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Since the mid-1990s, when "creative city" ideas heralded a new revitalization strategy for older industrial cities, urban and economic development planners in communities of all sizes have increasingly turned to arts and culture as development tools. Performing and visual arts centers, festivals, public art, artist live/work buildings, artists' centers and community cultural centers have been planned, invested in and built as ways to revitalize emptying downtowns, attract tourists, preserve historic buildings and cultural traditions while celebrating new ones, stabilize communities and solve community problems. These efforts are also aimed at nurturing urban distinctiveness and contributing to the creative economy by producing, attracting and retaining artists, who in turn export significant portions of their artwork, provide a flexible creative workforce for employers in cultural industries, make it easier for all employers to recruit skilled workers, and invest sweat equity in neighborhoods.

Despite the fact that the creative city rubric has the potential to tie urban planning, economic development and arts and cultural policy efforts together, this has for the most part not happened in most American cities, though some smaller towns have been able to do so. Furthermore, the theoretical and institutional underpinnings for such a synthetic effort have not been well explored. In this paper, I begin by exploring the economic development case for creative city initiatives, proposing a consumption base theory in which greater participation in and patronage for cultural events and facilities captures a larger share of local disposable income, thus generating jobs and incomes. This cultural dividend is a function both of displacing local spending on imports and of higher local multipliers associated with arts and cultural spending, because the cultural sectors are
labor-intensive and recipients of cultural incomes are more apt to spend their incomes locally.

In addition, economic development planning is increasingly emphasizing the human capital side of the growth equation, stressing occupation as well as industry in analysis and policy. Using an occupational lens helps planners and cultural policymakers appreciate the significance of artists as core cultural workers and enables a fuller picture of the local cultural economy, balkanized in much of the economic geography and policy literatures into three separate spheres: the commercial "cultural industries," the nonprofit arts and cultural sector (museums, theatres, artists' centers, and ballet, opera and orchestral companies, arts schools), and the community sector, where unincorporated, often informal cultural activities take place.

The creative city agenda has to date outpaced institutional capabilities to implement it. In the next two sections of the paper, I explore the institutional context for urban cultural planning. First, I analyze the constituencies for cultural planning—the nonprofit arts sector, community cultural leaders, and the cultural industries—delineating the interests of each and how the creative city notion offers the potential to join them across high barriers. I argue that the nonprofit arts sector, still in a serious shake-up following the implosion of federal and state funding in the 1990s, has a wonderful opportunity to reconfigure arts policy by "getting spatial." Community cultural leaders can use the creative city impetus as a vehicle for pushing forward their agendas for tolerance, diversity and neighborhood resources. The cultural industries have an opportunity to articulate their human capital and creativity needs that might attract public
investment analogous to the success that the high tech industries have had in making their case for science and engineering resources and research funding.

In the following section, I explore the way that cultural planning is sliced up in city and town government. In larger cities, arts and cultural policy is the domain of one set of bureaucracies, which vary widely in their resources and discretionary powers; economic development is the domain of another set of actors, with important tools for cultural development but poor understanding of this sector; and city planning, with its key regulatory powers and potential for creating an integrated spatial vision of cultural development, but few direct resources to bring to bear. Ironically, it is in small towns where these bureaucratic boundaries have been most successfully scaled, although the New England Creative Economy initiative is a successful pioneering initiative involving larger cities and regions, even entire states.

The planning issues for the creative city can be illustrated by exploring three types of cultural spaces in cities: performing arts facilities, artists' live/work and studio buildings, and artists' centers. In the fourth section, I briefly explore these, addressing issues of public investment, placement, urban design, and community development.

The creative economy "buzz" has opened up promising opportunities for cities, suburbs and smaller towns, but these can be squandered without strategic thinking and careful use of resources. In the fifth section of the paper, I explore "cultural districts" and "cultural tourism" as creative city themes that tie together the three local government agencies/functions involved. Should cities and states try to develop "cultural districts" where cultural activities are clustered together or should they encourage a decentralized mosaic of cultural activities throughout neighborhoods and regions? I argue for minimal
clustering and for dispersion on the grounds that cultural space can play powerful roles in stabilizing and revitalizing neighborhoods and in generating greater cultural participation by diverse groups.

Should cities and states invest in cultural tourism initiatives that try to attract visitors from outside of the region to increase jobs and income? I argue that cultural tourism for all but the very largest cities (New York, perhaps Los Angeles and San Francisco) and one-function dominant smaller cities like Las Vegas, Orlando and Nashville can provide only modest economic development benefits, based on hard data from economic impact studies, and that economic development resources would be much better spent encouraging people in the region to participate more fully in cultural activities. Nurturing local enthusiasm for and engagement in arts and cultural activities is apt to induce more tourism than spending lavishly on advertising elsewhere. For both these issues, I show how a consumption base theory and an occupational approach help to deepen understanding of the creative city challenge.

In closing, I return to the tasks laid out for city and smaller town planners as well as community, city and state cultural policy leaders. How can leaders work across the three sectors (commercial, nonprofit and community) and across the three government domains (cultural affairs, economic development, city planning) to envision their creative city, make sounds investments, and maximize results? I lay out some directions for leadership and further research.

I. Culture in Consumption and Human Capital Theories of Urban Growth
Regional economists have long embraced an export base theory of growth and development, positing that the size of a local economy is constrained by the size of its economic base, or its ability to export output to other regions. But the consumption base—that portion of local economic activity that is sold to local residents—can also serve as a growth sector. The history of economic base theory, its lock on economic development thinking and practice today, and the mechanics of a consumption base alternative, applied to the cultural sector, are presented in Markusen (2006a). The basic argument is that city residents may divert income that they would have spent on goods and services originating from outside the region to local cultural spending that in turn supports other local incomes. An example would be encouraging residents to patronize live performances in their communities and to buy art from local artists rather than spending their discretionary incomes at nearby suburban shopping malls that sell mainly imported products sold by low-wage unskilled workers. Actors, visual artists and related workers are more likely to recycle their incomes through the local arts sector, while mall retail workers are more likely to spend their earnings on other imported goods available at the mall.

A second challenge to conventional economic development practice critiques the singular emphasis on physical capital and industry analysis, calling for a parallel emphasis on human capital and occupational analysis (Thompson and Thompson, 1985; Feser, 2003; Mather, 1999; Markusen 2004, 2006b). The cultural sector is a particularly apt sphere for these arguments, because artists as core cultural workers make considerable investments in human capital, cross over fluidly among commercial, nonprofit and community sectors (Markusen et al, 2006), and have exceptionally high
rates of self-employment--45% compared with 8% in the workforce as a whole (Table 1; Markusen and Schrock, 2006). Artists are also extraordinary citizens as attested to by their high rates of political and community participation (Markusen, 2006c, Zucker, 1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Title</th>
<th>Total Employment</th>
<th>Self-employed</th>
<th>% Self-employed</th>
<th>Primary job</th>
<th>Secondary job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writers &amp; authors</td>
<td>138,980</td>
<td>94,377</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>80,509</td>
<td>13,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual artists</td>
<td>307,254</td>
<td>155,159</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>129,109</td>
<td>26,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists and related workers</td>
<td>148,682</td>
<td>80,022</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>70,731</td>
<td>9,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts directors</td>
<td>50,664</td>
<td>27,139</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>23,988</td>
<td>3,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine artists: painters, sculptors, illustrators</td>
<td>23,192</td>
<td>12,866</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>11,372</td>
<td>1,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-media artists &amp; animators</td>
<td>74,826</td>
<td>40,017</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>35,371</td>
<td>4,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographers</td>
<td>130,442</td>
<td>68,432</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54,024</td>
<td>14,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera operators, TV/Video/Motion picture</td>
<td>28,130</td>
<td>6,705</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4,354</td>
<td>2,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing artists</td>
<td>176,463</td>
<td>42,724</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38,174</td>
<td>4,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors</td>
<td>63,033</td>
<td>10,992</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9,754</td>
<td>1,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producers and directors</td>
<td>76,125</td>
<td>24,995</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21,683</td>
<td>3,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancers &amp; choreographers</td>
<td>37,305</td>
<td>6,737</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6,737</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancers</td>
<td>19,992</td>
<td>3,854</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3,854</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choreographers</td>
<td>17,313</td>
<td>2,883</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2,883</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicians, singers, composers</td>
<td>215,425</td>
<td>83,121</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>56,770</td>
<td>26,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music directors &amp; composers</td>
<td>54,271</td>
<td>21,354</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>14,584</td>
<td>6,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicians &amp; singers</td>
<td>161,154</td>
<td>61,767</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42,186</td>
<td>19,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designers</td>
<td>531,921</td>
<td>168,806</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>132,827</td>
<td>35,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; industrial designers</td>
<td>51,823</td>
<td>16,088</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12,659</td>
<td>3,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion designers</td>
<td>14,844</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floral designers</td>
<td>103,993</td>
<td>33,832</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26,621</td>
<td>7,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic designers</td>
<td>211,871</td>
<td>67,422</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>53,052</td>
<td>14,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior designers</td>
<td>60,050</td>
<td>19,325</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15,206</td>
<td>4,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise displayers, window trimmers</td>
<td>77,221</td>
<td>23,881</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18,791</td>
<td>5,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set and exhibit designers</td>
<td>12,119</td>
<td>3,905</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>136,378</td>
<td>29,678</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23,809</td>
<td>5,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects, ex. landscape and naval</td>
<td>113,243</td>
<td>24,253</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19,457</td>
<td>4,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape architects</td>
<td>23,135</td>
<td>5,425</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4,352</td>
<td>1,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, all artistic occupations</td>
<td>1,506,421</td>
<td>573,865</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>461,198</td>
<td>112,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, all occupations</td>
<td>144,013,600</td>
<td>11,451,600</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9,926,000</td>
<td>1,525,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Cities may capitalize on cultural consumption and occupational potentials by making investments in cultural facilities and programming that are directed at artists as
well as arts organizations and audiences, i.e. by engaging in cultural planning. In addition to capturing more discretionary resident spending, such investments may "home grow" more artists in the region and also attract footloose artists who bring their own export sales (or grant-getting abilities) with them in relocating to the community as well as new ideas and creativity that increase non-arts sectors productivity. Since artists gravitate to inner city areas, their growth may revitalize areas that previously have lost population and spur other retail investments and tourists. These arguments and evidence for them are covered in greater depth in Markusen, 2006a, and Markusen and Johnson, 2006.

II. The Institutional Context I: Arts and Cultural Stakeholders

The constituency for cultural planning is distinctive. Compare it with the relatively simplicity of science and technology policy, for instance, whose constituency consists of the high tech industries, public and nonprofit research laboratories, universities and scientists and engineers, who have very low rates of self-employment and mainly work for the commercial sector. In contrast, the arts and cultural sphere is balkanized into three distinctive organizational segments—commercial, nonprofit and community—with artists themselves comprising a crosscutting occupation with multiple service organizations and an independent voice. In this section, I define the three segments, review how each operates, and suggest the stakes that the leaders of each have in cultural planning.

The commercial sector encompasses for-profit firms in industries whose product in large part consists of texts and symbols (Hesmondhalgh, 2002). These cultural
industries have been the subject of pioneering work in sociology, economics and economic geography (Hirsch, 1972; Heilbrun and Gray, 1993; Hesmondhalgh, 2002; Pratt; Power; Power and Scott, 2004). The industries include architecture, design, media, advertising, publishing, recording and movie, TV and radio, though some definitions are more expansive than others. The commercial cultural sector also includes art markets (galleries, art fairs, on-line websites) and for-profit performing arts spaces (theaters, music clubs, restaurants). It also includes artists who directly sell their work on commission, to the public, or on the web, those these artists will not be counted in firm-based tallies of employment.

For-profit cultural industry activity is driven by bottom-line concerns. The entrepreneurs, who can be artists themselves, and firm managers and owners organize production and marketing to maximize the returns given the investments they make and the costs they face. Cultural work in the commercial sector is thus quite cost-conscious and time-conscious (Vogel, 2000). Firms and independent proprietors struggle to meet deadlines, important to their reputations, but also to keep quality as high as possible. Marketing is apt to be more important and professionalized in the commercial sector, as in the hype around new film or recordings releases. Artistic products in the commercial sector can be, as a result, less innovative and distinctive but more lucrative, serving a mass market.

In most regions, cultural industries have not banded together around public policy or planning issues. Key regulatory issues include intellectual property rights protections and telecommunications access, but these are national not local issues. In distinctive cultural cities, industry-specific issues have been organized around—in Los Angeles,
instance, the media industries have created an Entertainment Economy Institute whose major task to date is fashioning an industry-wide training system for technicians (Entertainment Economy Institute, 2005). This leaves the cultural planning playing field open to the other two segments, robbing cultural planning advocates of influential and well-heeled partners.

The second sector covers those organizations explicitly fashioned as nonprofits—a distinction codified into US law with distinctive incorporation, tax treatment and reporting requirements. Religious organizations and institutions of higher education can be considered nonprofit cultural industries, though they are rarely incorporated in cultural industry analyses. Since the enormous growth of patron, foundation and state-funded arts programs that began in the 1960s (Kreidler, 1996), the nonprofit format has allowed artists and art patrons to create spaces and support systems that do not aspire to make profits and that avoid a considerable tax burden. Most museums, orchestra halls, opera houses, artists’ centers, theatres, and community arts facilities are nonprofits, as are some artists' studio and live/work buildings. So are the many foundations that engage in arts and cultural philanthropy.

Cultural nonprofits are governed by self-perpetuating boards of volunteers rather than by owners or paid board members and may encompass a mix of artists, relevantly skilled people and donors. They cover the costs of their operations with a mix of contributed income (from donors, foundations, individuals) and earned income (e.g. memberships, performances, sales of artwork, work for schools or community groups, and fees for classes, events or studio and equipment rentals). Nonprofits can operate more cheaply than commercial firms because they enjoy substantial tax advantages (no
property taxes, for instance) and because they do not have to make normal (on the order of 5-10%) rates of return on invested capital (Gray and Heilbrun, 2000). Freer from short-term profitability pressures, nonprofits enjoy a license to focus on artistic quality and community outreach in ways that for profits cannot. But they may also be risk averse, because high community expectations feed a fear of failure (Ivey, 1999.) And they must pursue contributed and earned income to survive (Wyszomirski, 1999) and face scrutiny or conditions from funders or patrons that alters their programming.

Nonprofit arts organizations have been intensively studied (e.g. Gray and Heilbrun, 2000; Miller, 2005; Americans for the Arts, 2003) and have come to shape the way many artists and their publics conceive of art worlds and cultural policy. Arts impact assessments, for instance, study only the nonprofit cultural sector's influence on a regional economy, leaving out music clubs and cultural for-profit industries, as well as community arts activities not formally incorporated as nonprofits. Arts advocacy organizations, such as Americans for the Arts and Citizens for the Arts (Minnesota's group) are mainly populated and run by the nonprofit arts organizations. In contrast to the for-profit cultural industries, nonprofits are aggressively involved in public sector cultural policy and planning, which are essential for their financial survival and visibility, both individually and in concert. They lobby for state and local arts and cultural budgets, subsidies for particular facilities, and operating budgets for specific programs.

But these two sectors do not exhaust the organizational forums that foster artistic practice and careers. There is also a third sector, the community sector, where artistic activity is organized by actors outside of either for-profit or formal nonprofit status. The
community sector is variously called informal, traditional, or folk art. In one of the first articulations of this sector, Peters and Cherbo (1998) describe it as unincorporated:

The unincorporated arts are usually small and organized informally, with little economic interchange (recorded expenses, income, payrolls); or they generate income that goes to an overarching institution such as an educational or religious organization or an artist's agent. They can flow in and out of existence, can be volunteer based and hard to locate, can lack permanent addresses, and can have little or no staff to respond to requests for information (p. 117).

Some community arts organizations are unincorporated but use or work out of facilities provided by not-for-profit organizations such as churches, community centers or social service organizations.

For some critics, "unincorporated" is a negative term that suggests lower quality, lack of commitment, or ephemeral status. They point out that it ill-fits many artists who never aspire to become incorporated or earn income from their work yet consistently develop their art form and share it with others. Pioneering studies of community-based artists (Peterson, 1996; Wali, Severson and Longoni, 2002; Wali et al, 2006; Jackson, Herranz, and Kabwasa-Green, 2003; Walker, Jackson, and Rosenstein, 2003) celebrate this third sphere, the legitimacy of its art forms, its changing character, and its service to communities. In a critique of "formal" sector designations that reflect notions of "high art" as distinct from folk, traditional or amateur arts, Alvarez (2005) provocatively entitles her study of this sector in Silicon Valley as *There's Nothing Informal About It*, and uses the term "participatory arts" to encompass experiences that take place mostly in non-arts spaces and outside of the art world's organizational formats.

Artistic activity in the community, or unincorporated, sector is insulated from the scrutiny and pressures faced in legally-structured and regulated for-profit and nonprofit settings. By and large, community sector activities are lead by small groups of people
working informally, perhaps intermittently, without dedicated space. Many types of activities fall under this rubric – festivals organized by ethnic or affinity groups; gatherings for artistic sharing and performance in people's homes or parks; community networks of bartered artistic services, lessons or products; informal, ongoing support groups of artists themselves. Some of these activities morph into nonprofit organizations, or the individuals participating may sell their work commercially within their arenas.

The community sector may be highly creative and innovative, a place where ethnic traditions are kept alive and new, synthetic or oppositional art forms take shape. It may offer artists who work in other spheres a chance to contribute their skills and contacts to their own or others' communities on a volunteer or unpaid basis. A desire to preserve community, to help under-served and low income groups, or to bridge across communities may motivate organizers and artists to spend time and energy on community arts activities, even for little or no pay or compensation. At the same time, community arts sector activities may be fraught with money problems, personality conflicts, delays, and managerial deficits that reinforce their fragility and inability to sustain themselves. The failure and regrouping rate is likely highest among community sector arts activities, but the range of experience more varied.

Two other groups deserve mention as actors and potential protagoists in the local arts ecology. Artists often band together to form unions, in the cultural industries (the Screen Actors' Guild) or the nonprofit sector (the Musicians' Union), or they form unions and professional service organizations independent of particular employers or industries (the National Writers Union or the Metal Arts Guild). Or they create organizations along disciplinary lines, such as the American Composers' Forum, Alliance for California
Traditional Arts, or Movimiento de Arte y Cultura Latino Americana. Finally, the local built environment industry—developers, the construction industry, real estate brokers, banks, newspapers and others whose livelihoods depend on the making and maintenance of urban spatial form—forms a coalition with an active interest in cultural space development.

Although artists cross over these divides all the time (Markusen, et al, 2006), the organizations at the helm of each rarely work together on common problems or policy agendas. The divide between for-profit and nonprofit arts sectors received historic attention in a 1998 meeting of the American Assembly focused on how organizations in each sector operate and what might be done to bring them more closely together, but do date, little concrete actions have been taken (Pankratz, 1999; Arthurs, Hodsoll, & Lavine, 1999). An outstanding exception to this pattern is the successful attempt by the New England Council to build a New England Creative Economy coalition across private and nonprofit sector lines, an effort it began precociously in 1998 (Mt. Auburn Associates, 2000; Markusen, Wassall, DeNatale and Cohen, 2006). The nonprofit sector does fund and support many community cultural activities, and yet, since this third sector is relatively unorganized, there is no easy way to forge a policy link. Yet in city after city, large and small, the creative economy idea is generating unlikely new coalitions for cultural planning, while in others, cleavages among various of these groups complicates planning progress.

III. The Institutional Context II: Fragmented Local Responsibilities
Although the "creative city/creative region" vision provides impetus for significance gains for the cultural sector, the institutional configuration of capabilities at the state and local level make it difficult to realize them. Here, I use the local, or city, level to illustrate the problems, because cities possess a fuller array of tools and instruments to shape the cultural economy than do states, although the bureaucratic fragmentation described holds at the state level as well. Cities have regulatory tools—land use and redevelopment planning, ownership of substantial parcels of redevelopable land and buildings, and financial resources such as dedicated taxes and community and economic development funds to bring to bear.

Currently, most American city governments contain a baffling array of agencies whose responsibilities bear on the cultural economy. These have evolved over many decades, and they vary dramatically from place to place. Some cities (Los Angeles and San Francisco, for instance) have dedicated Arts Funds, supported by dedicated portions of hotel and other types of taxes, that they use to support publicly-owned arts facilities (museums, performing arts centers) and/or to support grants programs for artists and arts organizations. Most have some sort of public arts programming, from commissioned pieces of visual art to a schedule of publicly supported cultural events. Some support community cultural centers. Some actively nurture artists' centers, live/work building and smaller performing arts venues, the subject of the next section. In what follows, I generalize across cities, but since cities are the creatures of state governments as well as the products of decades and even centuries of evolution, individual cities' structures may vary substantially from this profile.
The major challenge at the local level is the fragmentation of responsibility for cultural and arts policy and planning among across at least three distinct agencies. First, most larger cities have some sort of cultural affairs department or office in city government, generally staffed by people with expertise in the arts and culture. These range from the large and well-budgeted to small and relatively powerless. The City of Los Angeles, for instance, has a Department of Cultural Affairs, and Los Angeles County, a much larger entity encompassing many of the surrounding communities, supports a Los Angeles County Arts Commission. But in others, the role and powers of cultural affairs is limited to running public arts programming on very small budgets. In Minneapolis, for instance, the City Council abolished its Department of Cultural Affairs in the 1990s, leaving only a small Office of Cultural Affairs with responsibility for public art and publicly supported arts programming, moved under the umbrella Community Planning and Economic Development Department. There is also a separate City of Minneapolis Arts Commission, but it has few powers and little political clout, and is in general ignored by the more powerful arts institutions in the City. Cultural affairs departments and offices have suffered relative resource losses in recent decades as taxpayer revolts and higher priority placed on everything from public safety to economic development have squeezed their shares of the public purse. Responding to a survey by Grodach and Loukaitou-Sideris (2006), many cities reported having subsumed cultural planning under economic development functions in recent decades.

Many of the regulatory tools that enable or hamper the creation of artistic space in cities are lodged in city planning departments and run by people with city planning degrees, a training that may or may not include expertise in urban design. Artists' centers
and live/work buildings, permits for art fairs and festivals, and urban redevelopment plans that include cultural space and facilities must be compatible with current land use and zoning ordinances or receive variances. In some cities—Minneapolis would be an example—it is very difficult to build artists' live/work buildings because of strict zoning laws that do not permit the mixing of commercial and residential use (Johnson, 2005). In most cities, cultural policy has little standing or interface with city planning departments and their management of land use.

The economic development department (sometimes with a separate economic development authority) is most powerful of the city three agencies affecting the creation of cultural space. As the manager of land and buildings that the city owns, a city's ED agency makes decisions on re-use and redevelopment and has at its disposal considerable funds for building rehabilitation, brownfield clean-up, enterprise zone initiatives, commercial corridors, workforce development and other federal and state economic development pass-through funds. Like city planning departments, they tend to operate on a parcel-by-parcel basis—district-wide planning, whether cultural or other, is unusual despite the existence of comprehensive plans. In general, economic development agencies are pro-development and work very closely with private landowners, developers and real estate interests. In Minneapolis, it appears that larger arts and cultural institutions have garnered the lion's share of city commitments in terms of land, parking garages, and support for state bonding funds, while in other cities--San Francisco, for instance—neighborhood arts and cultural centers receive a larger share. Some have speculated that a tax-funded Arts Fund diversifies arts and cultural support at the local
level compared with cities where the nonprofit arts and cultural sector is more dependent on philanthropy and state-level bonding, but this remains untested.

In addition to these agencies, many cities also run cultural programs through departments of parks and recreation, and of course, through their largely independent school districts. Public works departments may be responsible for some cultural facilities and for the parking ramps that often subsidize them. Public safety departments may be responsible for parade permitting and public space use. A recent San Francisco Arts Task Force Report (2006) clearly lays out the complex web of city/county agencies involved in support for the arts, shows how funding streams work their way through this web and makes challenging suggestions for reconfiguring and consolidating arts funding. Complicating this stylized bureaucratic account is the political life of the city—the changing character of city councils and mayorships that may bring cultural policy to the fore or ignore it, or may interpret arts and cultural policy very different from previous regimes.

In all of this city cultural planning, Universities and colleges play very little role. Larger universities have their own facilities management groups and may make decisions on their arts facilities largely independent of their host cities. The University of Minnesota, for instance, has built and advertises its "Arts Quarter" with signage, but it has little relationship with the neighborhood or even with the city at large. Campus decisions on presentation space and programming are not made in consultation with a larger arts community, including the negative competitive impact that their large new arts facilities might have on existing commercial or nonprofit space.
The creative city rubric has suddenly jolted cities and smaller towns into thinking that they must work to be competitive on the cultural front. The "Cool Cities" initiative in Michigan, for instance, with real state money attached, sent towns of all sizes scrambling to stylize themselves as such. Few cities large or small have the expertise to bridge current balkanized bureaucratic structures, and few know how to work with multiple constituencies for cultural policy to develop an agenda that works. Some slap down "cultural districts" on maps without thinking about their viability or impact on neighbors or competitors. Some commission cultural plans from outsiders that have no after-life, since they are not generated through the efforts of local coalitions.

Ironically, smaller towns find it easier to join forces with potential partners to develop a vibrant cultural life and economy. Those hosting colleges are grateful for the arts presentation space and programming provided. In even very small towns, City Councils and local government agencies have transcended traditional turfs and training to create arts-driven urban revitalization—documented examples include New York Mills, Minnesota (Markusen and Johnson, 2006), Lanesboro, Minnesota (Borrup, 2006a), and many other Minnesota communities (Metropolitan Regional Arts Council, 2006; Cuesta, Gillespie and Lillis, 2005), In tiny New York Mills, for instance, the City Council pays have the salary of the Director of the non-profit New York Mills Regional Cultural Center, since she also serves as the town's tourism director.

In larger cities, the job of leading a creative economy effort or developing a cultural strategy that serves diverse parties is tougher. The San Francisco Arts Task Force report (2006) and the New England Council's Creative Economy endeavor (Mount Auburn Associates et al, 2000) are among the best-staffed and politically mounted efforts
in recent years. But much more research and policy activism is needed to enable cities to do a good job and avoid costly mistakes.

IV. Cultural Districts, Cultural Tourism?

Should cities and states try to develop "cultural districts" where cultural activities are clustered together or should they encourage a decentralized mosaic of cultural activities throughout neighborhoods and regions? A cultural district is defined as "a well-recognized, labeled, mixed-use area of a city in which a high concentration of cultural facilities serves as the anchor of attraction" (Frost-Kumpf, 1998: 10). They are often centered around large arts institutions and may range from labeled usage in planning and promotional documents to legally designations in zoning ordinances.

Enthusiasm for cultural districts often materializes in creative city agendas, often without much analysis of associated resource use or consequences (Frost-Kumpf, 1998; Brooks and Kushner, 2001). City planners have a tendency to divide urban space into distinctive use patterns, because zoning and subdivision regulations are among their strongest tools, aggravated by economic developers' site-specific approach to redevelopment. Downtown development interests and urban arts coalitions often jump on the cultural district bandwagon (Whitt, 1987). Although dissident voices, from Jane Jacobs in the 1960s to the new urbanists in the 1990s, have argued for finer-grained urban development patterns that mix uses, the dominant trend is still the larger-grained separation of industrial, retail and cultural space from residential space. When large arts organizations dominate cultural policy advocacy in regions, they tend to reinforce this
pattern, focusing philanthropic and public resources on specific institutions or cultural
districts dissociated from a large vision of cultural pluralism and decentralization.

Examples of historic cultural districts are the Civic Center in San Francisco,
Lincoln Center in New York and the Seattle Center. The first of these dates from the City
Beautiful era, Seattle's Center is a legacy of its World Fair, and Lincoln Center was a
major urban renewal project. In each case, large performing arts spaces (and sometimes
flagship museums) are co-located in a single "destination" district, relatively detached
from the fabric of neighborhoods and residences. Audience members as well as
performers must travel by car or public transportation to attend and mount performances,
and complementary experiences, including dining or shopping, are either internalized in
the cultural facilities themselves or must be traveled to separately.

In contrast, some cities' cultural lives revolve around a decentralized urban
mosaic of cultural spaces. In the 1960s, Jane Jacobs (1961) critiqued large-scale urban
renewal and celebrated instead the distinctive cultural neighborhoods of New York City.
She pointed out how SoHo, Little Italy, Chinatown and Greenwich Village each had its
distinctive character, yet invited city residents to cross over the porous boundaries to
spend a day or evening taking in a performance, eating ethnic food, and walking the
streets for their novelty and ambience. Some contemporary arts-rich cities support a
more decentralized array of cultural spaces, including New York City and San Francisco,
but in cities of all sizes, the tension between concentration and dispersion of cultural
spaces continue, especially in the bid for resources. Borrup (2006b) addresses the issues
of small versus large scale, critiquing the bias towards the latter and illustrating the
potential for smaller scale, dispersed cultural development with several examples.
How does decentralization work in a medium-sized city? In Minneapolis/St. Paul, the major arts institutions are not co-located—the Walker Art Center, Minneapolis Institute of Arts, Guthrie Theater, Symphony Hall, Ordway Performing Center (Opera and others) and St. Paul Chamber Orchestra are sited in separate, though chiefly inner city, neighborhoods, while new arts centers are being added in the suburbs. Recently, Minneapolis has invested in and owns four historic theaters downtown, now cheek-by-jowl with its Block E entertainment complex of multiplex cinemas, the Hard Rock Café and other imports, and is trying to market this remade downtown corridor as a regional and tourist destination, and along the river corridor, the new Mill City Museum is close to the new Guthrie theater, but both also operate as destination venues surrounded by municipally spec-built parking garages and new high end condos.

Yet the success of the Twin Cities as an arts-rich region lies more in its evolved pattern of dispersed performance, live/work and artist-centered spaces, true for other cities such as Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles and others as well (Markusen, 2006c). Artists' centers, for instance, are spread out throughout the cities (Figure 1).
Artists do favor inner city residential locations to suburban and rural places (Figure 2), a pattern that holds across the country. Yet the decentralization of artistic space enables them to live almost anywhere in the core cities (Figure 3). These cultural spaces and their artist users stabilize and enliven their neighborhoods. Although in cities with severe housing shortages, the occupation and restoration of abandoned buildings by and for artists may be used by developers to channel gentrification (see Markusen, 2006c), in most cities, including large ones like Philadelphia, the presence of artists has not resulted in displacement of lower income and long-time residents (Seifert and Stern, 2005).

Decentralized artistic spaces and artist residents help to expand participation in the arts as well, as studies in Philadelphia (Stern and Seifert, 1998), Chicago (Wali, Severson and Longoni, 2000, 2002; Wali et al, 2006) and Silicon Valley (Moriarity, 2004; Zenk, 2004;
Alvarez, 2005) demonstrate. This in turn builds the local consumption base, encouraging and recycling local spending that increases overall growth and development.
A case can be made, then, for minimal clustering and dispersion on the grounds that artistic space can play powerful roles in stabilizing and revitalizing neighborhoods and in generating greater cultural participation by diverse groups. Although a single cultural space might prompt the emergence of several others nearby—a theater, for instance, might encourage the creation of cafes and bookstores, planners should minimize the planned clustering of cultural facilities. In their data-rich study of Philadelphia, Seifert and Stern (2005) make the case for "natural" cultural districts that evolve "organically as a result of individuals agents' decisions—creators and participants, producers and consumers—to locate near one another."

One of the great disservices of the naming and imposing of cultural districts from above is that it suggests that all other neighborhoods are not culturally interesting or vibrant. In contrast, if cities celebrate the many and distinctive neighborhood cultural venues available to area residents, they can also encourage cross-neighborhood visits, encouraging local spending with high local multipliers and increasing understanding and cohesion across the city.

Should cities and states invest in cultural tourism initiatives to attract visitors from outside of the region to increase jobs and income? Currently, many larger cities and states are expanded efforts to brand themselves as cultural destinations, not only in marketing but with large new investments in flagship institutions, often designed by world-class architects. In their marketing efforts, they envision well-heeled visitors who will fly in to attend their new mega-theater or opera or museum, stay at hotels and spend considerable amounts on restaurant meals. How reasonable is it to expect that cultural institutions will be supported and patronized by outsiders?
Fortunately, the best of recent arts impact studies have generated hard data on the characteristics of attendees to large cultural institutions or centers. In separate studies on Los Angeles County (KPMG Peat Marwick, 1994), Seattle's King County (Beyers and GMA Research Corporation, 2006), and New York City (Audience Research Associates, 2006), researchers attempted to determine how many people attending cultural events came from outside the county or city, how many came expressly to attend the particular public event or venue, and how much each party spent on average during its visit. The share of cultural tourists in each study ranges in the 10-20% range. Even these are overestimates, because in the Seattle and New York cases, attendees from surrounding counties were considered to be out-of-town visitors. Though the researchers found that out-of-town tourists spend about twice as much as local residents when they visit a cultural destination, the overwhelming number of visits are made by local residents or by visitors who came to the city for other reasons (conventions, family) and may be as likely to stay with family and friends as at a hotel. Local and regional residences are thus much more important as targets for patronage and participation than are visitors. Interestingly, smaller towns like New York Mills and Lanesboro in Minnesota understand this and direct their marketing efforts regionally.

As with convention centers, ballparks, and spec-built prisons, cultural facilities can be over-invested in by communities with long-term negative consequences for the public purse. (Strom, 1999; Judd, 1999: Eisinger, 2000). Often, the expected patronage simply does not materialize, so that nonprofit arts organizations are faced with painful decisions to cut losses (quite a few regional symphonies have disbanded in the past decade, for instance), and city governments must pay off the bonds on subsidized parking
garages that don’t pay their way after all. Resources that might have been spent on more participatory, decentralized and neighborhood-anchored arts and cultural spaces are locked up for long periods of time.

In sum, then, cultural tourism for all but the very largest cities and some highly specialized medium-sized cities that were "first-movers" in their genres (Los Vegas in gambling, Nashville in country music, Orlando with Disneyworld) can provide only modest economic development benefits. Cities and towns would be better advised to search for support and patronage among their own residents and design cultural spaces to that end. They might do what founder John Davis of the New York Mills Cultural Center did it building a constituency for his dream—find the artist in every resident in the county (Markusen and Johnson, 2006).

V. Elements of a Cultural Planning Agenda

How can leaders work across the three sectors (commercial, nonprofit and community) and across the three government domains (cultural affairs, economic development, city planning) to envision their creative city, make sound investments, and maximize social, cultural and economic returns? Detailing an agenda is beyond the space resources of this paper, but several general points can be made. To begin with, it is important for cultural leaders wishing to capitalize on the creative city impetus to develop an inclusive and nuanced vision of what the creative city will be—diverse, decentralized, competitive in some ways, cooperative in others. This is contested terrain, because the larger arts institutions will present themselves as the heart of the cultural complex, mount capital campaigns that capture the lion's share of philanthropic resources, and lobby
legislatures and city councils to place their projects at the top of the public funding priority list. Smaller, edgier and diverse cultural groups must be represented as equal partners in the visioning and planning effort.

City cultural affairs officers and directors can play a powerful role in constructing a more inclusive vision of cultural life in the city and designing participatory mechanisms that ensure that diverse constituencies and all neighborhoods are included in resource allocation. Some cities, Seattle in particular, have been successful in breaking down the walls between the commercial and nonprofit sector. That city's Mayor's Office of Film and Music (www.seattle.gov/filmandmusic) supports a full menu of film and music offerings that embrace nonprofit, commercial and community events and actors. Some cities, like San Francisco, have placed neighborhood cultural centers high on their agendas, while others, like Minneapolis for artists' centers and St. Paul for artists' live/work buildings, have consistently supported nonprofit artist-centric spaces. The public sector can encourage communication and joint planning among the three cultural sectors by using its regulatory tools and resources to this end.

To enable a more cohesive and inclusive process, city governments should consolidate cultural functions and spending in a single agency (as the 2006 San Francisco Task Force recommends), dedicate tax revenues to cultural facilities and programming, and strengthen the status of cultural agencies vis-à-vis urban planning and economic development functions. The mish-mash of structures and spending tools currently relied on by cities for cultural planning makes it very difficult to generalize across places or to determine which cities are relatively successful, and why. More research comparing
cities' cultural planning capabilities and performance is badly needed. For smaller cities and towns, the project may be simpler, even though resources are leaner.
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