and take on the responsibilities of daily work. Given the actual condition of the project, under the guidance of the experts of the art committee, governments share some relatively simple daily cleaning techniques. For instance, to preserve and enhance sculpture in Portland, RACC signed a maintenance agreement with Portland Parks and Recreation (PP&R). PP&R will provide the routine maintenance of certain parts of the sculpture in consultation with RACC (RACC, 2008).

Periodic Review and Assessment

Maintain and review art project at regular times. Reassess each artwork, and according to the feedback and survey of the citizens, review the significance of the project to urban environment and culture, thus ensuring its influence to the city; this determines either removal or retainment of artworks.

CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION

Much needed attention has been recently given to sustainable development of the city, especially with regards to energy and the environment. Sustainable design, however, must also address social, cultural, and historical issues. The sustainable development of the city can also be achieved by shaping and displaying the character of the city, sustaining the city's unique characteristics of culture and attracting talent, technology and capital. Since the 20th century, public art has been continuously evolving in its form and function. Artists are continually expanding the creative fields (Goldstein, 2005), making public art in social life play a more extensive role, and creating work that becomes an integral part of urban space. As an important carrier of urban culture, the planning of public art programs can both respond to a city's formal and social trajectories and can serve to introduce new directions that may guide future urban development.

Well-developed operating protocols can help ensure a sound public art planning program. Through urban practice, public art planning in the U.S. has certainly developed into a mature public art operation mechanism. By evaluating existing programs, policies, and mechanisms as implemented in a number of major metropolitan areas, it is possible to develop "best practices" that can be used to develop proposals for new public arts programs.

The cities of Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, California, Chicago, Illinois, New York, New York, and Portland, Oregon were selected because of particular attributes of their public arts programs, as well as their overarching attitudes towards the development of American public art. Washington D.C has made a five-year plan for

directing future public art projects, and the city has formulated a distribution map with input from a number of different departments (DCCA, 2009). Los Angeles has formulated different ways to collect funds according to the different types of projects, including private funding sources, cultural trusts, and governmental sources (CRA, 2005). Chicago has a set of detailed and strict working procedures for selecting public artworks. Community representatives and artists collaborate in the process of choosing public artworks (DCA, 2007). Certain artists and art organizations in New York City are included because they are flexible, capable of proposing bold attitudes towards art, and evince unique innovations. These include new forms of expression, the use of diversified scientific and technological materials, development of electronic screen images, and LED technologies, to name a few (Creative Time, 2011). In the last case, Portland has established a relatively complete work mechanism to maintain artwork, track their status and evaluate them regularly. Special contact channels have also been established, encouraging people to participate in art maintenance works (RACC, 2011).

By analyzing the five cities above, we can summarize the policies and mechanisms of the referable public art projects in each city. First of all, the layout of public art should be combined with urban planning. In the process of launching new projects, existing city planning needs to be referred to, and public art project sites should be set. Secondly, to insure a stable source of funding for public art, funds need to be collected through multiple channels. Thirdly, the publicity of public art decides the necessity for public participation. In the process of operation, attention needs to be paid to the setting of public participation, which is helpful in reflecting the democracy of public art and guiding the interaction between the public and the work of art. Fourthly, the

diversified utilization of scientific and technological materials, LED, electronic screen, and images have encouraged artists to make still bolder attempts at self expression.

The combination of goals with design requirements will help reflect the inner meaning of art better. Finally, systematic maintenance work should be taken, so as to establish information databases for urban public art projects, strengthen the cooperation relationship between governments and citizens, and re-select art works periodically.

By documenting and understanding the guiding principles of successfully operated public art projects, this thesis aspires to serve as a critical reference for the planning and implementation of new public art programs. It aims to lead the planning in support of integrating, presenting, and sustaining the cultural characteristics of cities. To some extent, an effective planning mechanism ensures the realization of public art in urban space, which can improve citizens' spiritual life quality, enhance their sense of belonging within their own cities, attract talent and economic investment, and sustain both the life and character of the city.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Americans for the Arts, & Goldstein, B. (2005). *Public art by the book (1st ed.)*. Seattle: Americans for the Arts in association with University of Washington Press.
- Bach, P. B. (1989). To light up Philadelphia: Lighting, public art, and public space. *Art Journal*, 48(4), *Critical Issues in Public Art*, 324-330. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/777017>
- Barnett, T. (2001). The oral history review: Dialogues in public art. *The Oral History Review*, 28(2), 162-164. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3675790>; <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3675790>
- Basa, L. (2008). *The artist's guide to public art: How to find and win commissions*. New York, NY: Allworth Press.
- Berkowitz, R. L. (1978). One percent solution: A legislation response to public support for the arts. *U.Tol.L.Rev.*, 10, 124. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/utol10&div=12&g_sent=1&collection=journals
- Bischoff, A. (1995). Greenways as vehicles for expression. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 33(1-3), 317-325. doi:DOI: 10.1016/0169-2046(94)02025-B
- Blum, A., Houston Conwill, Johanson, P., Kozloff, J., Sonfist, A., Sugarman, G. Zimmerman, E. (1989). From the other side: Public artists on public art. *Art Journal*, 48(4), *Critical Issues in Public Art*, 336-346. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/777019>
- Brenson, M., Pasternak, A., & Peltason, R. A. (2007). *Creative time : The book : 33 years of public art in New York City (1st ed.)*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Chicago Department of Cultural Affairs. (2007). Guidelines for the Chicago Public Art Program. Retrieved from http://www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/depts/dca/provdrs/public_art_program.html
- City of Portland, (2011). Chapter 5.74 Acquisition of Public Art. Retrieved from <http://www.portlandonline.com/auditor/index.cfm?c=28803>
- Congdon, K. G. (1999). Spirit poles and flying pigs: Public art and cultural democracy in american communities. *The Journal of American Folklore*, 112(443), 108-110. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/541416>
- Costanzo, J. (2000). REPO history's circulation: The migration of public art to the internet. *Art Journal*, 59(4), 32-37. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/778119>

- Crane, D. A. (1964). The public art of city building. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 352, (*Urban Revival: Goals and Standards*), pp. 84-94. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1035416>;
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1035416>
- Crawford, T. (2010). *Legal guide for the visual artist (5th ed.)*. New York: Allworth Press.
- Creative Time. (2011). *Mission*. Retrieved from
<http://www.creativetime.org/mission>
- D.C. Commission on the Arts and Humanities, (2009). DC CREATES! Public Art Master Plan. Retrieved from
<http://dcarts.dc.gov/DC/DCARTS/DC+Creates+Public+Art/Public+Art+Master+Plan>
- Deutsche, R. (1988). Uneven development: Public art in New York City. *The MIT Press, October, Vol. 47 (Winter, 1988)*, 3-52. Retrieved from
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/778979>
- Deutsche, R., & Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts. (1996). *Evictions : Art and spatial politics. Chicago, Ill.; Cambridge, Mass.: Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts; MIT Press*. Retrieved from
<http://www.worldcat.org/title/evictions-art-and-spatial-politics/oclc/44655089>
- Dreeszen, C. A. (1994). Reimagining community: Community arts and cultural planning in America. *Ph.D., University of Massachusetts Amherst*, 334. Retrieved from
<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=741366351&Fmt=7&clientId=20179&RQT=309&VName=PQD>. (9510463)
- Dubrow, G. L. (1992). Claiming public space for women's history in Boston: A proposal for preservation, public art, and public historical interpretation. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 13(1), 111-148. Retrieved from
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3346948>
- Ernstrom, A. M. (1998). Stealing the show: Seven women artists in Canadian public art. *Woman's Art Journal*, 18(2), 53-55. Retrieved from
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1358558>
- Finkelpearl, T. (2001). *Dialogues in public art*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Fleming, R. L. (2007). *The art of placemaking : Interpreting community through public art and urban design*. London: Merrell.
- Harrison, M., & Rosenfeld, L. D. (2004). *Artwalks in New York : Delightful discoveries of public art and gardens in Manhattan, Brooklyn, Queens, the Bronx, and Staten Island*. New York: NYU Press.

- Hayden, D. (1983). The meaning of place in art and architecture. *Design Quarterly*, (122, Site: *The Meaning of Place in Art and Architecture*), 18-20. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4091078>
- Hayden, D. (1988). The power of place: A proposal for Los Angeles. *The Public Historian*, 10(3), 5-18. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3378526>
- Heartney, E., Heiferman, M., & New York Dept. of Cultural Affairs. (2005). *City art : New York's percent for art program*. London; New York: Merrell.
- Hein, H. (1996). What is public art?: Time, place, and meaning. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 54(1), 1-7. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/431675>
- Hilliard, H. (1991). Port has a chance to shape the future arts: It could incorporate education into its public art master plan, thereby giving students a background and thinking skills they sadly lack. *Los Angeles Times (Pre-1997 Fulltext)*, 2. Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=61315870&Fmt=7&clientId=20179&RQT=309&VName=PQD>
- Holmes, K., & Beebeejaun, Y. (2007). City centre master planning and cultural spaces: A case study of Sheffield. *Journal of Retail & Leisure Property*, 6(1), 29. Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1216893821&Fmt=7&clientId=20179&RQT=309&VName=PQD>
- Horowitz, G. M. (1996). Public Art/Public space: The spectacle of the Tilted Arc controversy. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 54(1), 8-14. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/431676>; <http://www.jstor.org/stable/431676>
- Jackson, F. (1991). Building the city beautiful: The Benjamin Franklin Parkway and the Philadelphia Museum of Art. *Journal of Design History*, 4(1), 62-64. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1315871>
- Jacob, M. J., Brenson, M., Olson, E. M., & Sculpture Chicago (Organization). (1995). *Culture in action: A public art program of sculpture Chicago*. Seattle: Bay Press.
- Jean Parker Phifer, & Francis Dzikowski. (2009). *Public art New York (1 edition ed.)*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company .
- Jones, B. (1993). Current directions in cultural planning. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 26(1-4), 89-97. doi:DOI: 10.1016/0169-2046(93)90009-3
- Julio, M. d. (1994). Art and the public sphere. *SubStance*, 23(2, Issue 74: Special Issue: *Between Science & Literature*), 130-132. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3685079>

- Kelly, M. (1996). Public art controversy: The Serra and Lin cases. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 54(1), 15-22. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/431677>
- Knight, C. K. (2008). *Public art : Theory, practice and populism*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell. Retrieved from <http://www.worldcat.org/title/public-art-theory-practice-and-populism/oclc/239570777>
- Kwon, M. (2004). One place after another: Site-specific art and locational identity *The MIT Press*. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=s8KviDnz1SwC&oi=fnd&pg=PP6&dq=One+Place+after+Another:+Site-Specific+Art+and+Locational+Identity&ots=F3kvS_Piql&sig=lsYLXw4MuKqlp5ILS3VrNOXHUFY#v=onepage&q&f=false;http://www.amazon.com/One-Place-after-Another-Site-Specific/dp/026261202X/ref=pd_sim_b_1
- Lee, P. M. (1998). Public art and the spaces of democracy. *Assemblage*, (35), 80-86. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3171240>
- Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency. (2005). *Art policy*. Retrieved from http://crala.org/internet-site/Other/Art_Program/Art_Policy.cfm
- Luke, T. W. (1996). But is it art? the spirit of art as activism. *Contemporary Sociology*, 25(5), 681-683. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2077595>
- Medeiros, N. (2005). Planning for creativity: The case of Winnipeg's Exchange District. *M.E.Des., University of Calgary (Canada)*, 141. Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1510543591&Fmt=7&clientId=20179&RQT=309&VName=PQD>. (MR37496)
- Miles, M. (1997). *Art, space and the city: Public art and urban futures*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Miles, M., Hall, T., & Borden, I. (2000). The city cultures reader. Retrieved from <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/111111/>
- Mitchell, W. J. T. (1990). The violence of public art: "Do the right thing". *Critical Inquiry*, 16(4), 880-899. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343773>
- National Endowment for the Arts, (2011). *2011 Guide to the National Endowment for the Arts*. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.gov/about/2011-NEA-Guide/index.html>
- Norman, E. H., & Norman, J. M. (2000). Community operational research issues and public art practice: The art director system. *The Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 51(5), 510-517. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/254182>; <http://www.jstor.org/stable/254182>

- North, M. (1990). The public as sculpture: From heavenly city to mass ornament. *Critical Inquiry*, 16(4), 860-879. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343772>;
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343772>
- Porter, L., & Barber, A. (2007). Planning the cultural quarter in Birmingham's eastside. *European Planning Studies*, 15(10), 1327. Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1343726651&Fmt=7&clientId=20179&RQT=309&VName=PQD>
- Powers, J. S. (2009). *Temporary art and public place: Comparing Berlin with Los Angeles*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Regional Arts and Culture Council.(2008). Public art program, Retrieved from http://racc.org/sites/default/files/PublicArtOverview_Dec2008.pdf
- Sandeen, E. J. (1990). Public sculpture and the civic ideal in New York City. *Winterthur Portfolio*, 25(2/3), 208-212. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1181340>
- Schneider, E. (1986). Democratic vistas: Post offices and public art in the New Deal. *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 110(2), 304-305. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20092008>
- Senie, H. (1989). Richard Serra's "Tilted Arc": Art and non-art issues. *Art Journal*, 48(4, *Critical Issues in Public Art*), 298-302. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/777012>
- Senie, H., & Webster, S. (1989). Critical issues in public art. *Art Journal*, 48(4, *Critical Issues in Public Art*), 287-290. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/777010>
- Senie, H., & Webster, S. (1992). *Critical issues in public art : Content, context, and controversy (1st ed.)*. New York: Icon Editions.
- Simon, L. (2001). Contemporary returns to conceptual art: Renée Green, Silvia Kolbowski, and Stephen Prina. *Art Journal*, 60(2), 54-71. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/778064>
- Taylor, N., & Taylor, N. M. (1998). *Urban planning theory since 1945*. California: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Webber, M. (1964). *Explorations into Urban Structure*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Westneat, D. (2007). Seattle Times Danny Westneat Column: Public art doesn't always fit. *Tribune Business News*, Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1347080801&Fmt=7&clientId=20179&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

- Williams, G. (2002). Cultural planning: An urban renaissance? *The Town Planning Review*, 73(4), 489. Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1975189391&Fmt=7&clientId=20179&RQT=309&VName=PQD>
- Yin, R.K.(2003). *Case study research design and methods*. (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Zhang, F. J., Jennifer, P., Lan, Y., Yi, W., & Yan, Z. (2005). Current progress of China's free art program. *Cell Research*, 15(11-12), 870-876. Retrieved from <http://www.nature.com/cr/journal/v15/n11/abs/7290362a.html#abs>

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Kexin Chen graduated from Huazhong University of Science & Technology, Wuhan, China in 2009, with a Bachelor of Arts and a second Bachelor of Architecture. She began graduate study at Huazhong University of Science & Technology's School of Architecture and Urban Planning in fall 2009 and joined the University of Florida's College of Design, Construction and Planning as a master degree program student in 2011. As a design student, Kexin was a reporter of the website of Landscape China and a member of Architectural Society of China (CHINAASC). While studying at the school She participated in a number of practical projects and published some professional papers. Kexin Chen plans to graduate from the University of Florida with a Master of Science in Architectural Studies in December 2011, and she will graduate from Huazhong University of Science & Technology with Master of Arts in 2012.