

Winter 12-16-2016

History in Collaboration: Equalizing the Arts and the Humanities in San Francisco

Nicole C. Meldahl

University of San Francisco, ncmeldahl@usfca.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.usfca.edu/capstone>

 Part of the [American Art and Architecture Commons](#), [Arts Management Commons](#), [Comparative Philosophy Commons](#), [Cultural History Commons](#), [History of Philosophy Commons](#), [Intellectual History Commons](#), [Other Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#), [Policy History, Theory, and Methods Commons](#), [Political History Commons](#), [Public Affairs Commons](#), [Public History Commons](#), [Real Estate Commons](#), [Strategic Management Policy Commons](#), [United States History Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Meldahl, Nicole C., "History in Collaboration: Equalizing the Arts and the Humanities in San Francisco" (2016). *Master's Projects and Capstones*. 470.

<https://repository.usfca.edu/capstone/470>

This Project/Capstone is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, Capstones and Projects at USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Projects and Capstones by an authorized administrator of USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. For more information, please contact repository@usfca.edu.

History in Collaboration:

Equalizing the Arts and Humanities in San Francisco

Keywords: museum studies, city government, nonprofit, public-private partnerships,
humanities, San Francisco history

By

Nicole Christin Meldahl

Capstone project submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts in Museum Studies

Department of Art + Architecture
University of San Francisco

Faculty Advisor: Stephanie A. Brown

Academic Director: Paula Birnbaum

December 15, 2016

Abstract

Historically, there has been a critical imbalance in the way history and preservation organizations are civically supported in comparison with the amount of funding that is available to arts organizations in the United States. To correct this imbalance in San Francisco, I propose the creation of a San Francisco Department of Culture that would place the San Francisco Arts Commission equally alongside a San Francisco History Commission within a department that absorbs responsibilities currently managed by other divisions within city government, such as the Planning Department and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. City government necessarily takes time to reorganize, so the first step will be to advocate for and demonstrate the need for a Department of Culture; this can be achieved by continuing to strengthen and expand San Francisco History Days, and by grooming key members of the event's organizing committee to become stakeholders in a nascent San Francisco History Commission. This, however, will only address part of the problem; we must also address the problematic federal and perceptual division of the Arts from the Humanities, and the inaccurate perception that History is boring and irrelevant to contemporary life. To do this, we must present History didactically—in conversation with its surroundings, through collaboration with other types of cultural organizations.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	4-17
I. Funding Culture in the United States	5-26
a. Percent for Art Programs	5-6
b. New York City Department of Cultural Affairs	6-12
c. Seattle Department of Arts & Culture	12-17
d. San Diego Commission of Arts & Culture	17-23
e. Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs	23-26
II. Funding Culture in San Francisco	26-42
a. San Francisco Arts Commission	26-32
b. Grants for the Arts	32-35
c. ArtSpan	35-36
e. The Office of Economic and Workforce Development	36-39
f. The Planning Department	40-42
Chapter 2: Literature Review	18-24
I. Origins of Federal Funding	43-45
II. Culture Confusion	45-46
III. The Relevance of History	47-48
IV. Conclusion	48-49
Chapter 3: Proposal	50-58
I. Analysis of External Departments	50-51
II. San Francisco Department of Culture	51-54
Chapter 4: Action Plan	55-58
Chapter 5: Summary and Conclusions	59-61
Appendices	62-83
A: Annotated Bibliography	62-71
B: Project Stakeholders	72
C: Works Cited	73-83

Chapter 1: Introduction

San Francisco is a city in flux. A tech boom, like so many booms before it, has brought a wave of new residents with different priorities than natives or long-time adopters of the City's quirks. Many are dismayed by the rate of change they witness, seemingly brought on by a lack of respect for the history that has made this metropolis so appealing. Change is good, progress inevitable, but our shared cultural heritage is disappearing in its patch. The City's history must and can be prioritized through mindful stewardship that balances a sense of place with contemporary needs; however, this has been difficult due to a critical imbalance in the way history and preservation organizations are civically supported in comparison with the amount of funding made available to arts organizations in San Francisco. To correct this imbalance, I propose that the San Francisco Arts Commission be transitioned into a more inclusive Department of Culture to more equitably assign civic-funded support to cultural organizations.

The San Francisco Department of Culture would not eliminate the San Francisco Arts Commission; instead, it would place the Arts Commission equally alongside a History Commission within a department that absorbs responsibilities currently managed by other city departments, as well as strategic public-private partnerships. This transition has been achieved in many cities nationwide, and the following departments are examined as case studies: the New York City Department of Cultural Affairs, the Seattle Office of Arts and Culture, the San Diego Commission of Arts and Culture, and the Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs. City government necessarily takes time to reorganize, so the first step is to advocate and demonstrate the need for a Department of Culture to engender political goodwill and popular support. Strengthening and expanding San Francisco History Days, an annual event in which small and large history groups in the San Francisco Bay Area stage exhibitions in the Old U.S. Mint, can achieve this. Key members of the organizing committee for History Days are also key stakeholders in a San Francisco History Commission, and this paper will outline the steps necessary to plan an expanded 2018 History Days that will increase the event's visibility, thereby helping to generate popular support for more equitable funding of cultural work in San Francisco.

The creation of a Department of Culture, however, will only address part of the problem. We must also speak to the problematic division of the Arts from the

Humanities, which constrains funding by creating arbitrary distinctions between different genres of cultural interpretation. This has helped to promote the inaccurate perception that the Arts are not complimentary to the field of History, and vice versa. Historical scholarship can provide context to the arts and increase their impact, while artistic interpretation of historical events can highlight their relevancy by activating them within different contexts. History is neither boring nor irrelevant, but this can only be communicated if we present it didactically—in conversation with its surroundings, through collaboration with other types of cultural organizations. An entrée into this collaboration is the medium of photography, which is concomitantly thought of as fine arts object and documentary artifact, depending on its placement within an art or a history museum. In addition, artist-curation within history museums can provide outsiders the opportunity to add new dimensions to permanent collections, and also critique the way in which history is traditionally presented.

Departments of culture take different forms across the country because there is no federal directive on how to organize city government; consequently, it is necessary to ground readers in the precedent for transitioning an arts commission into an expanded department of culture. In addition to a comprehensive examination of funding in San Francisco and a brief accounting for the origins of Percent for Art programs, four city departments have been examined as case studies: the New York City Department of Cultural Affairs (DCLA); the Seattle Office of Arts and Culture; the San Diego Arts and Culture Commission; and the Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs (DCA).

Funding Culture Across the United States

Percent for Art Programs

Among many similarities, all of the surveyed cities have a Percent for Art Program descendant from the public art movement that began in the United States after World War II. Artists studying overseas after the war imported the European custom of devoting a portion of construction budgets to the commissioning and acquisition of art. One such group in Philadelphia presented this idea to Louis Kahn, President of the Philadelphia Redevelopment Agency, who then advocated for the nation's first 1% allocation of a City's construction budget for art. Implemented in 1959, this type of

program has since been established at the local, state, and federal level—partnering with transit agencies, tourism bureaus, port authorities, redevelopment corporations and other quasi-government agencies. Central to this movement is the idea that public art can facilitate “place-making,” collapsing the space between urban planning and culture while benefiting residents and improving tourism. Many programs are integrated with infrastructure projects, including artists in the design process to encourage use and enjoyment while educating the public, commemorating local history, and reinforcing neighborhood and community identity. Perhaps most importantly, they create jobs for those in the arts and culture sector through a dedicated revenue stream far more stable than finite grants (City of San Diego, 2004, p. 16-21).

New York City Department of Cultural Affairs (DCLA)

Funding for cultural organizations in New York City traces back to the 19th-century when private citizens partnered with the City to build and operate the American Museum of Natural History, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Staten Island Institute of Arts and Sciences, The New York Botanical Garden and the Bronx Zoo. In 1898, an 11-member Art Commission was created to review art, architecture and landscape designs for City-owned property. This led to the creation of a Municipal Art Committee by Mayor Fiorello La Guardia using funds from the Works Progress Administration (WPA) during the Great Depression. In the 1940s and 1950s, the City found ways to fund music, theater and dance, and bestow awards to significant contributors to the City’s intellectual and cultural life. The need for a centralized agency with a dedicated funding stream for local culture was made obvious after the City purchased Carnegie Hall, saving it from demolition, around the same time it began funding free performances of Shakespeare in Central Park in 1960 (“About Cultural Affairs: History”, n.d.); it was time for a department of culture.

The first iteration of New York City’s DCLA was created by Mayor Robert F. Wagner as the Office of Cultural Affairs (OCA) in 1962 to “promote and stimulate cultural life in the City” (“About Cultural Affairs: History”, n.d.). Robert W. Dowling was hired as its unsalaried Cultural Executive, and he oversaw a six-member staff paid through the Mayor’s office—receiving its first City-appropriated budget in 1964. The following year, buildings from the World’s Fair in Flushing Meadow were converted to

house the Queens Museum, New York Hall of Science, Queens Botanical Garden and New York State Theater at Lincoln Center. Shortly thereafter, Mayor John V. Lindsay expanded OCA beyond the performing arts to include all cultural institutions—museums, zoos, libraries, botanical gardens and theaters—in 1966.

As with many departments of culture, New York City equivocated on what part of city government it belonged under. OCA was eventually combined with Parks and Recreation to become the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Affairs Administration (PRCA) until Cultural Affairs was separated as an independent agency within the Parks Department in 1968. An independent DCLA was created by Mayor Abraham D. Beame in 1976, and the department absorbed 15 cultural institutions that previously received funding from the Bureau of Budget that later became known as the City Institutions Group (CIG). The department continued to grow its mission, presenting new cultural initiatives and moving into a larger space with a gallery. In fiscal year 1982 funding for DCLA was included in the Executive Budget with one percent of the City’s construction budget allocated to create public artwork, which DLCA began to administer in 1986. Another important milestone came in 1995 when the City’s Corporation Counsel enabled DLCA to award funding as grants instead of contracts (“About Cultural Affairs: History,” n.d.). Finally, in 2003, Mayor Bloomberg modified the City Charter to mandate a Cultural Affairs Advisory Commission, which continues to support the DCLA (“Advisory Commission,” n.d.).

The DCLA is the largest cultural funding agency in the United States, administering a \$156 million budget in fiscal year 2014 and a capital budget of \$822 million through fiscal year 2018 (“Funding for Cultural Organizations,” n.d.). Its current mission is to support and strengthen New York City’s “vibrant cultural life...ensur[ing] adequate public funding for non-profit cultural organizations, both large and small, throughout the five boroughs.” It supports “cultural organizations involved in the visual, literary and performing arts; public-oriented science and humanities institutions including zoos, botanical gardens and historic and preservation societies; and creative artists at all skill levels” (“About Cultural Affairs,” n.d.). The DCLA currently has eleven divisions, with three functioning as primary funders—Program Services Unit, Cultural Institutions Unit, and Capital Projects Unit (“About Cultural Affairs,” n.d.).

The Program Services Unit supports 881 groups that provide “cultural experiences” (“About Cultural Affairs,” n.d.), and has also administered the Cultural Development Fund (CDF), which awards annual grants to a variety of institutions from neighborhood groups to large cultural organizations since 2002 (“Cultural Development Fund,” n.d.). The Cultural Institutions Unit began with a 33-member CIG, and provided unrestricted operating grants for organizations occupying City-owned property; beginning with the American Museum of Natural History in 1869, CIG organizations have used these grants to pay base bills such as security, maintenance, administration and utilities. Staff members of the Unit attend board meetings, periodically monitor operations and programming, provide management and technical assistance, and liaise between other City agencies for each CIG member (“City-Owned Institutions,” n.d.). In addition, CIG members receive funding for design, construction and equipment through the Capital Projects Unit, which also distributes funding to approximately 200 other cultural facilities. These grants are intended to provide better access for the disabled, historic preservation and maintenance, and increased security or enhanced exhibition and performing space (“Capital Funding,” n.d.).

In 2011, the DCLA created a public-private partnership called Spaceworks to renovate underutilized real estate for artist rehearsal and studio space. Unlike temporary residence programs, Spaceworks is a collaborative that works with local cultural and community organizations to provide development, maintenance, and lease expertise in making permanent workspaces available to artists (“Mayor Bloomberg Opens,” 2013). Eligibility is open only to artists who primarily reside in New York City and can prove an active practice, and focus groups from this demographic were surveyed to assess and define what was affordable in 2013 (“FAQ,” n.d.). Depending on location and size, performing artist rehearsal studios are \$10-18 per hour, and are located in Long Island City, the Williamsburgh Library, and the Brooklyn Conservatory of Music (“Rehearsal Spaces,” n.d.). Visual arts studios are available by lottery at Gowanus and the Williamsburgh Library, and start at \$350 per month, with leases renewable annually (“FAQ,” n.d.). During ribbon-cutting ceremonies at the privately-funded pilot site in Long Island City, Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg said: “By integrating affordable workspace for artists into neighborhoods across the city, Spaceworks is helping us to find

innovative ways to attract the talented workers that help shape our City's economy, identity and quality of life" ("Mayor Bloomberg Opens," 2013).

Where Spaceworks falls short of its goal to shape the City's identity, however, is its exclusive service to artists to the exclusion of scholars and preservationists; this is a pattern of bias within the department. Despite the DCLA's hierarchically equitable distribution of funding, it does not seem to equally promote work within the arts and the humanities. Annual Reports from 2012 and 2013 predominantly advertises accomplishments within the performing arts, only mentioning science or humanities work when it pertains to architectural improvements. In addition, auxiliary programs are almost exclusively devoted to the arts. DCLA manages Materials for the Arts (MFTA), which has collected reusable materials and distributes them to non-profits, City agencies, public schools, and service organizations with arts programs since 1978 ("Materials for the Arts," n.d.); Percent for Art, which has overseen public artwork created through funding from the City's construction budget since 1982 ("Percent for Art," n.d.); and Creative Aging, which places artists in residence at senior centers ("Creative Aging," n.d.). One exception is the recent Building Community Capacity (BCC) initiative developed by the Capacity Building Unit. This initiative ensures cultural organizations are able to impact community development in low-income neighborhoods, and uses an interagency collaboration—including the Department of City Planning (DCP), Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) and the New York City Economic Development Corporation (EDC)—to execute its goals ("Building Community Capacity," n.d.). While the DCLA sets a national precedent for departments of culture, it still leaves much to be desired.

Historic resources in New York City are protected by the a separate Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC), which was created by the 1965 Landmarks Law in response to the high volume loss of historically significant buildings—most notably the demolition of Pennsylvania Station to build Madison Square Garden in 1963. The Law stated that preserving the City's cultural, social, economic, political and architectural history by safeguarding landmark structures and places would stabilize and improve property value; foster civic pride; make the City more attractive to tourists; and strengthen the economy ("About LPC," n.d.). In 1980, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, the New York Landmarks Preservation Foundation, was established to support the LPC by raising

public and private funds, which it does in part by sponsoring an annual benefit, Lunch at a Landmark (“Preservation Foundation,” n.d.). In addition to fundraising, the Foundation sponsors the Bronze Plaque, Historic District Markers, and Street Sign programs that identify historic resources and districts, as well as forums and educational events that increase public awareness of the City’s preservation work. The Foundation also publishes the *Guide to New York City Landmarks* and *Context/Contrast: New York Architecture in Historic Districts, 1967-2009* (“Signs and Plaques,” n.d.)

LPC is the largest municipal preservation agency in the nation with a panel of eleven commissioners appointed by the Mayor. A staff of 70 preservationists, researchers, architects, historians, attorneys, archaeologists, and administrative employees oversee the maintenance and protection of more than 35,000 landmarks within 139 historic districts and extensions throughout the five boroughs; these include 1,355 individual, 117 interior, and 10 scenic landmarks (“About LPC,” n.d.). The work of the LPC is divided into six areas—Research, Preservation, Enforcement, Archaeology, Environmental Review, and the Historic Preservation Grant Program—which operate as their titles imply. The Research Department assesses the significance of buildings eligible for landmark consideration, while the Preservation Department reviews applications and issues permits for certain work on landmarked properties in addition to preparing applications for review by the full LPC. The Enforcement Department ensures alterations to landmarked properties are in compliance with issued permits, and investigates reported violations. The Environmental Review Department works with the Research and Archaeology Departments to offer guidance for and review of compliance on federal, state, and city projects, and also issues determinations on Energy Conservation Code exemptions for historic resources (“Environmental Review,” n.d.).

The City began acquiring archaeological collections after the adoption of an environmental review law in 1979. The Archaeology Department was created in 2002, despite having a collection and an archaeologist on staff since the 1980s. It currently reviews subsurface work under environmental and/or landmark review, and then oversees resulting archaeology projects. Artifacts recovered from these projects are held in perpetuity and made accessible at the NYC Archaeological Repository, which was created in 2014 to “curate the city’s archaeological collections and to make them

accessible to archaeologists, researchers, teachers, students, and the public (“All About,” n.d.). The Repository was named for Nan A. Rothschild, a Columbia University anthropology professor who was active in city excavations, and the department began moving archaeological artifacts to a centralized repository. The Nan A Rothschild Research Center opened the public in October of 2016, and is located in a 1,400-square-foot, climate controlled basement in a midtown Manhattan office tower—space donated by The Durst Organization. It currently houses artifacts from 31 sites in more than 1,500 boxes alongside a small display—all of which are open by appointment to researchers, scholars, and the curious public. In addition, the Repository is working with the Museum of the City of New York to populate a comprehensive digital database that is accessible by the public online, and 15 of the City’s 31 collections are currently discoverable with more forthcoming, as funding becomes available.

Preservation work in the city is assisted by the Historic Preservation Grant Program (HPGP) established in 1977 to award grants funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG). Preference is given to applicants who can supply matching funds, and \$10,000-\$30,000 grants are awarded to nonprofit organizations and income-eligible owners in historic districts or landmarks, primarily for façade restoration. It’s interesting to note that the program’s website omits reference to the arts in defining eligible organizations as “charitable, scientific, educational, literary, or other” nonprofits that demonstrate need (“HPGP,” n.d.). In addition to reviewing and awarding grants, staff members help recipients prepare bids for and then select contractors, and continue to provide guidance through site visits after projects are underway.

Work accomplished by the LPC is externally extended by The New York Landmarks Conservancy, which was established in 1973 by a group of architects, lawyers, planners, writers, and preservationists to protect New York’s historic resources. “Through pragmatic leadership, financial and technical assistance, advocacy, and public education, the Conservancy ensures that New York’s historically and culturally significant buildings, streetscapes, and neighborhoods continue to contribute to New York’s economy, tourism, and quality of life” (“Mission Statement,” n.d.). The Conservancy provides funding similar to that of the HGPB through the Historic

Properties Fund, created in 1982 and now the largest revolving loan fund in the nation that is dedicated to historic preservation. Since 1986, its Sacred Sites Program has offered technical assistance and grants to religious organizations in landmark meetinghouses, churches, mosques and synagogues. In addition, it oversees the City Ventures Fund, which provides grants and loans to nonprofits in low- and middle-income neighborhoods to convert architecturally significant buildings into affordable spaces for housing or community groups (“What We Do,” n.d.).

The New York City DCLA is one of the most advanced departments of culture in the country. The way it structures oversight for core programs within the Program Services, Cultural Institutions, and Capital Projects Units is something San Francisco should strive for, in addition to emulating the City’s Archaeology Department.

Seattle Office of Arts & Culture

In 1954, a small group informally known as the “Beer and Culture Society” convened the Congress of the Allied Arts in Seattle (“60 Years,” n.d.). This group formally incorporated as Allied Arts of Seattle (AAS) the next year, and successfully lobbied the mayor and city council to establish an advisory board—creating the Municipal Arts Commission on June 7, 1955. This Municipal Arts Commission was formed to integrate “artistic experiences into Seattleites’ daily life” by civically funding historic preservation, local performance groups, and establishing resident opera and ballet companies (Biecha, 2014). Comprised of prominent citizens who advised the mayor on cultural development and urban development issues, the Commission was an early advocate of dedicating 2% of the city’s capital funds to purchase art; stage cultural events; acquire, beautify and preserve property; and support the performing arts. Working in partnership, the AAS and the Commission began to amass an extensive public art collection, displayed in public parks and buildings, and were responsible for saving a large body of public historic resources such as Westlake Park, Pioneer Square, and Pike Place Market. In addition, they campaigned in favor of the Civic Auditorium that would later give rise to Seattle Center, enabling the world’s fair in 1962.

In the 1960s, the AAS focused on regulating billboards, and formed the Corporate Council for the Arts, which has since become the largest private arts funder in the Pacific Northwest (“60 Years,” n.d.). In 1969, AAS recommended that a hotel and entertainment

tax replace a 5% admission levied on arts organizations to shift the burden from local government to tourists. Political support for civic funding of the arts moved forward under Mayor Wes Uhlman, who included a budget line item to establish a Seattle Arts Commission (SAC) staffed by one paid employee aided by volunteers, within Seattle Center's development office. On June 1, 1971, the Seattle City Council formalized SAC under Ordinance 99982 to "initiate, sponsor or conduct, alone or in cooperation with other public or private agencies, public programs to further development and public awareness of, and interest in, the fine and performing arts" (Biecha, 2014). The following year, the Commission established two funding categories to distinguish between Resident Performing Arts organizations and Arts Commission Projects, and it worked with the Department of Community Development to inventory unused city-owned facilities that could be converted for creative use. This was a busy time, and the also Commission began a newsletter, a public access television station, and funded productions at local theaters (Biecha, 2014).

In 1973, AAS proposed an ordinance to redistribute 1% of all municipal capital improvement projects to a new Municipal Arts Fund for the purchase of public art; SAC administered this One Percent for Art program after the City Council Seattle City Council adopted Ordinance 102210 on May 21, 1973. Initially purchasing existing works of art, SAC transitioned into commissioning pieces by contemporary artists, and the collection numbered 420 installed and 3,000 portable works by 2013—all displayed and rotated through public spaces. The Commission's budget was increased the following year, allowing SAC to expand the annual Bumbershoot Festival and classroom outreach, and it received NEA funding for programs such as the Independent Creative Artists Project (ICAP), which connected artists with commissions and workshop space (Biecha, 2014).

SAC was separated from Seattle Center and made an independent city department in 1976. It partnered with the Downtown Seattle Association on a beautification program that commissioned murals, and used funding from the Comprehensive Employee and Training Act (CETA) to commission 54 visual arts projects from local artists. A Municipal Arts Plan implemented in 1977 began tracking how SAC worked with other departments, and the commission began collaborating with the Building Department in 1978 to streamline renovation rules in the city. A critical debate regarding artistic

freedom within SAC began in the 1980s, but it reorganized in 1988 and embarked on a project titled “In Public: Seattle 1991” that commissioned public art to coincide with the opening of the Seattle Art Museum. The 1990s also brought to fruition a 20-year planning document titled *Seattle 2010: Charting Our Course* that committed the City to “promote conditions and contribute to a vital environment for the arts and artists” in 1993. As the 20th-century wound down in 1996, SAC, relocated to the Key Tower along with other relocated City offices, and prepared for an ambitious new millennium (Biecha, 2014).

In 2000, SAC began publishing neighborhood maps that “highlighted public art, architecture, historic sites and urban lore,” and are now downloadable from the Office of Arts & Culture website. Throughout the first decade of the new millennium, SAC continued to support artist housing (particularly after the Nisqually earthquake of 2001), and outreach that connects artists with members of the community. In addition, the Vera Project hosted events that targeted young people who had flocked to the Pacific Northwest when it was a popular grunge music mecca in the late 1990s. The Mayor’s Office of Arts & Culture (later revised to the Office of Arts & Culture, dropping the Mayoral prefix, in 2013) was created on November 18, 2002, at which time SAC became its 16-person volunteer advisory board. The Office weathered a Seattle City Light ratepayer challenge to the utility’s participation in 1 Percent for Art, and the Office of Arts and Cultural Affairs partnered with Seattle Municipal Archives and HistoryLink.org to produce a commemorative exhibition that marked Pike Place Market’s centennial. This led to office participation in the citywide centennial celebration of the 1909 Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition (Biecha, 2014)—proving the arts play a vital role in connecting people to a place’s past.

The mission of the Office of Arts & Culture is “to activate and sustain Seattle through arts and culture” (“About Us,” n.d.). It continues to provide a significant amount of funding for arts education in local schools and professional development resources for local artists. “Recent years have seen a shift away from exclusively funding for fine arts to funding cultural events in which all members of diverse communities can participate. These include neighborhood parades, community festivals, lecture series, and other events that encourage Seattleites to come together and experience their rich and varied

cultures, and are an important component of the Office of Arts and Culture’s participation in Seattle’s Race and Social Justice Initiative” (Biecha, 2014). A key part of this focus is to protect cultural space, which includes parks and outdoor recreation spaces “in all neighborhoods where arts activities can occur and are fostered,” in order to “[integrate] arts into all aspects of the city’s structure” (Biecha, 2014).

The Office connects this focus to the adaptive reuse and renovation of city buildings begun by SAC in the 1970s. After an Oddfellows Building in Capital Hill was converted from low-rent artist studios to market-rate housing in 2008, the City Council created the Cultural Overlay District Advisory Committee (CODAC)—a volunteer group charged with crafting policies to protect neighborhood cultural spaces. The Office works closely with the Department of Planning and Development in order to help artists and arts organizations navigate land use (Biecha, 2014). Most recently, the Office has collaborated with the Seattle Department of Transportation and the Office of Economic Development to transform King Street Station into a “hub for arts and culture” (“ARTS at King Street Station,” n.d.). Called ARTS at King Station, the project is currently in the “cultural space planning phase” overseen by SAC, and seeks to convert the underutilized space to “address issues of affordability and livability while preserving the unique creative economy that drives Seattle” (“ARTS at King Street Station,” n.d.). The third floor of the building will be reserved for staff offices, enabling public access to professional development services and grant application assistance; this will share space with meeting rooms and public gathering spaces.

Although the Office of Arts and Culture participates in adaptive reuse projects, this type of work is predominantly overseen by Seattle’s Historic Preservation Program managed by the Department of Neighborhoods (“Historic Preservation,” n.d.). As part of this Program, the City undertook comprehensive surveys of its historic resources in 1979 and 2000. While the program was only able to conduct a “windshield” survey that merely identified buildings that appeared to be significant in 1979, the 2000 survey inventoried more than 5,000 properties and these records are now accessible to the public in the Historic Resources Survey Database. Also available to the public on the Department’s Historic Resources Survey website are over 20 Historic Context Statements (“Historic Resources Survey,” n.d.). Essential to this program is the Landmarks Preservation Board,

which was established in 1973 with assistance from AAS and now designates the City's sites, buildings, vehicles, vessels, and street clocks as historic resources subject to protection by city ordinance ("Landmarks," n.d.).

Since 1970, eight historic districts have been identified by either a citizen's board alone or in partnership with the Landmarks Preservation Board, or vice versa. The eight historic districts include: Ballard Avenue, which is overseen by the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board; Columbia City, which is overseen by the Columbia City Review Committee; International District, overseen by the International Special Review District Board; Pike Place Market, overseen by the Pike Place Market Historical Commission; Pioneer Square, overseen by the Pioneer Square Preservation Board; Sand Point, overseen by the Sand Point Application Review Committee; and Fort Lawton and Harvard-Belmont, both overseen by the Landmarks Preservation Board ("Historic Districts," n.d.). Work pursued by the Board in historic districts is also supported by external organizations like Historic Seattle, which was founded in 1974. Historic Seattle educates the public on the existence of historic resources, and advocates for their preservation—acquiring and saving properties like Washington Hall from the wrecking ball through capital campaigns.

The Historic Preservation Program also oversees special projects such as the Southeast Seattle History Project, which was managed in partnership with Past Forward Northwest Cultural Services. The Project "combine[s] traditional historic preservation methods, like survey and inventory of historic sites, with community-based research to identify people, places, events and policies that shaped the post World War II era in [that] part of the city" ("About the Southeast Seattle History Project," n.d.). It utilized numerous partnerships within Seattle's history community, most significantly El Centro de la Raza, the Northwest African American Museum, the Washington State Jewish Historical Society, and the Wing Lake Museum of the Asian Pacific American Experience—relationships which helped the Project directly connect with their constituent communities in Southeast Seattle. A historian from the Rainier Valley Historical Society contributed a series of historical essays and source documents, and History Link created timelines and a map compatible with mobile platforms. In addition,

a series of posters that combined contemporary and historic imagery was created by Matsumoto Design to add a visual element to the project.

San Diego Commission of Arts and Culture

The City of San Diego has maintained a public art collection since 1909, when it accepted the donation of Horton Plaza fountain designed by Irving Gill. The City established a Public Art Advisory Board to administer its Public Art Program in 1984, and the Public Art Fund was created the following year as a separate source within the City Treasury financed by 1% of the City's Capital Outlay Fund through adoption of Ordinance 0-86-77 (City of San Diego, 2004, p. 23). This Advisory Board was disbanded to establish the San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture—a mayoral and City Council advisory board “promoting, encouraging and increasing support for the region’s artistic and cultural assets, integrating arts and culture into community life and showcasing San Diego as an international tourist destination” in 1988 (“About Arts and Culture,” n.d.); at that time, the Advisory Board was reconstituted as the Public Arts Advisory Council (PAAC).

While PAAC had no influence on the discretionary spending of the Commission, it administered funds collected through the Choose to Cultivate Culture Program (later renamed Voluntary Fund for the Arts) that enabled property owners to allocate tax-deductible money to the cultural organization of their choice by completing a flier and returning it with their property taxes (Harper, 1989). The Board of Supervisors established the program in 1981, and PAAC was listed as an official recipient in 1988 (Ollman, 1987). Voluntary Fund for the Arts helped to supplement the Commission’s work by supporting public art projects, developing programs that taught organizations how to diversify their boards, and generating a newsletter that kept members informed of arts and culture events (Morlan, 2014). In 1993, PAAC was defunded after Supervisors Dianne Jacob and Pam Slater-Price helped to eliminate numerous county programs that were not state-mandated, but it was allowed to apply for other city programs that funded arts and culture (Morlan, 2014). In addition, 1% of the Capital Outlay Fund was no longer dedicated to Public Art, and funding had to be replaced by grants from other sources while projects became subject to approval by City employees and project managers responsible for Capital Improvement Projects.

The Commission is composed of 15 volunteers appointed by the Mayor, and staffed by seven professional arts administrators and an executive director whom report to the Mayor and the Deputy Chief Operating Officer for Neighborhood Services. In addition, it receives core funding from the National Endowment for the Arts and the California Arts Council (CAC)—functioning as the CAC State and Local Partner for the city since the early 1980s. Standing committees, which are supported by ad hoc committees and advisory panels, include Executive, Policy & Funding, Advocacy and Outreach, and Public Art (“Rules and Regulations,” 2016; (“Committees,” n.d.):

<p style="text-align: center;">Executive Committee</p>	<p>Reviews and approves the recommendations of all other committees, and also reviews endorsement requests in addition to guiding planning efforts.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Policy & Funding Committee</p>	<p>Oversees programs, services, and legislative policies regarding arts and culture initiatives in or relevant to the City. In addition, it oversees the Commission’s annual budget, managing fair distribution in accordance with public feedback, and progress on Diversity and the Arts and Education Enrichment Initiatives.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Advocacy & Outreach Committee</p>	<p>Explores external funding sources and engages the public in Commission initiatives while evaluating the distribution of its resources throughout the City; central to this is tracking the Commission’s progress on the Visioning Initiative. It specifically acts as a liaison with international entities, and local businesses and tourism agencies.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Public Art Committee (formerly Art in Public Places Committee)</p>	<p>Oversees the Commission’s foundational purpose, and works closely with the Port of San Diego, the Public Art Department and the Public Library. Chief among its responsibilities is administration of the</p>

	<p>City’s Public Art Program, which manages City-owned art, oversees art in capital improvement projects, and ensures that space for arts and culture is included in private development projects. In addition, the Program trains artists, develops policy, and advocates for programming based on the recommendations of the 2004 Public Art Master Plan (“Public Art,” n.d.).</p>
--	--

In response to the 1993 disbanding of PAAC and the City’s One Percent for Art Program, the Commission created the Public Art Master Plan, and, soon thereafter, Policy 900-11 *Artist(s) Involvement in Selected Capital Improvement Projects* was adopted by the City Council—although it didn’t outline specific funding sources, and participation remained voluntary. In 2000, the Commission implemented Roundtable Forums on Public Art to assess the Program’s needs, and an independent consultant completed the *Public Art Program Report*. Jerry Allen and Associates, a consultant team overseen by a 30-member Steering Committee appointed by the Commission, developed the Public Art Master Plan in 2004 that included community analysis with recommendations for future development. This plan sought to create “engaging public spaces” built from “quality public infrastructure” with “artwork that celebrate[d] the extraordinary diversity and history of [the] community, while pointing to the city’s aspirations for the future,” and continues to inform programmatic work in San Diego (City of San Diego, 2004, p. i).

The One Percent for Art Program was reinstated in 2004 and developers now have three options for allocating 1% of total building permit valuations on their projects: to commission an on-site artwork, to create space for on-site cultural use, or to contribute to the Public Art Fund (“Developers/Applicant Guide,” 2004). Also supporting arts and culture organizations in San Diego is the Community Enhancement Program, funded by TOT revenues. “The goal of the Community Enhancement Program is to stimulate tourism, promote the economy, create jobs, and/or a better quality of life. Entities and activities currently funded are cultural activities, museums, visitor and convention bureaus, economic development councils, and any other similar institutions/organizations...which promote and generate tourism and/or economic

development” (“Community Enhancement Program,” n.d.). This Program works in tandem with the Neighborhood Reinvestment Program (NRP), through which supervisors receive discretionary \$2,000,000 to fund non-recurring expenses for nonprofits as well as county and other public agencies; this has been heavily criticized for essentially functioning as a slush-fund system. Both Programs, however, are not exclusively dedicated to arts and culture organizations, so these groups must compete with funding other recreation needs.

Funding initiatives overseen by the Commission support cultural organizations wherein culture is defined as “fine arts, humanities and the broad aspects of a science as distinguished from the vocational, recreational and technical. Art, architecture, science and history are considered cultural in this context” (“Guidelines for the Organizational Support Program,” 2015, p. 9). A central tenet of the Master Plan is to celebrate and strengthen neighborhood identity—highlighting the role of culture in urban planning—and the Commission has initiated several programs that place art in neighborhoods (City of San Diego, 2004, p. 27). FY 2017 initiatives include the Organizational Support Program (OSP) and the Creative Communities San Diego Program (CCSD) funded through the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) levied on hotels, motels and other lodging establishments (presumably sites like Air BnB). TOT revenue is intended to: (1) enhance the economy; (2) contribute to the City’s national and international reputation as a cultural destination; (3) provide accesses to culture for residents and visitors; (4) enrich the lives of San Diegans; and (5) build healthy, vital neighborhoods (“Guidelines for the Organizational Support Program,” 2015, p. 2).

OSP annually provides non-profit organizations with funding for general operating support, freeing them to focus scan resources on creating programs and services that “impact San Diego’s quality of life and tourism” (“Guidelines for the Organizational Support Program,” 2015, p. 3). Applicants are awarded amounts based on a logarithm that typically allots between 2%-10% of the organization’s Annual Operating Income (AOI), with the higher allotments generally provided to applicants with AOI’s between \$10,000-\$99,000. OSP supported 88 organizations with \$8.6 million in 2016 (“Guidelines for the Organizational Support Program,” 2015, p. 3). CCSD annually provides non-profit organizations funding to sponsor “community-based festivals,

parades and celebrations with an emphasis on projects that promote neighborhood pride and community reinvestment, and on sponsoring projects that make arts and culture activities more available and accessible in San Diego neighborhoods and encourage people of diverse backgrounds to share their heritage and culture” (“Guidelines for the Organizational Support Program,” 2015, Appendix 4). Funding is calculated based on the total projected expenses in relation to a \$30,000 threshold. CCSD supported 58 organizations with \$1,080,000 in 2016 (“Guidelines for Creative Communities,” 2015, p. 3).

The Public Art Program works alongside programs implemented by the San Diego Airport and the Port of San Diego. Since the early 1980s, the Port of San Diego has been a key partner in funding arts and culture in the region with guidance from the Public Art Committee. The Port has its own Office of Arts and Culture supported by an Arts & Culture Advisory Committee, and oversees a Tenant Percent for Art Program in which the Public Art Office works with the Real Estate Department and Port tenants to include commissioned or purchased artwork in facilities improvements. It also manages a Percent for Art Program in which the Public Art Office works with the Engineering and Construction Department to site artwork through the Port’s Capital Improvement Program. All donated, commissioned, and purchased artwork is maintained by the Office under supervision by the Chief Curator as part of the Port’s Tidelands Collection (San Diego Unified Port District, 2016). Its five-year Curatorial Strategy released in 2012 by the Public Art Office projected the allocation of \$2,250,000 to “focus on public art that responds to the environment” (Wise, 2012, p. 2). The Public Art Office prioritizes artists who collaborate with organizations and community partners outside the arts in order to “explore, contextualize, and engage with the complex and ever-changing nature of the San Diego Bay and tidelands” (Wise, 2012, p. 3).

The San Diego International Airport (SAN) established an Arts Program from guidelines set forth in the Arts Program Master Plan adopted by the Airport Authority Board in 2006. SAN now manages a Public Art Collection of “permanent artwork that supports and enhances the mission of the Airport Authority,” and is “thoughtfully integrated into the airport environment, with artists involved from the initial planning and design phase of each major development project” (“About Public Art,” n.d.). The

Program hosts performances from local groups, and stages temporary exhibitions each year based on themes relevant to the City of San Diego and the Airport. Exhibitors of selected by Program staff and a guest curator, and 10-15 exhibitions showcase “meaningful and imaginative perspectives on a single theme for the traveling public” (“About Temporary Exhibitions,” n.d.).

Groups in San Diego continue to advocate for reinstatement of the Advisory Council, but city officials are hesitant to constitute a governmental body with dedicated revenue streams when they feel the need is adequately covered by the status quo (Morlan, 2014). The San Diego Arts and Cultural Coalition (SDRACC), which was founded in 1989, has partially filled the void in PAAC’s absence (Morlan, 2011). SDRACC is a collaborative of arts and culture organizations that now includes about 100 members, and is directed by an eight-person Steering Committee (“About the Coalition,” n.d.; “Steering Committee Members,” n.d.). It strives to be “the voice of arts and culture supporters in San Diego,” and “has expanded to become the local partner for California Arts Advocates on state issues and Americans for the Arts on national issues. Arts and Culture organizations join SDRACC to add their voice to the chorus of support for government funding, sound policy, and an educated public” (“About the Coalition,” n.d.). While the Coalition does not directly officially advise the Board of Supervisor or the Commission, it does keep regular contact with City officials and informs the public by annually co-publishing the “San Diego Arts and Culture Economic and Community Impact Report;” orchestrating testimony and City Council and School Board Meetings; writing editorials in the San Diego Union-Tribune; hosting public forums that force candidates to address arts and culture issues during elections; and organizing candidate briefings to keep them informed on how arts and culture groups contribute to San Diego (“About the Coalition,” n.d.).

In 1970, San Diego began to pursue policies for the preservation for historical and archaeological resources to benefit the property owners, stabilize neighborhoods, and promote cultural tourism (“Benefits & Responsibilities,” n.d.). As the City’s adopted General Plan notes:

“No city can hope to understand its present or to forecast its future if it fails to recognize its past. For by tracing the past, a city can gain a clear sense of the process by which it achieved its present form and substance; and, even more

importantly, how it is likely to continue to evolve. For these reasons, efforts directed to identifying and preserving San Diego’s historic and archaeological resources—with their inherent ability to evoke the past—are most advisably pursued” (“About Historical Resources,” n.d.).

Within the Planning Department, the San Diego Historical Resources Board and its staff work with the City’s Housing Commission, Civic San Diego, Park & Recreation Department, and the San Diego Regional Airport Authority to identify, evaluate and preserve local historic resources. Between 2000 and 2003 alone, the Board designated 260 historic individual sites and districts that contained 318 contributing sites (“About Historical Resources,” n.d.).

Selection of these resources is guided by policy adopted by the Board in January of 1977, and was update in August 2000 and April 2002 to identify the following district categories: Geographic, Thematic, Emerging, Archaeological, and Voluntary/Tradition Historical. Since these were difficult to manage and were inconsistent with State and National Register policies, the policy was amended in 2011 to designate standard geographic districts with thematically related resources identified by Multiple Property Submissions (Historical Resources Board, 2011). The Board periodically conducts historical surveys—either executed by staff or historical consultants—that inventory properties older than 45 years, and inform redevelopment and community planning activities (“Historical Surveys,” n.d.).

Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs (DCA)

The Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs (DCA) was formed in 1925 to “promote arts and culture as a way to ignite powerful dialogue, engage LA’s residents and visitors, and ensure LA’s varied cultures are recognized, acknowledged, and experienced.” DCA’s mission is to strengthen the quality of life in Los Angeles by stimulating and supporting arts and cultural activities, ensuring public access to the arts for residents and visitors alike” (“About,” n.d.). In 1980, the City transferred “custody and supervision of all paintings, documents and records in possession of the City of Los Angeles, of historic or artistic value” for which it must “supervise and preserve the same in a manner to prevent deterioration” from the Department of Municipal Arts to the DCA (“City Art Collection,” n.d.).

The DCA is supported by the Cultural Affairs Commission, an advisory board that reviews and approves publically installed art and the architectural design of city properties (“About,” n.d.). Its programs and initiatives predominantly support visual and performing arts with the exception of Heritage Month Celebrations and Literary Programs (“Programs and Initiatives,” n.d.). Through the Grants Administration Division, it allocates over three hundred annual grants to nonprofit arts and cultural organizations, and eligible disciplines include: “dance, music, media, and the visual arts, as well as literature, educational programs, residencies, and professional fellowships” (“Grants Administration,” n.d.). All of its divisions are supported by the Marketing and Development Division, which partners with local to international organizations, private individuals and corporations, as well as the Mayor’s office and community stakeholders to fundraise for arts and cultural programming, in addition to providing digital and traditional marketing materials for funded organizations (“Marketing and Development,” n.d.).

The Public Art Division facilitates four major art programs: the Public Works Improvements Arts Program (PWIAP), the Private Arts Development Fee Program (ADF), the Citywide Mural Program, and the City’s Art Collection (“Public Art Division,” n.d.). PWIAP and ADF and receive funding from the Public Percent for Art Program, which was originally started by the Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency in 1985 and allocates 1% of capital improvement projects towards funding the arts (City of San Diego, 2004, p. 18). PWIAP was established to “provide publicly accessible works for art, arts and cultural facilities, and services for the cultural benefit of the City” (“PWIAP,” n.d.). Funding is spent on “amenities, facilities, services or restoration of historic features” (“PWIAP,” n.d.). ADF requires private development projects valued above \$500,000 to pay an arts fee based either on the square footage of the building or one-percent of the project’s Building and Safety permit valuation— whichever is lower. Developers can either work with DCA to commission a site-specific installation (developer-led project) or pay a fee (paid-in fee) that is administered by DCA through a trust fund that manages segregated, future projects (“ADF,” n.d.). Through these programs, it commissions public art and maintains 37 neighborhood arts and

cultural centers to “encourage civic engagement while inspiring creativity and conversation” by providing access to public art (“Public Art Division,” n.d.).

In addition, PAD manages the City Art Collection by acquiring and loaning artwork, as well as overseeing installations and ongoing maintenance. “The goal of the City Art Collection is to enhance the climate for artistic creativity, promote understanding and awareness of the visual arts, and heighten the artistic heritage of the City of Los Angeles” (“City Art Collection,” n.d.). The Collection includes more than 1,600 artworks, from paintings, prints, and photographs to furniture and sculpture. Holdings are made available to city employees and non-profits through its Interdepartmental and External Loan Programs, allowing the collection to be enjoyed in city offices and participate in museum exhibitions locally and elsewhere. Acquisitions must “address interests inherent in the cultural context of Los Angeles and represent the City in an interesting and expanded manner,” and the DCA avoids mass-produced objects in order to support local artists and amass a collection that promotes “artistic excellence, diversity and pluralism” (“City Art Collection,” n.d.)

The Community Arts Division provides affordable arts education through workshops, education and events, and also funds conservation of and education tours at historic sites. It manages 22 facilities: ten arts and cultural centers, four theaters, two historic sites (Hollyhock House, and the Warner Grand Theatre), and six galleries with twelve public/private partnership arts facilities and three art centers in development (“Community Arts Division,” n.d.).

Interestingly, historic preservation efforts in Los Angeles were initially separate from the DCA. Post-war population growth and expansion in Los Angeles resulted in the loss of many historic landmarks, enough to alarm members of the local American Institute of Architects’ (AIA) Historic Building Committee, which began working with the City’s Municipal Art Commission to create an advisory citizens board charged with identifying and protecting historic sites. They succeeded in passing the Cultural Heritage Ordinance in 1962, predating New York City’s Landmarks Preservation Law by three years. This Ordinance created a Cultural Heritage Board, and its five members were responsible for designating Historic-Cultural Monuments defined as “any building, structure, or site important to the development and preservation of the history of Los

Angeles, the state, and the nation (“History of the Cultural Heritage Commission,” n.d.). The first historic resource to be saved by the Board was the Leonis Adobe, which was under threat of demolition until its designation as Historic-Cultural Monument #1. In 1969, the Board was instrumental in saving architecturally significant Victorian buildings from redevelopment wrecking balls in an neighborhood near downtown Los Angeles known as Bunker Hill. These buildings were relocated to a parcel of land visible from the Pasadena Freeway, and the area became Heritage Square—an active museum that continues to interpret the history of Southern California architecture.

In 1980, a City code amendment required City Council confirmation of the Board's designation of landmark Historic-Cultural Monuments, and the Board was transitioned into a full-fledged Commission within the DCA in 1985. In 2004, the Department of City Planning was restructured to include the Cultural Heritage Commission as well as two staff members from the Historic Preservation Division to the Office of Historic Resources (OHR), created in 2006. The OHR office is now located in Los Angeles City Hall, has six staff members, and is undertaking a comprehensive Historic Resources Survey Project called SurveyLA (“About OHR,” n.d.).

Funding Culture in San Francisco

San Francisco Arts Commission (SFAC)

The San Francisco Arts Commission (SFAC) was established by City Charter in 1932, predating the California Arts Commission (later renamed the California Arts Council) and the National Endowment for the Arts (Grants for the Arts, 2011, p. 8). Its chief executive officer, the Director of Cultural Affairs, oversees implementation of the Commission's mission to “champion the arts as essential to daily life by investing in a vibrant arts community, enlivening the urban environment and shaping innovative cultural policy” (“Program Information,” n.d.). SFAC seeks to strengthen neighborhoods, build infrastructure, and foster positive social change by using the arts to inspire personal experiences, illuminate the human condition and foster meaningful engagement with each other and the built environment (“About SFAC,” n.d.). Responsibilities outlined in the charter include design approval for public buildings or Civic Design Review, which is overseen by the Civic Design Review Committee comprised of two architects, a

landscape architect and two additional design professionals appointed by the Mayor. For a fee of \$10,220 and up (depending on project size) in 2016, this Committee reviews capital projects that renovate or build new civic buildings to ensure they improve public and respect natural environments in the best interest of the public (“Civic Design Review,” n.d).

In addition, the charter gave the SFAC it jurisdiction to all art belonging to the City, entrusting the commission with the preservation and care of the Civic Art Collection. “The mission of the Civic Art Collection is to promote a rich, diverse and stimulating cultural environment in order to enrich the lives of the city’s residents, visitors and employees, and to enhance the city’s image both national and internationally” (“Policies and Guidelines for the Civic Art Collection,” 2015). This collection includes over 4,000 historic monuments, memorials, gifts to the city, annual art festival purchases made between 1946 and 1986, and contemporary art purchased through the City’s Public Art Program—all displayed in public buildings and outdoor spaces. ArtCare, established in 2010, provides maintenance conservation for the collection through a public-private partnership between SFAC and the San Francisco Art Dealers Association (“Program Information,” n.d.).

The Civic Art Collection and the Public Art Program are administered by SFAC and overseen by the Visual Arts Committee. This program is aligned with the 1969 Art Enrichment Ordinance, which guaranteed funding for the acquisition of art by establishing the first Percent for Art program that allocated not 1% but 2% of the city’s capital construction budget to the arts. Exemptions from this requirement include transportation and infrastructure improvement projects, park and landscape renovations, and airfield upgrades. The Ordinance allows the SFAC to take 20% of these funds to cover administrative costs, pending agreement from all participating City departments. Up to 10% of each project can be used for maintenance and conservation of artwork in the Civic Art Collection, and, in cases where the project has limited public access or the generated funds cannot cover the full cost of acquiring a new piece of art, the full Art Enrichment allocation can be used for this same purpose (“PAOO,” n.d.).

The need for civic-funded art in public spaces is created by modern architectural trends, which are more austere and do less to beautify their surroundings than those

designed in previous eras. “In the past, many prominent buildings included sculptured relief, ornate custom grillwork, mosaics, murals, carvings, as well as statuary and other forms of artistic embellishment. Buildings were less separable from art and artistic expression” (“Fine Arts Guidelines,” 1986, p. 2). This percent for public art movement in San Francisco is complimented by an equal commitment to open public spaces. The 1985 Downtown Plan required 1% of total construction costs from large private projects in and near Downtown neighborhoods be set aside for public art while simultaneously requiring developers to set aside publicly accessible open space within private developments, creating Privately-Owned Public Open Space (POPOS) (“POPOS,” n.d.). A San Francisco Planning + Urban Research Association (SPUR) survey recently identified 68 POPOs in downtown San Francisco—45 of which were created before the Downtown Plan’s requirement. Buildings with POPOs are required to display signage to ensure the public is aware of these spaces, and legislation passed in 2012 strengthening those requirements, allowing for stronger enforcement by the Planning Department’s Zoning and Compliance Division. (“POPOS,” n.d.). In 1986, the City Planning Division outlined guidelines for what constituted fine art within this Downtown Plan.

In May of 2012, the Public Art Trust was established by an amendment to the San Francisco Planning Code, and, thereafter, project sponsors have been allowed to dedicate their 1% to the Trust (“Public Art Trust,” n.d.); this was further amended by expanding the public art requirement to all non-residential projects that added new construction larger than 25,000 square feet in 2013 (“POPOS,” n.d.). The Trust provides additional flexibility to the current percent for art program by giving developers the option of select participation in eligible projects or programs. Funds are distributed through grants overseen by the SFAC, which can also use the funds to restore city-owned cultural assets and commission artwork, and all art must be permanent and in a location that promotes “public enjoyment” (“Ord. No. 2-12,” 2012). The funds are earmarked exclusively for art and improvements to cultural facilities (“Public Art Trust, n.d.). One large funder of this program is the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), which undertakes large capital projects that generate funding for public art through the Ordinance (“Investing in Art,” n.d.). SFAC utilizes this funding to oversee the integration or

installation of art in San Francisco’s central subway (which is currently under construction), public library, international airport, and city hospitals.

The 1932 Charter also gave SFAC supervision over Board of Supervisors expenditures on the visual, performing or literary arts, including music (“Policies and Guidelines for the Civic Art Collection,” 2015), which the Commission does through its Community Investments Program. In 1967, the SFAC created the Neighborhood Arts Program to provide services to community organizations through six cultural centers around San Francisco—currently the African American Art and Culture Complex, the Bayview Opera House Ruth Williams Memorial Theater, the Mission Cultural Center for Latino Arts, and the SOMArts Cultural Center, the Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, and the Queer Cultural Center. (Grants for the Arts, 2011, p. 10). The newest iteration of the Neighborhood Arts Program is the Community Investments Program (CIP), which is “committed to supporting and building cultural resources for [the] City’s diverse arts communities” through stewardship of the Cultural Equity Endowment and the Neighborhood Cultural Centers Funds (“About CIP,” n.d.). As a response to the 2014 SFAC Strategic Plan, the CIP also aligns two founding programs--Community Arts & Education (CAE) and Cultural Equity Grants (CEG)—to “provide equitable access to cultural resources and create more sustainable impact across the arts ecosystem” (“About CIP,” n.d.).

Funding is also used by the SFAC to award the following grants, often with support from Grants for the Arts: WritersCorps Teaching in Residence (WCTAIR), Artists and Communities in Partnership (ACIP), Cultural Equity Initiatives (CEI), Creative Space (CRSP), Arts for Neighborhood Vitality (ANV), Organization Project Grants (OPG), Special Project Grants (SPX), Individual Artist Commission (IAC), and Native American Arts and Cultural Traditions (NAACT). WCTAIR, or WritersCorps, enables teaching artists to provide long-term, literacy workshops for free in cooperation with local branches of the San Francisco Public Library, and priority is given to neighborhoods with disproportionately low-income and disadvantaged youth. Historically underserved communities are also provided for through the ACIP, which offers up to \$20,000 for projects administered by community organizations that foster social justice and position artists as advocates for social change; and CEI, which offers \$50,000-

\$100,000 (no more than 50% of their annual operating budget) to small organizations for capacity building initiatives (“Grant Programs,” n.d.).

CRSP grants support planning and facilities improvements for organizations with three-year budgets less than \$2,000,000, with up to \$50,000 in funding for studies, consultations, analyses, and capital campaign preparation; and up to \$100,000 to facilitate capital improvements that address safety, capacity, accessibility, and enjoyment in spaces that are integral to an organization’s activities. ANV funds non-recurring events that highlight art and culture to showcase the vitality of specific neighborhoods, whereas OPG offers up to \$20,000 to support the production and presentation of all art forms, from exhibitions, concerts, theater performances, and readings to publications, online projects, festivals and workshops. SPX grants are defined vaguely as “one-time grants to address emerging needs within the arts ecosystem...related to neighborhood and/or community-based engagement and arts access.” Up to \$15,000 in IAC grants are awarded to individual artists working in annually alternating disciplines such as Visual, Literary and Media—categories funding in this cycle. Grants fund the full development of any creative or aesthetic ideas, different than pure documentation or journalism, and require public presentation on the work’s progress or the final product. Originally created as a separate grant to fund individual Native American artists, NAACT applicants now apply through the previous grants but are also reviewed by a NAACT panel of Bay Area Native community members (“Grant Programs,” n.d.).

The SFAC receives considerable investment in these initiatives from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), which supports CAE programs like WritersCorps and Where Art Lives (“Investing in Art,” n.d.). Where Art Lives is an initiative created in partnership with the Department of Public Works (DPW) in which artists teach 4th-6th grade students art skills. It was developed as a response to the increase in graffiti vandalism, and the goal is to engage city youth in a discussion on the difference between public art and illegal vandalism (“Where Art Lives,” n.d.). SFAC and the DPW also collaborate on a Public Art Program called StreetSmARTS, which pairs artists with property owners to deter recurring graffiti vandalism by creating murals (“StreetSmARTS,” n.d.). CIP also manages the Art in Storefronts program, which sought to activate 26 vacant storefronts throughout the city with art installations. Over 200 artists

applied for 26 storefronts, and artist were prioritized if they lived in and created work that celebrated community within a given neighborhood. The entire budget for this pilot program was \$55,000, which covered project management, design, marketing, installation, and artists fees. Managed by Triple Base, the program was difficult to implement because property owners are wary of contractual obligations, such as a requirement to carry general liability insurance, so it was expanded to include under-utilized storefronts and external murals that advertise the work. Ultimately, the program was marginally successful—installing art in only five windows from one property owner along one commercial corridor (“Art in Storefronts,” n.d.).

The SFAC Galleries, which is the Commission’s exhibitions program, was founded in 1970. Its mission is to “make contemporary art accessible to broad audiences through curated exhibitions that both reflect our regional diversity and position Bay Area visual art production within an international contemporary art landscape” (“About SFAC Galleries,” n.d.). Programs are created by commission work from or working with local artists, and collaborating with arts and cultural organizations to enable “contemporary art to engage in a civic dialogue” (“About SFAC Galleries,” n.d.). Despite its focus on contemporary art, however, the SFAC Galleries frequently present historical exhibitions—proving that the division between the arts and the humanities is constructed, not fundamental.

To commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Summer of Love in 2017, the SFAC galleries will present an exhibition that showcases the work of legendary photographer Jim Marshall. Titled *Jim Marshall’s 1967*, the exhibition is presented in partnership with Jim Marshall Photography, LLC as part of a citywide celebration coordinated by the California Historical Society. It will feature 80 photographs in chronological order, and Meg Shiffler, Galleries Director and exhibition co-curator, expressed her excitement “to be presenting, for the first time, an exhibition that focuses on the way that photographer Jim Marshall helped to define our cultural understanding of the Summer of Love, the San Francisco hippie movement, and the birth of psychedelic rock and roll. Previous exhibitions have used Marshall’s work to illustrate a story about history, whereas this show will highlight the artist, his unfathomable shooting schedule, and his unprecedented access to his subjects” (“A Look at the Summer of Love,” 2016). This Summer of Love

display is, at its core, historical—intended to educate the public about key moments unfolding in a seminal year through one man’s lens. The distinction between a historical exhibition of art and an art exhibition informed by history is illustrated by a concurrent project called *American Civics*. In this project, artist Shephard Fairey interprets Marshall’s portraits of American icons, such as Cesar Chavez and Johnny Cash, to explore worker’s rights, mass incarceration, and other “enduring social issues” (“A Look at the Summer of Love,” 2016).

This is not the first time the SFAC Galleries has presented a historical exhibition of art. From April through December 2016, SFAC Galleries presented *In Search of Great Men*, a solo exhibition that examines cross-country train trips taken by McNair Evans from 2012 to 2014. Working with curator Ann Jestrab, Evans selected 100 photographs and journal excerpts that documented passing landscapes and provided intimate passenger portraits. “Collectively, their stories illustrate a moving portrait of the American people, and illuminate shared-experiences amidst forces of modernization” (“McNair Evans,” 2016). Evans, who studied anthropology in college, intended this documentary project to explore a mode of travel that “may soon be only a memory,” and, in the process, created an exhibition that “explores a search for hope that so defines our national identity” (“McNair Evans,” 2016). The artistic merit of Evans’ photographs is unquestionable, but the anthropological nature of his quest closer aligns his work with that of Nora Zeale Hurston and Langston Hughes, who documented a disappearing cultural landscape by collecting folk songs and stories during a road trip through the rural South in the 1930s.

Grants for the Arts (GFTA)

Grants for the Arts (GFTA) was established through legislation in 1961, and receives its annual revenue from the hotel tax portion of the City’s General Fund. The GFTA’s mission is to “support the arts...by supporting arts organizations’ general operating expenses” without term limits. It “strives to be a stable, dependable resource for organizations...and is committed to supporting the full spectrum of arts organizations in San Francisco.” Now, it is focused on the meaningful “presentation and enhancement of existing artforms, while cultivating artistic experimentation and the expansion of San Francisco’s dynamic cultural panorama” (“History and Purpose,” n.d.)

The Hotel Tax Fund that supports GFTA has a long and complicated history. In 1956, Mayor George Christopher floated an incredibly unpopular idea to add a 5% tax to hotel bills, thereby increasing city coffers by taxing tourists. This was meant to offset \$250,000 that went to the sustenance of tourist destinations, such as the Convention, the Visitors Bureau, the Chamber of Commerce and cultural organizations such as the Symphony and Operas. This tax, estimated to gross \$1,500,000, would go into a special fund that was protected from raids for city needs like potholes and police. Although the tax was voted down by the Board of Supervisors' Finance Committee, Christopher reintroduced his plan several times before it was rewritten to include funding for the arts; it was narrowly passed on April 17, 1961, as a 3% tax to be collected quarterly and deposited into the Hotel Tax Fund, the excess of which could be transferred to the City's General Fund at the end of each fiscal year. An early draft called for the distribution of the tax "for the advancement of cultural and fine arts," but this was replaced with "for publicity and advertising"—leaving use undefined, which has led to a diluted impact on arts funding as the City currently and frequently appropriates the funds for other uses ("Hotel Tax Fund," 2016).

Its first year of existence, the Hotel Tax brought in \$1.1 million and awarded \$553,000 in grants while \$540,000 in unspent funds were transferred to the General Fund. Funding was allocated by the Chief Administrative Officer under the advisement of a committee mostly comprised of business and hotel owners, and a majority of the grants went to tourism organizations, a handful of parades, and the Convention and Visitors Bureau while a quarter of the grants went to major arts organizations--the Opera, the Symphony, the Ballet and the Museum of Modern Art—as well as four smaller cultural groups. The largest grant was awarded to a group that encouraged people to move to California (Grants for the Arts, 2011, p. 9). For the second year of grants, Sherman Duckel, the Chief Administrative Officer, pushed the conservative committee to fund small arts organizations, and thereafter the number and size of the grants steadily grew (Grants for the Arts, 2011, p. 9).

However, funding for the arts from this source has been unreliable. Since 1968, more than half of the tax revenue has been allocated to Moscone Center, and the passing of Proposition 13 in 1978 caused further problems as the Board of Supervisors raided the

General Fund to replace revenues lost from decreased property taxes. Then, in 1982, the Board of Supervisors diverted an extra 1.75% to the General Fund and capped arts funding at 12%, while separating the Convention and Visitors Bureau out as a sub-fund (Grants for the Arts, 2011, p. 14). To combat this trend, Supervisor Louise Renne created a number of additional funding sources to supplement the Hotel Tax. In 1984, the Nonprofit Performing Arts Loan Program overseen by the Mayor’s Office of Housing helped small organizations to fund capital improvements. Voluntary Arts Contribution Fund, which allows property owners to make tax-deductible contributions of \$5 or more to support venue upgrades for more than 360 arts groups, as then created in 1986. This fund is distributed biannually, and has been particularly supportive of theater and street ministry groups (Grants for the Arts, 2012, p. 17).

In FY2015, GFTA issued \$10,3000,000 in grants to 213 cultural groups and arts activities, enhancing the City’s attractiveness to visitors and providing employment and enrichment to residents (“History and Purpose,” n.d.). San Francisco currently imposes a 14% tax (8% base tax and a 6% tax surcharge) on rented or hotel rooms that goes into the General Fund, which the Board of Supervisors can allocate towards any public purpose. In addition to GFTA, this funding goes towards the San Francisco Arts Commission, and maintenance, operations and improvements at city-owned cultural centers such as the War Memorial and Performing Arts Center—which consists of the War Memorial Opera House, Davies Symphony Hall, Herbst Theatre, the Green Room and Zellerback Rehearsal Hall, as well as San Francisco’s convention and exhibition complex in South of Market, Moscone Center. Decade by decade, allocated grants are less than collected taxes, and the margin is growing at an alarming rate (Grants for the Arts, 2011, p. 9):

Year	Tax Collected	Amount Allocated
1961	\$1.1 million	\$553,000
1971	\$4.5 million	\$2.1 million
1981	\$35.1 million	\$3.2 million
1991	\$71.3 million	\$13.3 million
2001	\$125.4 million	\$13.3 million
2011	\$220 million	\$11.8 million

This imbalance is to the advantage of the Board of Supervisors, since money not awarded by the GFTA is diverted back to the General Fund and can be used at their discretion. An attempt at correcting this came in the form of an amendment placed on the 2016 ballot to specifically allocate money raised from the 8% base to the Moscone Center (up to 50%), the War Memorial complex (5.8%), the Arts Commission (2.9%), and the Grants for the Arts Program (7.5% by 2020) (“Hotel Tax Fund,” 2016). Unfortunately, this measure failed to pass.

ArtSpan

In 1975, a small group of artists opened their studios for a weekend to show collectors where art was made, and the San Francisco’s Open Studios program was born. This weekend became an annual, then twice-annual, then thrice-annual event over the next fourteen years, funded privately and dependent on volunteers and registration fees. When the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake endangered the program’s continuation, the exhibition was abbreviated and an ad-hoc committee was formed to outline needs for the an Open Studios future. In February of 1990, an Executive Director was appointed, in addition to a Board of Directors that contributed approximately 5% of the program’s total expenses. California Lawyers for the Arts served as fiscal agent, and the newly-formed group began looking for outside funding while it surveyed participating artists and looked towards becoming a registered nonprofit. By its 15th year, SF Open Studios had increased participants by 13% and served approximately 20,000 visitors in 1990 (“History,” n.d.).

ArtSpan became a 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation in 1991 with a board comprised of 16 members overseen by an Executive Committee, and programs grew to include juried and curated exhibitions in order to provide greater exposure for participating artists (“History,” n.d.). It “is committed to cultivating a vibrant accessible, and world-class art community in San Francisco and to promoting the city’s unique creative energy locally and globally...guided by the belief that artists play a vital role in society and that broad public engagement with their work is essential to defining a new cultural environment for our changing city” (“Mission,” n.d.). The Art for City Youth program was added in 1994 to provide visual arts opportunities to youth in the South of Market area; this launched a mural program that has since expanded to other

neighborhoods, in addition to Family Art Day at Hungers Point Shipyard, Kaleidoscope events, student tours of the SF Open Studios Exhibition and Youth Open Studios (“History,” n.d.). ArtSpan has continued these programs in addition to professional development for artists, and Art Curious events that educate and connect collectors with creators; live art and mural events that make artists visible in San Francisco; art mixers that encourage people to mingle and create; the Art-In-Neighborhoods program, working with community partners to install art exhibitions and stage art events in local business, dormant storefronts and empty spaces for lease (“Art-In-Neighborhoods,” n.d.); Public Outreach with Live Art and Community Mural Events; Youth Open Studios; as well as annual Art Auctions and Benefactor Galas (“Mission,” n.d.).

ArtSpan has also been a recent advocate against artist displacement. In 2015, it took advantage of construction delays by leasing studio space in 1 Oak Street owned by developer Build Inc. Build chose to lease vacant parts of the building to nonprofits while awaiting permit approvals for a 37-story residential high-rise to benefit the nonprofit community and curry favor with the neighborhood. To ensure this was a zero-sum venture for Building Inc., tenants paid no rent but were required to pay for improvements and insurance, and leases clearly state the agreements are temporary. In an August 2015 article, Build partner Michael Yarne spoke of this growing trend in the industry; “I think...the real estate industry is finally starting to innovate in ways that it has never historically done, and one of those ways is to take advantage of existing needs. The idea is that interim activation can add value to the finished project, that a run-down office building or parking lot can be shared in creative ways” (Dineen, 2015). Other developers are also following suit, particularly since hosting temporary, multi-use spaces is a great way to prototype what businesses will work in forthcoming commercial space.

The Office of Economic and Workforce Development

The Mayoral-appointed Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) was created to assist small businesses and nonprofits, which made up 17% of the City’s workforce in FY2014-2015 (“Nonprofits,” n.d.). More specifically, the OEWD supports “the ongoing economic vitality of San Francisco” by providing “city-wide leadership for workforce development, business attraction and retention, neighborhood commercial revitalization, international business and development planning” (“About

Us,” n.d.). Divisions within the office include the Joint Development Division, which manages large public and private real estate development projects (“Development,” n.d.), and the Workforce Development Division, which coordinates the San Francisco Workforce Development System—a network of public, private, and nonprofit organizations that assist job seekers and employers in San Francisco (“About Workforce,” n.d.).

One of the greatest current threats to small nonprofits in San Francisco is displacement, and, to combat this, the OEWD provides access to the Community Arts Stabilization Trust (CAST), the Nonprofit Displacement Mitigation Program, and the Northern California Community Loan Fund (NCCLF) as a countermeasure. Much like New York City’s Spaceworks program, CAST was created in 2013 with a \$5,000,000 contribution from The Kenneth Rainin Foundation “to acquire properties in San Francisco’s Mid-Market neighborhood to create permanently affordable arts spaces” in the face of rapidly increasing rents and development projects that are displacing arts and culture organizations. CAST purchases real estate and then offers long-term leases ranging from seven to ten years to organizations at risk of displacement and unable to purchase property; leases are renewable if participating organizations are unable to relocate. Organizations utilizing CAST services can also receive assistance from the NCCLF as they work to raise funds for the purchase of their own space by the end of the lease. The program has been remarkably successful, partially due to San Francisco’s hot real estate market. Initial buildings purchased by CAST doubled in value, allowing it to invest another \$5,000,000 into the program which has enabled diverse organizations such as The Luggage Store Gallery, CounterPulse dance company, and Hospitality House to settle into affordable spaces in a revitalizing part of San Francisco. Now CAST is partnering with developers to create dedicated space for cultural organizations within new construction projects, and is looking to expand its program to Oakland (Task Force, 2015, p. 2).

Working in partnership with CAST is the Nonprofit Displacement Mitigation Program, which utilizes \$4,500,000 from the General Fund to provide technical and financial assistance for nonprofits: \$2,000,000 from the San Francisco Arts Commission, which utilized CAST to offset relocation costs and provide other financial assistance, and

the \$2,500,000 from the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development through Urban Solutions (Task Force, 2015, p. 5). Eligibility is available to nonprofits facing displacement within 18 months or dealing with displacement since September 30, 2012. Services offered include financial and space planning, the identification and evaluation of potential sites, lease negotiation and purchase agreement consultation, the development of project timelines and budgets, an analysis of potential funders. The Program also awarded grants to cover relocation and construction costs, as well as legal expenses ("Nonprofits," n.d.). This program also worked closely with the NCCLF and awarded assistance to five cultural nonprofits in the first round (Task Force, 2015, p. 5).

The OEWD's Neighborhood Economic Development Division supports improvements to commercial districts, and oversees Mayor's Ed Lee's Invest in Neighborhoods initiative which "leverages resources from across multiple departments and nonprofit partners" to focus and customize assistance to these areas ("Neighborhoods," n.d.). "These include existing services, such as the Small Business Revolving Loan Fund, public art installations, and streetscape improvements, and brand new services such as Storefront SF (a citywide vacancy tracking system), the Jobs Squad, and a neighborhood improvement grant program" ("Invest in Neighborhoods," n.d.). One initiative of this division is the Community Capacity Building Program, a joint partnership between the OEWD and Bay Area Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC). The Program helps community groups such as merchant and resident associations, as well as small nonprofits with capacity building: developing mission and goal, writing by-laws and governance structures, etc. ("Community Capacity Building Program," n.d.).

Another facet of this initiative beneficial to cultural nonprofits are Neighborhood Improvement Project Grants, issued to community organizations that want to improve public spaces, develop marketing campaigns or event series, and other projects that will strengthen commercial districts ("Project Grants," n.d.). In reviewing grant award reports from 2013 through 2015, only one history group, the Bayview Historical Society, utilized this resource with guidance from the SFAC to relocate a sculpture called *RedFish* ("Grant Awards," 2014). Additional grants and loan programs available to nonprofits and neighborhood groups include Neighborhood Economic Development Grants, Americans

with Disabilities Act (ADA) Small Business Assessment Program, and SF Shines. Most important to history work in San Francisco is the Department’s administration of historic preservation grants based on recommendations from the Historic Preservation Fund Committee (HPFC) (“Grant and Loan Programs,” n.d.).

The HPFC was created to administer \$2,500,000 in settlement funds received from a 2005 civil action lawsuit filed after developers of San Francisco’s Emporium—Forest Enterprises of Cleveland and Westfield America of Los Angeles—demolished historically significant parts of the building they were legally obligated to retain. The developers obtained permission for the project from San Francisco’s Redevelopment Agency on the basis of this historic preservation, however, the Planning Department issued demolition permits for razing one of the historic elements—exposing the difficulties of using multiple city agencies to oversee historic resources. The settlement allotted the aforementioned funds for historic preservation, and called for the creation of guidelines to protect historic resources in future projects (Goodyear, 2005). The settlement also specified that grants issued by the HPFC should fund “education, feasibility studies, consultant services grants, monitoring of this Agreement, research and documentation for CEQA evaluations, the nomination of properties to state and federal historic registers, architectural surveys sponsored by neighborhood organizations that would further preservation planning in San Francisco, legislative and administrative actions to implement such surveys, and other preservation advocacy oriented purposes in the City and County” (“HPFC Fund Grants,” n.d.)

HPFC funds are awarded on the recommendations of the Historic Preservation Fund Committee, which is comprised of members appointed by the Mayor, the President of the Board of Supervisors, the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (predecessor of the Redevelopment Agency), the Historic Preservation Commission (formerly the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board), San Franciscans for Preservation Planning, San Francisco Heritage, and San Francisco Beautiful (“HPFC Fund Grants,” n.d.). This is the only city government fund explicitly dedicated to history work in San Francisco, and it is on course for depletion within the next two years.

The Planning Department

The San Francisco Planning Department oversees the physical development of San Francisco through six Divisions: Current Planning, Citywide Planning, Environmental Planning, Zoning Administration and Compliance, and Administration. These Divisions are supported by the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions, which advise the Mayor, Board of Supervisors and City departments on long-range goals, policies and programs on issues related to land use, transportation, current planning, and the protection of historic resources in accordance with San Francisco's General Plan and Planning Code ("About," n.d.). Historic preservation is a central facet of planning in San Francisco because "much of San Francisco's character...depends on the retention of its rich historical building fabric" ("Historic Preservation," n.d.). Maintaining and rehabilitating existing structures is also environmentally friendly and can be more cost-effective than new construction projects; therefore, "the Planning Department's Historic Preservation program...plays an important economic, environmental and cultural role in the ongoing development of San Francisco" ("Historic Preservation, n.d.). This program supports the Commissions and independently conducts project and environmental reviews, as well as historic and cultural resource surveys ("Historic Preservation," n.d.).

In 1967, the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board was created with the adoption of Planning Code Article 10: Preservation of Historical Architectural and Aesthetic Landmarks ("Article 10," n.d.). This was dissolved in 2008 and replaced by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), a seven-member body with a three-member Architectural Review Committee (ARC) that makes recommendations on the historic landmarking of buildings and districts in San Francisco to the Board of Supervisors; this work includes reviewing construction permit applications to alter or demolish historic resources, compliance with environmental reviews required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and projects protected by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act ("Historic Preservation," n.d.). Similar to the National Register of Historic Places, the City of San Francisco maintains a list of Landmarks, which can be buildings, sites, or landscape features, and Historic Districts where a plethora of historic resources remain situated in context ("Historic Preservation," n.d.). One of the Commission's key roles is to issue Certificates of Appropriateness, which are

required to alter landmarks or properties within a landmark district (“Certificate of Appropriateness,” n.d.).

Part of this review process is dependent on historical research often funded by the HPFC. Property owners, as well as the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, the SFAC, the HPC, and the Planning Commission can initiate the designation process (“FAQs,” n.d.). To landmark a district, for example, a building-by-building inventory is required for every parcel contained within the proposed boundaries of the district, and a Landmark/Historic District Designation Report is prepared to document dates of construction, architect(s) and builder(s), styles, design features, historic and physical contexts and an assessment of historical integrity (“Bulletin No. 1, 2003, p. 1). These are then submitted to the Planning Department and reviewed by the Commission, which sends back comments and recommendations. Approved documents are reviewed by the City Attorney and forwarded to the Planning Commission and then the Board of Supervisors, where the Mayor signs an ordinance that designates a landmark of historic district (“Landmarks Board,” 2003, p. 1). As of 2014, there were 266 designated landmarks in San Francisco (“San Francisco Landmarks,” 2014).

The HPC is also directly involved in the city’s recent program to protect small businesses from displacement. Inspired by the Legacy Bars & Restaurants initiative launched by San Francisco Heritage in 2013, the Board of Supervisors created the Legacy Business Registry overseen by the Small Business Commission (which advises the Office of Small Business) to assist “longstanding, community-serving businesses” that function as “valuable cultural assets to the City” in March of 2015 (“Legacy Business Registry,” n.d.). A voter-approved measure in November 2015 then established the Legacy Business Historic Preservation Fund, which provides grants to Legacy Business and property owners who agree to lease extensions with qualifying tenants (“Legacy Business Registry,” n.d.). To qualify, businesses need to be open and older than 20-30 years; have been nominated by the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor; be committed to maintaining physical features or traditions that define them; and prove that they’ve had a significant impact on the history or culture of their neighborhood to the Commission (“Legacy Business Registry,” n.d.). The HPC provides the Small Business Commission with recommendations on the validity of a business’s contribution to a neighborhood’s

identity, and then the Office of Small business sends nominations to the Planning Department where they are automatically placed on an agenda for review within 30 days (“Legacy Business Registry,” n.d.).

The priorities of the Planning Department are set by San Francisco’s General Plan, which is adopted by the Planning Commission to guide changes to the City’s economy, work force, housing stock, transportation systems, open spaces, and vacant lands taking into consideration social, economic, and environmental issues; State law requires it to address land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise and safety. In 1986, a voter-approved amendment to the Planning Code set Priority Policies added to the preamble to address inconsistencies the General Plan; these include, but are not limited to: preserving landmark and historic structures; preserving and enhancing neighborhood-serving retail space for resident employment and ownership; protecting existing housing to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of neighborhood character; preserving and enhancing affordable housing; and protecting and maintaining industrial service sectors (“SF General Plan” 1996).

The only reference to archaeological work under City purview appears in association with the Environmental Review process within the Planning Department, however, there is no reference to a formal program—just a list of a city-approved consultant pool to aid private projects with the review process. The Anthropological Studies Center (ASC) at Sonoma State University manages individual archaeological projects for the City, often in conjunction with other agencies such as California Department of Transportation (CalTrans). “Since its founding in 1974, ASC has conducted hundreds of cultural resource inventories and evaluations for landowners, developers, and public agencies throughout California...ASC’s David A. Fredrickson Archaeological Collections Facility (ACF) is the primary repository for artifact collections and associated documents from the San Francisco Bay Area and northwestern California (SSU, 2015, p. 2).”ASC makes these artifacts accessible to the public “through events, student tours, pamphlets, museum displays, video, websites, and presentations” through its Office of Interpretive and Outreach Services.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This literature review seeks to provide context to the case studies in Chapter 1 to explain why the Arts have traditionally been separated from Humanities subjects such as History. Three main areas will be examined: first, the arbitrary Federal division of the Arts from the Humanities; second, confusion regarding how to define the term Culture; and third, the debate on the relevance of History to contemporary life.

Origins of Federal Funding

In the 1960s, people began calling for federal investment in culture equal to the amount invested in science and technology, which had been the predominant federal allocation for decades as a race for space intensified in a world at cold war. Glen Seaborg, head of the Atomic Energy Commission, told a Senate Committee at the time that the United State couldn't "afford to drift physically, morally, or aesthetically in a world in which the current move[d] so rapidly;" while science and technology could give us the tools to "travel swiftly," mankind, not computers, had to determine the current's course (NEA's Office, 2012). In response to that movement, the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), the Council of Graduate Schools in America, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa established the National Commission on the Humanities in 1963. From this a proposal to establish the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities was presented to the White House in March of 1965, along with a request for \$20 million of initial funding. On September 29, 1965, President Lyndon Johnson signed the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act that created two separate but equal agencies—the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), each advised by leaders in their respective fields. Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island championed the bill as the most significant, comprehensive investment in the "nation's cultural advancement...to the full growth of a truly great society" (NEA's Office, 2012).

The Arts and Humanities Act was only one of many legislative efforts aimed at manifesting President Johnson's agenda to create The Great Society. While noble in intent, the Act federalized an arbitrary differentiation between genres of cultural work when it created the NEA separate from the NEH. For example, in a 2012 report on how

the United States allocates funding to the Arts, the NEA was defined as supporting creative, artistic work whereas the NEH funds scholarly work and public programming. The same report describes how funding from the NEA is used creatively to circumvent the confining language of the organization's purpose and support scholarly work done within the Arts, and arts work done within Humanities (NEA's Office, 2012). This division has restricted funding and helped to promote the inaccurate perception that the Arts are not complimentary to the Humanities, and vice versa.

In fact, the language of the Congressional declaration that makes up the main body of the Act almost seems biased towards the arts at the expense of the humanities even as it argues the importance of both for the good of the nation. After stating that the Arts and the Humanities belong to the people, that they merit federal support even while they remain "primarily a matter for private and local initiative," and that funding cannot be limited to science and technology, the declaration outlines the loftier importance of the Act. First and foremost, the United States must provide universal access to the arts and the humanities as part of a robust education system because "democracy demands wisdom and vision in its citizens." Federal support of the nation's cultural heritage fosters respect for diverse beliefs and demographics within this educated citizenry, as well as "worldwide respect and admiration of the Nation's high qualities as a leader in the realm of ideas and of the spirit." This work "require[s] constant dedication and devotion;" therefore the United States "must give full support to the other great branches of scholarly and cultural activity in order to achieve a better understanding of the past, a better analysis of the present, and a better view of the future."

While the Act seeks to promote a balanced appreciation for "the aesthetic dimensions of our lives, the diversity of excellence that comprises our cultural heritage, and artistic and scholarly expression," it fails to adequately define the humanities even as it provides explicit references to the arts. The seventh declaration admits that the Federal Government lacks the ability to "call a great artist into existence," but states it should "help create and sustain not only a climate encouraging freedom of thought, imagination, and inquiry but also the material conditions facilitating the release of this creative talent." In this scenario, work within the Humanities is explained almost as a compliment to the arts instead of as a field worthy of its own merit. The eighth declaration defines financial

support to artists and their supporting organizations as essential to preserving the nation's "multicultural artistic heritage," peripherally mentioning the support of "new ideas" which might be interpreted as humanities work or perhaps merely as part of the artistic process. The eleventh declaration expresses Federal need to "transmit the achievement and values of civilization from the past via the present to the future, and make widely available the greatest achievements of art" in order "to fulfill its educational mission, achieve an orderly continuation of free society, and provide models of excellence to the American people." Again, the importance of humanities work is implied but recedes to the background as context for work in the arts. (NEA ACT, 1965)

Culture Confusion

The federal separation of the Humanities from the Arts is further complicated by multifaceted definitions of the term Culture. Using a wide lens, everything we create as human beings separate from nature is considered culture (Fitzgerald, 2012). Current scholarship presented by Terry Eagleton suggests that culture is understood in four different ways: (1) as a body of artistic and intellectual work; (2) as a process of spiritual and intellectual development; (3) as the values, customs, beliefs and symbolic practices by which men and women live; or (4) as a whole way of life (Eagleton, 2016, p. 1). This means culture is perceived as work within the Arts and Humanities; a journey towards mature enlightenment; the traditions and habits which people either adopt or in which they are born and raised; or the total sum of an entire demographic. Despite their separation, however, these are not four competing definitions but rather overlapping facets of "civilized" society as a whole in the modern era.

Culture, no matter how it is defined, manifests wholeness by creating spaces for inclusion and dissent. Eagleton believes that civilizations—advanced, organized societies based on rules of law and order—are almost a foregone conclusion in the modern era, and that culture is a precondition of civilization. In this equation, culture functions as an estimation of value—one that is used to rank tiers of development and fulfillment within all four of Eagleton's definitions. While culture is a precondition of civilization, religion is no longer a foregone presence within contemporary society, and culture is increasingly imbued with a sense of spirituality as the centrality of religious devotion recedes from prominence in the 21st-century. In this sense, culture now facilitates the pursuit of

wholeness by providing guidance and community, filling the void once held by churches in the 19th-century and prior. Aside from this spiritual dimension, culture can also function as an internal critique of civilization if leveraged responsibly by its creators. Channeling Edmund Burke and echoing Frederic Jameson, Eagleton argues that culture has the ability to stoke revolution even while it concomitantly justifies nationalist fervor—proving that it can both disrupt and preserve simultaneously. Within this process, artists are more influential than politicians in the “making” of history because of Art’s emphasis on the “felt experience,” which enables cultural artifacts to connect people with the political and, therefore, the historical (Eagleton, 2016).

Eagleton’s connection of art to the historical supports Stanford Kwinter’s assessment that all culture is united in interpreting, or, more accurately, attempting to understand the problem of time in the modern era (2002). To do this, he stitches together fields that are often thought to be polar opposites: the arts and the physical sciences. Central to his argument is the way in which statistical mechanics obliterated the concept of absolute time or the understanding that all space is contextualized against a fixed backdrop; this enabled Einstein’s theory of relativity and led to a 20th-century obsession with “the event” and fragmentation—what Sontag called the “art form of our time” (Coo, 2013, p. 52). His accounting of this progression is exhaustive but not revolutionary until he connects quantitative concepts of math and science to qualitative sculpture, architecture, literature and philosophy. Heavily influenced by Frederic Jameson and Frederick Nietzsche, Kwinter advocates for a more cohesive interpretation of culture by collapsing the space between math, science, and the arts. His deconstruction of the event into an interplay of time, space and force provides an opening to discuss the unifying concept of linear time. Where history is the interpretation of singularities within time, art is the interpretation of flow and form within space, and both are acted upon by external forces explained by math and science (Kwinter, 2012). This shows that History, and greater work within the Humanities, is not a separate entity but actually interdependent facets on the same spectrum of culture.

The Relevance of History

Inequitable funding for the Arts and the Humanities is not only the fault of federal separation and an inability to properly define the term culture. Scholarship on the utility of History either finds it relevant or irrelevant to contemporary life. The Arts are often easier to connect with than scholarship, because History is often taught piously, highlighting aristocrats and generals to the exclusion of regular people—much to the chagrin of Howard Zinn. Nietzsche (2006) places History into three separate categories: the monumental, in which history is examined to find role models; the antiquarian, in which history is preserved intact for reference, out of deference; and the critical, in which history is interrogated in order to extract and create something new. This represents a conflict between two separate theories of history: historicism, the theory that social and cultural phenomena are determined by history; versus historical materialism, a Marxist theory that history is determined by a society's relationship to its modes of production. As opposed to historicism's conception of time as an eternal continuum, historical materialism fosters a vibrant experience in which history is a site of construction brought into what Walter Benjamin refers to as "now-time"—time in which the past is recontextualized within the present (2003).

Constructivist theory supports this concept of "now-time" by suggesting that we are the living embodiment of all that came before us, and this correlates to Ralph W. Emerson's assertion that all humans share one universal mind (Emerson, 1910). If "everything we think of as natural is historical and has roots" (Cott, 2102, p. 34), then an engaged study of History is imperative to understand how it impacts the contemporary, and how our actions in the present actively write future history. The continuum of History is by its very nature subjective; therefore, individuating all history—including that of art, literature, civil engineering, and the natural sciences—helps to transform the "There and Then" into the "Here and Now" (Emerson, 1910, p. 12). Key to this transformation is the private experience of individuals, which acts as a crucial tool in interpreting the monolith of a shared historical narrative (Emerson, 1910).

Some scholars consider the only genuine approach to History to be a personalized one, and that day-lighting small and large events equally are redemptive acts that make past events more relevant to the present (Jameson, 1988; Benjamin, 2003). In this process

History becomes more fluid, or more relevant, as it contextualizes every day experiences within “original circumstances,” or historical precedent; there is, after all, nothing that is not “social and historical (Emerson, 1910; Jameson, 1988). In other words, the past should merely be thought of as a series of flashpoint images that can and should be interpreted creatively in order to circumvent a static recounting of empty, homogenous time (Benjamin, 2003). Susan Sontag pushes this further by combining historicism with historical materialism to suggest that these flashpoints, or fragments, are actually a continuum of all that came before them (Cott, 2013).

The relevance of History is equally as complex as the multifaceted definition of culture. Nietzsche initially argues that the study of History is a “costly intellectual superfluity” while most of humanity still lacks the basic tangible necessities to survive and thrive (Nietzsche, 2006, p. 126). He speaks emphatically of remembrance, the foundation of History, as a great burden—one that “unhistoric” animals do not suffer from in the same way as conscious man. In order for humans to be productive they must be active, and action requires them to forget because a consistent examination of history stagnates us, preventing us from shaping the present by assimilating to the past. Simon Reynolds (2011), who theorizes that the 21st-century is afflicted with a paralyzing nostalgia that negates any unique contribution to the continuum of History, echoes this fear. All of this atemporal rehashing of the past creates culture out of context with its time, and, in the process, renders it dangerously on the verge of irrelevance. This reliance on the retro pervades museums, personal collecting habits, and, societal trends (Reynolds, 2011).

Conclusion

While there is much theory and literature on federal funding for the arts and the humanities, the linguistic complexities swirling about the term culture, and the ongoing debate on the relevance of history, there is no literature on how to reorganize local government to create a department from a commission; this is for good reason. City governments must structure themselves in manners fit for their local environments, and while common strings prevail between their branches, no two are wholly duplicative because cities are not identical. However, this review enables readers to understand the difficulty in defining culture, the continued debate over the relevancy of history to

contemporary life, and the origins of dividing the arts from the humanities when funding is at stake—the impediments to rearranging funding more equitably to the two arms of culture. These debates and divisions muddle any discourse surrounding the creation of a department of culture from the existing Arts Commission in San Francisco, making it hard to impart the urgency for expanded funding to all cultural work in order to correct the disproportionate dispersal to the arts.

Chapter 3: Proposal

I propose transitioning the San Francisco Arts Commission into a San Francisco Department of Culture, which will continue its important work of funding artists and providing public access to art while simultaneously supporting Humanities work more equitably in San Francisco. Working alongside the Arts Commission will be a San Francisco History Commission within a department that works hand-in-hand with the Planning Department and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. The key to the History Commission's success will rely on the strength of the City's popular history organizations, representatives of which can easily be recruited from the Organizing Committee of San Francisco History Days.

Analysis of Surveyed External Departments

While departments of culture in all surveyed cities are multifaceted and serve many purposes, their key role is the construction, preservation and expression of identity. Many of these departments emerge from grassroots origins—groups that formed to meet community needs and protect endangered resources. Most programs originated from arts commissions and increased capacity through percent for art programs or a legislated hotel tax. In addition, most of them have some type of program that utilizes city-owned property to provide artists and organizations with permanent or temporary homes, rehearsal space, or studios. Successful departments are closely aligned with workforce development agencies, merchants associations, and tourism boards because cultural organizations and their work create jobs, and encourage people to visit and spend money in local neighborhoods. In addition, most of the programs work closely with planning departments or building commissions to ensure city beautification and the retention of historic resources that add interest and continuity to municipal identity.

All of the departments surveyed are biased towards the arts at the expense of humanities work, most likely because of their origins as arts-exclusive commissions. In addition, significant funding for each of these departments comes from Percent for Art Programs that necessarily place an undue emphasis on public art at the expense of humanities work and historic preservation. When history is mentioned, it is buried deep in programmatic policy documents when department's are pressed to define the use of the

word “culture,” as in the case of San Diego’s FY2017 OSP and CDCC initiative literature. Los Angeles and New York City are the most outwardly inclusive of the four departments, yet annual reports and websites barely publicize humanities work or historic sites maintained by their departments—save for architectural improvements or changes in executive staff at history or science museums, zoos and botanical gardens. None of these departments include a designated committee, advisory panel, or funding source specifically focused on humanities work. Historical organizations are eligible to apply for grants and participate in programs, but that language in public literature and calls for proposals do not make that clear—a fact that is confusing and exclusionary, particularly for smaller and less experienced community history organizations.

San Francisco Department of Culture

A San Francisco Department of Culture would not eliminate the San Francisco Arts Commission; instead, it would place a San Francisco History Commission equally alongside the San Francisco Arts Commission in a department that works hand-in-hand with the Planning Department and the Office and Economic and Workforce Development. Recognized cultural commissions working within city departments receive funding from state and federal resources. Federal grants have already shown a willingness to fund arts work with historic import. In 2012, the SFAC received a \$250,000 grant from the NEA to support the revitalization of San Francisco’s blighted Mid-Market neighborhood as proposed by the Mayor’s Institute on City Design 25th Anniversary Initiative (MICD25). This grant program funded a design competition for new lighting in the district’s gateways, and the creation of visual arts installations and media arts projects for vacant storefronts and open spaces. It was also hoped to encourage cultural organizations in the neighborhood to host public events such as festivals, exhibitions and performances (“Arts Commission Receives,” 2010). This was part of a larger effort by Mayor Gavin Newsom to revitalize the historically significant area through the adoption of tax increment financing and the establishment of a \$11,500,000 loan fund for “cultural project development” (“Arts Commission Receives,” 2010). Following this third award from the NEA that year, SFAC Director Luis R. Cancel expressed his enthusiasm for this opportunity to “build upon Mid Market’s assets—its

strong arts institutions, historic buildings and transit access—to advance revitalization and foster long-term investments” (“Arts Commission Receives,” 2010).

In discussing this capstone openly with community stakeholders, one question continually surfaced: why do you want to take money away from arts organizations? If executed correctly, a Department of Culture would redistribute or more efficiently award existing funding sources while simultaneously enabling new funding streams. A formally recognized History Commission would be eligible for state and federal grants, thereby decreasing competition for local grants aimed specifically at the arts. Funds would be diverted away from arts organizations if the Percent for Art program is divided equitably, with 1% allocated to each Commission. Since unused funds from the Hotel Tax are automatically diverted to the General Fund to be used at the discretion of the Board of Supervisors, there is ample surplus available to fund humanities work in San Francisco—thereby compensating for the 1% redistributed from Percent for Art. Grants for the Arts should be likewise expanded to include stakeholders from the history community, and dividing the work between committees could focus and streamline the distribution of grants and extend the fund’s reach by contacting organizations not previously aware of their eligibility.

Programming and departments currently in place should be reoriented to support both Commissions, because repurposing what exists will be much easier than creating something new. For example, the Office of Economic and Workforce Development allocates much of its time and resources towards mitigating nonprofit displacement. These efforts could continue by adopting a Cultural Institutions Unit similar to that of the New York City DLCA, which sites cultural nonprofits in publicly owned land and then supports facilities maintenance and base administrative costs. In San Francisco, nonprofits could be located in surplus properties identified by the Planning Department (“Publicly Owned Land,” n.d.), and maintenance can be provided by absorbing parts of the Real Estate Division (RED) and working closely with the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (COII).

RED provides a range of services including custodial, engineering, trades, laborers, building managers and brokers for more than 60 City of San Francisco buildings. Cultural facilities it helps to operate and maintain include the Bill Graham

Civic Auditorium, Davies Symphony Hall, the Veterans Building, the War Memorial Opera House, and Zellerbach Rehearsal Hall—most of which already receive funding from the Hotel Tax managed Grants for the Arts. Additionally, RED assists SFAC by maintaining cultural centers such as SOMArts, the Bayview Opera House, the Mission Cultural Center, and the African American Art and Cultural Center that have been an integral facet of the Commission’s Community Investment Program since the 1960s (Annual Report, 2014).

COII is the successor to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, which was dissolved in February 2012, and is governed by the Oversight Board, which fiscally manages former Redevelopment Agency assets other than affordable housing (“Office of Community Investment,” n.d.; “Oversight Board,” n.d.). Further oversight is provided by the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure (CCII), which approves land use, development and design for Major Approved Development Projects such as Mission Bay, Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point, and Transbay in addition to managing former Redevelopment Agency assets in Yerba Buena Center (“Commission on Community,” n.d.). By working closely with these City agencies, the Department of Culture would ensure consideration and space for cultural organizations—performing a role similar to that of DCLA’s Building Community Capacity initiative—without the need for new funding sources.

Aside from reorienting city departments, private sector nonprofits would need to be convinced to expand their scope to support an equally expanded Department of Culture. Perhaps due to the casual use of terminology such as “culture” and “heritage,” many of these organizations have programmatic agendas that would lend themselves easily to the incorporation of humanities-focused funding. Last year, as it approached its 40th anniversary, ArtSpan stated that its “primary focus was on exploring ways to expand the organization’s capacity and impact, which ensuring that decisions and commitments made were sustainable” (“ArtSpan Strategic Plan,” n.d.). The organization’s strategic goals are acutely transferrable to an expanded cultural organization that embraces the arts and the humanities: expanding current membership and financial capacity; engaging broader audiences; empowering artists; educating patrons and youth; and cultivating strategic partnerships and building coalitions (“ArtSpan Strategic Plan,” n.d.).

When reviewing the vision statement of ArtSpan’s Strategic Statement, it is strikingly adaptable to funding an expanded Department of Culture if “art(s)” is replaced with the word “Culture”:

Artspan envisions a San Francisco in which personal connections made through [culture] are a part of everyday life. We recognize that the same economic forces that make for an increasing prosperous city also generate pressures on [cultural organizations], challenging their very presence as well as their ability to create new [work] and explore new modes of thinking and making. ArtSpan believes that it is essential for those of us who value creative freedom and self-expression to come together to advocate for sustainable solutions that recognize the essential work of cultural producers and the fundamental role of [cultural organizations] in our city.

Over the next three years, ArtSpan aims to position itself as a leader in a coalition of community organizations that speak collectively on behalf of the [cultural] community in San Francisco, lobbying public and private forces to take a strong stance on supporting a sustainable future for [cultural organizations] and offering a range of resources and services and resources to what we regard as our city’s most precious resource. With this coalition, we will strive to ensure that providing physical spaces for [cultural work] is a primary focus of public policy.

Above all, ArtSpan will continue to expand its promotion of alternative exhibition platforms, guided by the belief that greater public engagement is the key to a sustainable [cultural] ecosystem (“ArtSpan Strategic Plan,” n.d.).

These examples are by no means comprehensive, but they do show how easily and logically current departments and programs can be reoriented to support an expanded San Francisco Department of Culture. However, the key to a successful San Francisco History Commission will be the strength of the City’s popular history organizations. Beginning last year, a large number of these organizations—spearheaded by the California Historical Society (CHS), the Western Neighborhoods Project (WNP), and Shaping San Francisco (ShapingSF)—took over planning the annual San Francisco History Days in the Old U.S. Mint. History Days last year was far more successful than expected, and planning is currently underway for an expanded History Days 2017. However, the scope and scale of the event must continue to grow if the history community is to make itself more visible to the public.

Chapter 4: Action Plan

Reorganizing city government will require years of development; in the meantime, key members of the San Francisco History Days organizing committee should take steps to expand the scope of San Francisco History Days, and transition the committee into a year-round community resource—thereby increasing visibility for history work in San Francisco, and garnering political goodwill and popular support for reorganizing city funding. Stakeholder organizations on the committee in a position to step into this role are Shaping San Francisco, represented by LisaRuth Elliott; the California Historical Society, represented by Jason Herrington and Patty Pforte; and the Western Neighborhoods Project, represented by David Gallagher, Woody LaBounty, Chelsea Sellin and myself. Currently, this is an all-volunteer effort and requires no funding outside of what is provided by the Office of Economic and Workforce Development for which Jon Lau is currently the liaison to the Committee.

Phase 1

Planning is currently underway by the History Days Organizing Committee for the 2017 San Francisco History Days at the Old Mint, which will take place the first Friday through Sunday of March. The Organizing Committee is comprised of the following entities and/or sub-committees: the Coordinator and the Designer, as well as the Communications, the Education, the Logistics, the Programming, and the Volunteer sub-committees. At the end of March the committee will meet one final time for the year to review feedback from vendors and visitors to History Days, and also to discuss committee opinion on what was successful and what could be improved for next year. After this meeting, all sub-committees will compile a report on their experiences and recommendations for History Days 2018. These reports will then be submitted to the coordinator who will synthesize them into a report to be presented to Jon Lau at the mayoral Office of Economic and Workforce Development. Key among the requests will be for an expanded, week-long program following a similar model to Litquake or Noise Pop which feature programming at various locations throughout the City.

Phase 2

Provided support is found for it in City Hall, planning for an expanded History Days 2018 will start at the beginning of September 2018. The initial meeting will be a brainstorming session where the sub-committees will be assigned and a schedule of meetings will be set for the rest of the year. Essential to initial planning will be identifying twelve additional venues (three venues a day for Monday through Thursday) outside of the Old Mint to partner with the Committee in providing additional programming; all members of the Organization Committee will be responsible for this step. The budget from History Days 2017 will be revised by the Coordinator and reviewed by the Committee to accommodate the expanded programming and additional venues; this budget will then be submitted to venue partners and Jon Lau for approval from City Hall. In addition, a graphic designer will be secured to revise the logo from last year and change the color scheme on the poster and the postcard. Finally, an invitation will be created and finalized by the Education team for Education Day.

Phase 3

The Coordinator will secure Mint Plaza through the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. The task of sending a Save-the-Date to all participants from the previous year will be divided equally by all members of the Committee as will outreach to new groups in October 2018; the Coordinator will also ensure these groups know of the early registration deadline at this time. The Programming sub-committee will begin contacting artists and galleries for hallway installations in order to create cross-partnerships with arts groups, looking forward to greater collaboration in the future. In addition, the Programming sub-committee will contact authors for events staged a staff an author's lounge at the Old Mint. Once The Communications sub-committee will update the website with 2018 details and draft a press release. The Designer will have the revised poster and postcard, social media button, and online banner designs ready for approval by the Committee. The Logistics sub-committee will reach out to Off The Grid about pricing and the availability of placing food trucks in the courtyard surrounding the Old Mint on the weekend of History Days.

Phase 4

Starting in November, the Host Committee will meet twice monthly. The Coordinator will oversee confirmation of 2018 participants, and notify all interested parties of the final registration date—although there will be flexibility in registration going into 2018. The Communications sub-committee will continue to update the website with participants and partners as that they are confirmed. The Designer will print the first-run of postcards to be distributed to all participants for distribution. The Education sub-committee will reach out to the San Francisco Unified School District, private schools and the home school community about participation and registration in Education Day. The Programming sub-committee will begin contacting speakers and other performers as additional venues are confirmed.

Phase 5

The Communications sub-committee will continue to update the website, and begin disseminating the press release to traditional media and on social media. The Coordinator, with the help of all Committee members, will finalize the exhibitor layout in History Days. The Designer will finish the design of all banners that will be installed outside all participating venues. The Education sub-committee will confirm and finalize exhibitors and participants for Education Day. The Logistics sub-committee—working closely with the Coordinator—will secure insurance coverage for the Old Mint and all participating external venues; secure contract with Off The Grid; and finalize exhibitor needs and venue logistics such as internet access, load-in requirements, garbage, etc. The Programming sub-committee will confirm speakers and programs for auxiliary sites and at the Old Mint. The Volunteer sub-committee will begin recruitment of tour guides and volunteers for all sites.

Phase 6

The Communications sub-committee will continue to update the website with 2018 information. The Coordinator will finalize exhibitor layouts at venues, hire a volunteer coordinator to manage people during the event, and contact exhibitors with a deadline for nametag submission. The Designer will finalize and print the program. The Logistics sub-committee will begin intensive work during this phase: ordering water

dispensers; contacting venues to ensure all logistical needs are met; recruiting an event photographer; creating and printing room signs; and ordering food for volunteers at all venues throughout the week.

Phase 7

History Days 2018 will include programming at three auxiliary venues from Monday through Thursday. Friday through Sunday will be the more traditional History Days format, with Education Day open to school groups and then a weekend of pop-up historical exhibitions from all participating groups. At the end of March the committee will meet one to review feedback from vendors at and visitors to History Days, and also to discuss committee opinion on what was successful and what could be improved for next year. This meeting will provide a forum to discuss the transition into a more permanent body. Decisions to be considered at this meeting include the following:

- How many members should be on a permanent committee?
- What is the committee mission and purpose within the community?
- Should this committee be a recognized 501(c)(3)?
- Should the committee be fundraising throughout the year?
- What representative(s) from City government should be included?
- How can this committee advocate for reorganization within city government funding?
- What is the big dream? How can we advocate for a San Francisco Department of Culture?

After this meeting, all sub-committees and will compile a report on their experiences and recommendations for History Days 2019. These reports will then be submitted to the coordinator who will synthesize them into a report to be presented to Jon Lau at the mayoral Office of Economic and Workforce Development.

Chapter 5: Summary and Conclusions

History is neither boring nor irrelevant, but this can only be communicated if we present it didactically—in conversation with its surroundings, through collaboration with other types of cultural organizations. One way to achieve this is by creating space for and helping to legitimize non-traditional groups such as Odd Salon and Nerd Nite that trumpet a return to 19th-century salons and make the contextualized presentation of history more accessible and social. These groups are all-inclusive, allowing amateurs to share the stage equally with degreed historians, scientists, engineers, and other professionals. Similarly, participatory community history projects like Shaping San Francisco and the Western Neighborhoods Project engage people in place-making while they simultaneously preserve cultural narratives and the context of their historic surroundings.

Another avenue is through artist-curation in history museums, which provides outsiders the opportunity to add new dimensions to permanent collections, and also critique the way in which history is traditionally presented. Artists are able to extract greater meaning in history museums because they act as facilitators, creating non-traditional dialogue that emphasizes bearing witness over mechanical, linear learning (Boekenkamp, 2012). This is a process of disruption that helps to combat what Susan Crane refers to as a distortion of visitors' preconceived expectations in museums based on their personal memories (1997).

Artist-curators in history museums approach exhibitions like spectacles, and enact Guy Debord's theory of detournement in which conventional concepts are recontextualized by outsiders (Debord, 1983). Fred Wilson's work in the *Mining the Museum* exhibition at the Maryland Historical Society in 1993 (Corrin, 1994), and *Legacies: Contemporary Artists Reflect on Slavery* at the New-York Historical Society (Boekenkamp, 2012) set a precedent for artist curation in history museums. Although these exhibitions built on trends rooted in the 1960s, their success is owed to Wilson's engagement of a revisionist dialogue that radically examined the museum's role in society by juxtaposing collection objects in ways that addressed contemporary aesthetic and social issues (Corrin, 1994). Central to the success of these exhibitions is Wilson's deft manipulation of an object's aura—its uniqueness and authenticity—and

understanding that recontextualizing antiquity within the contemporary can serve as a form of allegory (Benjamin, 2006; Oloquiaga, 2002).

Changing the status quo in history exhibitions does not come without growing pains, and must be done responsibly. In San Francisco, Fred Wilson staged an installation about a fictitious prior resident in the Haas-Lilienthal house. Titled *An Invisible Life: A View into the World of a 120-Year-Old Man*, the installation presented no differently than other parts of the historic home, and visitors were lead to believe they were learning about a real figure named Baldwin Antinous Stein; it wasn't until after the tour was over that visitors learned of Wilson's deception. What these examples show is the difference between museums attempting to respectfully democratize historical narratives as opposed to contemporary art installations that critique the presentation of history through opaque deception (Crane, 1997).

One way to responsibly decompress the division of the Arts from the Humanities surrounds the medium of photography. Photographs are either treated as fine arts objects or documentary artifacts depending on the known intent of the photographer and/or focus of the repository that cares for them. Visual media has been arbitrarily segmented into different forms, divorcing painting from photography, to name one example, and their role as historical objects differs from their role as aesthetic objects. Since the field is self-segmenting, the intent of photographic moments—as well as their impacts on subjects and viewers—are best discussed as part of an outsider discourse (Cott, 2013).

Historically, there has been a critical imbalance in the way history and preservation organizations are civically supported in comparison with the amount of funding that is available to arts organizations in San Francisco. To correct this imbalance, I propose the creation of a San Francisco Department of Culture that would place the San Francisco Arts Commission equally alongside a San Francisco History Commission within a department that absorbs responsibilities currently managed by the Planning Department and the Office and Economic and Workforce Development. City government necessarily takes time to reorganize, so the first step will be to advocate for and demonstrate the need for a Department of Culture; this can be achieved by continuing to strengthen and expand San Francisco History Days, and by grooming key members of the event's organizing committee to become stakeholders in a nascent San Francisco History

Commission. This, however, will only address part of the problem; we must also address to the problematic federal and perceptual division of the Arts from the Humanities, and the inaccurate perception that History is boring and irrelevant to contemporary life. To do this, we must present History didactically—in conversation with its surroundings, through collaboration with other types of cultural organizations.

This paper identified origins for the arbitrary division of the arts from the humanities as well as the debate surrounding the relevance of History to contemporary life. The problem with History and the arbitrary division of the Arts from the Humanities can be corrected through collaboration. Although this topic was not addressed in this capstone, I encourage stakeholders within the arts and humanities to seek out ways in which their organizations can work together; organizations particularly well-suited to this type of collaboration include 500 Capp Street; small history organizations, such as the Western Neighborhoods Project; small art galleries, such as Little Lodge and 3 Fish Studios—organizations that are still relatively flexible with their funding and time. Historical scholarship can provide context to the arts and increase their impact, while artistic interpretation of historical events can highlight their relevancy by activating them within a different context.

Appendix A: Annotated Bibliography

Benjamin, Walter. (2003). On the Concept of History. In H. Eiland & M.W. Jennings (Eds.) *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, Volume 4, 1938-1940* (pp. 389-400). Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

In this essay, Benjamin compares historicism, the theory that social and cultural phenomena are determined by history, to historical materialism, a Marxist theory that history is determined by a society's relationship to its modes of production. Benjamin acknowledges the frequent use of history as an arm nationalism or fascism, and encourages those interpreting the past to daylight big and small events empathetically, with equal measure, as a redemptive act. He defines the past as a series of flashpoint images that can and should be interpreted creatively in order to circumvent a static recounting of empty, homogenous time. Historical materialism fosters a vibrant experience with the past, as opposed to historicism's conception of time as an eternal continuum, and, in the process, paints history as a site of construction brought into what he refers to as "now-time"—time in which the past is recontextualized within the present. This approach to history is essential to make history relevant to contemporary audiences, and should be used to open a dialogue on artist interpretations of historical content.

Benjamin, Walter. (2003). The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility. In H. Eiland & M.W. Jennings (Eds.) *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, Volume 4, 1938-1940* (pp. 251-283). Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

In this essay, Walter Benjamin explores the concept of an object's aura—its uniqueness and authenticity—through a Marxist lens. Benjamin ties an object's resonance to its process of manufacture and placement within a historical context. Other writings in this volume include Benjamin's reaction to Baudelaire's recontextualization of antiquity within the modern as a form of allegory, an important tool in museum exhibition. As with the work of Guy Debord also

referenced in this bibliography, Benjamin's philosophies provide the subtext for curatorial authority as it is traditionally applied, but also as curation blurs the boundaries between art and history as it moves into an increasingly non-professional realm in the 21st-century. Most importantly, it underscores the necessity of using real objects, not replicas, to facilitate visitor connection to historical materials on exhibition.

Berger, John. (1991). *About Looking*. New York: Vintage International.

John Berger—a novelist, art critic, and cultural historian—examines different modes of “reading” photographs. The first section of the book is titled “Uses of Photography,” and looks at the work of three photographers: August Sander, working in pre-Nazi Germany; Donald McCullin, working in war torn Vietnam; and Paul Strand, working through his international travels. Berger discusses the intent of photographic moments, as well as their impacts on subjects and viewers. Most importantly, he acknowledges the way in which visual media has been segmented into different areas of interest almost arbitrarily, divorcing painting from photography and so on, and how their role as historical objects differs from their role as aesthetic objects. Since photography is often considered a fine art or a documentary artifact, depending on intent or holding repository, this medium can be used to build a bridge between the arts and the humanities.

Boekenkamp, Lindsey. (2012). Alternative Legacies: Artists Projects in History Museums & the Importance of Context. *Journal of Arts and Humanities, 1*, 107-128.

A grant writer for the New-York Historical Society, Boekenkamp was inspired to write this paper investigating the desire of artists to work in history museums after attending a lecture about Ben Katchor's use of the Rosenbach Museum's permanent collection. She believes that artists are able to extract greater meaning with exhibitions by creating non-traditional dialogue in history museums, and

examines the role of artist-curators by discussing Susan Crane's theory of disruption; Dipti Desai's conception of artists as facilitators; and Bettina M. Carbonell's emphasis on bearing witness in exhibitions. Boekenkamp uses the case study of Fred Wilson's work *Liberty/Liberte* as it originally appeared in the New-York Historical Society exhibition "Legacies: Contemporary Artists Reflect on Slavery," and then after it was reinstalled in the main entrance of the renovated museum and the impact the two different contexts had on the piece's resonance. Collaborations of this nature are key to securing funding for history work, and are essential to making history relevant to broader audiences.

Corrin, Lisa G. (1994). Mining the Museum: An Installation by Fred Wilson In L.G. Corrin (Ed.). *Mining the Museum: Artists Look at Museums, Museums Look at Themselves*. New York, NY: New Press.

In 1993, Lisa G. Corrin was curator at The Contemporary and, as such, is referenced as the curator of Fred Wilson's *Mining the Museum* exhibition at the Maryland Historical Society. In this article, Corrin explores how artists and institutions engage a revisionist dialogue to radically examine the museum's role in society through the juxtaposition of collection objects in ways that address contemporary aesthetic and social issues. She does this by chronologically (and comprehensively) detailing specific exhibits and trends in exhibition that built upon one another from the 1960s through the 1980s, and she then dissects *Mining the Museum*. In total, she declares this much-emulated exhibit and its use of an outsider as an inside curator a success. This exhibition will be utilized as a touchstone for contemporary historical interpretation as recommended in this capstone.

Cott, Jonathan. (2013). *Susan Sontag: The Complete Rolling Stone Interview*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Susan Sontag was a writer and philosophical humanist whose work primarily

focused on modes of perception. In February of 1978, Jonathan Cott interviewed Sontag for *Rolling Stone* Magazine. The interview happened in two parts, on two different continents, and pertained to three of her books: *On Photography*, *I, etcetera*, and *Illness as Metaphor*. Although much ground is covered over the course of their conversations, some key concepts pertain to the utility of history and the significance of context within interpretation; the importance of outsider discourse to the field of photography; and the predominance of the concept of “the fragment” in 20th-century modern art. Sontag synthesizes all of these as a cultural critic who has also worked as an artist from the 1960s until her death in 2004, giving her a unique perspective on the segmentation of cultural fields.

Crane, Susan A. (1997). Memory, Distortion, and History in the Museum. *History and Theory*, 4, 44-62.

Susan Crane discusses the distortion that happens when visitors approach an exhibit with preconceived expectations based on their personal memories, and how historians and curators within history museums have tried to bridge the gap between personal history and institutional or national narratives. She specifically looks at national history museums in Germany, the Enola Gay exhibit at the Smithsonian’s Air and Space Museum, and contemporary art installations that play with the traditional presentation of history in museums. One case study Crane unpacks is in San Francisco, where Fred Wilson staged an installation about a fictitious prior resident in the Haas-Lillienthal house. Titled “An Invisible Life: A View into the World of a 120-Year-Old Man,” the installation presented no differently than other parts of the historic home, and visitors were lead to believe they were learning about a real figure named Baldwin Antinious Stein; it wasn’t until after the tour was over that visitors learned of Wilson’s deception.

This article clarifies the difference between museums attempting to respectfully democratize a historical narrative as opposed to contemporary art installations that critique the presentation of history, and then highlights the importance of that

clarification. It is a very interesting time for the field of History. Internet access is blurring the lines between genealogists and historians, anti-establishment history groups are creating new space for amateurs with conflicting success, and traditional museums are stepping outside their ivory towers. Crane's critique of Wilson's work will provide a cautionary tale for how we should proceed.

Debord, Guy. (1983). *Society of the Spectacle*. Detroit: Black and Red.

Guy Debord's seminal Situationist text is a Marxist critique of mass media in contemporary society that is organized into 221 (often overlapping) theses. At the core of this critique is his definition of "spectacle," which states that Society is mediated by images, and the concept of "detournement," where conventional concepts are recontextualized by outsiders. Although not strictly a museum studies text, Debord critiques the authenticity of social constructions in the same manner that artist-curators critique the authenticity of traditional exhibitions in history museums. Debord also builds upon Walter Benjamin's concept of the aura and authenticity, modernity's focus on the fragment, and provides a strong foundation for dissecting curatorial motivations and visitor reception when you substitute either for the term "spectacle."

Eagleton, Terry. (2016). *Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Terry Eagleton, a preeminent literary critic, uses anthropology, history, philosophy, art and literature to explain how culture is a "functionally viable term." Almost immediately, he notes the overlapping distinction between our definitions of culture and civilization, and outlines four main "senses" for the complex concept of culture: as a body of artistic and intellectual work; as a process of development; as the customs and beliefs of specific demographics; and as a whole way of life. If culture is a precondition of civilization and civilization is now almost a foregone conclusion, then culture becomes a question of value—one that is increasingly imbued with a sense of spirituality. In this sense, culture

facilitates the pursuit of wholeness in the 21st-century as religious devotion worked in the 19th-century and prior.

Culture functions most importantly as an internal critique of civilization. True to his Marxist roots, Eagleton cites Edmund Burke in discussing culture as a fundamental of power and nationalism, echoing Jameson's political unconscious, but he also notes its ability to stoke revolution—proving that it can both disrupt and preserve. Within this process, Eagleton believes that artists are more influential than politicians in the “making” of history. The reason for this is art's emphasis on the “felt experience,” which enables cultural artifacts to connect people with the political and therefore the historical.

Emerson, Ralph W. (1910). *Emerson's Essays and Representative Men*. London & Glasgow: Collins' Clear-Type Press.

In the first chapter titled “History,” Ralph W. Emerson boldly states that all men share one (theoretically) universal mind, and that we in the present are the living embodiment of all that has come before us. He goes on to recount how our actions actively write history in the present, and how it is imperative for us to be engaged students of History in order to better relate to and understand its impacts. This can be an overwhelming spectrum of study, therefore, private experiences of individuals act as a crucial tool in interpreting the monolith of a shared historical narrative. Since the continuum of History is by its very nature subjective, then individuating all history—including “civil and natural history, the history of art and of literature” and beyond—helps to transform what Emerson calls the “There and Then” into the “Here and Now.” In this process History becomes more fluid, or more relevant, as it contextualizes every day experiences within “original circumstances,” or historical precedent. This fluidity expands the study of History out of the Humanities and into the Arts, assigning equal weight to the work of poets, who add to the historical continuum through fables, as to that of generals, who affect it through weaponry.

Jameson, Fredric. (1988). *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Frederic Jameson argues that only rare, genuine philosophies of history are capable of making past events relevant to the present. Working within a Marxist tradition, he explains that the only way in which we can recover the historical narrative is to frame it as one collective story, and, more importantly, to unearth the narrative of repressed individuals or events. To Jameson, there is nothing that is not “social and historical,” and within this framework of understanding we can see that creative works are inherently political; therefore, to analyze and interpret art within a political, historical context is to explore multiple (often unexplored) paths that enable us to unmask cultural objects of any genre.

Kwinter, Sanford. (2002). *Architectures in Time: Toward a Theory of the Event in Modernist Culture*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Stanford Kwinter, a design professor at the School of Architecture at Rice University, examines the problem of time in the modern era as it relates to form. To do this, he stitches together fields that are often thought to be polar opposites: the arts and the physical sciences. Central to his argument is the way in which statistical mechanics obliterated the concept of absolute time or the understanding that all space is contextualized against a fixed backdrop; this led to a 20th-century obsession with “the event” and fragmentation, and enabled Einstein’s theory of relativity. His accounting of this progression is exhaustive but not revolutionary until he connects quantitative concepts of math and science to qualitative sculpture, architecture, literature and philosophy.

Heavily influenced by Frederic Jameson and Frederick Nietzsche, Kwinter advocates for a more cohesive interpretation of culture by collapsing the space between math, science, and the arts. His deconstruction of the event into an

interplay of time, space and force provides an opening to discuss the unifying concept of linear time. Where history is the interpretation of singularities within time, art is the interpretation of flow and form within space, and both are acted upon by external forces explained in math and science.

Nietzsche, Frederick. (2006). *On the Utility and Liability of History for Life*. In K.A. Pearson & A.D. Large (Eds.), *The Nietzsche Reader* (pp. 124-141). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Nietzsche uses *On the Utility and Liability of History for Life* to argue that the study of history is a “costly intellectual superfluity” while most of humanity still lacks the basic necessities to survive and thrive. He speaks emphatically of history and remembrance as a great burden, and contrasts humankind to that of animals—which he deems “unhistoric” due to their lack of awareness and focus on primal needs. The main thrust of his argument contends that action requires us to forget, and that a consistent examination of history prevents us from shaping the present by assimilating to the past.

Then, as only Nietzsche can do, he reverses his position to argue that the construction of our future depends on continuity with the past. He categorizes history into three views: the monumental, in which history is examined to find role models; the antiquarian, in which history is preserved intact for reference, out of deference; and the critical, in which history is interrogated in order to extract and create something new. According to Nietzsche, all three of these views should be utilized in tandem to advance Modernity.

Olalquiaga, Celeste. (2002). *The Artificial Kingdom: On the Kitsch Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Olalquiaga unpacks modernity’s culture of commodity, and philosophically attempts to explain the role of kitsch in personal and institutional collecting and

display. Heavily influenced by Walter Benjamin, the core of her argument is based on nostalgic concepts of authenticity; the debris of the aura and its corollary, dust; and allegory as it relates to the cultural impulse to juxtapose objects on display in order to create meaning. Central to the construction of meaningful displays is the use of dialogue and allegory, and these techniques are utilized in personal homes as well as professional museums. Essentially, selective curation brings history objects into contemporary dialogues and counteracts the role of nostalgia in display and reception while simultaneously embracing it; this, consequently, restores an object's disintegrated aura by contextualizing it within a historical and/or personal narrative. Much of the book details 19th-century Victorian collecting habits, which were goaded by industrialized production methods that produced vast quantities of souvenirs to be collected at international events, such as world's fairs.

Providing context for things we see is a human impulse, not an academic act; it allows us to better connect with objects on display. Everyday objects have the ability to be displayed as art, and art can be utilized to interpret historical events. Again, Olalquiaga provides further evidence that the divide between the Arts and the Humanities is conceptual and not factual.

Reynolds, Simon (2011). *Retromania: Pop Culture's Addiction to Its Own Past*. New York: Faber and Faber, Inc.

A noted music journalist, Simon Reynolds theorizes that the first part of the 21st-century is afflicted with a paralyzing nostalgia that negates any unique, everlasting contribution to the historical narrative. While he concedes that earlier eras were influenced by retro themes, he is concerned that contemporary culture has failed to produce a decade-defining sound due to our obsession of revisiting what's come before. Reynolds argues that this is different than any previous era, and he unpacks this argument by focusing on pop music—fearful that we're endangering the future of music by constantly recalling the past. He explores how

museums are trying to preserve and interpret the history of transitory, anti-establishment musical genres despite resistance from surviving participants; the commodification and fetishizing of artifacts, such as records, that distort their authenticity as experienced recordings; the impact of hipster trends and the expansion of curatorial authority; and also revival trends and the dangers of sampling. All of this atemporal rehashing of the past creates culture out of context with its time, and, in the process, renders it dangerously on the verge of irrelevance.

Reynolds' fears are well-founded, and should be kept in mind as historical exhibitions start to move beyond the gallery and into unchartered, collaborative territory. It is easy to sentimentalize history to the point of irrelevance, and even easier to craft exhibitions that pander to nostalgia instead of challenging visitors to engage in progressive meaning-making. Reynolds may be speaking about the future of pop music, but we can easily reframe this discussion in relation to the future of historical interpretation.

Appendix B: Project Stakeholders

1. Western Neighborhoods Projects
 - a. Woody LaBounty, Founding Director
 - b. David Gallagher, Founding Director
 - c. Nicole Meldahl, Board Member
 - d. Chelsea Sellin, Board Member
 - e. Anisha Gupta, Board Member
2. California Historical Society
 - a. Anthea Hartig, Executive Director
 - b. Adam Hirschfelder, Director of Strategic Initiatives
 - c. Jason Herrington, Assistant Director of Strategic Initiatives
 - d. Pattey Pforte,
3. Shaping San Francisco
 - a. LisaRuth Elliott, Founding Director
 - b. Chris Carlson, Founding Director

Appendix C: Works Cited

- Allied Arts of Seattle. *60 Years of Civic Memories*. Retrieved from <http://alliedartsofseattle.org/allied-arts-timeline/>
- ArtSpan. *Art-In-Neighborhoods*. Retrieved from <https://www.artspan.org/events-programs/art-neighborhoods>
- ArtSpan. *History*. Retrieved from <https://www.artspan.org/history>
- ArtSpan. *Mission*. Retrieved from <https://www.artspan.org/mission>
- ArtSpan. *Strategic Plan*. Retrieved from <https://www.artspan.org/strategic-plan>
- Benjamin, Walter. (2003). On the Concept of History. In H. Eiland & M.W. Jennings (Eds.) *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, Volume 4, 1938-1940* (pp. 389-400). Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Benjamin, Walter. (2003). The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility. In H. Eiland & M.W. Jennings (Eds.) *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, Volume 4, 1938-1940* (pp. 251-283). Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Berger, John. (1991). *About Looking*. New York: Vintage International.
- Biecha, Peter. (2014, October 3). *Seattle Arts Commission/Office of Arts and Culture*. Retrieved from <http://www.historylink.org/File/9684>
- Boekenkamp, Lindsey. (2012). Alternative Legacies: Artists Projects in History Museums & the Importance of Context. *Journal of Arts and Humanities, 1*, 107-128.
- Corrin, Lisa G. (1994). Mining the Museum: An Installation by Fred Wilson In L.G. Corrin (Ed.). *Mining the Museum: Artists Look at Museums, Museums Look at Themselves*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Cott, Jonathan. (2013). *Susan Sontag: The Complete Rolling Stone Interview*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Debord, Guy. (1983). *Society of the Spectacle*. Detroit: Black and Red.
- Dineen, J.K. (2015, August 11). Nonprofits get free space as developer waits to build. *San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/Nonprofits-get-free-space-as-developer-waits-to-6438780.php>
- Crane, Susan A. (1997). Memory, Distortion, and History in the Museum. *History and*

Theory, 4, 44-62.

Eagleton, Terry. (2016). *Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Emerson, Ralph W. (1910). *Emerson's Essays and Representative Men*. London & Glasgow: Collins' Clear-Type Press.

Fitzgerald, Sandy. (2012). *What is the difference between arts and culture?*. Retrieved from <http://www.culturefighter.eu/concept-of-creative-industries/critique/what-is-the-difference-between-arts-and-culture>

Goodyear, Charlie. (2005, May 3). Emporium developer to pay \$2.5 million. *San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/SAN-FRANCISCO-Emporium-developers-to-pay-2-5-2685654.php>

Grants for the Arts. (2011). *Grants for the Arts: The First 50 Years*. Retrieved from http://sfgfta.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/50th_Anniversary_Report.pdf

Grants for the Arts. *History and Purpose*. Retrieved from <http://sfgfta.org/about/history-and-purpose/>

Harper, Hilliard. (1989, April 01). COMMENTARY: Shaking That Second-Rate Arts Image: San Diego County. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from http://articles.latimes.com/1989-04-01/entertainment/ca-784_1_san-diego-symphony/2

Historic Seattle. *About*. Retrieved from <https://historicseattle.org/about/>

How NEH Got Its Start. Retrieved from <https://www.neh.gov/about/history>

Iltzky, Ula. (2016, October 5). *NYC launches archaeological repository and digital archive*. Retrieved from <http://phys.org/news/2016-10-nyc-archaeological-repository-digital-archive.html>

Invest in Neighborhoods. *Community Capacity Building Program*. Retrieved from <http://investsf.org/capacity-building/>

Invest in Neighborhoods. *Community Improvement Project Grants*. Retrieved from <http://investsf.org/project-grants/>

Invest in Neighborhoods. (2014, October). *Grant Awards: September RFP*. Retrieved from http://investsf.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/IIN-RFP-Awards_Fall-2014.pdf

Jameson, Fredric. (1988). *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic*

- Act*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kwinter, Sanford. (2002). *Architectures in Time: Toward a Theory of the Event in Modernist Culture*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs. *About*. Retrieved from <http://culturela.org/about/>
- Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs. *Community Arts Division*. Retrieved from <http://culturela.org/contact/community-arts-division/>
- Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs. *Grants Administration Division*. Retrieved from <http://culturela.org/contact/grants-administration-division/>
- Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs. *Marketing and Development Division*. Retrieved from <http://culturela.org/contact/marketing-and-development-division/>
- Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs. *Public Art Division*. Retrieved from <http://culturela.org/contact/public-art-division/>
- Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs. *Private Arts Development Fee Program (ADF)*. Retrieved from <http://culturela.org/percent-public-art/private-arts-development-fee-program-adf/>
- Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs. *Programs and Initiatives*. Retrieved from <http://culturela.org/programs-and-initiatives/>
- Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs. *Public Works Improvements Arts Program (PWIAP)*. Retrieved <http://culturela.org/percent-public-art/public-works-improvements-arts-program-pwiap/>
- Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs. *City Art Collection*. Retrieved from <http://culturela.org/city-art-collection/>
- Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources. *About OHR*. Retrieved from <http://preservation.lacity.org/about>
- Morlan, Kinsee. (2016, May 31). Every Piece of Public Art in San Diego, Mapped. Voice of San Diego. Retrieved from <http://www.voiceofsandiego.org/topics/arts/every-piece-of-public-art-in-san-diego-mapped/>
- Morlan, Kinsee. (2014, August 13). What more would we gain with an arts council? San Diego City Beat. Retrieved from <http://sdcitybeat.com/article-13313-%C2%91what-more-would-we-gain-with-an-arts-council.html>
- Morlan, Kinsee. (2011, November 16). "Is a countywide arts council needed?" *San Diego City Beat*. Retrieved from <http://sdcitybeat.com/blog-15532-Is-a-countywide-arts->

[council-needed.html](#)

New York City Department of Cultural Affairs. *About Cultural Affairs: History*. Retrieved from http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcla/html/about/history_96-64.shtml

New York City Archaeological Repository: The Nan A. Rothschild Research Center. *All About*. Retrieved from <http://archaeology.cityofnewyork.us/about>

New York City Department of Cultural Affairs. *About Cultural Affairs: Advisory Commission*. Retrieved from <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcla/html/about/advisory.shtml>

New York City Department of Cultural Affairs. (2012). *Annual Report 2012*. Retrieved from http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcla/downloads/pdf/annual_report_FY12.pdf

New York City Department of Cultural Affairs. (2013). *Annual Report 2013*. Retrieved from http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcla/downloads/pdf/annual_report_FY13.pdf

New York City Department of Cultural Affairs. *Creative Aging*. Retrieved from http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcla/html/creative_aging/su-casa.shtml

New York City Department of Cultural Affairs. *Funding for Cultural Organizations: Building Community Capacity FY2016*. Retrieved from <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcla/html/funding/cadp.shtml>

New York City Department of Cultural Affairs. *Material for the Arts*. Retrieved from <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcla/html/materials/materials.shtml>

New York City Department of Cultural Affairs. *Percent for Art*. Retrieved from <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcla/html/panyc/percent-for-art.shtml>

New York City Department of Cultural Affairs. *Funding for Cultural Organizations*. Retrieved from <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcla/html/funding/funding.shtml>

New York City Department of Cultural Affairs. *Funding for Cultural Organizations: Capital Funding*. Retrieved from <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcla/html/funding/capital.shtml>

New York City Department of Cultural Affairs. *Funding for Cultural Organizations: Cultural Development Fund*. Retrieved from <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcla/html/funding/cdf.shtml>

New York City Department of Cultural Affairs. *Funding for Cultural Organizations: City-Owned Institutions*. Retrieved from <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcla/html/funding/institutions.shtml>

- New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission. *Departments and Staff*. Historic Preservation Grant Program. Retrieved from http://www.nyc.gov/html/lpc/html/about/staff_historic.shtm
- New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission. *About LPC*. Retrieved from <http://www1.nyc.gov/site/lpc/about/about-lpc.page>
- New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission. *Environmental Review*. Retrieved from <http://www1.nyc.gov/site/lpc/about/environmental-review.page>
- New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission. *New York Landmarks Preservation Foundation*. Retrieved from <http://www1.nyc.gov/site/lpc/about/landmarks-preservation-foundation.page>
- New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission. *Signs and Plaques*. Retrieved from <http://www1.nyc.gov/site/lpc/designations/signs-and-plaques.page>
- New York City Office of the Mayor. (2013, August 20). *Mayor Bloomberg Opens Affordable, Rentable Work Space For Artists in Long Island City*. Retrieved from <http://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/281-13/mayor-bloomberg-opens-affordable-rentable-work-space-artists-long-island-city>
- The New York Landmarks Conservancy. *Mission Statement*. Retrieved from http://www.nylandmarks.org/about_us/mission_statement/
- The New York Landmarks Conservancy. *What We Do*. Retrieved from http://www.nylandmarks.org/about_us/what_we_do/
- Nietzsche, Frederick. (2006). On the Utility and Liability of History for Life. In K.A. Pearson & A.D. Large (Eds.), *The Nietzsche Reader* (pp. 124-141). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Oakland Mayor's Artist Housing and Workspace Task Force. (2015, December 23). *Memorandum to Mayor Libby Schaff: Top Three Strategies to Stem Artist Displacement*. Retrieved from <http://www2.oaklandnet.com/oakca1/groups/ceda/documents/report/oak057287.pdf>
- Olalquiaga, Celeste. *The Artificial Kingdom: On the Kitsch Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
- Ollman, Leah. (1987, November 25). San Diego Arts: Arts Beat. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved at http://articles.latimes.com/1987-11-25/entertainment/ca-16352_1_tax-bill
- Rand Engineering & Architecture, DPC. *Funding Assistance for Historic Properties*.

Retrieved from <https://randpc.com/articles/historic-preservation-articles/historic-properties>

Reynolds, Simon (2011). *Retromania: Pop Culture's Addiction to Its Own Past*. New York: Faber and Faber, Inc.

San Diego Arts and Culture Coalition. *About the Coalition*. Retrieved from <http://www.sdracc.org/about-sdracc/>

San Diego. (2004, March). *Public Art Master Plan: The Vision and Benefits to San Diego*. Retrieved from <https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/arts-culture/pdf/pubartmasterplan.pdf>

San Diego Auditor and Controller. *Community Enhancement Program*. Retrieved from <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/auditor/commehnc.html>

San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture. *About Arts and Culture*. Retrieved from <https://www.sandiego.gov/arts-culture/about>

San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture. *Committees*. Retrieved from <https://www.sandiego.gov/arts-culture/about/committees>

San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture. (2004, June 18). *Developer/Applicant Guide to the City of San Diego Public Art Ordinance Requirements*. Retrieved from <https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/arts-culture/pdf/ceadeveloperguide.pdf>

San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture. (2015, December 28). *Fiscal Year 2017 Application Guidelines for Creative Communities San Diego*. Retrieved from https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/fy17_ccsd_guidelines_for_release.pdf

San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture. (2015, December 28). *Fiscal Year 2017 Application Guidelines for the Organizational Support Program*. Retrieved from https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/fy17_osp_guidelines.pdf

San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture. *Public Art*. Retrieved from <https://www.sandiego.gov/arts-culture/publicart>

San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture. (2016, September 23). *Rules and Regulations*. Retrieved from https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/rules_and_regulations_v_09-23-16.pdf

San Diego Historical Resources Board. (2011, October 27). *Policy 4.1*. Retrieved from <https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy//planning/programs/historical/>

[pdf/111027districtpolicy41.pdf](#)

San Diego International Airport. *About Public Art*. Retrieved from <http://arts.san.org/public-art/>

San Diego International Airport. *About Public Art: Temporary Exhibitions*. Retrieved from <http://arts.san.org/temp-exhibitions-2015/>

San Diego Planning Department. *About Historical Resources*. Retrieved from <https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/historical/resources>

San Diego Planning Department. *Benefits & Responsibilities*. Retrieved from <https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/historical/benefits>

San Diego Planning Department. *Historical Surveys*. Retrieved from <https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/historical/faq/surveydocs>

San Diego Unified Port District. (2016, October 13). *BPC Policy No. 609: Public Art Programs*. Retrieved from <https://www.portofsandiego.org/document/public-art/public-art-policies/7044-bpc-policy-609-public-art/file.html>

San Francisco. (2016). Allocation of Hotel Tax Funds. *San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet & Sample Ballot*. Retrieved from <http://voterguide.sfelections.org/en/allocation-hotel-tax-funds>

San Francisco. *Article 10: Preservation of Historical Architectural and Aesthetic Landmarks*. Retrieved from [http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/article10preservationofhistoricalarchite?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco\\$ca\\$sync=1](http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/article10preservationofhistoricalarchite?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco$ca$sync=1)

San Francisco. (2015, March 18). *Policies and Guidelines for the Civic Art Collection*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfartscommission.org/pubartcollection/documentspa01-policies-and-guidelines/>

San Francisco. (2003, January). *San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 1: Jurisdiction and Procedures of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board*. Retrieved from http://default.sfplanning.org/Preservation/bulletins/HistPres_Bulletin_01.PDF

San Francisco. (2014, June). *San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 9: San Francisco Landmarks*. Retrieved from

San Francisco Arts Commission. (2016, November 17). *A Look at the Summer of Love Through the Eyes of Legendary Rock 'n' Roll Photographer Jim Marshall*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfartscommission.org/gallery/2016/a-look-at-the->

[summer-of-love-through-the-eyes-of-legendary-rock-n-roll-photographer-jim-marshall/](#)

San Francisco Arts Commission. *About SFAC*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfartscommission.org/about-sfac/>

San Francisco Arts Commission Galleries. *About SFAC Galleries*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfartscommission.org/gallery/about/#mission>

San Francisco Arts Commission. *Civic Design Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfartscommission.org/CDR/home/index.html>

San Francisco Arts Commission. *Community Investments: About CIP*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfartscommission.org/CAE/about-cip/>

San Francisco Arts Commission. *Community Investments: Art in Storefronts*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfartscommission.org/CAE/art-in-storefronts/>

San Francisco Arts Commission. *Community Investments: Grant Programs and Applications*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfartscommission.org/CAE/grants/grant-programs-and-applications/>

San Francisco Arts Commission. *Community Investments: Where Art Lives*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfartscommission.org/CAE/arts-education/where-art-lives/#01>

San Francisco Arts Commission Galleries. (2016). *McNair Evans: 'In Search of Great Men'*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfartscommission.org/gallery/2016/mcnair-evans-in-search-of-great-men/>

San Francisco Arts Commission. *Program Information*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfartscommission.org/pubartcollection/about-public-art-and-civic-art-collection/program-information/>

San Francisco Arts Commission. *Public Art: StreetSmARTS Program*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfartscommission.org/pubartcollection/pubart-projects/2016/05/23/streetsmarts-program/>

San Francisco Arts Commission. *Public Art Trust*. Retrieved from http://www.sfartscommission.org/pubartcollection/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Public-Art-Trust-Guidelines-09_11_14.pdf

San Francisco Mayor's Office of Communications. (2010, July 15). *Arts Commission Receives \$250,000 Grant from NEA for Mid Market*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfartscommission.org/2010/07/arts-commission-receives-250000-grant-from-nea-for-mid-market/>

- San Francisco Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure: *Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency*. Retrieved from <http://sfocii.org>
- San Francisco Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure: *Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure*. Retrieved from <http://sfocii.org/commission>
- San Francisco Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure: *Oversight Board*. Retrieved from <http://sfocii.org/oversight-board>
- San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development. *About Us*. Retrieved from <http://oewd.org/about-us>
- San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development. *About Workforce*. Retrieved from <http://oewd.org/workforce>
- San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development. *Development*. Retrieved from <http://oewd.org/Development>
- San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development. *Grant and Loan Programs*. Retrieved from <http://oewd.org/grant-and-loan-programs>
- San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development. *Historical Preservation Fund Committee Grants*. Retrieved from <http://oewd.org/historic-preservation-fund-committee-grants>
- San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development. *Invest in Neighborhoods*. Retrieved from <http://oewd.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/176-IIN%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf>
- San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development. *Neighborhoods*. Retrieved from <http://oewd.org/neighborhoods>
- San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development. *Nonprofits*. Retrieved from <http://oewd.org/nonprofits-0>
- San Francisco Planning Department. *About*. Retrieved from <http://sf-planning.org/about-san-francisco-planning-Department>
- San Francisco Planning Department. *Application Packet for the Certificate of Appropriateness*. Retrieved from <http://sf-planning.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/477-Certificate%20of%20Appropriateness%20-%20fillable%20-%20101512.pdf>
- San Francisco Planning Department. *Historic Preservation*. Retrieved from <http://sf->

planning.org/historic-preservation

San Francisco Planning Department. *Historic Preservation FAQs*. Retrieved from <http://sf-planning.org/historic-preservation-faqs>

San Francisco Planning Department. (2012, May 19). *New Planning Code Public Artworks Requirement, Ord. No. 62-12*. Retrieved from http://208.121.200.84/ftp/files/legislative_changes/new_code_summaries/110853_Public_Artworks_Requirement.pdf

San Francisco Arts Commission. *PAOO. Public Art Ordinance*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfartscommission.org/pubartcollection/documents/pa00-public-art-ordinance/>

San Francisco Planning Department. *Publicly Owned Land by San Francisco Supervisorial District*. Retrieved from http://sf-planning.org/ftp/files/plans-and-programs/planning-for-the-city/public-sites/PublicSites_All_Public_wSupervisor_Districts.pdf

San Francisco Planning Department. *Publicly-Owned Open Space and Public Art (POPOS)*. Retrieved from <http://sf-planning.org/privately-owned-public-open-space-and-public-art-popos>

San Francisco Planning Department. (1986, July 24). *San Francisco: Fine Art Guidelines*. Retrieved from http://sf-planning.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/5232-Fine_Arts_Guidelines.pdf

San Francisco Planning Department. (1996). *San Francisco General Plan*. Retrieved from <http://generalplan.sfplanning.org/index.htm>

San Francisco Planning + Urban Research Association. *Secrets of San Francisco: A guide to San Francisco's privately-owned public open spaces*. Retrieved from <https://www.spur.org/sites/default/files/migrated/anchors/popos-guide.pdf>

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. *Investing in Art*. Retrieved from <http://sfwater.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentID=3679>

San Francisco Real Estate Division. *Annual Report 2014*. Retrieved from <http://sfgov.org/realestate/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/12728-2014RealEstateAnnualReport.pdf>

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods. *About the Southeast Seattle History Project*. Retrieved from <https://wayback.archive-it.org/3241/20141217052434/http://www9.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/preservatio>

[n/southeastseattle/se_seattle_overview.htm](http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/programs-and-services/historic-preservation/historic-districts)

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods. *Historic Districts*. Retrieved from <http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/programs-and-services/historic-preservation/historic-districts>

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods. *Landmarks*. Retrieved from <http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/programs-and-services/historic-preservation/landmarks>

Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board. *Rules and Regulations, Code of Ethics, and Procedures*. Retrieved from <http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/Neighborhoods/HistoricPreservation/Landmarks/LandmarksPreservationBoard/LPB-Rules-and-Regulations.pdf>

Seattle Office of Arts & Culture. *About Us*. Retrieved from <http://www.seattle.gov/arts/about-us>

Seattle Office of Arts & Culture. (2014). *Annual Report to Community*. Retrieved from <http://www.seattlearts.report>

Seattle Office of Arts & Culture. *ARTS at King Street Station*. Retrieved from <http://www.seattle.gov/arts/king-street-station>

Sonoma State University. (2015). *ASC Statement of Qualifications*. Retrieved from http://www.sonoma.edu/asc/aboutus/ASC_SOQ_2015.pdf

Spaceworks. *FAQ*. Retrieved from <https://spaceworksnyc.org/aboutus/faq/>

Spaceworks. *Rehearsal Spaces*. Retrieved from <https://spaceworksnyc.org/rehearsalspaces/>

Wise, Yvonne. (2012). *Curatorial Strategy Five-Year Plan, 2012-2016*. Retrieved from <https://www.portofsandiego.org/document/public-art/3816-curatorial-strategy-2012-2016/file.html>