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ABOUT MASSINC
MassINC is an independent think tank using nonpartisan research, civic journalism, and public forums to stimulate debate and shape public policy. Our mission is to promote a public agenda for the middle class and to help all citizens achieve the American dream.

ABOUT ARTPLACE

In addition to the NEA, federal partners are the departments of Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, Agriculture, Education, and Transportation, along with leadership from the White House Office of Management and Budget and the Domestic Policy Council. Federal partners do not provide funding to ArtPlace but participate in the ArtPlace Presidents Council and Operations Committee meetings, ensuring alignment between high-priority federal investments and policy development and ArtPlace grants.
Gateway Cities are a defining feature in the Commonwealth’s social, physical, and economic fabric. Throughout our history, these older industrial communities have been at the center of the state’s regional economies, providing families climbing the economic ladder with an escalator to the middle class and entrepreneurs looking to grow their businesses with a launching pad. Unfortunately, the state’s venerable Gateway Cities have suffered in recent years. As suburbanization, manufacturing decline, and other adverse trends took their toll, some openly questioned whether these communities would have a significant role in the state’s 21st-century economy.

The struggle Gateway Cities have endured in recent years obscures the untapped potential of these communities in an economy that increasingly puts a premium on attractive, authentic, and livable communities. This has not been lost on a new generation of artists and cultural entrepreneurs, who are finding creative ways to remake these places. At a major Creative Placemaking Summit held last April in Lowell, MassINC put a spotlight on these efforts and their promise as a Gateway City growth and renewal strategy. This report presents four high-level takeaways from the Summit, succinctly summarized below:

1. Creative placemaking is a geographically targeted urban revitalization strategy, but it also supports the state’s broader economic development goal of increasing innovation and entrepreneurship throughout the Commonwealth. As Massachusetts transitions from an economy that delivers standard products and services to one that produces new innovations, there is an ever larger premium placed on individuals with unique skills. Attractive, welcoming communities can draw this talent; equally important, they can embrace the new ideas these innovators bring with them. By making Gateway Cities more appealing environments to live and work, and encouraging new thinking and civic dialogue, creative placemaking synergistically supports the Commonwealth’s drive to excel in growing innovation industries.

2. Many Gateway Cities have deployed creative placemaking strategies. Creative placemakers have devised an impressive array of programs leveraging modest resources. While far from conclusive, the data we do have are encouraging.
   - Gateway Cities have been able to do a lot with creative placemaking by practicing it in many different forms. They have brought visitors into their cities with public events and they have improved their built environments with parks and other public realm projects. They have restored theaters and expanded museums, and in a variety of ways, they have made their communities better places for cultural entrepreneurs to do business in.
   - State policies have provided crucial support for creative placemaking. The Massachusetts Cultural Council’s pioneering efforts to pursue arts-based community and economic development are most notable. But other state programs have been pivotal as well, and a number of local governments have channeled their capacity effectively by planning, zoning, and investing in creative placemaking initiatives.
• While measures of creative placemaking’s impact are still very limited, data do provide some indication that it has led to jobs that keep dollars circulating in the local economy, improved the image and brands of Gateway Cities, built social capital, and made downtowns more vibrant. . . . . . . . . . . . page 15.

3. The creative placemaking experience in Gateway Cities to date reveals both challenges and effective models. A review of these lessons can inform future initiatives. But more than anything, efforts to replicate success will require an increase in public funding to bring the creative placemaking strategy to scale. To secure these resources, creative placemakers must develop better metrics to demonstrate results. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . page 22.

4. To advance creative placemaking, leaders from Gateway Cities must coalesce as a network. Fiscal realities threaten the long-term success of creative placemaking just as it’s gaining traction. By joining together in a collaborative network, Gateway City leaders can alter this dynamic and make creative placemaking a successful growth and renewal strategy. We outline five strategic focal points and corresponding recommendations for a Gateway City Creative Placemaking Network.

- Money. Rally behind the Massachusetts Cultural Council; convince cash-strapped local governments to co-invest in efforts to get creative placemaking initiatives going; fix the Business Improvement District (BID) enabling law and get property owners excited about forming them; advocate for a federal partnership through agencies like the National Endowment for the Arts. . . . . . . page 28.
- Capacity. Make the Cultural Districts a capacity building prospect for cities with limited resources; push for transformative investments in new cultural institutions to anchor creative placemaking initiatives. . . . . . . page 28.
- Leadership. As a network, embrace the challenge of recruiting and preparing arts and cultural leaders to engage in civic life. . . . . . . page 29.
- Entrepreneurship. Promote efforts to spur entrepreneurship and provide entrepreneurs with training; play a role in efforts to connect immigrant entrepreneurs with resources and support. page 29.
- Metrics. Identify UMass faculty to lead an evaluation effort across the Gateway Cities drawing on resources from the university’s Creative Economy Fund. . . . . . . . . . . . page 30.
INTRODUCTION

Massachusetts Gateway Cities have lost the manufacturing base that once made them drivers of regional economies across the Commonwealth. To regain their footing in the state’s new innovation economy, these urban centers must first overcome difficult social and physical challenges left in the wake of industrial change. While there are no easy solutions and each city’s way forward will be unique, creative placemaking offers all of these historic urban communities one promising pathway toward growth and renewal.

Creative placemaking refers to an economic development strategy that involves deploying artistic endeavors to activate both public and private spaces. It can be as simple as a sculpture that makes a public park a more inviting place to visit, a cultural festival that draws new visitors to a neighborhood, or a small black box theater performing works by local playwrights. The strategy delivers fully on its promise in urban neighborhoods where these cultural experiences are both accessible and plentiful.

Creative placemaking’s ability to generate change begins with the direct benefits that come from simply bringing people out to visit downtowns and main streets. While harder to quantify, the social relationships forged from the highly collaborative process of building and sustaining these cultural initiatives also have real value. Creative placemaking narrowly targets a section of a neighborhood or downtown, but success can produce economic benefits that extend throughout entire regions.

Renaissance Art synthesizes what we know about creative placemaking in the Commonwealth’s Gateway Cities and beyond. Building off a dialogue that began at the MassINC Creative Placemaking Summit (see text box), it is designed to support both communities with nascent creative placemaking efforts and communities looking to build upon more mature creative placemaking strategies. The report is organized as follows:

• Section 1 spells out the argument for creative placemaking’s potential as an economic growth strategy.
• Section 2 catalogs creative placemaking efforts underway in Gateway Cities today and what we know about the economic activity they are fostering.
• Section 3 looks at the challenges Gateway Cities encounter as they work to build, sustain, and expand these efforts and strategies to overcome these obstacles.
• Section 4 presents a strategy for advancing robust creative placemaking policy through a collaborative network of Gateway City leaders.

HOW DO WE DEFINE THE GATEWAY CITIES?
MassINC identified 11 cities that drive regional economies outside of Greater Boston in a 2007 research report (Brockton, Fall River, Fitchburg, Haverhill, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford, Pittsfield, Springfield, and Worcester). The Massachusetts Legislature has since codified the term “Gateway municipality” in law with a formula that includes both demographic and economic factors. In addition to the 11 communities, the formula captures Barnstable, Chelsea, Chicopee, Everett, Leominster, Lynn, Malden, Methuen, Quincy, Revere, Salem, Taunton, and Westfield. While we limit our analysis to the 11 cities, as an economic development strategy, creative placemaking has universal appeal for all 24 of these historic urban communities.
1. Creativity: An Economic Growth Strategy

We live in an age of innovation that places a high premium on original thoughts, ideas, and expressions. Economic theorists have become fascinated with attributes of creativity that were once in the exclusive domain of the art world (see text box). While many look at creative placemaking purely as an urban revitalization tactic, this first section shows how it is also thoroughly intertwined with broader efforts in Massachusetts to build an exceptionally creative innovation economy.

Creatively Growing Gateway City Regions

From Boston to the Berkshires and from the South Coast to the Merrimack Valley, Gateway Cities lie in distinct regions competing in a global economy. To replace jobs lost in recent years to lower-cost locations, these regions must grow innovative industries that produce new ideas and processes, as opposed to routine products and services.

The growth of these innovative industries is dependent on skilled talent. In contrast to the days of stable, large-scale factory production, workers are no longer interchangeable parts. They are now highly valued individuals with specialized training. While strong education systems are critical to preparing a skilled labor force, Gateway City regions must also retain these talented workers and draw others with different experiences and new ideas from around the world.

Attracting and retaining talent means providing a high quality of life. It also means being open to newcomers with different backgrounds and accepting of the ideas they bring with them. Receptivity to new thinking can sometimes be a challenge for smaller regions where leadership often comes from those with long-established roots. But willingness to embrace new ways is now an essential quality for success. Waves of economic change came slowly in the past. Today entire industries sprout up and disappear seemingly overnight. Regions must be nimble in order to succeed.

As central places, Gateway Cities play important roles in regional leadership. They are also well positioned to draw diverse individuals. In this sense, a focus on remaking Gateway Cities as attractive, creative places that have it in their DNA to nurture new ideas will have an outsized impact on regional economies across the state.

Creative Placemaking as a Gateway City Revitalization Strategy

Keeping this big-picture regional lens in mind, we turn now to Gateway City downtowns and commercial districts, where creative placemaking must take root first as a physical revitalization strategy.

Gateway Cities have not been able to recover from the loss of industrial jobs largely because much of their built environment was designed centuries ago for manufacturers with specific needs. Reconfiguring these older industrial buildings for new uses is challenging. Because Gateway Cities haven't been able to repurpose these structures for new employers (and raw land for new buildings is extremely limited in these densely developed communities), job growth has occurred elsewhere, and Gateway City housing and retail markets suffer as a result.

Where others see only challenges, practitioners of creative placemaking, inspired by the unique look and feel of Gateway City architecture, see opportunity. They can breathe life into vacant buildings by finding new niches for restaurants, shops, and cultural organizations.

While their efforts generally produce only a modest number of jobs at first, they can attract new residents and draw new visitors to the city from surrounding communities. By competing with restaurant chains, big box stores, and multiplex cinemas for a share of regional consumer spending, these locally owned shops, cafes, and cultural organizations add a layer of urban economic activ-

“CULTURE IS AN ECONOMY”
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Equally important, this new cultural activity gives downtowns and urban neighborhoods a new form of vitality. It puts more people on the street, which reduces crime and makes communities look and feel safer.

Cities that have been at work on a creative placemaking strategy for a decade or more may still not be able to claim a home run, but their demonstrated achievements have set them up for long-term success.

Cities that once suffered internally from negative perceptions—where residents had limited faith in institutions, limited confidence in their communities, and a growing sense of helplessness—feel more optimistic about their communities' prospects. Residents of neighboring communities, accustomed to only negative perceptions and negative media portrayals, now have positive experiences to associate with these core cities.

Because creative placemaking is a collaborative effort that brings together partners from many sectors, it is also a way to reweave the social fabric that in many communities has been frayed by decades of economic decline. This benefit is particularly valuable in culturally diverse communities, where creative placemaking engages residents from different backgrounds, particularly immigrant entrepreneurs with storefront businesses. In the long term, these relationships help residents forge a common vision for their community's future—and to build the trust in each other they need to work toward a common goal.

Over time, creative placemaking can help Gateway Cities become stronger urban centers. Increasingly, professionals want to live and work in authentic and vibrant cities with walkable neighborhoods and a diverse set of cultural offerings. While many highly skilled professionals will still prefer leafy suburbs, these workers value close proximity to amenity-rich cities. If Gateway Cities succeed with creative placemaking, as described above, they'll contribute more to the state's “big picture” regional innovation strategy.

THE GATEWAY CITIES CREATIVE PLACEMAKING SUMMIT
On April 11, 2012, creative placemaking experts gathered for a full-day conference on the future of the strategy in Gateway Cities. MassINC partnered with the Massachusetts Cultural Council and the Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development to present the summit. Teams representing each Gateway City attended to share visions for creative placemaking in their communities, exchange ideas, and collect input.

John Robert Smith, president of Reconnecting America and former mayor of Meridian, Mississippi, and Anne Gadwa Nicodemus, author of a seminal study on creative placemaking for the National Endowment of the Arts, delivered formal remarks. Fitchburg Mayor Lisa Wong, Holyoke Mayor Alex Morse, New Bedford Mayor Jon Mitchell, and Worcester City Manager Michael O'Brien joined a panel on local leadership. In afternoon workshops, the cities of Fitchburg, Haverhill, Lawrence, Lowell, Lynn, and Pittsfield presented on their strategies; expert respondents joined these strategy sessions to offer input and advice.

The Gateway Cities Creative Placemaking Summit was underwritten with generous support from ArtPlace, the Parker Foundation, and MassDevelopment. Quotes from summit participants are interspersed throughout this paper. Video and other materials are available online at www.massinc.org.
Capturing Creative Placemaking’s Potential

While creative placemaking efforts take time to mature, the approach is gaining currency in part because it presents an alternative to the costly and largely ineffective revitalization model that relies on attracting new employers with subsidies. Likewise, it marks a clear departure from past efforts that involved costly physical rebuilding, but with a homogenous “Starbucks and stadia” recipe. In too many places, these tactics provided lackluster results, both in terms of building vibrancy and in providing broadly shared economic benefit.

National foundations, sensitive to the shortcomings of these approaches, have been experimenting with creative placemaking as a more comprehensive community change strategy. In 2002, the Ford Foundation launched the Shifting Sands initiative, which highlighted the power of arts-based community development as a tool for achieving social integration, civic engagement, and upward mobility. Ford Foundation grantmaking was also instrumental to the Animating Democracy initiative, an effort by Americans for the Arts to bolster the role of artists and cultural organizations in civic dialogue, particularly in changing communities.

More recently, national funders have started to advance creative placemaking as a tool for both community and economic development, but with a heavy emphasis on the regeneration of an actual place as the starting point. In 2010, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) launched the Our Town initiative, which provides $5 million in grant funding for projects specifically focused on creative placemaking. The NEA was also instrumental in the creation of ArtPlace, a collaboration of 11 major national foundations, eight government agencies, and six of the nation’s largest banks. ArtPlace issued $15.4 million in grants in 2012, and expects to make a similar level of investment again in 2013.

Massachusetts has played a prominent role in helping shape this national creative placemaking movement. The Massachusetts Cultural Council was the first state agency to award grant funding specifically for arts-based economic development. These resources spurred a number of creative placemaking efforts in the Commonwealth’s Gateway Cities that are gaining real traction.

As we’ll see in the pages that follow, the growing national momentum for creative placemaking gives Gateway Cities with established creative placemaking strategies a chance to take their work to the next level. Gateway Cities that are just getting started can also tap this national energy, along with the deep vein of experience in Massachusetts, as they embark on new creative placemaking efforts of their own.

PITTSFIELD: A CASE STUDY IN CREATIVE PLACEMAKING’S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

Since 2004, the city of Pittsfield has made creative placemaking a central part of its economic revitalization strategy. Mayor James M. Ruberto began the effort by launching an Office of Cultural Development and issuing a Downtown Arts Overlay District. The city invested over $3 million in historic buildings housing new and existing arts and entertainment venues, from the Colonial Theatre and Barrington Stage to the Beacon Cinema and the Berkshire Museum. The focus on downtown revitalization through creative placemaking has resulted in close to 50 new shops, restaurants, and cultural hotspots opening since 2005.

The payoff for Pittsfield’s investment in creative placemaking is most clearly demonstrated in the striking increase in the economic impact of the non-profit arts sector as measured in two studies conducted 5 years apart by Americans for the Arts. Between 2005 and 2010, the cultural sector’s economic impact has almost doubled in a number of key areas, including a 49 percent increase in direct economic expenditures by organizations and audiences, a 44 percent increase in the number of FTE jobs created, and a 47 percent increase in the amount of state and local government revenue generated.
CREATIVE PLACEMAKING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT THEORY

With global economic competition increasingly focused on the quest to build and maintain high-growth, high-wage innovation industries, “creativity” has become an intriguing subject for economists. Richard Florida’s 2002 book *The Rise of the Creative Class* framed the question in the context of place. According to Florida, the distinguishing factor between the winners and losers in this new economic age is the ability to attract and nurture what he calls the emerging “creative class,” which includes writers, artists, entertainers, designers, architects, software developers, scientists, and engineers. Florida argues that cities must have three T’s to attract and retain the creative class: talent, technology, and tolerance.

While widely popular, Florida’s views haven’t resonated with everyone. Ed Glaeser, the distinguished Harvard economist, has been particularly critical. Glaeser agrees that innovation has been fundamental to economic growth, but he associates it with advanced education and training. He argues that talented workers are a much more diverse bunch than bohemians sipping coffee in cafes. Glaeser believes attracting a skilled workforce is more about providing basics—good schools, a wide range of housing options, and reliable transportation—that most people see as important when they rate quality of life.

But economics is about scarcity, and other leading thinkers have recognized that part of being attractive is being different. Robert Solow, a Nobel Prize–winning growth theorist at MIT, once noted that, “...places with strong, distinctive identities are more likely to prosper than places without them. Every place must identify its strongest, most distinctive features and develop them, or run the risk of being all things to all persons and nothing special to any.”

Fortunately, this debate isn’t an either/or dilemma. Gateway Cities and their regions can work to become distinctive, tolerant, and welcoming places just as they come together to ensure that they have strong schools, housing, and transportation options.
2. Creative Placemaking Moves Gateway Cities Forward

A look at the strategy at work in Gateway Cities is an excellent way to get a better feel for creative placemaking's potential. In this section, we catalog creative placemaking efforts in these communities, call attention to the policy tools that have supported these initiatives, and summarize what we know about the contribution of these projects to Gateway City growth and renewal.

Creative Placemaking in Gateway Cities

Creative placemaking occurs in a variety of forms. To organize this scan of creative placemaking in the state’s Gateway Cities, we’ve grouped initiatives loosely into four categories: cultural programming, cultural facilities, public realm, and creative economy.

Cultural Programming Initiatives

A number of Gateway Cities have built creative placemaking efforts around cultural festivals that focus attention on local heritage. These events have been an effective strategy for increasing civic pride, supporting local artists and cultural institutions, and stimulating social and economic activity in targeted neighborhoods.

Many of the most successful examples started out with modest ambitions decades ago. The Lowell Folk Festival, which has grown to attract as many as 200,000 visitors each year, began in 1990 as an effort to boost the struggling city. New Bedford's Feast of the Blessed Sacrament, which brings over 100,000 visitors to the city's North End, stretches all the way back to 1915. According to local tradition, it was founded to fulfill a promise made by four Portuguese immigrants during a hazardous ocean crossing.

In recent years, Gateway Cities have worked to build and sustain more robust event schedules as a strategy to support local cultural businesses. The frequency and regularity of these activities range from community to community. New Bedford’s AHA! arts festival occurs on the second Thursday of every month and weekly during the summer. Pittsfield holds its First Fridays Artswalk year-round. Discover Lowell is an ongoing celebration of Lowell’s cultural community with regular events. Worcester engages hundreds of artists and tens of thousands of visitors each year with three large “stART on the Street” festivals.

Cultural Facilities Initiatives

Gateway Cities are home to architecturally rich buildings, including former churches, factories, and other historic structures that were once focal points of community activity and now sit vacant. Recognizing this unique asset, cultural entrepreneurs and grass-roots groups have worked hard to reinvent these buildings as museums, theaters, and arts centers. At varying scales, these newly renovated cultural facilities are providing anchors for community revitalization, economic activity, and community development through the arts.

Across our Gateway Cities, many small cultural organizations occupy historic buildings and have an outsized impact on their surroundings. For example, the Community Music School in Springfield has slowly renovated a historic former bank building, where they train thousands of students each year. New Bedford’s Gallery X, a nonprofit, artist-owned gallery, purchased and renovated the Hanover Theatre.
city’s First Universalist Church, built in 1855. In addition to visual arts, the gallery hosts live performances and can seat an audience of 150.

There have been a number of recent efforts to restore vacant theaters to serve as local cultural anchors with significant capacity. Pittsfield’s Colonial Theatre, closed since the 1950s, reopened in 2006. Worcester rescued Poli’s Palace Theatre (now the Hanover) after a decade of disuse. And across the Gateway Cities, active groups are working to bring more theaters back to life. In Holyoke, a citizen’s group has purchased the Victory Theater, lost to the community since 1979. New Bedford leaders are fighting to save the Orpheum Theater, which hasn’t seen patrons since 1958.

A few Gateway Cities have been the beneficiaries of large-scale anchor institutions. Lowell was the first city in the nation to host an urban National Park, dedicated to preserving cultural resources citywide. New Bedford has been the beneficiary of both a National Park and the adaptive reuse of the downtown Star department store by the University of Massachusetts–Dartmouth College of Visual and Performing Arts.

There are also notable examples outside of the 11 Gateway Cities. MASS MoCA, which opened its doors in North Adams in 1999, has become an internationally recognized model for using a large cultural organization as the primary catalyst for revitalization in a small, older industrial city. The 2003 expansion of the Peabody-Essex Museum in Salem is another case study of the transformative change large cultural institutions can fuel in a small-city context.

Public Realm Initiatives
Many public spaces in cities are underutilized because of their physical layout. Often the challenges are enormous, such as highways coursing through a neighborhood or an ill-conceived urban renewal project that makes swaths of downtown inhospitable. But in many instances, the problem is simply a trash-strewn vacant lot or a stretch of a main street designed for cars rather than people. With help from architects and landscape architects, Gateway Cities are finding creative ways to reactivate these public spaces through design.

Often the solution is a public park. The Concord River Greenway, a multiuse trail through the heart of downtown Lowell that opened in 2010, is one recent example. Gateway Park, which Fitchburg unveiled last year, is another. The Spicket River Greenway, under construction in Lawrence, is a third.

Public art is another common strategy. Often it’s an attempt to activate open space. For instance, Worcester’s “Art in the Park” includes juried, temporary installations that promote the work of talented artists and engage people in the art. The Urban Arts Institute at MassArt is currently involved in several fixed public art projects in Gateway Cities, including initiatives associated with open space in two large, mixed-use redevelopment projects: Union Crossing in Lawrence and the Hamilton Canal District in Lowell. Both these efforts, which evolved through a master planning process, look to make public spaces more inviting through creative design.

Working with transportation planners and engineers, cities can make their public spaces more
inviting to the types of activity creative placemaking aims to achieve. This approach is slowly taking root in Gateway Cities. Springfield, for example, worked with the Project for Public Spaces to incorporate design concepts that add active use to the city’s recently unveiled tornado rebuilding plan. With organizations like the Massachusetts Department of Transportation, the Massachusetts Smart Growth Alliance, and WalkBoston promoting public realm concepts such as Complete Streets in communities around the state, this approach is gaining traction.9

Creative Economy Initiatives
Many Gateway Cities are working to build cultural industries, a component of the larger creative economy cluster, by attracting and supporting artists and other cultural entrepreneurs. These efforts take several forms.

The most direct focus on building markets for cultural products and services. In Pittsfield, the nonprofit Storefront Artist Project helped local artists find places to create their work by collaborating with downtown property owners with vacant commercial space. Lowell has experimented with a range of strategies, including the “Buy Art! Buy Lowell!” campaign and Destination World, an effort to support food and other cultural products offered by immigrant entrepreneurs. Creative Haverhill hosts a holiday pop-up show giving local artists a venue to sell their work. The Worcester Cultural Coalition’s WOO Card helps groups market their programming to a wider audience, including 12,000 local college students, who receive the card and the discounts it provides free of charge.

In addition to these market-making activities, cities are working to provide cultural entrepreneurs with seed capital and technical assistance. For example, in 2008, Mass MoCA and several partners launched Assets for Artists, a program offered throughout the Berkshires and in Lowell that combines financial education with matched savings accounts. The New Bedford Economic Development Council makes microloans to cultural entrepreneurs. Worcester is currently working on a program that will offer cultural businesses low-interest rate financing. In partnership with the Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts, Pittsfield has provided a form of participatory technical assistance with a series of “Tricks of the Trade” roundtables.

A third creative economy strategy is attracting creative entrepreneurs and helping them find productive work environments with live-work artist housing. In 1998, Lowell rezoned formerly industrial areas with an Artist Overlay District. This relatively mundane zoning change caught the attention of artists. Hundreds migrated to the city to open studios, and two mills within the district were renovated for live-work artist housing (Appleton Mills Apartments and Western Avenue Studios). In New Bedford, artists converted the Ropeworks mill into New Bedford’s first live-work space. The city has also been working to implement a recommendation in its 2010 master plan by repurposing more mill buildings for live-work artist housing.

Key Pillars of Support for Creative Placemaking in State and Local Policy
After surveying the many creative placemaking initiatives Gateway Cities have built over the last decade, the obvious question to ask is, how did all of this come about? Gateway Cities have wielded state, local, and national resources to get their creative placemaking strategies off the ground.

State Policy
Massachusetts Cultural Council (MCC) grants. The Cultural Council’s modest Adams Grant program has provided the seed capital for projects and organizations leading the charge for creative placemaking.
Gateway Cities, including AHA!, Creative Haverhill, Cultural Pittsfield, and the Worcester Cultural Coalition. MCC operating support grants give nonprofit cultural organizations, which sustain many creative placemaking efforts across the state, a resource to support programming. In Gateway Cities where philanthropic resources are limited, these grants provide a vital lifeline. While the MCC has clearly been critical to the success that Gateway Cities have had with creative placemaking, its state appropriation has been cut in half over the last decade, falling from $19 million in 2002 to just $9 million in 2012.

**Cultural Facilities Fund.** The Cultural Facilities Fund has supported the development of new spaces to feature performing arts and other creative programming in Gateway Cities. Examples include the construction of the new performance space at the Community Music School in Springfield and the Barrington Stage’s Union Street Theatre in Pittsfield.

Less visible but equally critical, the Cultural Facilities Fund has also helped older cultural institutions maintain their physical infrastructure. The Fuller Craft Museum in Brockton, the Zeiterion Theatre in New Bedford, the Memorial Auditorium in Lowell, and the EcoTarium in Worcester are among the many beneficiaries of grants to complete critical but difficult-to-finance maintenance projects. The Cultural Facilities Fund was created in 2006. The most recent capital budget appropriation to the Fund was $5 million, made in 2012. To date, the Fund has made more than 300 grants totaling $50 million.

**State Historic Tax Credits.** The historic tax credit has also been essential for the revival of theaters, including the Hanover ($5.2 million) and the Colonial ($1.6 million). In Lowell, these resources supported the development of live-work artist housing. Enacted in 2003 with an annual allocation of $10 million, the program grew to $15 million the following year. In 2006, the Legislature increased the credit to $50 million annually. A provision in pending legislation would raise the cap once again, bringing the total resources available up to $60 million annually.

**Gateway Cities Parks Program.** These flexible funds for parks, greenways, and park facilities can be used for planning, site assessment, cleanup, and acquisition, as well as design and construction. The program has supported open space projects with a heavy creative placemaking bent, such as the Spicket River Greenway in Lawrence. The state awards approximately $7 million annually to

---

**Figure 2: A Timeline of Gateway City Creative Placemaking Programs and Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Lowell National Historical Park created</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>MCC creates Adams Grant</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Pittsfield’s Colonial Theater Reopens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>First Lowell Folk Festival</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>First AHA! Night held in New Bedford</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Lowell opens Concord River Greenway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Gallery X purchases New Bedford’s First Universalist Church</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Pittsfield creates office of Cultural Development</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Fitchburg opens Gateway Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Legislature creates State Historic Tax Credit</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Legislature creates Cultural Facilities Fund</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Construction begins on Lawrence Spicket River Greenway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gateway City projects through this fund.

**MassWorks Grants.** MassWorks is the state’s major infrastructure investment program. Recent legislation consolidates a number of legacy funding programs into this single stream. For Gateway Cities, these resources will be critical to advancing placemaking projects. New Bedford has already been a beneficiary, receiving $1.2 million in the first round of funding for streetscape improvements in the city’s North End. The grant will support New Bedford’s effort to foster a bustling “international marketplace” in this older commercial district. MassWorks will have approximately $50 million annually to award. While most of these funds will support large, core-infrastructure investments, forward-thinking Gateway Cities may find openings to access these funds opportunistically for creative placemaking initiatives.

**Cultural Districts.** Cultural districts can attract and concentrate arts programming in a geographic area, improving the visitor experience and helping organizations co-market their offerings. The Legislature passed a bill empowering the Massachusetts Cultural Council to create cultural districts in 2010, and after a competitive process, the MCC designated the first five districts last April. While cultural district designation is not currently associated with funding, as the program matures there is potential to use this framework to strategically target state assistance. For example, the state Senate is currently considering legislation that would allow cultural districts to apply for MassWorks infrastructure grants.

**Creative Economy Initiatives.** Governor Patrick signed a law in 2008 forming the Massachusetts Creative Economy Council, an advisory committee to both the Legislature and the Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development. Also in 2008, Massachusetts became the first state in the nation to appoint a creative economy industry director. Pending legislation aims to reinforce this effort by allowing for the formation of a Creative Economy Network to be led by the industry director. The network will be empowered to raise private funds to advance creative economy planning and development efforts.

**Local Policy Planning.** Over the last decade there has been a flurry of planning activity in Gateway Cities around both the creative economy and creative placemaking. These efforts have provided a very positive contribution. In 2007, the Berkshire Economic Development Corporation devised a region-wide creative economy strategy. That same year the Lowell Plan, a nonprofit economic development organization, produced a Cultural Plan for the city of Lowell, and the New Bedford Economic Development Council established a creative economy task force. This task force visited communities throughout New England...
and developed recommendations for the city's 2010 master plan.

**Zoning Overlay Districts.** Many Gateway Cities, including Fall River, Lowell, New Bedford, Pittsfield, and Worcester, have thoughtfully employed their zoning powers to advance creative placemaking. The most common approach is to allow residential occupancy in areas zoned for industrial and commercial use so that artists can develop live-work space. Arts district overlays also regulate signage and the use of public space for street performers, art installations, sidewalk cafes, and vendors.

**Cultural Offices.** A number of Gateway Cities have full-time staff in citywide cultural organizations. Worcester has employed a cultural development officer in the city's Executive Office for Economic Development since 2000. The current officer also serves as the executive director of the Worcester Cultural Coalition, a public-private partnership with the city of Worcester. Similarly, Lowell established the Office of Cultural Affairs & Special Events (CASE) in 2008 in the city manager's office. This office shares a director with the Cultural Organization of Lowell (COOL), an affiliated nonprofit. In New Bedford, this work has been staffed by both the New Bedford Economic Development Council, a quasi-public economic agency, and AHA!, an independent nonprofit organization. Pittsfield established an office of Cultural Development in 2004. The office is led by a direct report to the mayor.

**Community Development Block Grants.** Many cities devote a portion of their federal block grants to creative placemaking efforts. Lowell and Pittsfield, for example, invested CDBG dollars to capitalize the Assets for Artists initiative. Lowell also contributed CDBG funds to the construction of the Western Avenue Artist Studios. These flexible resources can be used for a range of activities, from providing support for cultural facilities, to making low-interest loans to artists and cultural organizations, to financing public realm enhancements such as landscaping, streetscaping, and facade improvements.

**HOME Funds.** Federal HOME funds for affordable housing are awarded to Gateway Cities as a block grant. Lowell used these funds to support the construction of Appleton Mills live-work artist housing.

**The Impact of Creative Placemaking in Gateway Cities**

With all of this focus and investment on creative placemaking, it’s important to get a better sense of the extent to which these efforts are contributing to growth and renewal. While it’s still early to fully substantiate the value of creative placemaking as a Gateway City growth and renewal strategy, below we examine different dimensions of creative placemaking’s impact for signs of success.

**Growing local and regional economies**

The accounting is far from complete, but it’s possible to get a sense of the impact that cultural industries have on the economies of Gateway Cities and their regions.

Gateway City museums, theaters, and other cultural institutions create a lot of economic activity by spending, both on their own payrolls and through contractual services to support their work. This cultural spending also has a “multiplier effect” as it circulates throughout Gateway Cities and their regions.

The multipliers are particularly large when cultural activities draw patrons (and their money) from outside the regional economy. The multiplier effect is also stronger when local residents substitute local cultural purchases for spending on items less connected to the local economy (i.e., attending a live performance vs. viewing a Hollywood film at a national theater chain).

Analysis from the Center for Creative Community Development (C3D) at Williams College gives a sense of how this multiplier effect translates into a job creation engine for Gateway Cities and their regions. For example, they find that the Colonial Theatre in Pittsfield, which employs 76 workers directly, also generates 15 full-time positions in the regional economy indirectly. With 173 employees, the Worcester Museum is able to spin off another 75
jobs in the regional economy. Because the Worces-
ter museum draws a higher proportion of visitors
from outside the region (40 percent vs. 17 percent),
its employment multiplier is about double that of
the Colonial.

The New England Foundation for the Arts pro-
vides C3D’s economic impact data aggregated for
communities across the state. These figures show
that cultural organizations in the 11 Gateway Cit-
ties spent approximately $115 million in 2003. They
employed nearly 2,500 workers directly, which indi-
rectly supported an additional 1,500 full-time jobs.
These numbers, based on data reported to the IRS,
almost certainly underestimate the direct contribu-
tion of the arts.

More recent state employment figures provide
a more complete picture, suggesting that art and
entertainment industries support 4,600 full- and
part-time positions in Gateway Cities. Applying
C3D’s multiplier, this translates into a direct and
indirect economic impact of more than 7,300 jobs.

While these figures give us a feel for the eco-
nomic contribution of nonprofit cultural organiza-
tions, they tell us little about the other varieties of
creative placemaking that these institutions help
support, such as the hundreds of festivals that take
place throughout Gateway Cities each year. The
majority of these cultural events have been thought-
fully shaped to support local businesses (as opposed
to traveling festivals provided by national operators
that extract dollars from local economies).

The best example we have of an analysis of the
economic impact of these local cultural events is of
New Bedford’s AHA! Program, completed by UMass–
Dartmouth’s Center for Policy Analysis in 2009. This
study found that roughly two-thirds of AHA! partici-
pants patronized a downtown restaurant and just
over half shopped at a downtown retail establish-
ment. This amounted to $734,719 pumped into the
local economy, enough to support roughly eight
full-time workers.

This is a fairly small direct impact, but it could
make a difference for locally owned businesses
that often survive on tight margins. If this spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ($ MILLIONS)</th>
<th>DIRECT EMPLOYMENT IMPACT</th>
<th>INDIRECT &amp; INDUCED EMPLOYMENT IMPACT</th>
<th>TOTAL EMPLOYMENT IMPACT</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT MULTIPLIER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>$3.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg</td>
<td>$2.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverhill</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoke</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>$12.6</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>$7.6</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$35.5</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>$33.4</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities</td>
<td>$114.9</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Center for Creative Community Development estimates provided by the New England Foundation for the Arts

Figure 3: Economic Impact of Cultural Organizations in Gateway Cities, 2003
does, in fact, keep these businesses viable, then we can attribute significantly more impact to the existence of cultural events.

In this sense, cultural events complement creative economy campaigns that promote day-to-day discretionary spending at locally owned businesses. “Buy local” efforts, such as the Cultural Organization of Lowell’s “Buy Art. By Lowell.” campaign, attempt to keep dollars circulating in the local economy. While these initiatives haven’t been rigorously evaluated in Massachusetts, studies elsewhere suggest they could make a significant contribution to economic growth.14 Nationally, peer-reviewed research shows that, all things being equal, residents living in communities with more small local businesses tend to see their incomes rise faster than do other communities.15

Perhaps the greatest void in our understanding of the contribution of these placemaking activities is what, if any, impact they have on the state’s creative economy writ large. Some argue that creative places have limited interaction with the growth of other industry clusters. But others believe there is significant overlap, and that vibrant urban places are essential to attracting the workers and entrepreneurs that drive all these sectors.

**Catalyzing reinvestment**

Less is known about creative placemaking’s overall impact on reinvestment in Gateway Cities. In communities like New Bedford, change is tangible. In just the past few years, 30 new businesses have opened in the downtown area, and over $55 million has been spent renovating more than 500,000 square feet of commercial space.16 While it seems almost certain that New Bedford’s AHA! programming—combined with efforts to build the city’s cultural spaces (i.e., the Whaling National Historic Park) and locating UMass–Dartmouth’s College of Visual and Performing Arts downtown—had a major role in revitalization, it is difficult to tease out the contribution of any single activity. It is particularly challenging in a place like Lowell, which has enjoyed an equally impressive downtown transfor-

---

**Figure 4: Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation Employment, Second Quarter 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ESTABLISHMENTS</th>
<th>TOTAL WAGES</th>
<th>AVERAGE MONTHLY EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>AVERAGE ANNUAL PAY PER JOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,289,293</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>$20,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1,217,455</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>$19,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$768,344</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>$17,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverhill</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$2,399,928</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>$15,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoke</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$579,309</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>$13,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$148,450</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$29,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$3,823,902</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>$34,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$1,794,525</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>$20,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$2,720,313</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>$19,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$4,350,070</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>$25,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$8,503,892</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>$24,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$25,595,481</td>
<td>4,601</td>
<td>$22,252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MA Department of Labor and Workforce Development
C3D has tried to disentangle the impact of cultural organizations from other influences on property values. In a rigorous study, they found that for a combined sample of 11 Massachusetts communities (including three Gateway Cities), cultural activity has a statistically significant and positive effect on residential property values. Using similar techniques, they estimate that cultural industries currently increase property values in Gateway Cities by 14 percent, or about $21,500, on average. For the 11 Gateway Cities combined, this equates to nearly $100 million in property tax collections. While this figure is an interesting starting point, it is fairly imprecise, given the incomplete data and small sample sizes.

**Building social capital and improving city image**

The most interesting data with respect to creative placemaking’s impact on community relationships and spirit come from a poll conducted by MassINC last December. The survey found that one-third of recent event attendees met someone with whom they later became friends. Participating in cultural events and meeting new neighbors appears to improve how residents view their cities. Among Gateway City residents who attended an event and made at least one new friendship, 82 percent provided a positive assessment of their city’s quality of life, compared with less than half (46 percent) of residents who had not attended a cultural event.

Survey results also show that creative placemaking may be improving the image of these cities in their regions. In Lowell, New Bedford, and Pittsfield—all Gateway Cities with established creative placemaking efforts—the gap between how positively residents view their city and how they perceive that outsiders view their city is just 15 percentage points. This gap is 22 percentage points in Gateway Cities without strong creative placemaking initiatives.

A 2008 survey conducted among New Bedford AHA! Night participants provides some backing for the MassINC poll’s image-building findings. In this survey, 82 percent of respondents said they had a more positive perception of downtown New Bedford after attending the event.

While these poll results are promising, we know relatively little about the direct contribution creative placemakers have made to civic capacity. A better understanding of how those involved in these
efforts are contributing their training and energy to the community apart from their arts-based efforts, such as running for public office and serving on boards and committees, would be helpful.

**Increasing vibrancy**

Vibrancy is the most direct indicator of creative placemaking. Efforts that make urban places more vibrant will almost certainly produce the positive economic impacts we aim to achieve. One basic measure of vibrancy is the number of residents and jobs per acre. Unfortunately, this index has held fairly steady over the last decade, due in large part to the Great Recession. One way to distinguish between the success of creative placemaking and larger macroeconomic trends is to look at smaller geographies and at businesses associated with cultural vitality (i.e., the growth of arts and entertainment businesses and the bars, restaurants, and cafes that should be the first spinoff from their success). Lowell’s achievements in this regard are clear in the data. Over the last decade, along with 1,500 new residents, the ZIP Code covering downtown gained 17 new creative businesses.\(^{21}\)
CREATIVE ECONOMY: COOL IN LOWELL

In 2007, the Lowell Plan, a nonprofit economic development organization, and the Cultural Organization of Lowell (COOL), a city-affiliated nonprofit arts development organization, funded City of World Culture: Strategies for the Creative Economy in Lowell to lay out a plan for building a strong creative economy over the next two decades. The report focused on five primary goals: strengthening Lowell's cultural organizations and artists, enhancing the city and region's cultural product, promoting creative business development, building the next generation of cultural leaders, and improving city marketing and branding.

Following the roadmap laid out in the report, COOL and its partners have undertaken a variety of measures to advance these primary goals. Since 2005, Discover Lowell has been COOL’s flagship creative placemaking program, but the organization has recently expanded its efforts to include creative economy initiatives that more directly address the concerns outlined in the report, particularly in the areas of business and workforce development. These new events, programs, and resources form a strong support system for local creative businesses by assisting them in developing effective business strategies, facilitating collaboration among creative workers, offering financial tools, and providing free marketing and retail space.

COOL’s website offers an array of resources for Lowell’s arts community and creative businesses with a comprehensive directory of the city’s creative businesses, cultural organizations, museums, and cultural offerings.

In addition to serving as an informational resource, COOL has organized key programs to support a strong creative economy, such as unPanel, COOL Bus, COOL Pop-Up Galleries, and Assets for Artists. The unPanel networking and idea-sharing event provides a formal venue for creative workers to discuss best practices for building and expanding creative businesses. The COOL Bus is an in-your-face traveling shop for local creative products. COOL is also using Pop-Up Galleries to provide artists with the opportunity to turn empty storefronts into public art galleries, exhibitions, and performance centers. The new pop-up galleries will not only increase downtown foot traffic, but will also give artists an outlet to exhibit their work and reach new customers.
BUILDING VIBRANCY: CREATIVE PLACEMAKING STRATEGIES FOR GATEWAY CITY GROWTH AND RENEWAL

CULTURAL FACILITIES: THE HANOVER THEATRE, WORCESTER

In 2008, the Worcester Center for the Performing Arts (WCPA) opened the Hanover Theatre in downtown Worcester. The theater owes its revival to two performing arts enthusiasts, Ed Madaus and Paul Demoga, who acknowledged the lack of a theater capable of supporting Broadway shows and the possibility of a formerly majestic (but then poorly maintained) theater in Worcester filling that void.

The historic building, built in 1904, went dark in the late 1990s. In 2002, the WCPA purchased the building and started making its vision a reality. The WCPA received capital from a variety of private and government organizations to fund the $31 million renovation. The MCC Cultural Facilities Fund awarded the project a $675,000 capital grant, and MassDevelopment provided a $25,000 predevelopment loan, as well as a $300,000 development loan. The project also partnered with the Nonprofit Finance Fund and Commonwealth National Bank to attain loans totaling $2.35 million.

The theater officially opened in 2008, with seating for 2,300, and has since been a successful venue for Broadway plays, nationally recognized performers, and family-oriented shows. In its first three years of operation, the Hanover Theatre has drawn an estimated 600,000 patrons who not only support the theatre's life, but have also sparked business growth for surrounding restaurants, hotels, and retail shops.

Operating on a budget of $6.5 million, the theater employs 15 full-time and 250 part-time staff in addition to the jobs for performers, stagehands, stage managers, designers, musicians, and directors needed for each performance. Although no comprehensive economic impact analysis has yet been done on the Hanover Theatre, it is estimated that the theater generates $40 million annually in direct and indirect spending, jobs, property values, and taxes.

CULTURAL PROGRAMMING: AHA! NEW BEDFORD

When New Bedford was a prosperous industrial community, families congregated downtown, paycheck in hand, every Thursday night for eating, drinking, shopping, and socializing. Over the decades, the flow of families gathering downtown on Thursdays ebbed along with the city's industrial economy.

A decade ago, a group of civic leaders resolved to bring back the downtown tradition with “AHA! Nights.” AHA!—which stands for Art, History, and Architecture—is a free event held on the second Thursday of every month. A wide range of performers and artists present their work, partnering with downtown museums, galleries, cultural organizations, retailers, and restaurants.

In its most recent impact evaluation of AHA!, the Center for Policy Analysis at UMass–Dartmouth found that roughly two-thirds of event participants patronized a downtown restaurant, and just over half shopped at a retail establishment. This spending has a total economic impact exceeding $700,000 annually. For every dollar spent by AHA!, 2.5 dollars were created in the local economy.

These dollars have clearly been an important part of the rejuvenation of downtown New Bedford. Since the program’s inception, over 30 new downtown businesses have opened (10 choose an AHA! Night to launch). These new businesses have generated $55 million in improvements to over 500,000 square feet of downtown commercial space.

Richard Florida’s recent ranking of New Bedford as the seventh most artistic city in the US, based on the community’s concentration of self-identified artists, is another testament to the event’s contribution.
3. Building and Sustaining Creative Placemaking in Gateway Cities

The creative placemaking experience to date in Massachusetts and beyond provides lessons about the obstacles to creative placemaking that we can try to counter, as well as the qualities of creative placemaking done right that we can look to emulate. This section distills these experiences for Gateway City leaders and policymakers. After looking at the good and bad of creative placemaking, we offer a few points on measuring success, a defining issue with regard to the long-term sustainability of public support for creative placemaking.

Creative Placemaking Hurdles

Creative Placemaking, an authoritative look at the experience of cities nationally, was produced by the Mayors’ Institute on City Design and reveals challenges that initiatives commonly confront. Gateway City leaders looking to launch new initiatives or build a supportive policy climate for creative placemaking should pay careful attention to five obstacles to local initiatives that have been particularly stubborn:

1. Assembling adequate financing

As focus and attention grows on creative placemaking as a potent growth and renewal strategy, demand has grown for scarce resources. The economic downturn has accentuated this problem. Direct funding from the Massachusetts Cultural Council has been reduced by more than 50 percent since 2002, and local governments also have significantly less capacity to support cultural programs. Between 2009 and 2012, non-school state aid to Gateway Cities fell by more than one-third, taking $122 million out of their budgets. Accounting for inflation, federal CDBG funds have declined by more than 50 percent over the last decade. For Gateway Cities, this means nearly $25 million less annually for discretionary spending. Federal earmarks, which have supported both capital campaigns (e.g., the Barrington Stage in Pittsfield) and direct programming (e.g., the Whaling Museum in New Bedford) have disappeared altogether.

These extreme resource challenges mean that even when city governments take the lead on a well-conceived placemaking plan and deliberately build private sector support for the initiative, they often can’t find the modest resources to carry out a project. In this difficult environment, arts organizations are also facing new challenges securing resources at prior levels from philanthropy. Many of their most dedicated funders have been forced to triage grantmaking to organizations delivering human services.

Even in a healthy economic climate, artists and cultural organizations with growing capital needs aren’t well served by financial markets. This is because they are generally the first movers, adaptively reusing space designed for other purposes. Lenders have no way to assess the market, which makes it difficult to determine risk. And many cultural entrepreneurs that could have a hand in revitalizing distressed real estate markets can’t access the resource of less risk-averse, mission-driven community development lenders, who often restrict their financing to nonprofits or low-income individuals.

2. Forging and sustaining partnerships

The ability to break down barriers between communities is one of the most powerful contributions of creative placemaking, but in order for this to happen, there must be some basic level of trust or a neutral convener. In many communities, neither exists. In other communities, there maybe plenty of goodwill, but there isn’t an obvious organization with sufficient capacity to facilitate and grow a collaborative placemaking effort. In Lowell and New Bedford, the National Park Service was an important early-stage go-between because of the resources and independence it brought to the community. Lowell and New Bedford have also had the talent and stability of state university campuses. Unfortunately, many Gateway Cities have yet to find an organization that will serve as a sturdy bridge.
3. Ensuring maintenance and sustainability
Maintaining both the physical and social infrastructures needed for creative placemaking is difficult. Arts organizations can run capital campaigns to support new buildings, but raising funds for maintenance is harder, and thin operating revenues mean that organizations are often forced to defer needed improvements and repairs. Fortunately, Massachusetts has a cultural facilities fund that ameliorates this problem by specifically providing resources for maintenance and capital improvements.

On the social side, however, the environment is more challenging for Gateway Cities. Creative placemaking efforts often rely on charismatic leadership. Transferring this energy and know-how can be difficult when founders are ready to pass the baton. It is particularly challenging when established nonprofit organizations are constantly struggling to raise funds for continued operation. The cuts at the Massachusetts Cultural Council and at local levels have exacerbated this problem in recent years.

In the other parts of the US, many cities address the need for sustainable revenue with special assessments on property owners in cultural districts. These funds can provide steady resources for programming and marketing that benefit owners in the district. But Gateway Cities have a difficult time utilizing this tool. The state’s Business Improvement District (BID) legislation, which allows cities to put these special assessments before property owners for a vote, is weak because it allows owners to simply opt out. This creates unpredictability and severely limits the potential of BIDs in Massachusetts.

4. Clearing regulatory hurdles
Well-meaning leaders in the cultural community frequently come up against complex and seemingly arcane regulatory issues. Local governments in Gateway Cities are generally friendly and open to those who bring ideas for positive change. Zoning and other restrictive ordinances will typically succumb to a good idea with some persistence. But other issues are more formidable. Use limitations on contaminated land, for instance, require expensive mitigation and a lengthy approval process. Many Gateway City creative placemaking efforts have also had to contend with historic district regulations. While these bylaws contribute significantly to maintaining a community’s cultural heritage, they can at times become a barrier for creative entrepreneurs.
5. Developing metrics of performance

Measuring the success of creative placemaking is critical to building and maintaining support from both public and private investors in community change. Data are equally important to the financial community looking to identify opportunities, measure market demand, and evaluate risk. While the New England Foundation for the Arts and the Massachusetts Cultural Council provide good data on the output and economic impact of organizations in these communities, less is known about their direct contribution to neighborhood revitalization. In contrast to larger cities, there are no third-party providers collecting basic data on rents. To really understand what triggered a change in values, it is helpful to have data on repeat sales of the same property. However, even when these data are available, producing definitive findings can be tricky because Gateway City markets often have relatively few transactions to analyze.

Overcoming the Barriers

Case studies in the Mayors’ Institute on City Design’s Creative Placemaking study also reveal six features that make initiatives successful. Gateway Cities looking to overcome the barriers will find a quick review of these qualities informative:

1. Creative initiators

In small communities, the mayor is often the civic champion who builds energy for creative placemaking, as Creative Placemaking Summit participants heard so forcefully from John Robert Smith, the former mayor of Meridian, Mississippi. Here in Massachusetts, the record of Pittsfield’s former mayor James Ruberto demonstrates the power of an effective CEO leading the effort on behalf of city government.

But it doesn’t have to be a mayor. Many entrepreneurial creative placemaking initiatives begin with a bold individual with a distinctive vision and the determination to act. These creative initiators are particularly critical when it comes to assuming the risk associated with acquiring and renovating real estate. John Aubin made a bold statement with the development of Open Square, at a former paper mill in Holyoke, for creative businesses; Norman and Adam Buck sent a similar signal with the successful redevelopment of the New Bedford Rope works Building to live-work artist housing.

In other successful communities, efforts have been fueled by a series of visionaries from different spheres. For example, Lowell has seen leadership from planners (Paul Marion and Colin McNeice), elected officials (former city councilor Grady Mulligan), and public officials (Rosemary Noon).

2. Designing around distinctiveness

As noted earlier, too many cities have employed the “Starbucks and stadia” recipe that overlooked their most distinctive and valuable asset. Often they made big bets on projects that did little to establish an authentic and attractive brand to anchor revitalization. Creative placemaking is a marked departure from this model. Successful projects like the National Parks in Lowell and New Bedford tap into a community’s history and culture. And they identify distinctive physical assets, such as harbors, canals, and parks, and work to make them a destination for creative energy.

3. Mobilizing public will

While part of the power of creative placemaking is the leverage a web of motivated collaborative partners can provide with public dollars, success requires real engagement from government. City agencies need to be responsive, and mayors/city managers and city council leaders must serve as both champions and reliable co-investors who market their city’s potential, advance bold new approaches by putting public resources at risk, and leverage transportation and infrastructure funds in ways that facilitate creative placemaking. By bringing high-level staff directly into economic development agencies, Lowell and Worcester have signaled their serious commitment to creative placemaking.
The state and federal government are also essential partners. For small to midsize communities like the Gateway Cities, it is vital to have a high-performing agency like the Massachusetts Cultural Council providing support and technical assistance in addition to grant resources.

4. Garnering private sector support
With real engagement from public sector leaders, the private sector is more likely to take a second look at proposals from artists and cultural entrepreneurs and find innovative ways to finance these projects. In Lowell and Pittsfield, the city government’s drive to capitalize on the potential of creative placemaking has attracted millions of dollars in investment from local banks. In addition to financing, local banks have become a valued partner with corporate sponsorships to support cultural programming.

Creative placemakers can also engage philanthropy and encourage those accustomed to investing in traditional cultural institutions, as well as foundations that traditionally invest in education and other community development projects, to support a blend of art-based community development that contributes to the long-term regeneration of place.

As featured at the Creative Placemaking Summit, entrepreneurial cities find unorthodox ways to engage the private sector. Market Basket’s contribution to sculptor Gillian Christy’s *Pathways* public art project in Fitchburg is a great example of the kinds of synergies communities can bring about with strong private sector support.

5. Securing arts community engagement
Artists aren’t always present or eager to take on the local revitalization cause. Cities where artists aren’t abundant need to attract them. The Paducah Artists Relocation Program, in Kentucky, is a nationally renowned example of a city drawing creative entrepreneurs with its unique and affordable housing stock. Attracting artists who have been priced out of gentrifying neighborhoods in other cities is another strategy. The Revolving Museum, for example, was recruited successfully by Lowell from Boston’s changing Fort Point neighborhood.

There are also many model strategies from our Gateway Cities for eliciting leadership from the creative community in broader growth and renewal initiatives, including the Worcester Wayfinding Project and Pittsfield’s “Tricks of the Trade” roundtables, both mentioned earlier.

6. Building partnerships
Artists bring entrepreneurial talent, community organizations understand grass-roots change, developers know buildings, financial institutions and foundations have resources, and political leaders can convene and problem-solve. Uniting these groups is both the challenge and the opportunity of creative placemaking. Gateway Cities need not look much beyond Massachusetts to find models that work. Cultural Pittsfield, the Cultural Organization of Lowell, and the Worcester Cultural Coalition have all demonstrated successful structures to build and sustain broad-based partnerships.
Measuring Success
As noted above, developing strong metrics to measure success is a challenge all creative placemakers have encountered individually. To become a serious economic development strategy that attracts sustained public investment, creative placemaking must find ways to compile standardized and reliable performance measures. While this will be challenging, leaders are investing considerable energy and effort to help develop these measurement models.

The first priority is to clearly delineate the outcomes creative placemaking is working to accomplish. This is complicated by the many forms in which the strategy is implemented and the multiple goals it seeks to achieve. ArtPlace has encouraged grantees to focus on vibrancy, first by carefully documenting “10 signals of momentum” and ultimately demonstrating that efforts have brought new jobs, residents, and value to an area. The NEA’s impact hypotheses for the Our Town initiative looks at four outcomes concerned with both economic growth and the prosperity of the arts community.

Academic researchers, including the Center for Creative Community Development (C3D) at Williams College and the Social Impact of the Arts Project (SIAP) at the University of Pennsylvania, are pioneering rigorous evaluation methods. While they aren’t as focused on place, indicators of cultural vitality (such as the regional measures produced by the Urban Institute) may also provide ideas for replication.

“In addition to collecting data to demonstrate success, establishing an evaluation process at the outset will help creative placemaking efforts focus on the outcomes they are trying to achieve and the logic model that will bring about change. Grounding efforts in this concrete analytical framework is important because the pathways to change are complex—particularly as they relate to the interaction of regional creative economy cluster strategies, intended to create jobs, with placemaking efforts intended to stimulate revitalization in targeted geographic spaces.

“THERE IS NO REASON THAT PEOPLE IN THE ARTS CANNOT BE LEADERS”
— LISA WONG, MAYOR OF FITCHBURG
CREATIVE PLACEMAKING SUCCESS IN SMALL TO MIDSIZE CITIES

Syracuse, NY: Clinton Square
In 1999, Project for Public Spaces helped the city of Syracuse reopen a historic and once-bustling square that became underutilized after a busy boulevard bisected it. The square is now a popular destination for residents and visitors, hosting festivals, concerts, farmers’ markets, and ice skating. The reconfiguration has decreased air pollution and stimulated economic development, with new businesses and housing units springing up throughout the surrounding neighborhood.31

Paducah, KY: Artists Relocation Program
In 2000, a mayor and an artist came together to fashion a highly successful neighborhood revitalization program. Paducah invites artists to apply for the titles of city-owned properties for as little as $1. Artists must submit both a business plan and a redevelopment proposal. The city makes grants of $2,500 per artist to cover predevelopment costs, and a local bank provides low-interest loans. In the targeted neighborhood, artists have rehabilitated 80 properties and constructed 10 new buildings.32

San Jose, CA: Creative Entrepreneur Project
A collaborative program of the city and the nonprofit Center for Cultural Innovation, the Creative Entrepreneur Project (CEP) aims to help artists increase their income by providing training, an online small creative business resource guide, and a creative business component in its workforce development program. CEP is driven by a steering committee with successful entrepreneurs, developers, architects, and city officials. The program has signaled the community’s support for arts-based economic development, and it has successfully spawned a number of innovative new enterprises.33

Denton, TX: 35 Denton
Denton is a city with 110,000 residents about 40 miles north of Dallas. A new commuter rail station is planned to make Denton a spoke in the Dallas hub, much the same as Lowell and other Gateway Cities orbit Boston. 35 Denton, a four-day music festival featuring local and national bands that began in 2005, attracts over 10,000 residents to the city. The festival has branded Denton as a hip city with a strong music scene attracting new life to the community’s downtown.34

ARTPLACE AMERICA’S 10 SIGNALS OF MOMENTUM
1. Is there evidence of cleanup?
2. Is the neighborhood safer?
3. Is the neighborhood more attractive?
4. Are there fewer vacancies?
5. Are there more people on the sidewalks?
6. Is there a popular new outdoor gathering place?
7. Is there a popular new indoor gathering place?
8. Is there new evidence of arts activity?
9. Has the local press reported positively?
10. Do people in the neighborhood generally agree that the neighborhood is getting better?

THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS’ IMPACT HYPOTHESES
1. Local economic conditions, from household income to business and property values, will be positively affected by creative placemaking.
2. Creative placemaking will improve quality of life for neighborhood residents.
3. Residents’ attachment to communities will be increased by creative placemaking.
4. Creative placemaking will have a positive effect on artists and the surrounding arts community.
4. A Creative Placemaking Network for Gateway City Growth and Renewal

Together, Gateway Cities can advance growth and renewal strategies, joining forces to build support for innovative approaches at the state and federal level, and learning from one another as they implement new practices. Creative placemaking is prime for this kind of collaborative effort. Up until now, it has grown quietly and organically in different ways in different cities. Free from outside interference, the strategy has had a chance to prove itself without outside intrusion or the risk of high-profile failures. But the hard truth is that fiscal realities threaten the long-term success of creative placemaking just as it's gaining traction.

By joining together in a collaborative network, Gateway City leaders can alter this dynamic and make creative placemaking a highly successful long-term growth and renewal strategy. Below we offer five strategic focal points and corresponding recommendations for a Gateway City Creative Placemaking Network.

1. Money

As individual projects, creative placemakers can do a lot with a little. But increasing vitality throughout our Gateway Cities will require many sustainable projects. The way budgets look now, across all levels of government, the public sector resources simply aren't there. Here are a few ideas the Network can strategize around to secure the necessary funding:

- **Rally behind the Massachusetts Cultural Council.** At a time when the promise of creative placemaking is so high, the state should not back away from the very modest investment it makes in the MCC. These resources sustain the work of cultural institutions with the capacity to organize and leverage local support. Equally critical, they provide the venture capital behind promising new groups and initiatives. Without adequate funding for MCC, innovators in Gateway Cities looking to build on the success of others will not have the resources to get their ideas off the ground. The Network should get behind MassCreative, the state’s newly formed arts advocacy coalition, as it develops strategies to build greater political support for the Cultural Council.

- **Convince local governments to co-invest in efforts to get creative placemaking initiatives going.** MassINC polling finds exceptionally high levels of support for investments in the arts among Gateway City voters. By putting a modest sum of local dollars into creative placemaking efforts, cities can demonstrate their commitment to the project, which will help draw support from corporate donors, foundations, and state agencies. Devoting resources to arts organizations will not be easy for cash-strapped cities, but research suggests that these investments can improve quality of life, driving up property values. If cities invest wisely, this seed capital will provide excellent long-term payoff.

- **Fix the Business Improvement District (BID) enabling law and get property owners excited about forming them.** As creative placemaking efforts have success, many require a larger outlay of resources to grow and sustain the initiative. BIDs are often the best tool to sustain well-resourced programming in cultural districts. The Network should push for legislative reforms that would help BIDs perform up to their potential in Massachusetts.

- **Advocate for federal partnership.** At the federal level, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute for Museum and Library Services provide critical support. The Community Development Block Grant and federal earmarks are also vital resources. The Network should engage with creative placemakers nationally in efforts to demonstrate the positive impact of these federal programs in communities across the country.

2. Capacity

Gateway Cities that don’t have a strong institution with the capacity to serve as a convener will have a difficult time establishing and maintaining the
collaborative structure critical to success. The Network must find tactics to address this roadblock. Two ideas:

- **Make the Cultural Districts a capacity-building prospect.** One way to resource the Cultural District program is to use the designation process as an opening to formally offer community assistance to cities with capacity limitations. Through a competitive process that tests local commitment, MCC could lend a technical assistance team to a city for a three-year period. This would give cities a chance to build the partnerships and track record of success needed to sustain a creative placemaking initiative. MCC would have difficulty filling this role effectively with current resources. Therefore, the Network should press for support for an MCC-led program that utilizes independent consultants and collaborative participation from other state agencies, such as MassDevelopment and the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development.

- **Push for transformative investments.** Following the success of the Star Store in New Bedford, creative placemakers should be talking to each other about how the state can make investments in institutions that will anchor revitalization. This conversation, which MassINC is encouraging with a larger network of Gateway City leaders, requires the kind of blue sky thinking that creative placemakers do best. While budget constraints will certainly make large capital projects a difficult sell, with a big idea and strong support from a cross-sector Gateway Cities network, more communities could become the beneficiaries of transformative investments that lead to innovative, high-capacity anchor institutions.

3. Leadership

A key outcome of creative placemaking is building the social capital of communities. For this to really take hold, artists must engage in community life beyond the arts. Creative placemaking programs can prepare artists to testify at hearings and speak out at public forums. Efforts could also be made to recruit and train artists willing to take on an even greater role as members of city councils, school committees, zoning boards, and the like. Nationally, Americans for the Arts has been a leader in this regard. The strategy for executing on leadership development should be quite simple:

- **Embrace this challenge as a network.** Leadership development is a low-cost, high-impact proposition. Through convening and knowledge sharing, the Gateway City Creative Placemaking Network can take it upon itself to accomplish this objective.

- **Look to MassCreative to provide direction.** Someone will need to carry the baton. Organizing the leadership development effort is an excellent opportunity for MassCreative to demonstrate its credentials.

4. Entrepreneurship

In Gateway Cities, entrepreneurs provide a significant boost to creative placemaking. The Network should support efforts to support aspiring entrepreneurs and increase local entrepreneurship more generally. Here are two angles:

- **Entrepreneurship.** Creative placemakers can also advocate for programs that promote and support entrepreneurship. Economic development leaders are increasingly recognizing that home-grown entrepreneurs are a vital source for job creation. The Merrimack Valley Sandbox is demonstrating new models that the Creative Placemaking Network can rally behind for replication in Gateway City regions around the state.

- **Immigrant entrepreneurship.** With the Immigrant Learning Center, MassINC is currently explor-
ing new models to provide specialized supports to immigrant entrepreneurs, whose businesses are critical to vibrancy in Gateway City neighborhoods. The Creative Placemaking Network can get behind innovative new strategies to help ensure that Gateway Cities are welcoming and supportive of immigrant businesses.

5. Metrics
To demonstrate results and hold ourselves accountable, it is vital that the Creative Placemaking Network develop standardized metrics. These measures should capture near-term output and outcomes, while positioning programs to demonstrate long-term impact. They need not be overly technical, and they must not become a black box. Creative placemaking focuses on the basic premise that it can generate vitality and revitalize a place. While it will not be simple, with focus and coordination, demonstrating success in those terms with relatively modest resources is very doable. Toward this end, we have two suggestions to offer:

- Use ArtPlace America’s Vibrancy Indicators as a foundation for evaluation. This fall ArtPlace will release a set of measures that look at the people, the activities, and the value of places to determine whether initiatives are increasing vibrancy in an area. These measures will provide a rigorously developed and nationally accepted standard to assess Gateway City efforts.

- Identify UMass faculty to lead evaluations across the Gateway Cities drawing on resources from the university’s Creative Economy Fund. Measurable increases in vibrancy may take years to achieve. Evaluation will be needed to assess whether Gateway City initiatives are on the right tract. UMass faculty have both the resources and the expertise to carry out this important work.

Engaged leaders at the summit show that strong nodes of a network to advance creative placemaking already exist.
RESOURCES

CREATIVE ECONOMY

ArtSpace
ArtSpace is a leading nonprofit real estate developer for the arts.
www.artspace.org

Assets for Artists
A program that provides financial education, business assistance, and matched savings for low- to moderate-income artists.
www.assetsforartists.org

Civic Tourism
A website promoting a forum of cultural tourism and events that enhances place, particularly as it is viewed by local residents.
www.civictourism.org

Matchbook.org
An online marketplace that connects artists, presenters, and communities throughout New England.
www.matchbook.org

FUNDING AND ADVOCACY

ArtPlace America
ArtPlace works to accelerate creative placemaking by making grants and loans; through partnerships; and with research, communication, and advocacy.
www.artplaceamerica.org

Artist Link
A Massachusetts affiliate of LINC, the organization works to create a stable environment for Massachusetts artists as they seek workspace and housing.
www.artistlink.org

Creative Capital
A national nonprofit that provides artists with financing, technical assistance, and professional development.
www.creative-capital.org

Design Industry Group of Massachusetts
DIGMA is an association representing the state’s design community by providing industry research, events, and advocacy.
www.digma.us

LINC
A consortium of national foundations working to improve working conditions for artists. LINC makes grants to communities and provides leadership on policy issues.
www.linc.net

PUBLIC REALM

The Atlantic Cities
Articles exploring innovations in placemaking from cities around the world.
www.theatlanticcities.com

Congress for New Urbanism
CNU promotes walkable, mixed-use neighborhood development, sustainable communities, and healthier living conditions.
www.cnu.org

Complete Streets
Complete Streets is a design practice focused on making it easy to cross the street, walk, and bicycle.
www.completestreets.org

Mayors’ Institute for City Design
MICD prepares mayors to be advocates for good urban design.
www.micd.org

Project for Public Spaces
PPS is a nonprofit planning, design and educational organization dedicated to helping people create and sustain public spaces that build stronger communities.
www.pps.org

Small Streets
Ideas for making great creative places on small, human-scale streets.
www.smallstreets.org

The Tactical Urbanism Salon
“Creative” creative placemaking.
tacticalurbanismsalon.com

The Urban Arts Institute
Urban Arts Institute works to promote excellence in public art through design services, education, and advocacy.
www.massart.edu/about_massart/urban_arts_institute.html

EVALUATION

Center for Creative Community Development
A research, education, and training center focused on the role of the arts in community re-development.
web.williams.edu/Economics/ArtsEcon/index.html

Social Impact of the Arts Project
A research center focused on the relationship of the arts to community change.
www.sp2.upenn.edu/siap/index/html
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