PUBLIC ART AND DESIGN: LESSONS FROM WITHIN AN URBAN REGION

Margi Glavovic Nothard
Lucy Keshavarz
David C. Prosperi

INTRODUCTION

Cultural policy and management is a priority for government officials and cultural organizations. The priority appears to be, at least in the United States and the western world, based in cultural tourism. Unfortunately, cultural policy and management remains mostly an ad-hoc enterprise, characterized by multiple planning organizations, multiple providers, and multiple constituents. Exacerbating the "on-the-ground" reality is the relative paucity of academic and/or professional organizations that provide theoretical and/or management rationales for how cultural policy and management should be conducted particularly at the local level. The field remains fragmented.

This paper attempts to draw, inductively, principles of cultural policy and management by comparing and contrasting public art and design programs in three urban counties that compose the greater South Florida urban region. It is organized as follows. First, theoretical perspectives regarding cultural policy and management are briefly reviewed and a context is set for our investigation. The specific research problem and research methodologies are then articulated. Third, we present our research findings, initially in terms of "thick descriptions" of the provision of public art and design programs and then in terms of policy and management principles. The final section of the paper reflects on the contribution of this paper to the extant theoretical and management basis of cultural policy and management.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND CONTEXT

THEORETICAL CONCEPTS

Here, we focus on three elements: the role of culture in urban development, a definition of public art and design, and rudiments of a theory of cultural policy and management for the local level.

Cultural Provision and Urban Development

The role of culture and the provision of cultural amenities in urban development has received increased attention, particularly over the past decade (cf. e.g., Miles, 1977, Judd and Fainstein, 1999; Prosperi and Downen, 1999; Bennett and Butler, 2000; Heilbrun and Gray, 2001). Much of this work has focused on either the dynamics of cultural tourism and/or the documentation of cultural consumption studies. Many of these studies provide

the details of the use of culture as an economic development engine, providing culture-specific arguments for Mayer's (1995) observation that economic development has become the principal focus of local jurisdictions in the late 20th century Post-Fordist economies. Typical studies of cultural consumption focus on that portion of the more general "arts and recreation" spending of the consumer budget. The relative proportions of the latter are reasonably well documented (e.g., Heilbrun and Gray, 2001).

The question that receives less attention is the specific "institutional arrangements" for cultural policy and management. Within large urban regions, cultural policy and management is often organized through separate, often competing, local authorities and jurisdictions. Large urban regions contain significant sub-spaces (e.g., central cities, older suburbs, newer suburbs, exurbs) that are at different points on the development axis and consequentially develop alternative means for providing cultural policy and management. These can range from large, sophisticated, centrally-controlled organizations typically located in the city center to smaller, ad-hoc organizations on the periphery.

Mostly uncharted in the urban-oriented literature are theoretical and/or well-documented (inductive) case studies of the "institutional arrangements" for, or descriptions of variations in, cultural policy and management. What is particularly missing is the resolution of the market dynamic that, at least in the US, consumers desire "small town" atmospheres and "urban" amenities. The desire for "town-country" results in a diffusion of cultural venues and activities over the urban region. Thus, within a large urban region, the concept of access becomes important and there is a tendency to over-concentrate cultural venues and activities. Places *within* the urban region use culture as a competitive calling card.

What is Public Art and Design?

In this paper, we focus on public art and design. We define public art and design to mean the provision of (mostly) visual works intended to enhance the built environment. Often, public art and design is equated with "art in public places;" and, although we focus on that element, public art and design could mean more, including, for example, activities ranging from the provision of cultural venues for performance to the encouragement of places where artists gather and work.

Which begs the question: why public art and design? If public art and design is different from other "economic cultural assets" in that they are not related directly to consumer expenditure patterns, then what is the purpose? To some extent, the subtexts are the larger questions: what is art?; and, what is the role of the artist? Large questions indeed, but the focus of attention here is how the specific cultural policy and management systems in place allow the answer to be formulated. For example, in a scenario where the public is allowed to participate and the review processes include a community role as the art is developed, the expectations and limitations of the definition of art come to the fore. The possibility for disparity between "artists" and "public" definitions of art becomes manifest.

What is Cultural Policy and Management?

Recent literature on cultural policy and management tends to focus on national and/or cross-cultural perspectives (e.g., Zemans and Kleingartner, 1999; Quinn, 1998). Here, we attempt to adapt the dominant features of the theoretical models used above for use at the local level.

We use an organizational behavior/development approach (e.g., Pfeffer and Salancik, 2003) to study cultural policy and management. The model is very simple. Basically, we define cultural policy and management as being describable by "institutional arrangements" and the "outcomes" of those arrangements. The description and analysis of institutional arrangements, in turn, focuses on both *resources* and *activities*. A description of resources is an elaboration of how resources are identified and made available, including any relevant constraints on those resources. A description of activities is an elaboration of how cultural policy makers and managers choose to organize the delivery of services, once the resource base is identified. And, finally, the *outcome* of any cultural policy and management system is "culture" or in our case the public art and design for a locality.

The generation of resources for culture and cultural activities (be they performance, visual, or more general) is a permanent quest. For cultural activities that respond to market conditions, the focus in recent years has been on activities that generate a market. For those that don't, the emphasis remains on government programs, philanthropy, and/or sponsorships. Resource dependence, in terms of both the procurement of funds and sponsor expectations about the eventual outcomes of these funds, is a major feature of public art and design programs.

A "cultural agency" exists to carry out cultural activities. Description of this "agency" must contain both endogenous and exogenous factors. The "agency" relies and is dependent on resources (and does, in fact, work to create more resources), develops the set of activities that comprise cultural policy and management, and with the help of the community (market) generates outcomes. The choice of how the "agency" develops its set of activities is paramount. Any given place will choose the set of "institutional arrangements" that suits its purposes at a given point in time: some will choose a large centralized public organization; others might choose a decentralized but mostly public organization; while others might choose privatization.

Thus, in sum, the theoretical literature leads us to an exploration that involves the "thick description" of the specific "institutional arrangements" and "outcomes" that identify cultural policy and management within our study area.

CULTURAL POLICY AND MANAGEMENT IN THE SOUTH FLORIDA URBAN REGION

The South Florida urban region is defined, for the purposes of this paper, as three large contiguous counties. These are: Miami-Dade (the cities of Miami and Miami Beach among others), Broward (the City of Fort Lauderdale among others), and Palm Beach

(the City of West Palm Beach among others). Demographic statistics, summary information about cultural organizations, and nominal outcomes of public art and design policy and management are shown in Table 1.

The first major feature of Table 1 shows that there are significant socio-economic differences among the counties. What is not apparent is that the South Florida region has grown, for the most part, in a linear progression from the south (Miami-Dade) to the north (Palm Beach). During this, still continuing, northward progression, prior villages and towns have become enveloped into the landscape of the urban region. County boundaries are meaningful in political terms, but bear little resemblance to the economic region of the cultural marketer. The oldest county, Miami-Dade, is virtually developed, has a larger proportion of Hispanic residents, is poorer, is younger, and surprisingly less dense than its neighbor to the north. The 'youngest' county, Palm Beach, is richer, older, whiter, and not very dense. The intermediate county, demographically and geographically, is denser.

The second salient discriminator shown in Table 1 is the identification of the "lead" agency for cultural policy and management. In two of the three counties, county government, through its "cultural affairs" sub-organization, is the lead agency; whereas in the third county, the lead agency is a private council. This basic difference permeates virtually all other differences: two of the counties have public art and design ordinances; the other does not. Two of the counties have extensive public participation processes; the third county does not.

Table 1: Descriptive Demographics, Organizations, and Outcomes

Variable / Place	Miami-Dade County	Broward County	Palm Beach County
DEMOGRAPHICS			
Population	2,253,362	1,623,108	1,131,184
Density	1,157	1,623	573
Municipalities	31	31	37
Cities > 60,000	5	11	4
Median Household Income	$35,966	$41,691	$45,062
Percent Families Below Poverty	14.5%	8.7%	8.7%
% Over 60	17.6%	19.8%	27.6%
% Black/Hispanic	77.6%	37.2%	26.2%
ORGANIZATIONS			
Lead Agency	County Cultural Affairs Department	County Cultural Affairs Division	Palm Beach County Cultural Council
Cultural Groups	750	377	Over 400
OUTCOMES			
AIPP Ordinance	YES, 1973	YES, 1995	NO

RESEARCH QUESTION AND METHODOLOGY

The principle research question is to draw lessons about cultural policy and management from a descriptive analysis of the public art and design programs within the South Florida urban region. Our methodology is straightforward and twofold. First, we document the "institutional arrangements" for public art and design programs using "thick descriptions" of resources and activities as well as discussing outcomes. Both published and refugee materials are combined with personal reflection based on board memberships and/or business relationships to perform this task. Second, based on both the case study results and reflection of the theoretical perspectives outlined above, we develop a set of strategic planning and/or management principles.

FINDINGS

THE ORGANIZATION OF PUBLIC ART AND DESIGN PROGRAMS IN THE SOUTH FLORIDA URBAN REGION

In this section, we describe, as thickly as possible within the constraints of space, how public art and design programs are carried out in the three counties. We have structured our findings around the three analytical points in our model: resources, activities, and outcomes.

Resource similarities and differences exist among the three counties. The first distinction to be drawn is between the programs in Miami-Dade and Broward counties versus the program in Palm Beach County. Resources, in the organizational behavior literature are often distinguished as being either "normal" or "episodic." In the first two counties, resources are obtained through ordinance, whereas in Palm Beach County, resources for public art and design can best be explained as episodic.

In Miami-Dade and Broward counties, public art and design is funded by ordinances that require a portion of construction costs of government building be used for such purposes. In Miami-Dade County, it is funded by the requirement of 1½% of the construction of new governmental buildings to provide for the acquisition of works of art. No provision is made for the distribution of these funds among works of art, maintenance of these works, or program support other than "to the extent the total appropriation is not used for the acquisition … the remainder may be used for … program administrative costs, insurance and maintenance … (and) … to supplement other appropriations." In Broward County, the ordinance instituted a requirement for contributions for art funding based on a percentage of eligible cost components for eligible capital projects. The specific percentages of public art allocation are as follows: 2% of the eligible costs for buildings, park expansions and improvements, unincorporated roads, sidewalks, trails and building renovations; and 1% of the design and construction of major road projects. Eligible costs include design, engineering, construction and custom designed equipment. Within the public art allocation, 70% is allotted to public art, with equal 15% portions provided for the maintenance of public art works and for program support.

By way of contrast, public art and design in Palm Beach is best described as episodic and/or ad-hoc. Two examples provide evidence. First, AIPP programming began in 1988 at the Palm Beach International Airport (PBIA) with the opening of the new airport terminal. Purchased art at the airport was initially funded from fees imposed on airport concessionaires. Details of the selection process are not available. Ongoing AIPP activity at PBIA includes an exhibition space used for loaned artwork at the main concourse. The exhibition space and program is sponsored by HMSHost, manager of all food venders in the airport through interest from an endowment. The second example was the creation of the Palm Beach County Committee for Courthouse Art. This champion-led (county commissioner) activity was created for art selection purposes. Various arts professionals from within the county, many of whom were also involved in art selection for the airport were involved here as well.

A major similarity among all three counties is that all use either direct or indirect bond referendums to support PAD/AIPP. Perhaps the leader in this area was Palm Beach County, where a bond referendum was passed in 1999, for $500,000, to place public art in the county courthouses. More recently, an "Arts & Parks" bond for $50,000,000 passed in November 2002 and included $1,000,000 for AIPP to be used on county property throughout the county. The former ad-hoc Committee for Courthouse Art has now become the Committee for Public Art; and, in June of 2003 is scheduled to give their recommendations for sites and appropriations of the $1,000,000 AIPP monies. A similar process is unfolding in Broward County, where voters passed the 2000 Safe Parks and Lands Preservation Bond Issue for $400 million, which included a $5 million line item to create a culture center in a park. The program has proved successful, and the County has expanded the program.

Activity similarities and differences exist among the three counties. We describe below differences in organization, devolution, and partnerships.

The Cultural Affairs Council, a politically appointed board, through its public art and design subcommittee carries out the public art and design program in Broward County. The program operates as follows. First, the public art selection process starts with the County Board of Commissioners who authorize the capital project and allocate the art percentage. The Cultural Affairs Council then directs the public art and design sub-committee to proceed with project. The sub-committee defines the project budget, provides parameters for the selection process and recommends an art selection panel. The Council ratifies this decision and formally appoints the artist selection panel for specific projects. The artist selection panel tours the site, takes public input, and issues a call for artists. Staff at Cultural Affairs Division of county government administers all of this and makes arrangements for the interviews with artists and facilitates the review of the artist proposals. The sub-committee reviews the artist recommendation and transmits the artist recommendation to the Council. The Council and Cultural Affairs Division staff affirms the artist recommendation and staff negotiates contracts. The County Administrator approves and executes the artist contracts.

On the other hand, Palm Beach County does not have an ordinance for AIPP and has no long-term plan or programming for public art, other than the episodic activities described above. Arts and cultural events and programming have relied primarily on the initiatives of private individuals and municipalities within the county. However, change seems to be occurring and "institutional arrangements" are beginning to "look more like" those of its two southern neighbors. For example, since 2000, an outside consultant, under the title of Director of Public Art, has administered the AIPP projects. This office was within the private PBC Cultural Council; as of January 2003 this position and responsibility has moved to county government, placed with the Facilities Department. And, similar to the Cultural Affairs Councils in Miami-Dade and Broward, the PBC Committee for Public Art is now charged with making the art selections for all AIPP programming, the exhibition space at PBIA, and the recently approved bond-funded public art. Selections are now made through call to artists and competitive processes. Final approval by the Board of County Commissioners is required for any selections of purchased or commissioned artwork.

There are, however, two major similarities that seem to be occurring in all three counties. The first is the *devolution* of the perceived responsibility for the provision of public art and design. Within a fragmented urban region, the fact that such devolution is only now beginning to happen is somewhat surprising. And, the "mechanics" of the devolution are somewhat different. In Palm Beach, with no countywide ordinance, various cities have picked up the ball and have initiated their own PAD/AIPP programs and ordinances. For example, the town of Jupiter has a rotating AIPP program using loaned pieces; the city of Palm Beach Gardens has an AIPP ordinance imposed on private commercial development and municipal capital improvements; the City of West Palm Beach has an AIPP ordinance imposed on municipal capital improvements; and the City of Delray Beach has an AIPP ordinance under development. On the other hand, several cities in Broward have tapped into the Safe Parks and Lands Preservation bond issue. Included here are public art and design programs, focused on the construction of venues in Hollywood, Pembroke Pines, Miramar, and Lauderhill.

The second major similarity is the emergence of a *network of partnerships* between and/or among the organizations providing public art and design. Here, the "oldest" county has the most sophisticated and articulated network of partners. This is no doubt tied to both the longer time frame as well as the emergence of Miami and Miami Beach as a global cultural center. There are well-established special purpose organizations like the Miami Design Preservation League. In Broward County, more and more "Dade-like" organizations are beginning to appear, but they are limited in terms of resources and capacity. The general impression is that, outside of the bond-inspired opportunities, limited partnerships have developed between the county, cities, and/or cultural organizations. Partnership formation is less frequent in Palm Beach County where the perception persists that older, elite-oriented organizations still cling to original mission statements and internally focused activity patterns.

Despite variations in "institutional arrangements," there are <u>outcome</u> similarities as well as differences among the three counties. There is an ongoing challenge in Broward

County to create a cohesive urban fabric. The landscape, generally characterized as a dichotomy between the eastern, city-oriented areas versus the western, suburban oriented communities, presents a challenge for those seeking to create "place." Government programs in the past few years such as the Parks Bond and the Library Bond have contributed significantly to the increase in opportunities in the west. Not unintentional was the preparation of the Auerbach report (a technical appendix to the county cultural planning efforts) that stressed the need for proactive interventions. The result of the dispersed county is more destination-oriented art experiences out west rather than urban interactive public art in the east. The 5-year Plan in 2002 was developed partially to address these challenges and included a series of goals that may or may not be mutually supportive. For example, two goals are: "celebrate and preserve the special resources in Broward County"; and, "through collaboration, expand the access to and impact of artworks and excellent design throughout the county." In regards to public art and design, specifically, there are currently 178 titled artworks with an estimated value of $11.5 million.

In Palm Beach, there is a very strong base for arts and culture in terms of median income and higher than national attendance levels. Cultural organizations emerge, survive and grow despite little government assistance. Many of them rely on earned income, higher than national rates, to keep their budgets healthy. The result is that there are many large cultural organizations with healthy finances, construction/expansion projects proceed on time, and are paid for or nearly paid for at construction completion. These larger organizations also encourage tourism and are eligible for tourism-based grants that help keep the momentum going.

At the other end of the spectrum, however, is the public art and design activity. The lack of consistent funding and paid staff has lead to frustration and mostly "plop art." There appears to be lack of understanding among government officials and county cultural leaders that public art can and should interface with urban design, park design, building design, urban renewal, cultural design, etc. There are a growing number of arts consultants, cultural organizations and individuals that do recognize the potential, but no one in a leadership position that can champion and advocate for AIPP, has emerged.

There is, however, an overriding similarity among all three counties. Two frustrations seem to be common. The first relates to the funding. Where the proprietors of venues control resources, the issue of "we want flamingos" emerges. The second relates to the narrow definition of culture and brand names that emerge out of both private (no apparent decision rules) and public (bureaucratizing the "muse") models. In this situation, public art and design can be highly constrained or generic, does not expand the envelope of human expression, and more often than not, is located in places where the majority of the population never visits (airports, courthouses, libraries). Public art and design is clearly not a "populist" idea or activity.

STRATEGIC PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

Our descriptive study of the "institutional arrangements" and "outcomes" of public art and design programs in the South Florida urban region leads to the identification of a set

of management and strategic planning principles. We state them here as both preliminary findings as well as potential hypotheses for future study.

<u>There is a development path in the "institutional arrangements" for provision of cultural policy and management that is consistent with the development path of the community</u>

We have seen, in our case study, three different, increasingly sophisticated models of describing the provision of cultural policy and management. We believe that they are related to the "age" of the place. In our study area, Palm Beach County is the youngest place (in terms of population, in terms of its recent achievement of a population of over 1 million, in terms of political and managerial sophistication). Not unexpectedly, private, wealthy interests who sought their own cultural diversions controlled cultural policy and management. No attention was paid to the development of indigenous capacity or to the diffusion of cultural opportunity to places outside the "spatial core" of the society. On the other hand, Miami-Dade is the oldest place (in terms of population size, years since it achieved a population of over 1 million, and in terms of political and managerial sophistication). Miami-Dade is culturally diverse and sophisticated and it is difficult to identify a single "cultural voice." Although there is a well-developed Cultural Affairs Department within county government, there are many other "voices"; as Miami-Dade is also the home of many major organizations – the best-funded symphony, major museums, the Miami Design Preservation League, facilities to host international events (e.g., "Art Basel") as well as the home of major supporters. It is viewed, perhaps more than anywhere else in South Florida as the "urban region of the future."

<u>The number and range of cultural organizations with the ability to provide PAD programs increases and their connectivity thickens as places grow more sophisticated and diverse</u>

In our study, we observed a simple, but apparent, finding: the older, more populated and more diverse the place, the more groups are involved in public art and design. This occurs in at least three ways.

First, older places have more groups and a longer time period from which to view. So, for example, the Broward Trust for Historical Preservation was recently formed (in 2002), twenty years after the Miami Design Preservation League. The latter is a fully funded organization with paid staff and its own programs. The former consists of two champions, little money and a dream.

Second, as populations continue to grow, several municipalities grow to the size where they seek their own public art and design expression. It would be obvious to state the differences, for example, between Miami and Miami Beach, two municipalities in Miami-Dade County. Similar dynamics are at work throughout the region, particularly in Broward County, where the settlement pattern has emerged from a mono-centric cone (where Fort Lauderdale was the dominant city) to a polycentric pattern where there are now at least three cities with a population of over 100,000. Perhaps enhanced by programmatic decisions emanating from the Auerbach report, there has been a diffusion of cultural venues and the emergence of a large network of cultural providers.

Second, for different reasons (shown above), municipalities in Broward and Palm Beach have taken public art and design under their own wings. First, several municipalities (Jupiter, Palm Beach Gardens, West Palm Beach, Delray Beach) in Palm Beach County have AIPP programming, ordinance driven and other types of programs. Several cities in Broward (Miramar, Pembroke Pines, Lauderhill, Hollywood) are beginning to develop cultural centers, using monies from the Safe Parks and Lands Preservation Bond and several smaller towns, such as Sunrise and Tamarac, are instituting their own public art and design programs. This "new trend" points to increasing sophistication in the cultural planning and policy landscape.

Third, there is the influence of other large cultural organizations and/or sponsors. Large cultural organizations often have the resources to create public art and design, in terms of both their own venues as well as through participation in or on important community level boards and trusts. Large cultural organizations seem to be more dominant in either very advanced (Miami-Dade) or emerging (Palm Beach) urban sub-spaces. While "on the surface" cooperation is evident in large centralized cultural management systems, little influence has been noted on the public art and design program.

The intermediate phase on the development path of "organizational institutional arrangements" – large centrally controlled programs -- seems to focus more on access and education that either of the other two forms

Here, we focus on identification of a recognized "cultural voice," particularly in regards to access and education in regards to public art and design. While there is general agreement that the vanguard of public art and design is "located" in Miami-Dade, and that in Palm Beach the emphasis is on "GRAND public places," there is also general agreement that the best process for insuring access (to government funds) and education (in terms of providing an emphasis for art as part of the public fabric) is in Broward County. The Auerbach Report stresses the role of access and education. And, it is a hallmark of the Broward County processes that more money is spent on small enterprises and individual artists, and education than in other counties. In this manner, the issue of public art and design is kept in the public's mind.

The down side of this is that cultural policy and management tends to become overly process oriented and there is little flexibility. The County uses the consulting reports as working documents. All decisions and programs are directly related to the consulting documents. For example, the consulting document was the basis for the County Cultural Affairs Division to seek county bond monies.

The political dimension is always present

The political dimension manifests itself in three ways: direct (through the appointment of personnel on key Council and subcommittee positions); internally indirect (the "bureaucratizing of the muse"); and externally indirect (organizations or sponsors that provide funding). Each is discussed in turn.

First, cultural affairs councils -- in the two counties that have them as well as in the "ad-hoc" case -- are politically appointed. Thus, while these councils are nominally formed to "isolate" political influence, they are nonetheless evident. However, the official line is somewhat like, for example, the following: in Broward, the public art and design program *always* puts the art and the artist at the forefront and works hard to maintain this. On the other hand, the political efforts are at the Council level, since they report directly to the County Commission. The real political challenge is due to the fact that so few cities are committed to this ordinance, therefore the net effect is diminished as one is unable to influence the local environment and public realm unless it is County controlled.

A related notion, particularly in those places that are more private in their approach to cultural policy and management, the role of the politician is to organizationally perform the role of *champion*. Now the role of champions is to move the purpose forward; more often than not, champions are not innovators in the details of the purpose, but believe in the purpose. It is a very early (in terms of a development path) form of "institutional arrangement." The movement of public art and design programs in Palm Beach County over the past five years shows the development from a situation of no interest (through the private council) through a champion (courthouse initiative) to the rudiments of a governmental program (the new agency).

Second, internally indirect politics come about through internal politics of cultural workers, a phenomenon noted by Dubin (1987). Various artists become local favorites, and with the absence of assessment and evaluation (see below), the outcome of local public art and design projects may, at times, be undervalued in terms of artistic merit.

Third, the resource dependence of public art and design programs – be they dependent on local government construction or private philanthropy or sponsors – often leads to a discussion that is more "political" than "artistic" as regards the eventual outcome. Thus, if the sponsor wants flamingos, the cultural worker is likely to look for artists that do flamingos.

Assessment and evaluation can be improved

Cultural policy and management, from the perspectives of strategic planning or rational approaches, would seem to need to rely on such attributes as mission statements, assessment of alternatives, and evaluation. We found "quasi-mission" statements in the two counties that have ordinances.

However, we found little in terms of assessment of operational procedures, except in Broward County. And, even there, significant "thought gaps" emerge. For example, in the realm of resources, the issue of whether or not to "pool" resources from different sources in pursuit of a larger project is not legally possible, and it doesn't seems to be on any ones agenda to change it. And, in Palm Beach County, where there is a move to make the government more involved in public art and design programs, there is no known effort to rationalize the process through a pre-conceived planning document.

Third, while all three counties use consultants (and all three have engaged major world class consultants in a attempt to be major league participants in the development of cultural enterprise and activity), use of consultant reports has varied. The difference between the use of consultants in Palm Beach (Wolf, Keens & Co, 1997) and Broward (Bay Consulting Group, 2000) is instructive. In the former, the consultant report was shelved because it represented a totally new way of thinking. Only in early 2003 has this report been dusted off for insight into possible actions. In the latter, the report and its appendices are used as a blueprint for activity.

Finally, and perhaps most disturbingly, we found *no* evidence of any systematic assessment of the art itself. Perhaps this is beyond the reach of cultural planners and policy makers.

<u>Public art and design programs are used as economic development tools, but instrumentalities vary</u>

There is an overt attempt to link public art and design programs to more broad county goals in Broward County. It is interesting to note that most of the public art and design funding comes from the Airport, Port and Convention Center, all of which coincide with the tourist industry.

It is also perfectly clear, in policy and mechanics, that the cultural policy and management in Palm Beach County is directly related to tourism. Tourist type taxes are funneled through the Palm Beach County Cultural Council and existing public art and design projects are episodic and related to tourist-associated facilities such as the airport.

CONCLUSIONS

Here, we reflect on the contribution of this paper. We make three observations. First, it is extremely clear that tourism and cultural tourism plays a major role in the political decision makers mind to fund public art and design. Many of the projects result from tourist-related construction activities (e.g., airport expansion, convention center expansion, etc.). Since the funding source is derived, in those cases that have ordinances, from government building, and since the goal of government seems to be economic development, this is perhaps not surprising.

Second, it is clear that it is challenging to maintain the highest standards possible for art in general and to fully understand how public art and design is related to other attributes of urban space such as urban design, park design, building design, urban renewal, or cultural design. The emphasis on "branded public art" resulting from both private and public approaches is disturbing in terms of expanding the notion of art or culture. Where is the debate on the quality of art?

Finally, the good news is that, despite its market origins and sometimes generic art, the phrase public art and design is developing cachet. Perhaps the time is right to seek ways

to capitalize on the apparent devolution processes noted. Perhaps the time is right to seek creation of partnerships with other agencies that have the capacity to develop. In such a scenario, the opportunity for the coincidence of form, funding, and framework increases.

REFERENCES

Bennett, S. and J. Butler, eds. 2000. **Locality, Regeneration and Diverse Cities**. Bristol, England: Intellect.

Broward County Cultural Affairs Division (Bay Consulting Group). 2000. **Building The Cultural Mosaic of Broward County: Community Cultural Plan 2010.**

Broward County Cultural Affairs Division (Bay Consulting Group). 2000. **Building The Cultural Mosaic of Broward County: Community Cultural Plan 2010: Research Reports**.

Dubin, S.C. 1987. **Bureaucratizing the Muse: Public Funds and the Cultural Worker**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Heilbrun, J. and C.M. Gray. 2001. **The Economics of Art and Culture**. New York: Cambridge.

Judd, D.R. and S.S. Fainstein, eds. 1999. **The Tourist City**. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Mayer, M. 1995. Post-Fordist City Politics. In A. Amin. Ed., **Post-Fordism: A Reader**. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell**.**

Miles, M. 1997. Art, Space and The City: **Public Art and Urban Futures**. London: Routledge.

Quinn, R-B M. 1998. **Public Policy and the Arts**. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Palm Beach County Cultural Council (Wolf, Keens & Co). 1997. **A Cultural Plan for Palm Beach County**.

Pfeffer, J. and G. R. Salancik. 2003. **The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective**. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Prosperi, D.C. and J. Downen. 1998. Cultural Planning in Two Metropolitan Counties: Similarities and Differences. Paper presented at 10th International Conference on Cultural Economics, Barcelona, Spain.

Zemans, J. and A. Kleingartner. 1999. **Comparing Cultural Policy**. Walnut Creek, CA: Sage.