

**Public | Art | Plan**  
**Art | Public | Plan**  
**Plan | Public | Art**



**Prepared for:**  
**City of Eugene, Oregon**

**By:**  
**Barney & Worth, Inc.**

**In association with:**  
**Regional Arts & Culture Council**



**November 2009**



## Eugene Public Art Plan

---

### Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge contributions of the many Eugene citizens who joined in the community-wide process to develop the Public Art Plan. Some of the active participants are listed below. Thank you all for sharing your creative ideas and vision for the arts in Eugene's future!

### Steering Committee

Fred Crafts, Eugene Ambassador to the Arts \*  
Susan Detroy, Artist, Exhibit Designer, Jacobs Gallery \*  
Renee Grube, City of Eugene  
Kevin Finney, City of Eugene  
Jill Hartz, Jordan Schnitzer Museum of Art, UO \*  
Laura Niles, City of Eugene  
Mike Penwell, City of Eugene  
Tina Rinaldi, University of Oregon \*  
Jim Robinson, Artist, UO Youth Enrichment/Tag Programs \*  
Yvonne Stubbs, Artist \*  
Ellen Tykeson, Lane Community College \*  
Mary Unruh, Downtown Initiative for the Visual Arts (DIVA) \*  
Kari Westlund, Travel Lane County \*  
Rick Williams, Lane Community College \*

### City of Eugene

Renee Grube, Library, Recreation and Cultural Services Director  
Laura Niles, Cultural Services Director (now retired) \*\*  
Theresa Sizemore, Events Manager, Project Coordinator \*\*  
Isaac Marquez, Assistant Community Events Manager  
Nan Laurence, Senior Planner  
Neil Bjorklund, Planning Manager  
Mike Penwell, Facilities Management Division  
Kate Nosen, Public Art Intern

### Consultants

Clark Worth, Barney & Worth, Inc. \*\*  
Eloise Damrosch, Regional Arts & Culture Council \*\*  
Libby Barg, Barney & Worth, Inc.  
Michele Neary, Barney & Worth, Inc.

\* Public Art Committee

\*\* Project Team members

### Stakeholder Interviews

Douglas Beauchamp, Lane Arts Council  
Greg Brokaw, Rowell Brokaw Architects  
Mark Clarke, Artist, Karin Clarke Gallery  
Fred Crafts, Eugene Ambassador to the Arts, Arts and Business Alliance of Eugene  
Kiersten Diechman, Public Art Management  
Kevin Finney, Park Operations – City of Eugene  
James Fox, Knight Library – University of Oregon  
Renee Grube, Library, Recreation & Cultural Services – City of Eugene  
Jill Hartz, Jordan Schnitzer Museum of Art – University of Oregon  
Andrea Heid, Oregon Arts Commission  
Peter Helzer, Artist  
Lee Imonen, Artist, Lane Community College  
William Kennedy, Downtown Neighborhood Association  
Nan Laurence, Planning and Development – City of Eugene  
Brian Obie, 5th Street Public Market  
Karen Pavelec, Maude Kerns Art Center, Art in the Vineyard  
Mike Penwell, Facilities Division – City of Eugene  
Kitty Piercy, Mayor – City of Eugene  
Jon Ruiz, City Manager – City of Eugene  
Randy Stender, Downtown Business Alliance, DIVA  
Dave Suchart, Management Services – Lane County  
Mike Sullivan, Community Development – City of Eugene  
Glen Svendsen, Facilities – City of Eugene (retired)  
Meg Trendler, Travel Lane County, Lane Cultural Coalition  
Ellen Tykeson, Artist, Lane Community College  
Mary Unruh, Downtown Initiative for the Visual Arts (DIVA)  
Kari Westlund, Travel Lane County  
Rick Williams, Lane Community College



## Table of Contents

	Page
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	i
<b>I. Introduction</b>	
"World's Greatest City" .....	3
Eugene's Public Art Program .....	3
Public Art Master Plan.....	4
Community Participation.....	4
<b>II. Context for Public Art</b>	
National Best Practices .....	7
Peer Communities .....	10
Eugene Scene.....	12
<b>III. Opportunities</b>	
Performing Arts and Public Art .....	12
Partnerships .....	13
Community Planning.....	14
Eugene Public Library -- A model.....	14
Percent-for-Art Funding .....	14
<b>IV. Public Art Plan: Vision &amp; Priorities</b>	
Community Vision .....	15
Public Art Priorities .....	16
Funding Strategies .....	17
Policies & Guidelines .....	18
<b>V. Appendices</b>	
Community Survey -- Highlights	
City of Eugene Public Art Collection Policies and Procedures	
• Art Acquisition Policy	
• Public Art Committee Membership and Guidelines	
• Deaccessing Procedure	



### Executive Summary

In 1981, a new performing arts center was taking shape in Eugene’s downtown. At the same time, the City enacted a percent-for-art funding ordinance to support public art, placing Eugene on the leading edge of a national public art movement.

After almost three decades, the Hult Center and performing arts continue to flourish. The visual arts are present too, with an art museum and numerous galleries. Eugene has emerged as an arts destination, with an abundance of arts and cultural offerings enjoyed by visitors and residents alike. In contrast, Eugene’s public art collection has grown slowly over this same period; nearly 30 years later, the public art program as experienced modest and mixed success.

Recently, Eugene completed the Cultural Policy Review, a ten-year cultural plan that recognizes the city’s accomplishments and raises the bar once again. With full community support, Eugene boldly states its aspiration to become “*The World’s Greatest City of the Arts and Outdoors*”.

Eugene’s cultural plan counts on public art to play a role in that transformation: to help “integrate arts and culture into the fabric of Eugene’s downtown and neighborhoods.” A public art master plan is identified in the cultural plan as a strategic tool to assist in reinvigorating Eugene’s public art program.

In 2009, assisted by a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts, Eugene began work on a plan to review, reshape and redirect the public art program. The project was directed by the Eugene Public Art Committee and a 14-member Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee sponsored an extensive community outreach process. More than 400 community members participated in the planning, sharing their vision and creative ideas on ways to move public art forward.

In summary, the community’s shared vision for public art is: *more art – better art – distributed more widely – more conspicuous*. Community leaders and others expect Eugene’s public art to be exceptional.

Why hasn’t this already happened? The answer is funding. Eugene’s percent-for-art funding source relies on construction or purchase of large public buildings, parks, etc. Such projects don’t happen every year in a mid-sized city, leaving gaps in public art funding. Without a stable, reliable funding base, Eugene’s public art program has been inconsistent over the years. The program does not have full-time dedicated staff – an ingredient that is essential for on-going success. Components of the program are housed in three different City departments.

In light of these handicaps, Eugene’s progress has been just short of remarkable. The public art inventory encompasses 198 pieces of art located in the downtown and other parts of the city, representing a variety of media. Some 90% of community members surveyed recently say they are aware of Eugene’s public art.

In re-shaping Eugene’s public art program, five important opportunities have been identified:

- Linking public art to Eugene’s successful performing arts;
- Partnerships with the University of Oregon, Lane Community College, and other institutions;

- Integrating public art into community planning;
- Replicating the successful model of public art installed at the Eugene Public Library; and
- Expanding Eugene’s percent-for art funding.

Priorities for expanding and upgrading Eugene’s public art has been developed in consultation with more than four hundred community volunteers (see below).

### Priorities for Eugene’s Public Art Program

*Priorities for Eugene’s public art program include these key ingredients identified by community leaders and citizens who participated in planning:*

- ✓ Build a public art collection of the highest quality – worthy of Eugene’s notable arts and cultural offerings and significant achievements.
- ✓ Appraise Eugene’s existing public art collection, inviting a panel of independent artists and public art professionals to review and critique the current body of work.
- ✓ Extend public art beyond the downtown, to new locations across the city: the airport and other gateways, parks and playgrounds, schools, walkways and bike paths.
- ✓ Forge partnerships with the University of Oregon, Lane Community College, Lane County, EWEB, and other institutions able to support and nurture public art.
- ✓ Integrate public art into community planning, looking for opportunities to make public art part of every project.
- ✓ Expand Eugene’s percent-for-art funding ordinance to yield additional funds to purchase and maintain art. Seek other public and private funds to leverage public percent-for-art monies.
- ✓ Assign full-time, professional staff to manage the public art program. (Most mid-size cities have a minimum of two FTE). Organize the program under one lead department.
- ✓ Develop a program that assures ongoing maintenance and repairs for Eugene’s growing public art collection.
- ✓ Improve public accessibility of Eugene’s public art collection with interpretive and educational materials and methods. *Show it off!*
- ✓ Involve citizens and volunteers in all aspects of the public art program.



## Eugene Public Art Plan

---

The accompanying Eugene Public Art Plan gives further details on public arts needs, community priorities, opportunities and strategies. With this strategic plan in place, Eugene has a chance to celebrate public art’s 30<sup>th</sup> birthday well on the way toward building a truly exceptional public art collection.

Authentic experiences offer unexpected surprises. Astonish visitors. Inspire creativity and community pride. Eugene’s public art – *we can do that!*

### I. Introduction

#### “World’s Greatest City”

In recent decades, the City of Eugene has consciously worked to brand itself as an arts community. With the opening of the Hult Center for the performing arts, professional theater and dance resident companies, a world class music festival, an art museum, galleries, professional arts education offerings and a vibrant local arts scene, Eugene is striving to live up to its slogan as *“The World’s Greatest City of the Arts and Outdoors.”*

The City is taking steps to ensure that art continues to be an indelible part of the daily experience for Eugene’s citizens and visitors. Art is appreciated in Eugene as a basic ingredient, a way to enhance the built environment, create a unique “sense of place”, improve quality of life – and also stimulate economic activity. In 2007, the City completed a ten-year cultural plan to outline strategies that integrate arts and culture into the fabric of Eugene’s downtown and neighborhoods.

#### Eugene’s Public Art Program

Public art – art that is community-owned and displayed in public places – can play a pivotal role in spreading arts and culture citywide. In recent years, the Eugene Public Art Committee has been reinstated and its job has been expanded and includes overseeing the community’s public art program. In 1981, among the earlier cities across the U.S., the City of Eugene enacted a percent-for-art ordinance that designates a percentage of capital improvement project budgets to “create, collect and display public art,” supporting the purchase of artworks to be placed in public spaces.

Over its 25+ year history, Eugene’s public art collection has accumulated 198 works of art representing outdoor sculpture and a variety of media, three-dimensional and two-dimensional, from monumental scale to miniature. The City’s public art collection is concentrated in the downtown and the adjoining Alton Baker Park – but some works have spread to other locations.

Now a mature (in age) program, Eugene’s public art requires a cohesive plan, policies and procedures to ensure the community will continue to enjoy all of the benefits of high quality public art.



#### Eugene Public Art Program – Goal

*Foster arts and the development of artists and provide experiences which enrich and better the social and physical environment.*

---



## Eugene Public Art Plan

---

### Public Art Master Plan

The ten-year Cultural Policy Review identified public art as a key ingredient in reinforcing Eugene’s emerging arts identity – to help “*integrate arts and culture into the fabric of Eugene’s downtown and neighborhoods*” (Goal V). A public art plan was pinpointed as a tool needed to help “*enhance Eugene’s physical environment through public art in the downtown and throughout the City*” (Strategy V.3).

In 2009, the City of Eugene began work on its citywide public art plan assisted by a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts. Eugene’s initiative to create a comprehensive *public art plan* has been guided by the Eugene Public Art Committee and a citizen volunteer Steering Committee. This group retained the services of a consultant team headed by Barney & Worth, Inc. to assist in developing the public art plan. The Steering Committee collaborated with the consultant at every stage of planning.

While the fourteen-member Steering Committee (and Public Art Committee) oversaw the consultant’s work and guided the public art planning, many other groups participated: Eugene City Council, local community arts organizations, artists, downtown businesses, City planning and parks departments, neighborhoods and others. The master plan was developed through meaningful outreach and collaboration with these and other interested parties.

The City’s goal is to develop a public art plan that establishes a vision, and re-shapes the program to ensure it will flourish. There are countless opportunity sites for placement of public art: at Eugene’s public art community gateways, in the downtown, commercial districts, neighborhoods, parks and elsewhere. It is envisioned the Public Art Plan will recommend updated organizing principles and policies for Eugene’s emerging public art program, and help identify immediate and long-term program goals and priorities. The plan will also pinpoint special opportunities and new features for the community’s expanded public art collection.

Policies to regulate and operate the public art program are also very important. Experience in other communities has shown that any single public art commission can attract controversy. The art solicitation and selection process must be transparent and efficient, capable of attracting responses from top artists and yielding high quality art. The master plan will also address questions about funding methods, art selection and commissioning, siting, security, ongoing conservation and maintenance, and staffing.

### Community Participation

The foundation for Eugene’s Public Art Plan is broad-based citizen input. A multi-faceted program for public outreach enlisted hundreds of citizens who volunteered and involved themselves in the plan.

Members of the Steering Committee overseeing the planning included Eugene Public Art Committee members and City staff. The Steering Committee participated in consultant selection, designed the workscope and schedule, toured Portland’s public art collection with Regional Arts and Culture Council staff, designed public outreach, sponsored and distributed a community survey, facilitated a public workshop, deliberated on recommendations and reviewed the draft public art plan.



## Eugene Public Art Plan

---

The public workshop gave a still wider range of interested citizens a chance to contribute their creative suggestions and help shape the Public Art Plan. The October 20, 2009 workshop attracted some 45 participants for a lively discussion.

Community outreach also included a survey, mailed to:

- Eugene area arts organizations
- Local artists
- Neighborhood associations
- Participants in the 2007 cultural plan

The survey attracted 335 detailed on-line and written responses from citizens across the city, most of whom were unable to attend the workshop. A summary of survey results appears in an appendix.

Finally, more than 25 key stakeholders – community leaders and other interested citizens identified by the Steering Committee – were interviewed to seek their views on important issues surrounding the Public Art Plan, and capture their ideas for Eugene’s future.

A synopsis of community members’ comments appears below. The strength of community participation confirms participants’ deep interest and support to expand and upgrade Eugene’s public art program. The results of community input have shaped Eugene’s Public Art Plan, and are integrated into every facet of the plan.

Key points offered by community leaders and others who were interviewed:

1. *Eugene has accumulated a sizeable public art collection, but observers say it doesn’t yet “add up”.* There is some concern that the public art collection, to date, lacks a unifying vision or distinctive character.
2. *There are some public art projects where Eugene has “got it right”.* The Eugene Public Library is mentioned most often for its consistent high quality, variety – in artists, scale and media, and integration of public art with the architectural design.
3. *A strength of Eugene’s collection is its strong representation of local artists.* Some area arts leaders see this local emphasis as a shortcoming, however, and urge the City to broaden artist selection to acquire more diverse works from regional/national/international talent.
4. *The overall quality of Eugene’s public art is questioned,* perhaps due to the collection’s “home grown” character or the absence of a centering vision. The public art program receives some criticism for accepting uneven quality.
5. *Eugene’s public art is not yet penetrating public awareness,* and there is not a sense of shared ownership in the community. Many artworks are prominently placed in public spaces – but reportedly remain unnoticed or underappreciated.

### Eugene Public Art Plan – Public Workshop

*October 20, 2009 – “Share Your Vision and  
Priorities for Public Art”*

---

6. *Partnerships with higher education institutions offer an opportunity to extend the reach of Eugene’s public art program.* While Eugene is only a mid-sized city, the presence of the University of Oregon (and art museum) and Lane Community College, with formidable arts resources, has the potential to raise the quality and expanse of the community’s public art.
7. *Public art can become an amenity for visitors.* Eugene’s rich performing arts offerings continue to attract visitors year-round. High quality public art would appeal to this same out-of-town audience and help reinforce Eugene’s image as an arts destination.
8. *A lack of full-time staff hampers the future prospects for Eugene’s public art program.* The City’s public art program needs full-time staff to take on the wide range of art selection, marketing, fundraising and curatorial duties required to support a well-managed program.
9. *Responsibility for the public art program also needs to be organized under one lead department.* Until recently, program responsibilities have been distributed among several City offices, which makes coordination of activities difficult.
10. *There’s also a need for more funding.* The current percent-for-art funding source is no longer considered adequate to sustain, care for, and grow Eugene’s public art.

The hundreds of community members who responded to the survey concur with many of these key points. Nearly 80% of the survey participants are Eugene residents and are directly involved in the arts – 23% identify themselves as artists, and another 11% represent arts and culture organizations. Some 90% of participants say they are familiar/very familiar with Eugene’s public art and have noticed concentrations along downtown streets, in parks, at the Hult Center and Eugene Public Library.

Two-thirds of respondents want to see public art in both the downtown and neighborhoods. Preferred sites include public buildings (74%), parks (78%), institutions (71%), city streets and sidewalks (71%). There’s wide concurrence on preferences for types of art: art that is integrated into landscape/building design and functional objects; sculpture and other outdoor art.

The open-ended comments offered by survey respondents echo three themes:

- *Vision:* More! Visible and accessible. Diverse. Higher quality. Partnerships (UO, LCC, EWEB, others).
- *Sites:* Everywhere! Downtown, gateways, parks/playgrounds, schools.
- *Disappointment:* Can Eugene truly claim to be the “World’s Greatest City of the Arts and Outdoors”?



### II. Context for Public Art

#### National Best Practices

The most comprehensive national survey of public art programs (in 2001) found 350 programs in the United States. Public art programs for typical mid-size cities (100,000 to 250,000 population) in 2001:

- Were operated by government
- Had annual budgets averaging \$330,000
- Had two full-time professional staff and also used consultants
- Were supported largely by a percent-for-art funding source (73% of total funding)

A recap of standard practices appears below:



### Public Art Programs – Standard Practices (2001)\*

#### Organization

- 81 percent of programs are operated by public agencies; 19 percent are operated by non-profits.
- Most programs (72 percent) serve a single city or county.
- Non-profits that run public art programs usually operate other programs, too.
- Public art committees (boards, commissions) average ten members. They often include architects / design professionals, artists, arts administrators, business leaders, community representatives and others. Half of public art programs train their committee members.
- Three-quarters of programs operate with a public art ordinance; these programs tend to be larger and faster growing.

#### Staffing

- Public art programs range from 0.5 to 11.0 staff, with an average of 2.1.
- Staff commonly hold degrees in studio art, art history or arts administration. Their prior experience typically covers arts administration (90 percent), studio art, curatorial, art history, public administration, public relations and/or museum.
- More than two-thirds of programs (69 percent) also utilize public art consultants.

#### Budget

- Average annual budget in 2001 was about \$750,000. For mid-size cities (100,000 to 250,000) the average was \$330,000.
- Government-run programs have larger budgets – \$912,000 vs. \$306,000 for non-profits. Budgets for government programs are growing faster than for non-profits, and faster than inflation.
- Typical government programs receive 73 percent of their revenue from percent-for-art funds.
- Other funding sources are private contributions (corporations, foundations, individuals) and earned income.
- Non-profits rely on roughly equal amounts of public funding, private funding and earned income.
- Art commissions and purchases account for three-quarters of program spending.

#### Projects

- Commissioning permanent projects and purchasing existing works outnumber temporary projects eight to one.
- Project budgets range widely: from \$25 to \$3 million. The vast majority of public art programs (86 percent) require liability insurance for public art commissions.

#### Artists

- The average public art collection includes 80 different artists.
- Artist contracts typically comply with the Visual Artist Rights Act and artists retain the copyright for their work.
- Most artists apply for commissions, via open call.
- Most public art programs pay finalist artists for their proposals (\$250 to \$2,000 or more).
- Nearly half of public art programs provide training for artists.

#### Art Selection

- Selection is routinely made by independent selection panels. These usually include architects, artists, arts professionals, business leaders and other community members, as well as representatives of the commissioning agency and public art program.
- Selection panels average 8.6 members (including support staff).
- Many communities (49 percent) require artists to meet a defined level of experience; some limit eligibility to “local” artists (typically defined as living in the same state).

#### Publicity

- The most common marketing materials are printed brochures (82 percent), website (77 percent), maps of public art (48 percent), and post cards (48 percent).
- Nearly all public art programs (88 percent) offer web images / descriptions of their collection.

\*Source: *Public Art Programs – Fiscal Year 2001, Americans for the Arts, 2003.*

While the standard funding source for public art programs is percent-for-art, there is no standard formula. In various cities across the United States, percent-for-art is calculated on the basis of 1% to 2% of:

- Annual capital budget
- Above-ground capital improvements
- Newly constructed, purchased and renovated buildings
- Newly constructed buildings only
- Designated facilities (e.g. airport, libraries)
- Capital bond measures
- Private (non-residential) construction
- Many more methods!

The City of Eugene can draw upon its own experience and lessons learned in many peer communities where mature public art programs are in place. Thanks to these efforts, the requirements for a successful community public art program are generally known and accepted (see below).

### Components of a Successful Public Art Program

- Commitment to institutionalize the program via ordinance or policy
  - Well-defined goals
  - Inclusive definition of public art
  - Good communication with government agencies
  - Decision-making body (Art Committee or Commission): with participation by community leaders, arts, arts and design professionals, other citizens with arts interest/experience
  - Professional staff
  - Criteria and guidelines for selection of artists and art
  - Percent-for-art funding source (2% for entire capital budget for leading cities)
  - Dedicated fund to collect and disburse public art funds
  - Policies for considering donations, memorials, resiting and deaccessioning
  - Artist-friendly contracts
  - Plan, funds, staff and protocols for ongoing maintenance
  - System to catalogue artworks in the public collection
  - Public education activities and publications
  - Ongoing community interaction
-



## Eugene Public Art Plan

---

### Peer Communities

For purposes of comparison, a review of six mid-size and larger communities in the southeastern United States shows the variety of public art programs and percent-for-art funding sources in place today. These six programs cover the full spectrum: from one of the largest and most mature programs in the nation—Broward County, Florida (Ft. Lauderdale -- 1976) – to Huntsville, Alabama’s newly created program. Most communities have completed public art plans. All but Huntsville have percent-for-art funding sources in place, with percentages calculated from 1% (Ashville, Charlotte, Nashville) to 1.5% (Atlanta) and 2% (Broward County). Four of the public art programs are operated by city government; two programs are run by regional authorities. All programs (except Huntsville) have full-time professional staff, with nine full-time staff in Broward County.

The accompanying table provides an overview of the six public art programs:



### Public Art Programs – Southeastern Cities

#### Ashville, NC

Public Art Board

Public Art Master Plan (2000/2008)

Funding: 1% of amount allocated to general Capital Improvement Program

- Parks / Greenway bond referendums: 1% tied to art
- Tourism Development Authority Room Tax for art
- Private development incentives

Program management: Department of Parks, Recreation & Cultural Arts

#### Atlanta, GA

Public Art Programs

Public Art Advisory Committee

Public Art Interagency Task Force

Public Art Master Plan (2001)

Public Art Park (Freedom Park): for siting temporary and permanent sculpture

Funding:

- 1.5% of capital project budget (increased 2008)
- .5% dedicated for construction (2008)
- 1% of airport construction funds for Airport Art Program

Program management: Department of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Affairs; Office of Cultural Affairs; Public Art Division

#### Broward County, FL

Public Art & Design Program (1976)

Public Art & Design Committee

Nine full-time staff

*Design Broward: 1995 Master Plan*

*Five Year Plan: Broward County Public Art & Design*

Funding:

- 2% of new construction budget for County facilities

#### Charlotte, NC

Public Art Program (1981) – Charlotte / Mecklenburg County

Cultural Facilities Master Plan

Funding:

- 1% of eligible capital improvement project funds (2003)

Program management: Arts & Science Council (1958)

#### Huntsville, AL

Huntsville Arts Council

*Create Huntsville Strategic Plan:*

- Inspired by Chattanooga's and Asheville's success
- Support economic development through expanded arts and cultural opportunities
- Downtown Arts & Entertainment District: develop new outdoor / indoor arts & culture attractions
- Public art: focus for 2009

Mayor Tommy Battle: "*Arts are the heart and soul of the City*".

#### Nashville, TN

Art in Public Places

Full-time Public Art Project Manager

Funding:

- 1% of Metro government's construction budget
- 1% of net proceeds of GO bonds

Program management: Metro Nashville Arts Commission



### Eugene Scene

So how does Eugene’s public art program compare to peer communities’ standard practices and best practices?

At 28 years, Eugene’s public art program is among the more mature programs in the United States. The nation’s earliest programs are nearing 40 years old. Portland’s program will celebrate its 30<sup>th</sup> birthday in 2010, Eugene in 2011. Like most peer public art programs, Eugene’s program is operated by city government. The size of Eugene’s public art collection (198 artworks) is above average – but much smaller than other mature programs. Over the years, Eugene has collected around six pieces of art per year. Eugene also has fewer than average number of artists represented.

One reason for Eugene’s relatively modest collection is a pattern of uneven funding. Like most other cities, Eugene has a percent-for-art funding ordinance in place. However, the capital projects qualifying for the percents are defined narrowly. In some years, little or no money is generated for public art. As a result the program has experienced something of a start-and-stop existence.

No full-time professional staff is dedicated to public art, and there is no ongoing annual budget allocation for the program. Until recently, staff have been assigned part-time from three different departments (Cultural Services, Facilities Management, Parks and Recreation).

Other points of comparison with peer cities:

- Eugene lacks other funding sources to supplement percent-for-art.
- Eugene’s percent ordinance allocates 1%; leading cities have raised their percentage to 2%.
- Eugene operates an art gallery – unusual for a mid-sized city.
- Eugene’s public art collection places more emphasis on local (Eugene area) artists. Even in other cities where local artists are prioritized, “local” is usually defined as same state.
- Unlike its peers, Eugene has not developed a robust array of printed brochures, maps, web information, and other interpretive materials.

### III. Opportunities

The future of Eugene’s public art program hinges on the community’s success in establishing public art as a community priority – one that is recognized by policymakers and citizens as key to attaining the desired status as the “World’s Greatest City of the Arts and Outdoors”. Then, Eugene must become opportunity-driven, seizing opportunities and doing whatever possible to leverage what will always be – due to Eugene’s population size – limited financial resources.

### Performing Arts and Public Art

To date, Eugene’s stature as an emerging arts and culture center rests largely on the foundation of the performing arts. The Hult Center is Eugene’s hub for the performing arts, with the 2,500-seat Silva Concert Hall, 500-seat Soreng Theater and 225-seat Studio. The facility opened in September 1982 and was an immediate success, selling one million tickets over its first four years of operation.



## Eugene Public Art Plan

---

Eugene benefits from its investment in the Hult Center and enjoys an unusual wealth of resident professional performance companies – dance, theater, music – for a mid-sized city. The annual Bach Festival attracts visitors from around the world. The Shedd Institute hosts year-round concerts and performances. Eugene is a frequent tour stop for internationally known performers. In short, Eugene is “on the map” for arts and culture.

The reputation and reality of Eugene’s success in performing arts presents an opportunity to experience public art – in the Hult Center, Jacobs Gallery and adjoining hotel / conference center. Patrons of the performing arts represent a natural audience for Eugene’s public art. Jacobs Gallery is already open during Hult Center performances. Other spaces in and around the Hult Center (and other key performance venues) can be programmed to make public art more visible and accessible.

Even with busy events venues, performances cover only a fraction of the hours in any year. In the “dark” days and hours at these performance venues, public art can become the best way to send a strong, continuous signal that Eugene has special status as an arts community.

### Partnerships

Eugene is a college town, home to a major public university, a thriving community college and other institutions of higher education. The University of Oregon offers professional training for artists and arts educators, has several performance venues, an outstanding art museum, and its own diverse public art collection. The University is also considering opening a downtown extension of its Jordan Schnitzer Museum of Art, to provide more exhibit space and make the collection more accessible to the public.

Lane Community College also offers art classes and professional artist training. The campus includes an art collection and galleries with works by faculty members, students, alumni and other artists. Community College officials are also planning to expand LCC’s presence in downtown Eugene with possible links to the city’s cultural resources.

Eugene is already taking advantage of these unique higher education resources, drawing upon UO and LCC expertise for arts and culture leadership. In the future, more can be done to leverage these resources:

- Inventory the UO and LCC public art collections – already open and visible to the public – and include this art in interpretive materials as an extension of the City’s public art collection.
- Move portions of the Schnitzer Museum’s collection into public spaces, following the innovative model of the Hunter Museum of American Art (Chattanooga). The Hunter redesigned and opened its sculpture garden to public access, and moved several sculptures into downtown plazas. Recently, the Hunter teamed with a local foundation to commission four major works, with artists chosen through a public vote. Thousands of Chattanoogaans have participated in the art selections.
- Jointly curate art exhibits and co-produce and publicize arts and culture events.
- Draw upon the museum’s curatorial expertise to advise/oversee maintenance of the city’s public art collection.
- UO and LCC expand their roles in community education about public art.
- Develop a curriculum at UO and/or LCC linked to public art.
- Utilize Jacobs Gallery and other venues to showcase emerging young artists.
- Enlist students as volunteers to assist with curatorial, interpretive and other functions for Eugene’s public art collection.



## Eugene Public Art Plan

---

Additional partnership opportunities shouldn't be overlooked. Lane County, nearby jurisdictions, Lane Transit District, EWEB, GSA (federal agencies), Sacred Heart/Peace Health and others may also build their own art collections that contribute to the quality, depth, and distribution of public art community-wide and regionally.

### Community Planning

Eugene is a city that plans! There is a strong tradition of community planning producing long-range and project-specific plans and planning documents. This instinct and imperative to plan opens the door to a systematic search for ways to integrate public art into urban design. Representatives of Eugene's Public Art Committee and public art staff could be assigned to participate in various planning teams to help introduce public art into the discussion.

Community leaders raise several specific opportunities and projects for public art, particularly in the city center. Public art can "lead from one special place to another special place", enliven a downtown that many observers characterize as architecturally uninteresting. Mentioned most often as projects/areas where public art can make a difference are Eugene's riverfront, the "cultural corridor" connecting downtown arts and performance venues, and "Green Streets" initiative.

### Eugene Public Library – A Model

There's wide agreement that one of Eugene's major public art projects – at the Eugene Public Library – represents a model that can be successfully replicated for the future. Local observers applaud the early consideration of public art with integration of art into the building design. Also noted are the quality and diversity of the works – prominently displayed, and inclusion of local artists along with prominent artists from outside the region. Another strength is the number of artworks chosen to appeal to a younger audience: children are important library users. Most of the art was carefully selected as a body of work, rather than piecemeal.

This formula can be repeated with good effect in the future for another major building project. However, large scale projects – a new city hall or park or administration building – don't come along very often in Eugene. Meanwhile, it may be possible to use a library-like approach unconstrained by the confines of a building. Looking across the downtown, for example, what opportunities present themselves to complement and enhance the existing collection, or make it more visible? How could the Hult Center collection be updated and upgraded in conjunction with future improvements to the performance halls and adjacent facilities?

### Percent-for-Art Funding

The standard funding source for public art programs all across the nation is "percent-for-art". This method sets aside a very small portion of budgets for capital projects – usually just one or two percent – to commission, administer and maintain public art.

Three-fourths of the hundreds of public art programs in the U.S. rely on percent-for-art funds for most of their support (providing 73% of total budgets on average). Other supplemental funding sources for public art typically include private contributions (corporations, foundations, individuals) and earned income. Programs with a percent-for-art funding base tend to be larger and faster growing.



## Eugene Public Art Plan

---

Eugene has just this type of percent-for-art funding source. A public art ordinance and percent-for-art funding have been in place in Eugene since 1981. Eugene’s percent-for-art funding is calculated on the basis of one percent (1%) of all construction and remodeling funds for public places. “Public place” is defined as *any building, park, mall or other capital construction project (but not including streets, alleys, bicycle paths, and other public thoroughfares) constructed or remodeled by the city which construction or remodeling involves in expenditure of more than \$50,000* (Ordinance No. 18849, Adopted August 10, 1981). New purchased buildings are also covered by Eugene’s percent-for-art formulas.

This definition – specifically leaving out transportation-related projects – significantly narrows the types of capital projects that contribute to the public art fund. Broadening Eugene’s percent-for-art funding source in the future to encompass a wider range of projects would increase the size of the public art fund and help stabilize public art funding from year-to-year. New buildings, parks and malls are not constructed or remodeled every year in Eugene. Transportation facilities are. (Eugene’s downtown transit center is an example).

The rationale for Eugene’s narrow percent-for-art definition is no longer clear. The omission of transportation projects is somewhat ironic. Transportation facilities – “*streets, alleys, bicycle paths and other public thoroughfares*” – provide some of the best, most visible sites for installation of public art.

As discussed earlier, cities use many different formulas to calculate their percent-for-art. National best practices now often base the percentage on a municipality’s entire capital budget. This produces a more robust funding source – and is also much easier to calculate.

Eugene’s one percent funding level also now falls behind national best practices. Most leading communities in the U.S. now earmark two percent of their capital budgets.

## IV. Public Art Plan: Vision & Priorities

### Community Vision

The City of Eugene’s goal for its public art program is to “*foster arts and the development of artists and provide experiences which enrich and better the social and physical environment.*” In creating the Public Art Plan, arts community leaders and citizens were invited to revisit this goal and express their personal vision for ways that public art can “enrich and better the social and physical environment.”

Community members who contributed to the plan envision Eugene having more public art, of higher quality, and reaching all parts of the city. Key elements of this vision include:

*Art integrated into urban design:* shaping and contributing to the design of buildings (public and private), public spaces, landscape, and everyday functional objects (from lighting fixtures to bicycle racks to manhole covers).

*Large scale pieces:* a few larger works placed at prominent locations strategically chosen so that visitors and residents will be sure to take notice.



## Eugene Public Art Plan

---

*Information:* a map and brochure, interpretive signage, history, website and photo images, walking tours and podcasts, information on artists, lecture series, and other educational materials to inform and activate the community and “tell the story”.

*Sustainable funding:* adequate resources to expand, manage and maintain Eugene’s public art collection.

*Champions:* a well organized team of committed arts community leaders and other supporters poised to serve as cheerleaders and ambassadors to help catalyze the transformation of Eugene’s public art program, enlisting new followers and fans along the way.

Other elements of the community vision for Eugene’s public art for the future:

- More two-dimensional art, greatly expanding the list of opportunity sites and opening the process to more artists
- Greater variety of art media and materials; less commemorative sculpture
- More temporary art installations; rotating sculpture exhibits; kiosks to accommodate temporary exhibits
- Interactive art projects that engage the community in the creative process
- Student-created art and public art in schools and playgrounds
- Kinetic art
- Neighborhood matching grants to inspire residents to help commission and install their own distinctive art
- Community events to spotlight public art

### Public Art Priorities

Community participation has demonstrated deep interest in making public art a priority. Policymakers, community leaders, art followers and other citizens see public art as an “image-maker” and an important complement to the significant investment the community is already making in the arts. Public art, they say, can contribute to Eugene’s ongoing efforts to revitalize the community to help “*integrate arts and culture into the fabric of Eugene’s downtown and neighborhoods*”. As an amenity appreciated by local residents and visitors alike, public art can play a role in the community’s economic vitality.

The following highlights describe key elements of the “public art program of the future” as desired by Eugene’s community leaders and citizens.

### *Eugene's Public Art Priorities*

*Priorities for Eugene's public art as defined by community leaders and citizens who participated in planning:*

- ✓ Build a public art collection of the highest quality – worthy of Eugene's notable arts and cultural offerings and significant achievements.
- ✓ Appraise Eugene's existing public art collection, inviting a panel of independent artists and public art professionals to review and critique the current body of work.
- ✓ Extend public art beyond the downtown, to new locations across the city: the airport and other gateways, parks and playgrounds, schools, walkways and bike paths.
- ✓ Forge partnerships with the University of Oregon, Lane Community College, Lane County, EWEB, and other institutions able to support and nurture public art.
- ✓ Integrate public art into community planning, looking for opportunities to make public art part of every project.
- ✓ Expand Eugene's percent-for-art funding ordinance to yield additional funds to purchase and maintain art. Seek other public and private funds to leverage public percent-for-art monies.
- ✓ Assign full-time, professional staff to manage the public art program. Organize the program under one lead department. (Most mid-size cities have a minimum of two FTE).
- ✓ Develop a program that assures ongoing maintenance and repairs for Eugene's growing public art collection.
- ✓ Improve public accessibility of Eugene's public art collection with interpretive and educational materials and methods. *Show it off!*
- ✓ Involve citizens and volunteers in all aspects of the public art program.

### Funding Strategies

The success of any community's public art program hinges on adequate, reliable funding. Ideally, Eugene's public art program will be supported through a blend of public and private funding methods and mechanisms. The objective is to create a portfolio of funding sources, which together can sustain and perpetuate the community's gradually expanding public art collection.

Funding mechanisms recommended for consideration for Eugene's public art program include:

- The current one percent-for-art program covering the City of Eugene's capital budgets for certain projects provides a shaky foundation for the public art program. One solution is to broaden the definition of eligible projects. Adding transportation projects would bring Eugene in line with many other communities. Calculating the percentage on the basis of the entire capital budget, another option, would provide the reliable pool of funds that Eugene's public art program so badly needs to move to the next level.

- Leading cities in the nation are now allocating a somewhat higher percentage of their capital budgets for public art – up to two percent. Experience in other cities has shown this additional funding is needed for curating and maintaining the public art collection, as well as purchasing and installing new artworks.
- Even with a broader definition of eligible capital projects, at increased percentages, it is possible that the percent-for-art source will still not generate enough money year-to-year to sustain ongoing program operations. In small and mid-sized cities, the percent contributions are sometimes supplemented with general fund support in the range of \$.50 to \$1 per capita. This steady funding base can then be used to administer the program, while lumpy percent-for art proceeds are allocated to purchase and maintain art.
- Incentives that encourage private development projects to dedicate a percentage of their construction costs for art could enable Eugene to leverage its modest public program.
- Financial contributions and gifts by corporations and private individuals for artworks to be displayed in public places are prominent funding sources for many public art programs. Eugene has benefitted from such contributions/gifts in the past and can continue to seek ways to leverage limited public dollars.
- Grants from private foundations, state and federal sources can also provide important resources.

It is recommended that proceeds from these various funding sources be deposited and held in Eugene’s Public Art Fund and/or another secure, designated fund for subsequent art procurement and maintenance.

### Policies & Guidelines

As Eugene’s public art program nears the 30-year mark, and significant program changes are enacted, it will be prudent for the City of Eugene to revisit the policies, procedures and guidelines currently in place. At a minimum, clear policies are needed to:

Provide for professional staffing.

Establish the Public Art Committee’s authority, duties and responsibilities for the public art program.

Authorize percent-for-art and other funding sources.

Establish a Public Art Fund to sequester and secure percent-for-art proceeds and other dedicated funds.

Develop procedures for cataloging and repairing the City’s art collection.

Define procedures for selecting and procuring new artworks.

Other peer communities have also found it necessary to adopt additional policies. Examples cover:

- Art in Private Development
- Donations and Memorials

- Re-siting and De-accessioning of Artworks
- Conflict of Interest
- Selection Panels
- Selection Criteria
- Inventory, Management, and Maintenance
- Risk and Insurance
- City Code Provisions may also need to be update to accommodate changes in Eugene’s public art program.

## V. Appendices

### Community Survey – Highlights

#### Survey Respondents

- 27% Government
- 23% Artist
- 11% Arts & culture organization
- 79% Eugene residents

#### Awareness of Public Art

- 90% Familiar/very familiar with Eugene’s public art
- Notice art most where there are concentrations:
  - 95% Downtown streets/parks
  - 94% Hult Center
  - 89% Library
- 46% Think Eugene has 101 to 500 artworks (*Good guess! Correct answer is 198.*)
- 64% Not sure if all areas/groups are adequately served
- 23% Not adequately served
  - Low income/ethnic groups/borderline neighborhoods
  - Public schools
  - Parks
  - Gateways



## Preferences

### Locations for art:

- 66% Downtown and neighborhoods
- 23% Downtown

### Favorite types of site:

- 79% Outside public buildings
- 78% Public parks
- 71% Institutions: library, museums, etc.
- 71% City streets and sidewalks
- 54% Inside public buildings
- 46% City gateways
- 44% Schools

Top priority site: downtown, parks, gateways

### Favorite types of art:

- 71% Art integrated into functional objects
- 70% Outdoor art
- 68% Sculpture
- 65% Art integrated into landscape design
- 64% Art integrated into building design

### Origin of artists:

- 55% Local artists
- 54% Pacific Northwest
- 45% All artists

### Funding sources:

- 90% Private donors
- 81% City/County government
- 79% Businesses

## Value of Public Art

- 76% Public art contributes significantly to Eugene’s vision as “World’s Greatest City of the Arts and Outdoors”

### Makes Eugene more appealing:

- 90% More/much more for residents
- 93% More/much more for visitors

## Public Participation

Best ways to inform/involve citizens:

- 78% Newspaper
- 71% Television
- 60% Website
- 56% Neighborhood associations
- 56% School classes

Want to stay involved:

- 56% Just keep me informed
- 25% Participate actively
- 19% Not that interested

Want to be kept informed?

- 42% Provided contact information

## In Their Own Words

### Sites

*Everywhere! Seriously, where SHOULDN'T public art go? (Yes, in the downtown; yes, in the neighborhoods; yes, in the LTD stops; yes, on the UO campus; yes, everywhere).*

*Along with the downtown, I like seeing public art at the airport, the Hult, and all other major areas where people congregate.*

*City gateways to suggest to visitors that Eugene is a creative city with respect for art.*

*Leave that up to the Public Art Committee.*

### Vision

*A destination for both artists and visitors who include in their reasons for planning trips.*

*Enough statues of Rosa Parks, Eugene Skinner, Ken Kesey, etc!*

*More art would make me feel the phrase "Greatest city of the arts and outdoors" was justified.*

*I'm not interested in art in front of (or in) places you can only go to in a car. Accessible art for all!*

*Like many mid-sized cities, Eugene has a dead or dying downtown. Unlike many, Eugene has not thus far seen the value in turning downtown into a cultural (and education) center.*

*Art must be as conspicuous as restaurants.*

*I am very tired of sculptures of clothed persons sitting on a bench. Art should be uplifting and imaginative.*

*The more art, the better! Art can only help to verify and beautify the community. It can also help spark community wide discussions, and stimulate thought and expression in residents and visitors.*

*The art in Eugene really needs to diversify. We have the same three artists doing all the visible public art.*

*Lots more art, focused on the downtown Art and Entertainment District.*

*It's not the '60s anymore. Keep the flavor but be sure to transition to the new century.*

*Art that inspires creativity and civic pride, a sense of Eugene as a welcoming community.*

*Art is food for the soul. I want visitors to leave feeling well fed and residents to know they never have to go hungry.*

### Advice

*Guys GET ON TWITTER. Come on. It's time. (I've already tweeted the survey today & it's been (retweeted) by others. Use the tech!)*

*The city should also have a more active partnership with the UO's art students and programs.*

*I think the "World's Greatest..." theme is a wrong vision, even a tad ridiculous. It may be aspirational, but it goes very overboard on what I think we can do in a community our size.*

*Public art is the only chance of making Eugene look nice apart from tearing down all the ugly buildings.*

*To change the culture, begin with the children. They can be our best supporters in the future.*

*Eugene is a great place to do art but a lousy place to sell it.*

*An annual art tour would be nice.*

*We moved to Eugene specifically because of the vibrant art scene and Hult Center, and have not been disappointed. Love the Eugene Ballet, all the galleries, all the free Eugene City shows in the summer, and the local theater scene. More, more, more!*

*I am disappointed by most of the art that I have experienced in Eugene and find myself looking elsewhere.*

*Don't show a lot of expensive "art objects" around town. Work on the deep structure!*

*It is more important for my family to be financially stable than to spend my wages on public art.*



## Eugene Public Art Plan

---

*I am strongly in favor of a list, guide or method for citizens and visitors to find and view our public art. I hope that the public will become interested and involved.*



BARNEY & WORTH, INC.

1211 SW FIFTH AVE, STE 1140  
PORTLAND, OREGON 97204-3732  
503/222-0146 phone 503/274-7955 fax

247 COMMERCIAL ST NE, STE 204  
SALEM, OREGON 97301-3411  
503/585-4043 phone 503/589-4165 fax

[www.barneyandworth.com](http://www.barneyandworth.com)