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We thank you for making the commitment to participate in the 98th Arizona Town Hall to be held in Tucson on May 1-4, 2011. You will be discussing and developing consensus with fellow Arizonans on the ways in which Arizona’s arts and culture can invigorate our economy.

An essential element to the success of these consensus-driven discussions is this background report that is provided to all participants before the Town Hall convenes. As they have so often done for past Arizona Town Halls, Arizona State University has prepared a detailed and informative report that will provide a unique and unparalleled resource for your Town Hall panel sessions.

A very special thanks goes to editor Betsy Fahlman who spearheaded this effort and marshaled an amazing number of talented professionals to write individual chapters.

For sharing their wealth of knowledge and professional talents, our thanks go to the many authors who contributed to the report. Our deepest gratitude also goes to University Vice President and Dean of the College of Public Programs for ASU, Debra Friedman, who for several years has made great efforts to ensure that ASU can provide this type of resource to Arizona.

The 98th Town Hall could not occur without the financial assistance of our generous sponsors, which include Presenting Sponsors Flinn Foundation and Virginia G. Piper Charitable Trust; Collaborating Sponsor Schaller Anderson; Supporting Sponsor Snell & Wilmer; and Civic Sponsor Perkins Coie Brown & Bain.

When the 98th Town Hall ends, ASU’s background report will be combined with the recommendations from the Town Hall into a final report. This final report will be available to the public on the Town Hall’s website and will be widely distributed and promoted throughout Arizona. The Town Hall’s report of recommendations and background report will be used as a resource, a discussion guide and an action plan for how all of Arizona can capitalize on arts and culture to broaden the many attributes of our state, improve its economy, and enrich our quality of life.

Sincerely,

Bruce Dusenberry
Board Chair, Arizona Town Hall
Capitalizing on Arizona’s Arts & Culture
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The Heritage

Carole Jarvis
c. 1985

Four generations ranched this land,
Two are buried here.
Wood and stone still mark the place
They’ve rested through the years.

Grandpa brought his new bride
A century ago,
To homestead on the bottomlands,
Where clear sweet waters flow.

They raised three boys to manhood,
But one went hunting gold,
Another left to serve the Lord.
Just one stayed in the fold.

In time that one son married
A girl named Emily.
They built a home and raised for kids,
And one of them was me.

We grew up knowin’ cattle
From their bawlin’ to their brand,
And Dad instilled his rancher’s pride
And feelings for the land.

Keep the fences mended,
Give your best, was what he asked.
Never break another’s trust
Or let an anger last.

Hard work was just one measure
Of how he judged a man.
If his horse had ‘saavy’,
What kind of bulls he ran.

Mama had her own ideas,
But seldom made them known.
Her time was mostly occupied
In managing our home.

And I guess we took for granted
Our life out on the range,
But we grew up and they grew old,
And things began to change.

Destiny, it seemed, had plans
That no one could foresee.
My sister moved away to teach,
John died at Normandy.

That left Justin and myself
Who made the choice to stay,
And we were living on the ranch
When both folks passed away.

Though the world and times keep changing,
The cows still wear our brand,
And our kids grew up on horseback,
And learned to love this land.

We’re a family grateful for this life,
And what freedom it still allows.
Each generation passing on
It’s heritage of cows.
Chapter 1

Art Galore for the Capital

Betsy Fahlman
Professor of Art History, Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts
Arizona State University

Key Points

- Federal funding for the arts in Arizona began in the 19th Century
- The tourism industry used the arts as a key element in marketing the West
- Arts and culture remain significant economic engines in Arizona

The Arizona Town Hall and Arts and Culture

The 98th Arizona Town Hall on “Capitalizing on Arizona’s Arts and Culture” represents the first time the Arizona Town Hall has focused on this important topic since its founding in 1962. The subject has been included in several previous background reports, but only as an adjunct to larger issues.¹

When I arrived in Arizona in the summer of 1988 to take a position at Arizona State University, I discovered an arts community poised for expansion (public art played a key role in this development), matching the state’s vigorous economic growth. But until that happened, it was common to hear an old joke: “What’s the difference between Phoenix and yoghurt? At least yoghurt has culture.”

The authors and topics contained in the 98th Arizona Town Hall background report reflect a radically changed and expanded cultural climate since the eighties, though one facing considerable economic challenges. Capitalizing on Arizona Arts and Culture is a comprehensive document comprised of many more essays than previous reports, presenting a range of voices, issues, and topics in order to convey an in-depth understanding of the state of the arts in Arizona, as well as the most important issues facing this community. The linked themes that run through this report are the close relationship between the arts, education, and economic development.

Defining Arts and Culture

A broad definition of arts and culture as exemplified in the institutional missions of those who have contributed to this background report has been adopted in order to give readers the broadest foundation for a lively and productive dialogue from which informed policy recommendations may be made. Sports have not been included as it was felt that they would make the report too broad to be useful. Sporting events have their own logic and base, and function in a completely different economy, though one that also competes for the leisure dollars of Arizonans.
The performing, literary, and visual arts form the heart of what has been traditionally defined as Arizona’s nonprofit arts sector. This category includes the symphony, ballet, opera, modern dance, art museums, theatre, chamber music, literary magazines, musicals, the visual arts, galleries, reading groups, and jazz, as well as a lively popular culture that embraces a wide range of new media and electronic art forms. History and preservation are also important, and Arizona’s many stories are told by its historical museums, archaeological sites, heritage programs, and historic buildings and districts. Arizona has celebrated the arts and humanities in festivals and events that promote the culture and history of the American West and highlight the state’s diverse ethnic groups. Science and nature are presented in our natural history and science museums, and botanical gardens (some of which have arts programs). The state’s landscapes and natural landmarks have contributed to its distinct regional cultural identity. The desert environment and wilderness areas, including the Sonoran Desert and the Grand Canyon, add a unique dimension to residents’ and tourists’ experiences. All of these represent significant economic engines for the state.

A Short Lesson in Arizona’s Art and Cultural History

Since the nineteenth century, painters and photographers have traveled through Arizona, though the resident arts community was small until the mid-twentieth century, and one in which women outnumbered the men. Declaring oneself an artist took fortitude, as painter Maynard Dixon, a regular visitor to the state, recollected: “In those days in Arizona being an artist was something you just had to endure—or be smart enough to explain why.”² There were no art schools where aspirant artists could seek training, and exhibition opportunities and collectors scarcely existed. An ambitious artist stood a far better chance of critical and economic success in California or New Mexico, where there were the requisite support systems for art production—galleries, museums, patrons, and art schools.

Arts and culture gradually took root in this desert state faced, and faced daunting challenges in the early years of the twentieth century, especially as Arizona offered an artist few of the advantages found in its neighbors to the west and east. California promoted its romantic Spanish heritage, and it was there that the Mission Revival began, its allure bolstered by popular Hollywood movies. But it was New Mexico that capitalized most extensively on its distinctive regional culture, fostering the development of a thriving tourist industry. The writers who created a national image of the Southwest with their evocative literary portrayals were comfortably situated in the art colonies of Santa Fe and Taos, places with many amenities for visitors. The early Spanish land grant families retained a powerful presence in that state, and the intertwined ambience of Indian and Spanish culture was irresistible to tourists. The fact that the New Mexico pueblos are relatively close together made them readily accessible to both tourists and artists. Spanish and Pueblo revival styles were officially adopted by Santa Fe’s leaders in the teens, making it a kind of cultural theme park. In contrast, the Navajo settlements in Arizona were spread out over a broad geography, and the Hopi mesas were hard to get to and offered few comforts to visitors. Nothing like the concerted effort of cultural marketing that developed over time in New Mexico existed in Arizona.
Arizona’s first artist-visitors were dazzled by the state’s geographically impressive landscape, while others sought inspiration in the rich heritage of the region’s Native American culture. The paintings and photographs they produced helped define the state’s national image to those unable to travel to the far West. From the start, art and economics were intertwined in Arizona. Beginning in the middle years of the nineteenth century, government-sponsored surveys of the American West charted potential mineral wealth and railroad routes with future expansion and development in mind. Artists were important participants in these efforts.

At the turn of the twentieth century, art was strongly linked with the expansion of facilities at the Grand Canyon. The site of the state’s only well-developed tourist industry, it was established as a National Park in 1919.³ Painter Thomas Moran visited Arizona in 1873, and the magisterial canvas that resulted from his first trip was purchased by Congress for $10,000. The many artists who followed him were among the chief factors in making the state’s signature landscape feature “grand.” The handsome “parkitecture” by Mary Jane Colter further contributed to its becoming a mecca for tourists eager to experience the ethnic and scenic richness of northern Arizona. The Fred Harvey Company, which formed a partnership with the Santa Fe Railway, operated restaurants and luxurious hotels throughout a system that stretched from Chicago to Los Angeles, including El Tovar on the South Rim. To promote things to see along its routes, railroad officials began assembling America’s first corporate art collection in the 1890s, and, together with the Fred Harvey Company, assiduously marketed the southwestern experience to visitors.

The Old West is still celebrated throughout the state, exemplified by dude ranches, cowboy poetry gatherings, and chuck wagon cook-offs. The Phoenix Art Museum hosts an annual exhibition of work by members of the Cowboy Artists of America, a group founded at a bar in Sedona in 1965. For more than fifty years, the Hashknife Pony Express has made an annual mail run from Holbrook to Scottsdale (whose moniker is the “West’s Most Western Town”) to kick off the Parada del Sol. In Wickenburg, the Desert Caballeros Western Museum annually hosts “Cowgirl Up!” This exhibition of contemporary western women artists draws visitors from all over America.

Important institutions were established in Arizona well before statehood. The Arizona Historical Society was founded in 1864, and the Copper Queen Library (1882) in Bisbee, remains the oldest library in the state. A public library opened in Phoenix in 1898, and Carnegie Libraries followed in Tucson (1901), Prescott (1903), and Phoenix (1908).⁴ These institutions were important cultural centers in the communities where they were located, but geographical distance limited a sense of state-wide connection. Before statehood, the arts were a rare commodity in Arizona and it would be a long time before Culture took its place beside the “five Cs” that are the historic foundation of Arizona’s economy—Copper, Cattle, Citrus, Climate, and Cotton.

The first significant act of public arts patronage in Arizona came at statehood when Lon Megargee was commissioned to paint fifteen mural-sized canvasses for the State Capitol.
The artist was paid $250 apiece, receiving a total of $4000, and the *Arizona Republican* celebrated the fact that there would be “Art Galore for Capitol.” Megargee’s themes parallel the iconography of the state seal, and broadly summarize the visual culture of Arizona at statehood, encompassing its spectacular landscape and natural wonders, the structures and customs of its indigenous Native American peoples, artifacts of Spanish Colonial settlement, and the agriculture, mining, and ranching that sustained its early settlers. These remain elements still promoted by the state’s tourism industry.

Exhibition venues and patrons were sparse in the early years of statehood. The state’s first annual art exhibition commenced in 1914, and was held not in a museum, but was at the Arizona State Fair. Its sponsor, the Women’s Club of Phoenix, purchased one work annually for the city’s municipal collection.

The twenties witnessed a flurry of civic cultural activity, mostly centered in the capital. The Phoenix Little Theatre (now the Phoenix Theatre) was founded in 1920, and is the oldest arts institution in the state. Three years later, in 1923, the Arizona Museum of History (now the Phoenix Museum of History) was founded, opening in 1927. Dwight and Maie Heard established the museum that bears their name in 1929. Artists’ groups included the Phoenix Fine Arts Association (1925) and the Arizona Artists’ Guild (1928). Outside of Maricopa County, the Tucson Fine Arts Association (now the Tucson Museum of Art) had been formed in 1924, the Temple of Music and Art opened in 1927, and the Tucson Symphony Orchestra gave its first performance in 1929. In Flagstaff, the Museum of Northern Arizona was established by painter Mary-Russell Ferrell Colton and her husband Harold in 1928, the same year Sharlot Hall opened her museum in Prescott to the public. The stock market crash of 1929 must have made the economic prospects of these fledgling groups seem uncertain at best.

During the Depression years, the federal art programs established by Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s New Deal benefited the state. Post Office murals were commissioned for Phoenix (1938), Springerville (1939), Flagstaff (1940), and Safford (1942). With the Miners’ Monument (1935) in Bisbee, these remain among the tangible artifacts of the Works Progress Administration’s (WPA) cultural support in Arizona. The Phoenix Federal Art Center opened in 1937, and WPA programs funded projects to record cultural heritage throughout the state, supporting efforts by participants in the Index of American Design, the Historical American Buildings Survey, and the Writers’ Project.

Many people moved to Arizona during the thirties and the World War II years, and the population boom that they began signaled increased cultural life, which meant the arts grew as well. Walter Bimson moved to Arizona in 1932, and as President of the Valley National Bank, then the state’s largest financial institution, began to form a corporate art collection of Arizona artists. Frank Lloyd Wright established his winter headquarters at Taliesin West in 1937, giving a strong presence to contemporary architecture. Civic leaders in the “Valley of the Sun,” as the Phoenix area came to be known, recognizing that the state’s sunshine was a tremendous asset, began promoting Arizona as an attractive winter destination and health
mecca during this period. *Arizona Highways*, founded in 1921 and published by the state’s Highway Commission, began to emphasize its signature staples of tourism, travel, and scenery during the thirties. New institutions opened in Phoenix, including the Symphony (1947) and the Art Museum (1959). The Arizona Opera began as the Tucson Opera Company in 1971, and with the 1976-1977 season began staging complete seasons in both Tucson and Phoenix. Growth also led to the establishment of percent for art ordinances during the eighties, and public art programs were begun in the Phoenix and Tucson metropolitan areas. Situated at the intersection of art and civic dialogue, these programs have since achieved national recognition.

**The Cultural Desert: Looking to the Future**

Arizona’s current economic challenges have infused the discussion of every sector of the state, including arts and culture. In January 2010, the Americans for the Arts issued its Creative Industries Report on the creative industries in Arizona, and revealed that there were 11,600 arts-related businesses in the state employing 47,712 people (Figure 1.1, Table 1.1). Even more worked in businesses related to cultural tourism. Creative industries are focused on generating and exploiting knowledge and information (this also referred to as the knowledge economy). These ideas were the subject of considerable debate and critique when economist and sociologist Richard Florida published *The Rise of the Creative Class* in 2002. His book was widely read by those involved in the arts, economic development, and urban transformation and regeneration. Florida identified several key elements in this group, whose members were comprised of well-educated creative professionals who valued talent, tolerance, and technology (especially the Internet) within a dynamic urban environment. While his cohort was decidedly elitist, his ideas regarding the kind of social texture, in which arts and culture play a prominent role, that attracts these individuals to live in particular cities, retains much validity.

As documented by the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, public funding for the arts in Arizona was at its highest in fiscal year 2007, at 65 cents per capita. The state then ranked 33rd in the nation. In fiscal year 2010, Arizona’s legislative allocation in support of the arts fell to 15 cents per capita (the national average was $1.00 per capita), lowering our ranking to 47th in the nation (taking it back to funding levels for fiscal year 1976). Appropriations are expected to decline in 2011 by more than 28% (Table 1.2). Yet writers on what is termed the creative economy have argued that arts and culture play a significant role in both attracting and retaining a diverse pool of well-educated and innovative knowledge workers (Graph 1.1). Such individuals, who include a younger demographic, often want more than a job and a salary, and issues relating to quality of life and community building are important to them. Arizonans may want to consider this, as they work to stabilize the state’s economy so as to remain nationally competitive within a global marketplace. The arts can contribute significantly to this process.
The Creative Industries in Arizona

This Creative Industries report offers a research-based approach to understanding the scope and economic importance of the arts in Arizona. The creative industries are composed of arts businesses that range from non-profit museums, symphonies, and theaters to for-profit film, architecture, and advertising companies. Arts businesses and the creative people they employ stimulate innovation in today’s global marketplace.

Nationally, there are 668,267 businesses in the U.S. involved in the creation or distribution of the arts. They employ 2.9 million people, representing 4.05 percent of all businesses and 2.18 percent of all employees, respectively. The source for these data is Dun & Bradstreet, the most comprehensive and trusted source for business information in the U.S. As of January 2010, Arizona is home to 11,600 arts-related businesses that employ 47,712 people.

These arts-centric businesses play an important role in building and sustaining economic vibrancy. They employ a creative workforce, spend money locally, generate government revenue, and are a cornerstone of tourism and economic development. The map below provides a clear picture of the creative industries in Arizona, with each dot representing an arts-centric business.
**Table 1.1**

**Arts-Related Business and Employment in Arizona**

Data current as of January 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museums and Collections</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>2,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoos and Botanical</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Society</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planetarium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>9,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>3,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Facilities</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>2,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performers (nec)</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>3,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts/Photography</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>11,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>1,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>5,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>3,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film, Radio and TV</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>8,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion Pictures</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>5,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Publishing</td>
<td>3,933</td>
<td>13,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>4,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>2,261</td>
<td>5,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>3,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Schools Services</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>1,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Councils</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Schools and Instruction</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>1,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,712</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the source of these data is based solely on business that have registered with Dun & Bradstreet, our analyses indicate an under-representation of nonprofit arts organizations and individual artists. Therefore, this Creative Industries report should be considered a conservative estimate. For more information, maps, and to make sure you are included in our Creative Industries research, visit [www.AmericansForTheArts.org/sc/CreativeIndustries](http://www.AmericansForTheArts.org/sc/CreativeIndustries)
Table 1.2
Per Capita Spending on State Arts Agencies, Fiscal Year 2010.
Source: National Assembly of State Arts Agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State or Special Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Legislative Appropriation Including Line Items Per Capita Amount</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$0.98</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Marianas</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.87</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per capita amounts represent the total dollar figure for each variable divided by the total population. Total per capita dollar figures listed in the bottom row are based on the aggregate population for all 56 states and jurisdictions. States are ranked out of 50, jurisdictions are ranked out of 56.

Credit: National Assembly of State Arts Agencies
UNCTAD Classification of Creative Industries

Source:
Some Questions to Consider Throughout *Capitalizing on Arizona’s Arts and Culture*

- What is the role of the arts in Arizona in building the creative economy?
- What do the arts contribute to Arizona’s economy?
- What role can the arts play in Arizona’s economic recovery?
- What are the economic benefits of investing in arts and culture?
- What role should public and private funding play in the arts?
- Are the arts an appropriate function of government?


---


3. It had been designated a National Monument in 1908.


6. These arts-related industries were defined as museum/collections; performing arts, visual/photography; film, radio, and TV; design/publishing, and arts schools/services.

7. The role of the arts fostering global competitiveness and educational achievement will be discussed in several subsequent essays. Two recent articles in the Arizona Republic address related issues. See, Russ Wiles, “Arizona Needs to Look Overseas to be Successful in Economy” (2 December 2010). The article cites Arizona’s ten “global bright spots,” which include two museums, the Heard and the Musical Instrument Museum. See also Nick Anderson, “On World Scale, U.S. Students Average” (8 December 2010). According to a report recently released by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, students in the United States are average in reading and science, and slightly below average in math. Europe and Asia report higher scores.
Who’s That Good-Looking Pie Chart
Walking Down the Hall?

Alberto Rios
2010

We get lost in the wandering story,
Small, individual, unbalanced, personal
Equations that we are,

Lost in the graphs, the full-color charts,
The electronic bytes and latest trends
Busily narrating us.

Because of them, we know much,
But should also know better.
What we know is less than what we will know.

Charts begin with people
And end with people.
But in between, they are not people.

And yet, we explain ourselves in these ways—
As if our insides were a meat of numbers
Holding us up, a bone construct

Working within allowable tolerances,
Our lungs, our livers,
Our lives more statistical than actual,

We walking around
As handsome percentages of ourselves,
Beautiful portions of our futures.

We do this anyway: We let numbers
Enchant us, be our best novelists,
X-rays our best art.

But they are us.
They are us. And let’s just be messy
And say it again: They are us.
American Arts Funding and the Delivery of Arts Funding in Arizona:
A Primer

Jaime Dempsey
Deputy Director, Arizona Commission on the Arts

Key Points

- America’s current public/private partnership funding model was established in the 1960s, and is distinct from arts funding models in other nations.
- America’s largest arts funder, the National Endowment for the Arts, was founded in 1965.
- Direct government support for the arts in America accounts on average for 13% of a nonprofit arts organization’s total budget; in Arizona the average is 2%-8%.
- Governments at all levels invest in their arts industries because the arts offer economic, educational, civic, and cultural benefits to communities.
- Though it was never robust, public funding for the arts in Arizona has been drastically reduced since the beginning of the recent recession.
- Arizona now ranks 49th in the nation in annual per capita arts support, providing less than 10 cents per capita in support of its arts industry.
- The Arizona ArtShare Endowment Program, developed in 1996 and considered a model public/private partnership, was dismantled as a result of budget-balancing efforts during the 2009-2011 fiscal years.
- Arizona struggles with undercapitalized private funds sources and among arts organizations there is stiff competition for private dollars.

Overview

The American structure of arts support is at its core a public/private partnership, meant to ensure broad access to arts activities and to capitalize on the vast and diverse potential of arts activities within communities. In support of an industry whose key assets include imagination, innovation, ingenuity, and inspiration, American arts funding structures work to advance the arts field and respond to evolving industry needs and economic conditions.

This chapter introduces essential arts funding information, including ways in which funding structures have been carefully constructed such that they are both reliant upon and catalysts for one another. It includes Arizona-specific arts funding data, including descriptions of support mechanisms and opportunities for further consideration and investment.
Information provided herein relates most specifically to funding support for nonprofit arts organizations, though funding support for individual artists and investments in arts education are areas worthy of profound consideration. Indeed, the contributions of artists and opportunities to learn in, through, and about the arts form the nucleus of the arts industry itself. Because artist funding is uniquely calibrated to an artist’s discipline and product, and because in-school arts education is funded by government and non-government entities at multiple levels, for which the arts are not always a primary focus, this chapter focuses primarily on existing support structures for the nonprofit arts sector.

It is important to note that not all arts organizations are nonprofits and that there are successful for-profit arts organizations which do not rely on the types of funding support discussed within this chapter. Additionally the national arts sector is currently witnessing increased development of for-profit/nonprofit hybrid organizations. Though these hybrid organizations’ structural rationales are as diverse as the organizations themselves, broadly stated, some arts organizations find that the limitations of the traditional nonprofit model do not allow them to best serve their identified constituencies.

Foundational Elements of the American Arts Funding Structure

Before examining American arts funding structures and their application in Arizona, it is important to understand some arts sector nomenclature and taxonomy.

A nonprofit arts organization is a business that pursues the development of creative product or provides arts-based services or enrichment to a community. Nonprofit arts organizations do not have owners and instead are governed by boards of directors or trustees. Like nonprofits of other types, a nonprofit arts organization does not exist to create a profit for owners or members and instead uses its funds in pursuit of its creative mission and service to its community. Most nonprofit arts organizations are eligible for exemption from some federal income taxes under section 501(c) of the United States Internal Revenue Code. Twenty-eight types of nonprofits are listed under this code; most arts organizations are type 501(c)(3).¹

Public funding for the arts relates to funding and resources provided by governments to government-designated arts agencies, which deliver funding and support to designated constituencies. Funding itself can be made up of governments’ general fund dollars, fees collected by municipal agencies, or by revenue-generating activities undertaken by government-designated arts agencies. Government-designated arts agencies typically receive legislative allocations of public monies from their authorizing government or supervisory department. Funds are most often disbursed to nonprofit arts organizations as grants. Less typically, some arts organizations receive direct line-item appropriations from federal, state, and local governments.

Government-designated arts agencies refer to agencies which support arts and cultural activities at macro- and micro-levels across America.
America’s **national government-designated arts agency** is the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). The NEA was created in 1965 as an independent agency of the United States government which offers support and funding for projects exhibiting artistic excellence. America’s largest arts funder, the NEA receives its funding by way of an annual Congressional appropriation (the NEA’s budget is roughly the size of Canada’s annual budget for arts and culture, though America’s population is roughly ten times greater than that of Canada). 60% of the NEA’s grantmaking budget is delivered via direct grants to nonprofit arts organizations across the nation; 40% is delivered via a competitive grant process to state and regional arts agencies, as Partnership Agreements. State arts agencies are required to match their annual NEA Partnership Agreement grant on a one-to-one basis with a guaranteed allocation of state funds.²

At state levels, **state arts agencies** provide programs and services in support of statewide arts industries, and receive and disburse funds from state governments’ budgets. All fifty states and the six U.S. jurisdictions (American Samoa, District of Columbia, Guam, Northern Marianas, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands) have state arts agencies, most of which were created shortly after Congress established the NEA in 1965. At that time, Congress required the newly-established NEA to apportion funds to any state that established an arts agency. Within a few years, nearly every state had a state arts agency.³ Arizona’s state arts agency was established in 1966 as the Arizona Commission on the Arts.

According to Americans for the Arts, **local arts agencies** are “community organizations or agencies of local government which provide services to artists and arts organizations and/or present arts programming to the public. Each local arts agency is unique to the community it serves.”⁴ Many local arts agencies receive and disburse funds from city or county governments, while others have designated tax revenue streams used to fund the arts within their jurisdictions. Some local arts agencies are private nonprofit arts organizations that support themselves through a combination of fund sources.

**Private funding** for the arts relates to funding and resources provided by national, state and local foundations, corporations, small businesses, and individual donors.

**Contributed income** relates to a nonprofit arts organization’s aggregate public funding and private funding revenue, including revenue generated from fundraising activities.

**Earned income** relates to a nonprofit arts organization’s aggregate revenue generated through ticket sales, gift shops, registration, or entry fees, including fees paid to the organization for use or purchase of artistic product, facilities rentals, or for services provided.

**Arts Funding in America**

Our nation established its most current public/private partnership model in support of an American arts industry in 1960s with the formation of the National Endowment for the Arts and the majority of state arts agencies. These structures were launched with fiscal incentives and “match requirements,” requiring that public funding be matched by other public and
private fund sources in support of access to the arts. As examples, state arts agencies are required to match their annual NEA Partnership Agreement grant monies on a one-to-one basis with a guaranteed allocation of state funds. State arts agencies themselves typically require that their grants to organizations be matched on a one-to-one basis with other public or private dollars.

The American system of funding the arts is described herein as distinct from arts support in other nations, as every nation invests in its arts industry in different ways, at varied levels. As examples, in Mexico, many large arts institutions are funded, programmed, and managed directly by state governments and public sector employees. According to the NEA, “A theatre or orchestra in Germany will likely receive 80% or more of its budget from direct governmental support. In France and Italy, government support at various levels accounts for almost all of the funding for a typical museum. Even the Louvre, which was asked to find private funding as of 1993, raises less than half of its operating budget. In America, direct government support accounts, on average, for 13% of a nonprofit arts organization’s total budget.”5 (As indicated by the grantee database maintained by the Arizona Commission on the Arts, government support accounts, on average, for 2% to 8% of Arizona arts organizations’ budgets.)

For many years American nonprofit arts organizations were encouraged to aim for a “60/40” income ratio, meaning an organization’s revenue would be made up of 60% earned income and 40% contributed income. Arts organizations meeting that 60% earned income threshold were further encouraged by funders to seek an even greater percentage of earned income, to increase their capacity to support their work with ticket sales and registration fees.

The ideal “60/40” income ratio theory for nonprofit arts organizations has come under increased scrutiny over the last decade. Michael Kaiser, President of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and one of the arts sector’s thought leaders, said in a September 2010 Huffington Post column:

Organizations that serve very poor communities have very low levels of earned income. Their missions demand that they produce art for very low ticket prices if they are going to make their art accessible to people with little or no discretionary income. They must rely on contributed income for a large share of their total revenue. This is not bad; it is an essential part of the strategy for these groups.

The level of earned income as a percent of revenue differs from organization to organization. There is not a better ratio, nor a worse one. There are simply implications of having strong or weak levels of earned income.

Arts organizations with strong earned income must protect it by developing important art and by ensuring their programmatic marketing efforts are significant. If the environment is changing and it seems unlikely that these steps will be enough to protect the level of earned income, these organizations must develop stronger fundraising capabilities. Organizations with low levels of earned income must develop the strong institutional marketing programs required to ensure growth of contributed
income. If it will be difficult to continue to build the level of contributed revenue, they must also explore ways to bolster earned income through additional ticket sales or touring activity or by finding new auxiliary sources of earned income.\(^6\)

In a December 2010 interview, Executive Director of the Arizona Commission on the Arts, Robert Booker, reported:

"With the data we have access to as an arts funder, income ratios seem to align more with artistic discipline. At present we see that visual arts, museums and literary arts organizations typically have something closer to a 40% earned, 60% contributed income ratio, while performing arts organizations have more of a 60% earned, 40% contributed income ratio. This is likely because, in a very general sense, performing arts organizations have more opportunities to raise revenue through ticket sales, while visual arts, museums, and literary arts organizations generally rely on admission fees which are purposely kept low to increase public access."

**An Investment of Public Funds in Support of the Arts**

Rationale for government investment in arts industries is comprehensively outlined in a 2010 policy brief by the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies,\(^7\) as follows:

Governments at all levels invest in the arts because, in addition to what is considered by many to be an inherent value to society, the arts offer a distinctive blend of benefits to communities, including:

- **Economic Drivers**: The arts create jobs and produce tax revenue. A strong arts sector is an economic asset that stimulates business activity, attracts tourism revenue, retains a high quality work force, and stabilizes property values. The arts have been shown to be a successful and sustainable strategy for revitalizing rural areas, inner cities, and populations struggling with poverty.
- **Educational Assets**: The arts foster young imaginations and facilitate children’s success in school. They provide the critical thinking, communications, and innovation skills essential to a productive 21st-century workforce.
- **Civic Catalysts**: The arts create a welcoming sense of place and a desirable quality of life. The arts also support a strong democracy, engaging citizens in civic discourse, dramatizing important issues, and encouraging collective problem solving.
- **Cultural Legacies**: The arts preserve unique culture and heritage, passing precious cultural character and traditions along to future generations.

In the marketplace or among individual philanthropists, many motivations (including personal goals and advertising exposure) drive funding decisions. In contrast, government investment serves the *public* interest and ensures that all areas within a government’s jurisdiction receive the benefits of the arts. Government support also:
• **provides fair access to arts resources**, especially among underserved populations
• **accurately assesses a constituency’s cultural needs and assets**, then organizes efforts to help that constituency achieve goals that are relevant to its policy priorities
• **provides accountability**, ensuring that funds are distributed according to the public interest
• **reduces barriers to public participation in the arts**, such as those linked to poverty, geographic isolation, limited education, disability, age, or ethnicity.

Public funding for the arts is generally organized into three areas: federal arts support, most specifically from the National Endowment for the Arts; state arts support, most often delivered by a state arts agency; and local arts support, delivered by a local arts agency or by direct funding from a city or county government.

**Supporting the Arts with Private Funding**

Private funding for the arts is generally organized into three areas as well: foundation support, corporate support, and individual donations.

Private funders support the arts for a variety of reasons. Private and family foundations often fund the arts because they have identified arts support as a need in the communities they serve, because they believe investing in the arts impacts local economies and increases educational opportunities, or because the persons for whom a foundation was established identified the arts as a chief interest. Corporate funders may invest in the arts because they too have an interest in developing arts industries and activities which support improved quality of life. Corporate and business donors also fund arts initiatives as promotional or advertising tools in what is viewed as an enriching, positive industry, thereby expanding audiences for products and services.

Individual donors’ reasons for supporting the arts are similarly diverse: they might have an interest in a specific creative product, they could be “giving back” to a community they care about, or their motivation might be emotional and personal, resulting from positive, inspirational artistic experiences. Other motivating factors for individual private philanthropy relate to tax exemptions. Since 1917, any donation to a tax-exempt nonprofit organization has qualified as a potential deduction for the taxpaying donor, requiring only that the taxpayer itemize his or her deductions rather than taking the standard deduction allowed by law. Today about 60% of American taxpayers itemize their tax deductions. For these individuals, the donation of a dollar to a nonprofit institution reduces taxes between 28 and 40 cents per dollar, depending on the individual’s tax position. This tax incentive applies to most arts giving.\(^8\)

According to the NEA, “Individual private philanthropy to the arts is rare in most European nations. As individual donors, Americans give almost 10 times more to nonprofits on a per capita basis than do their French counterparts.”\(^9\)
**Earned Income in the Arts**

As stated previously, nonprofit arts organizations also support their work with an array of earned income strategies, including individual and subscription ticket sales, registration and entry fees, facilities rentals, gift shop sales and concessions, and specialized community and educational services. Primarily, arts organizations’ earned income revenue comes from fees paid to experience or participate in arts activities, as in tickets and entry fees. It is important to note that in order to comply with federal regulations governing tax-exempt status, a nonprofit arts organization’s earned income projects must relate to its core organizational mission.

Like all industries for which monies are exchanged, nonprofit arts organizations must always seek a balance between current market rates, perceived value provided, quality customer service, covering organizational expenditures, and keeping consumer costs as low as possible.

**The Delivery of Public and Private Arts Funding in Arizona**

**Table 2.1:**
**Federal Funding Delivered to Arizona by the National Endowment for the Arts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Agreement Grants</td>
<td>$717,900</td>
<td>$708,400</td>
<td>$806,900</td>
<td>$863,400</td>
<td>$938,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Grants to Organizations</td>
<td>$535,000</td>
<td>$620,000</td>
<td>$404,500</td>
<td>$504,000</td>
<td>$461,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total NEA Funding in AZ</td>
<td>$1,252,900</td>
<td>$1,328,400</td>
<td>$1,211,400</td>
<td>$1,367,400</td>
<td>$1,399,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, National Endowment for the Arts

In fiscal year 1967, the Arizona Commission on the Arts received its first Partnership Agreement grant in the amount of $12,053 from the NEA, to support a statewide arts industry with grants, programs, and services. On what is now a three-year rotation, state arts agencies apply to the NEA for funds as a part of a competitive grant application process (Table 22.1). Partnership Agreement grant amounts have increased fairly steadily since the birth of the NEA, with funds appropriated in the following areas: *State Arts Plan, Arts in Underserved Communities, Arts Education, and Poetry Out Loud Program*. As stated previously, Partnership Agreements must be matched on a one-to-one basis with a guaranteed allocation of state funds.

Arts organizations may also be eligible to apply directly to the NEA for project support. Additionally, state arts agencies, nonprofit arts organizations, and other municipal agencies can at times access limited support for specific arts initiatives, as administered by other areas of federal government.

**Regional Funding Delivered to Arizona**

Besides service provided by a state arts agency, Arizona’s arts industry is supported by a regional arts agency, the Western States Arts Federation (WESTAF). WESTAF is a nonprofit
arts service organization located in Denver, Colorado, dedicated to the creative advancement and preservation of the arts, its mission to “strengthen the financial, organizational, and policy infrastructure of the arts in the western states.”¹⁰ WESTAF provides support for a diverse array of programs and services to advance western states’ arts industries, including several grantmaking programs. On average, WESTAF delivers between $30,000 and $50,000 annually in direct grants to Arizona arts organizations.

**Arts Support at the State Level**

In order to maintain their federal match, each American state is required to allocate funds to its state arts agency. To increase support to arts industries, several American cities and states have developed tax-based initiatives related to sales or property taxes, while others benefit from certain municipal licensing fees. Arizona’s state arts funding has for the last fourteen years been made up of three components: a Legislative Appropriation, receipts from the Arts Trust Fund, and interest receipts from the State of Arizona-held ArtShare Endowment.

**Table 2.2: State Arts Budget Summary, Fiscal Years 2006 through 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arizona Commission on the Arts: State Arts Budget Summary, Fiscal Years 2006 through 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislative Appropriation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Appropriated</td>
<td>$1,847,100.00 $1,888,100.00 $2,127,600.00 $1,930,800.00 $968,500.00 $665,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Reductions</td>
<td>— $— $96,900.00 $423,200.00 $146,000.00 TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation Adjusted</td>
<td>$1,847,100.00 $1,888,100.00 $2,030,700.00 $1,507,600.00 $822,500.00 TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts Trust Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Received (estimate for 2011)</td>
<td>$1,496,130.00 $1,560,300.00 $1,706,625.00 $1,480,020.00 $1,546,460.00 $1,182,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Reductions</td>
<td>$— $— $— $— $115,400.00 $115,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Trust Fund Adjusted</td>
<td>$1,496,130.00 $1,560,300.00 $1,706,625.00 $1,480,020.00 $1,431,060.00 $1,066,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ArtShare Endowment Interest</strong></td>
<td>$462,283.57 $827,609.82 $1,000,134.71 $400,312.55 $141,133.86 $9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEA Partnership Agreement</td>
<td>$717,900.00 $708,400.00 $806,900.00 $863,400.00 $938,600.00 $938,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants, Private Funds</td>
<td>(estimate for 2011) $123,300.00 $130,000.00 $95,900.00 $129,300.00 $116,600.00 $116,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Annual Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(estimate for 2011)</td>
<td>$4,646,713.57 $5,114,409.82 $5,640,259.71 $4,380,632.55 $3,449,893.86 $2,796,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ArtShare Endowment Corpus</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus</td>
<td>$11,000,000.00 $12,000,000.00 $20,000,000.00 $20,000,000.00 $14,652,300.00 $9,884,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Reductions</td>
<td>— $— $— $5,347,700.00 $(4,767,700.00) $(9,884,600.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Adjusted</td>
<td>$11,000,000.00 $12,000,000.00 $20,000,000.00 $14,652,300.00 $9,884,600.00 $0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Arizona Commission on the Arts

Within the Governor’s proposed state budget for fiscal years 2012 and 2013, the Arts Commission’s legislative appropriation has been zeroed out, listed at $0.
Overall Budget and Legislative Appropriation: The Arizona Commission on the Arts was established in 1966 with a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts. The State of Arizona began contributing funding to its state arts agency in fiscal year 1970, with a legislative appropriation of $23,561. At its highest level of funding, in 2008, the Arts Commission received a legislative appropriation of $2.1 million. With this appropriation, in 2008, Arizona ranked 33rd in the nation in annual per capita arts support.

During the prolonged recession at the end of the 21st century’s first decade, and as Arizona’s fiscal crisis worsened, state funding for the Arizona Commission on the Arts was legislatively reduced by 60% over three years, in addition to the raid and elimination of the groundbreaking publicly-held $20 million ArtShare Endowment (Table 22.2).

For the current fiscal year, fiscal year 2011, the Arts Commission’s annual legislative appropriation stands at $665,600, its lowest level in twenty-six years. The Arts Commission’s fiscal year 2011 budget of $2.8 million stands at its lowest level in twenty-one years. Arizona now ranks 49th in the nation in annual per capita arts support, providing only 10 cents per capita in support of its arts industry. The national annual average for arts support is 87 cents per capita.11

In January 2011, Arizona Governor Jan Brewer released her budget proposal for fiscal years 2012 and 2013. This budget proposal recommends eliminating the Arts Commission’s annual legislative appropriation, listing it at $0 for both fiscal years.

Arts Trust Fund: The Arizona Arts Trust Fund was established in 1989 as a supplemental statewide funding source for the arts. In recognition of a vibrant arts industry’s pivotal role in attracting lucrative corporate contracts to Arizona, as well as its role as an economic driver in local communities (rural communities in particular), Governor Rose Mofford and the Arizona State Legislature sought to broaden state arts support, or as per statute, to “advance and foster the arts in Arizona.”

Arizona businesses are required to file annually with the Arizona Corporation Commission at a rate of $45 per year. With the establishment of the Arts Trust Fund, the Arizona State Legislature directed $15 from every annual Corporation Commission filing fee to the Arizona Commission on the Arts. Receipts are delivered monthly to the Arts Commission and disbursed statewide through existing operating support and arts learning grant programs.

Requirements as part of the enabling legislation related to investment in communities or areas the legislature identified as underserved. Per statute, “participating organizations (are required) to outline a plan to include representatives of racial and ethnic minorities on their boards,” and the Arts Commission is required to direct “a portion of the funds to organizations representing handicapped persons, a portion of the funds to artists who are members of racial or ethnic minorities, and a portion of the funds to organizations representing rural areas.” As demonstrated in Table 22.2, this dedicated fund continues to be targeted for reductions as a part of ongoing efforts to balance Arizona’s state budget.

Governor Brewer’s proposed fiscal year 2012 and 2013 budget includes an additional 8% reduction to the Arts Trust Fund.
ArtShare Endowment Program: The Arizona ArtShare Endowment program was developed in 1996 by Arizona Governor Fife Symington and the Arizona State Legislature in an effort to sustain the future of the arts in Arizona through perpetual endowments funded by public and private contributions. The program was constructed as a model public/private partnership.

The State of Arizona committed to fund a $20 million endowment.
- This endowment was to be held by the State Treasurer and invested on behalf of the Arizona Commission on the Arts, the state arts agency.
- The Arts Commission would use earned interest to provide grants to support stabilization and advancement of nonprofit arts organizations, training of educators in implementation and assessment of Department of Education Art Standards, and statewide arts education opportunities. The endowment corpus would remain invested and untapped in perpetuity.
- Funds from the endowment would augment, not replace, existing state appropriations and other support for the arts in Arizona.
- The endowment would be funded in installments by the Arizona State Legislature between fiscal years 1998 and 2008, with the public funding component completed in 2008, concluding the State of Arizona’s funding obligation to the program.

The Arizona business community and private donors engaged in fundraising efforts to support the development of private statewide arts endowments.
- Leveraging the state commitment to the partnership, Arizona arts organizations would collect funding from national and local businesses, as well as private donors, to develop their own endowment funds.
- Private endowment funds would be managed by entities such as the Arizona Community Foundation (including a private statewide arts endowment invested on behalf of the Arts Commission which now totals $1.4 million; providing $75,000 in annual interest income), Community Foundation for Southern Arizona, and other local arts organizations.

By constructing the endowment program in this manner, the State of Arizona provided an incentive for national and local businesses and individual donors to donate directly to statewide arts organizations: donors could feel confident that the organizations to which they donated met the strict accountability standards required for state arts agency grants. With this program the State of Arizona modeled best business practices by promoting the development of endowments and cash reserves, and by committing to long-term public/private enterprise.

Full funding of the endowment was considered a momentous statewide achievement and looked upon nationally as a model public/private investment in the perpetuity of Arizona’s arts, culture, and arts education communities, and an exemplary commitment to creativity, infrastructure, and development in a new American state. In addition, when the ArtShare Endowment program was launched in 1996, only two Arizona arts organizations had active endowment programs, totaling $3 million. In 2008 when the state completed its funding obligation to the program, nearly twenty Arizona arts organizations had endowment funds, totaling $41 million.
In budget-balancing efforts from fiscal years 2009 to 2011, with three separate actions, the Arizona State Legislature redirected portions of the ArtShare Endowment corpus to the state’s general fund, zeroing out the publicly-held endowment by extricating all public funds from the venture. The Arts Commission still maintains its small private ArtShare Endowment, held by the Arizona Community Foundation, and in 2010 renewed its effort to solicit private funds to increase the capacity of this endowment with its *The Choice is Art* campaign.12

**Support for the Arts in Arizona from Local Governments**

The primary mechanism for the delivery of funding from city and county governments is through designated local arts agencies, though a small number of cities and counties provide direct grants to Arizona arts organizations. Arizona is home to thirty-six designated local arts agencies, half of which are nonprofit arts organizations and half of which are city-operated (generally speaking, those with larger annual budgets are city-operated). Some of these local arts agencies provide grants to arts organizations within their jurisdictions, and others offer programming and services in areas such as arts education, public art, performing arts presenting, festivals, and professional development programs for artists and education professionals. Annual budgets for Arizona local arts agencies range from $2,000 to $10 million.

Many of Arizona’s cities and towns have experienced sizeable budget shortfalls since the beginning of the recent recession. For city-operated, municipally-funded local arts agencies, this has meant significant reductions to their budgets, which has in turn meant significant reductions to the grants they deliver to arts organizations. Two of Arizona’s largest local arts agencies have outlined their reductions thusly: the Phoenix Office of Cultural Affairs estimates it is receiving 72% less funding from the City of Phoenix since the beginning of the recession; the Tucson Pima Arts Council has experienced a 70% reduction in funding over three years.

**Private Funding for the Arts in Arizona**

Arizona does not at this time have evidentiary data outlining aggregate private sector contributions to the Arizona arts industry. This lack of credible data is being addressed by the 2011 launch of the Pew Charitable Trust’s Cultural Data Project in Arizona.13 The Cultural Data Project is an online system which collects grantees’ financial data and offers powerful reporting tools, allowing organizations and funders to monitor and analyze industry-wide fiscal trends.

Still, even without substantiating private funding information, there is little doubt that Arizona struggles with undercapitalized private funds sources and that among arts organizations there is stiff competition for private dollars. This is likely the result of several factors:

- Arizona is a young state without longstanding philanthropic relationships and traditions.
- Arizona is home to very few foundation funders as compared to other American states.
• Arizona lacks a critical mass of midsized and large corporate headquarters which might be inclined to support arts industry programs and initiatives.
• Arizona’s business sector is under-diversified and largely dependent on new construction, which, given the challenges facing the real estate market, means that developers and construction companies likely do not have funds to invest in arts-based ventures.
• Arizona is home to a significant population of retirees who have moved from other American cities. These retirees are often more likely to support arts institutions in the cities they’ve moved from than arts organizations in their newly-adopted state.

Though statewide private funding data is not currently available, studies from the early 2000s produced robust funding data for the Phoenix Metropolitan area. In the Maricopa Regional Arts and Culture Task Force’s 2004 report, Vibrant Culture, Thriving Economy, Phoenix ranked last amongst 10 like-sized cities in per capita contributed revenue to the arts.  

**Questions for Discussion**

How can Arizona best capitalize on the creative, economic, and educational potential of its arts sector in the context of post-recession economic recovery?

What kind of funding goals should Arizona strive to achieve in support of its arts sector, and in what timeframe?

Jaime Dempsey joined the Arizona Commission on the Arts in 2006, and has since been instrumental in reimagining the public relations potential of a state arts agency, leading the renovation of the agency’s communications vehicles, online presence, and social media efforts. As Deputy Director, she has managed the restructuring of programs and services amidst significant agency budget reductions, curates the annual Southwest Arts Conference (a statewide convening of arts administrators, artists, educators, and advocates), and currently leads the development of the promotional campaign for the arts in Arizona, The Choice is Art. Jaime also serves on planning committees and coordinates peer-learning opportunities for the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, an organization serving the United States’ 56 state and territorial arts agencies. Prior to joining the Arts Commission, Jaime developed community programs and partnerships as the inaugural Program Manager for the Virginia G. Piper Center for Creative Writing at Arizona State University. From 1998 to 2003, Jaime managed arts education programs for the nexStage theatre and coordinated programs for the multidisciplinary Sun Valley Center for the Arts in Sun Valley, Idaho. From 2007 to 2009, she taught semester-long courses in Arts Leadership and Nonprofit Arts Management for Arizona State University. Jaime studied theatre and anthropology at Arizona State University and grew up in Peoria, Arizona. She is passionate about responsible pet ownership and volunteers regularly for Phoenix’s HALO Animal Rescue.


*How the United States Funds the Arts.*

Ibid. The history of European art patronage is radically different from that of America, as are current funding mechanisms.

Western States Arts Federation: http://www.westaf.org/.


See *Vibrant Culture—Thriving Economy: Arts, Culture and Prosperity in Arizona’s Valley of the Sun* (Maricopa Regional Arts and Culture Task Force, 2004):
http://www.pipertrust.org/publications/programspecificpubs.aspx
Chapter 3

Arts and Culture: Arizona’s Significant Stealth Economy

James K. Ballinger
Director, Phoenix Art Museum

Key Points

- The arts and culture industries represent a significant economic engine
- Arizona’s arts and culture non-profits have not been included in economic impact studies
- Arts and culture professionals can play an important role in economic development discussions
- Education, arts, and culture are among the factors businesses consider when deciding where to locate
- Investment in the arts and culture creates a better business environment and overall quality of life

Arizona’s economy, like other states is driven by the industrial employee base and the gross revenues derived by various industries. Thus, you have the Arizona Commerce Authority ranking categories, economic indicator studies of all kinds, and even the Business Journal’s book of lists. These studies year after year create both the reality and the perception of a State’s economic engine. For decades Arizona was known for the “Five C’s”: copper, cattle, cotton, citrus, and climate. In more recent years it is tourism, banking, mining, high technology, etc.

Absent from the larger view is the non-profit group as a whole, and as the subject for this overview, the more narrow category of the arts and culture economy. The purpose of this brief chapter is to create a framework that brings cultural Arizona out of the economic shadows and offers recommendations as to how this “industry” can become active part of local and statewide economic and public policy dialogues, helping to move the state out of these difficult times toward economic recovery.

A June 18, 2000, Boston Globe article by Gail Kelly effectively sums up the situation. “Close Look, Healthy Arts Community Helps Draw Business,” discusses a report written by Beth Siegel and funded by the Massachusetts Port Authority, Philip Morris and Raytheon (also located in Tucson) for the New England Foundation for the Arts which states: “it became evident to us how much the environment and arts and culture were determining where companies want to locate. But arts people were never at the table when economic development was being discussed.” The New England Foundation took this study and enlarged the findings with their own, titled The Creative Economy Initiative: The Role of the Arts and Culture in New England’s Economic Competitiveness. This study moved the discussion away from what the author called the normal “yawn” and successfully activated it
by including a much broader look at who and what comprises the arts and culture economy. Over ten years ago a national meeting of Fortune 200 relocation officers convened at the Arizona Biltmore Hotel in Phoenix. During the meeting the president of the association was interviewed by a local radio station and commented that education was far and away the number one consideration for relocating a company or for retaining a company because it meant an available quality workforce locally and it satisfied company employees’ needs. When asked, “how about arts and culture?” he responded that a vibrant cultural scene would never dictate a move, but it would be a very significant reason for not putting a city on the list of potential communities. Obviously this is a lesson worth bearing in mind when considering “Capitalizing on Arizona’s Arts and Culture.”

Recently an example of the blending of cultural activity and the economy is the offer made by several major Canadian investors to bring an exhibition of major works of art from the Vatican Museum collections in Rome to the Phoenix Art Museum. The investors decided to visit Phoenix. It is normal to inspect the facilities for space, environmental conditions, staffing, and security systems; surprisingly, this was not the purpose. They emphasized the Museum was well known and respected; rather the concerns were “can the community support such an expensive exhibition?” Three issues needed to be resolved: first, the state-wide economy is not particularly strong and diverse; second, given the overall educational rankings, will there be a curious audience wanting to purchase tickets for the exhibition; and third, the local corporations do not have a reputation of supporting expensive traveling international exhibitions and cultural venues. These investors recognized that Arizona ranks 48th in government support of the arts and 42nd in combined public and private support. Arizona is also at the bottom of most national K-12 educational rankings. Numbers researched in depth between 2003 and 2008 by the now defunct Maricopa Partnership for Arts and Culture corroborated these numbers and went further and benchmarked metropolitan Phoenix against eight cities normally seen as economic competitors. The exhibition did not come to Phoenix.

To underscore the impact of arts and culture on our state, there are many other findings that can be reviewed. Several years ago, while attending the United States Conference of Mayors, 200 mayors across party lines signed a resolution emphatically stating the importance of investing in arts and culture to create a better business environment and a better overall quality of life. For decades national studies have demonstrated that the better the arts are integrated into the schools, the better students perform core studies, especially math and science.

More recently, a study created by the Rand Institute and the University of Chicago demonstrated how long-term investment in early childhood education is a tremendously positive investment against other social costs such as crime, health care, etc. (the report did not mention the arts). Mike Hicks, Director of the Center for Business and Economic Research at Ball State University, writing in the Indianapolis Business Journal (October 25-31, 2010) made the following statements after admitting he was dubious of the theory: “The return on investment of early childhood education was clearly positive. We double and triple-checked the numbers, ran the simulation again, and still the benefits were positive. In terms of investment, we found early childhood education outweighed virtually everything else government could do to boost long-run economic performance and enhance educational outcomes.” The experts also agree that K-12 students involved with the arts perform better, supporting
the idea that investment in these programs create long-term economic business success. The big question then, is if scientific studies by a broad range of academic institutions, consultants, and committees consistently prove investment and experience in arts and culture create greater life quality and make sense economically, then why are so few communities willing to create public/private partnerships to take significant action? The primary reason is that leaders of the arts and culture community are rarely included when community economic strategies and decisions are made, even when some cultural institutions are larger economic engines than some of those community for-profit businesses. Thus, in order for this process to change, cultural leaders must change their paradigms on how they describe their industry, and this creates several challenges. Traditionally arts and education are seen as separate entities.

However, most cultural organizations are incorporated as educational institutions and play a significant role in the educational process. Historically, arts and cultural economic impact studies tend to examine only the non-profit, institutional budgets with widely varied categories of organizations. This makes it very difficult to create benchmarking studies. Two consistent national economic benchmarking studies are normally created by Americans for the Arts and the National Endowment of the Arts. Finally, as non-profit corporations, arts and culture institutions are not seen as part of “the business community” but cultural leaders can provide creative ideas to move the discussion forward in partnership with those tackling significant economic challenges in a town, city, or state.

Assuming the citizens of Arizona are desirous of, and willing to adopt the core policy change required, what tools are needed? Establishing an agreed upon definition of what institutions, businesses, and professions make up the art economy is a place to start. Next, an in-depth research project can be undertaken to measure and benchmark the art economy. Finally, this information can be utilized to change the dialogue toward a full acceptance of the non-profit sector, especially arts and culture being a part of policy strategies. The good news is that pieces of the projects and some of the research already exist in a high quality form but performing more in-depth and complex work will add significantly to what we now know.

To describe what organizations, businesses, and professions comprise the art economy, let us begin with the categories funded by the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the appropriate areas of the National Endowment for Humanities (NEH). Both created in 1965, these two organizations have evolved their areas of funding over four decades. The NEA funds projects in the performing arts, theater arts, literary arts, visual arts, architecture, planning, graphic design, industrial design, and fashion design. The NEH overlaps some with the NEA but also deals with historic sites, cultural preservation, and publications. What is important to understand is that both the NEA and the NEH make grants almost totally to qualifying 510(c)3 tax-exempt organizations. They do, in addition, make very limited grants to individuals from their combined $370 million annual budget.

To expand the true definition of the art and culture economy from the institutional base many additional businesses and individuals must be evaluated. For this certain areas of historic sites, historic preservation, and defined park district projects may be considered. Looking next at what our local arts and culture commissions are funding, one would need to add zoological parks, botanical gardens, science museums, the new Musical Instrument Museum...
in north Phoenix, foundations open to the public such as the De Grazia Foundation in Tucson, the Amerind Foundation in Dragoon, Paolo Soleri’s Cosanti and Arcosanti, Taliesin West and other landmarked architectural sites, children’s museums, historical museums, historic houses, and more. Other non-profit educational entities which operate as a part of our universities and community colleges are a major part of this economy. All have museums, performing spaces, and publications created in art departments, history departments, creative writing departments and schools of architecture, design, and planning. If we look at K-12 education, there are many art teachers, theater programs, dance, and band programs.

Next, such a study would also want to include many for-profit businesses and individuals. Start with independent artists themselves, of which there are thousands all across the state on our Indian reservations and every size town. Their primary income is their art, craft, or creative talent whatever it might be. There are a number of for-profit art schools such as the Phoenix Art Institute and the Collins School of Graphic Design. Many of the state’s casinos also have gallery and museum components. As you dig deeper you will find a much broader economy than has previously been recognized.

Many of our cities have annual art, craft, and performing art festivals. They also have monthly “art walks” which do not discriminate between for-profit and non-profit entities. Many programs presented at public venues such as Comerica Theater in Phoenix will qualify. Peruse a recent, although “antiquated,” Greater Phoenix Yellow Pages, and you will find over one thousand listings under art materials stores, commercial art, graphic design (almost 200) video game design, dance instructors, musical instruction, music publishers, architects (450 listings), and art galleries and consultants (over 200). Arizona is also home to Fender Musical Instruments. The state has a significant movie industry, especially in Tucson. Add to this list all of the similar entities across Arizona and you will begin to see a clearer picture of the state’s yet to be fully defined art and culture economy. Everything listed above is a direct arts and culture business. It must be recognized that a reasonable portion of tourist activity in the areas of hotel accommodations, restaurants, and transportation is a direct result of cultural tourism.

At the outset of this chapter, it was noted that the New England Foundation was able to successfully energize the economic dialogue by being more inclusive. This is a model that Arizona could use. Arizona, through cooperation with Americans for the Arts, has assembled information three times during the past twenty years to reflect the tremendous vitality of our arts organizations.

Two further studies and publications were a direct result of these efforts, *Arts in Tucson’s Economy: An Economic and Tax Revenue Impact Study* (The University of Arizona Office of Economic Development, 2001) and *Vital to Valuable: The Economic Impact of the Valley Non-Profit Arts Organizations and Their Audiences* (coordinated by the Phoenix Office of Arts and Culture, 2007). The Tucson study reported a $100 million economic impact and the metropolitan Phoenix study arrived at a number of $361 million. Obviously, additional impact is felt in the smaller cities of Arizona resulting in over $500 million in economic impact.
During these same years benchmarking studies were masterfully undertaken by the Maricopa Partnership for Arts and Culture (MPAC—later Arizona Campaign for Arts and Culture). The purpose of their work was to declare the necessity of cultural vibrancy in a community’s development, benchmark our cities against national competitors, and finally recommend the path for Arizona to succeed. In many ways this Town Hall is the continuation of this fine work. Two economic facts of many stand out in the MPAC studies: *Creative Connections: Arts, Ideas and Economic Progress in Greater Phoenix* (prepared by Collaborative Economics) and *Perceptions Matter* (published with The Greater Phoenix Economic Council). First Phoenix, then the state, is woefully behind in government support and private support of the arts, ranking last against eight competitive benchmarked cities. These cities such as San Diego, Seattle, Salt Lake City, Austin, and others were selected by the business community as those we most compete with for a range of business and investment. Secondly, they found that while 75% to 80% of business leaders surveyed feel a vibrant cultural community is a key factor to decide where to live and work, only 20% of those surveyed feel that metropolitan Phoenix has this quality to offer. Clearly, we have work to do in Arizona to change the perception of national business leaders and for cultural leaders to be actively included in Arizona economic policy and strategy decisions.

One way to do this is to create an all inclusive, statistically correct and well-stated statement of the true art and culture economy of our state. If this would be done, and then placed within our own Commerce Authority’s categories of industry types it is quite possible that arts and culture would rank among our top industries. If that were the case, then other business entities might not consider the field as “charitable,” but rather “investible.” To create a fairly wide economic range, numbers could be assigned to various categories as mentioned in this essay, so that judgment can be passed. As a quick comparison, a broadly defined non-profit and for-profit economic study only of the performing arts in New Mexico (Av Shama and Associates, Albuquerque, Fall 1986) found over half a billion dollars in economic activity. The visual arts would most likely be larger, and then add the various cultural amenities to that total for the real impact in New Mexico.

**A Hypothetical Possibility:** Is Arizona perhaps even larger? Based on most indicators, the answer would be, “yes.” Looking at workforce estimates, the National Endowment of the Arts 2008 study, *Artists in the Workforce: 1990-2005*, IRS statistics found that 1.4% of the Arizona workforce is listed as artists, just below the national norm of 1.5%. Given Arizona’s workforce of 2.5 million, then 37,500 would be artists or arts professionals. Apply this number to average annual earnings of $27,500 and this results in industry earnings in Arizona of $1 billion. Of course, there is double counting as wages are part of reported institutional expenses, but the message remains a strong one, and makes clear the need to fully understand this component of our statewide cultural economy. For argument sake, assume our cultural economy to be easily over $1 billion, and perhaps upon a completed, accurate examination, over $1.5 billion. Where does that place its scale against other areas of the State’s economy? A cursory perusal of the State’s economic indicators of GDP as listed by the Bureau of Economic Analysis shows that the field would rate favorably with agriculture, information and data processing, insurance, and software and publishing. These last industries would all be considered when economic strategy and advancement are broadly discussed.
Arizona’s recovery from the current recession presents a new opportunity for members of the arts and culture community to participate both at the strategic economic level and with public policy discussions in advancing the good work done by community art commissions and the Maricopa Partnership for Arts and Culture. The studies connecting education and the quality of life can thus gain momentum. Creating a high quality study and description of the unrecognized art and culture economy, not just its economic impact, could support this, allowing the art and culture community to develop leadership who can speak with a more broad voice. Recasting the discussion from charity versus investments will give arts and culture leaders parity with other business and economic leaders. Changing the paradigm reveals that art and culture is big business that enhances so many other economic sectors. It is a growth business. It is clean business. It attracts outside investment and businesses. In summation, art and culture is smart business.

James K. Ballinger has been Director of the Phoenix Art Museum since 1982. He joined the staff as Curator of Collections in 1974. He also served as Curator of American Art from 1974 to 2004, and continues to serve as Chief Curator. In November 2006 working with architects Tod Williams/Billie Tsien and Associates, Phoenix Art Museum completed its master plan developed during the early 1990’s which included two capital and endowment campaigns. The first expansion completed in 1996 doubled the size of the facility. The most recent construction included a new lobby, sculpture garden and wing dedicated to modern and contemporary art. Combined the expansions cost $55,000,000, and $25,000,000 was added to the Museum’s endowment. Ballinger is the immediate past President of the Association of Art Museum Directors, and sits on the boards of the Phoenix Community Alliance and The Spencer Museum of Art at his alma mater, The University of Kansas. In November 2004, he was appointed by President Bush to serve a six-year term on the National Council on the Arts. The Council advises the chair of the National Endowment for the Arts on policies, programs, and procedures for carrying out the agency’s functions, duties and responsibilities. In addition, he is a member of the Dean’s Council of the Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts at Arizona State University. Previously, he served as a director for the L. Roy Papp Mutual Funds and in 2003/2004 was a member of the Maricopa Regional Arts and Culture Task Force. He received a B.A. in American History and an M.A. in the History of Art from the University of Kansas, and completed the Executive Program for Nonprofit Leaders at the Stanford Graduate School of Business.
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Key Points

- The humanities contribute significantly to civic and civil discussions about difficult issues
- The humanities bring citizens together and help identify common values
- By teaching us about the past, the humanities can help us better navigate the present and the future
- Fundamental to education and creativity, the humanities contribute to economic prosperity and personal well being

The Arizona Humanities Council builds a just and civil society by creating opportunities to explore our shared human experiences through discussion, learning and reflection.

— Mission Statement, Arizona Humanities Council

Knowledge is no guarantee of good behavior, but ignorance is a virtual guarantee of bad behavior.¹

My heroes are ordinary people but their lives are not ordinary. They learned from the power of history and personal experiences to transcend artificial barriers that demarcate and diminish human beings and, in turn, lay claim to the common ground of humanity that survives despite of it.²

The lens of this chapter is broadly grounded in the work of the Arizona Humanities Council, but there are comparable groups in each of the fifty states, making the issues addressed here national ones, though ones that are embedded in the social and cultural fabric of Arizona. Further, the issues articulated have direct links to the economy.
Can You Hear Me Now, or Is Anyone Listening?

Despite the fact that today we are incessantly emailing, texting, tweeting, and skyping, we are not always talking with one another in truly meaningful ways. Because we are all in such a hurry to get to some place and/or to get so many things done, ours seems always a race against the clock; so much so that our communications are often little more than sound bites—incomplete ideas with minimum to no substance beyond sending, receiving, and then often working to translate cryptic codes. Surely, communications can be much more. If we are not talking with each other in substantive ways, chances are that we are also not listening to each other any more attentively. Where there is no talking or listening, there is likely to be very little if any connecting with others in ways that enhance our lives or the lives of others.

The work of the Arizona Humanities Council (AHC) has always been and continues to be about encouraging and facilitating self-reflection, asking questions, and identifying the many ties that bind us in one shared experience of living as fulfilled, imaginative, peaceful, and, yes, vulnerable humans. Especially at this most critical time in our local, national, and global human history do we strive to look beyond the divisiveness of illegal immigration, beyond our different perspectives on immigration reform and national health care, beyond our own state’s ban on ethnic studies, beyond the perceived and real border-crossing threats and myths, beyond gross national products, and beyond national deficit numbers to see a greater Truth that transcends, inspires, and binds us to one another.

Humanities Bringing People Together

The mission of the humanities is central to our individual and collective efforts to achieve for ourselves and to help others to achieve a healthy life of contentment without spiritual, moral, or ethical compromise, making essential the vitality and range of humanist thinking and action. Through imagination, creativity, self-reflection, and self-examination, we can engage others in civil discourse that does not divide us. As Dr. Yasmin Saikia, Professor of History and Hardt-Nickachos Chair in Peace Studies at Arizona State University, maintains, “Peace is not conflict resolution, nor compromise and reconciliation with the brutal past as an afterthought. Peace is not non-violent means of politics. Peace requires continuous and active engagement with oneself and the world to learn and truly appreciate the indivisibility of the human community.”3 Humanists champion conflict that challenges mindless adherence to restrictive tradition and remain deeply suspicious of unmonitored authority. Humanists and humanist thinking resist ideas that control our minds and that lead us toward narcissism, ruthless competition, “suicide of the soul,” economic and technological hoarding, and self-identity and self-worth achieved through and defined by material acquisition.

Understanding and standing against social injustices even as we promote cultural humility are fundamental to our efforts to being culturally literate and to understanding and appreciating the value of compassion and empathy. Our global society flourishes only when individuals take risks by admitting our human frailties and our individual vulnerabilities. That we live and die is the great human equalizer. What each of us does between this starting and ending point is the humanities work to which we as representatives of the Arizona Humanities Council are steadfastly committed.
**Humanities Helping to Identify Common Values**

**Defining the humanities:** AHC shares with over fifty other such non-profits across the United States the goal of bringing people together to talk, to listen, and to connect with one another. In this spirit, the humanities are defined broadly as the study of “language, both modern and classical; linguistics; literature; history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archaeology; comparative religion; ethics; the history, criticism and theory of the arts; those aspects of social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods; and the study and application of the humanities to the human environment with particular attention to reflecting our diverse heritage, traditions, and history and to the relevance of the humanities to the current conditions of national life.”

True humanities work massages the human heart within each of us at the same time this work challenges each of us to look beyond our superficial differences to realize and celebrate our common connections. Although our values differ, our need to belong and to connect with others is fundamental to our collaborative efforts to create new knowledge. Our ability to be life-long learners has absolutely everything to do with the extent to which we know and act responsibly in our roles as engaged and enlightened global citizens who know that despite our differences, “we are more alike … than we are unalike.”

The challenge of engaged humanists is to demonstrate the local and more far-reaching impact of what we do, why we do what we do, and how we do what we do. Our crucial role of putting together the puzzles of our individual and collective past, present, and future is simultaneously our greatest challenge and indeed our greatest luxury in probing the complexities of how we exist. The who, why, and how of our existence is the strength of confirming that **humanities matter**, especially at this moment when attention to humanities work continues to be for too many of our neighbors invisible, unrealized, or undervalued.

Acknowledging that “Humanities create. Humanities communicate. Humanities remember,” we acknowledge as the duty and pleasure of humanists everywhere to question and to seek answers to the very questions that map and define our identities. We are encouraged by the notion of possibilities in humanities work, asking the right questions that lead to a host of creative possibilities. AHC encourages Arizonans to ask questions and to arrive at answers collaboratively, answers that invariably lead to other provocative questions. Humanities then is less about a static product than about a fluid process of making meaning, of interpreting, and of finding significance in our everyday lives.

**Humanities Teaching about Past to Navigate Future**

Arizona is an increasingly diverse, multicultural environment. The humanities offer insightful pathways to help identify problems, to find solutions, and to address the rapidly changing circumstances of our state. Since 1973, AHC has awarded over $10 million in grants to organizations that present a wide range of public humanities programs statewide. Most of these grants were under $3,000—all under $10,000. Often, these awards leveraged other support for the projects. While this is an unsophisticated barometer of the vitality of
humanities programming in Arizona because thousands of humanities projects and conversations occur without AHC support, it nevertheless indicates the reality that dialogues employing centrally humanist perspectives of bridging and sharing cultures through talking, listening, and connecting are happening throughout Arizona, a state leading the nation in its monumental change and growth. According to the *U.S. Census* (1980, 2009), Latinos comprised about 16% of Arizona’s population of 2.7 million persons in 1980. Today, Latinos are about 30.8% of the state’s 6.6 million population. By 2035, minority groups will constitute 51% of Arizona’s population, and by 2040, Latinos will be the majority ethnic group in the state. The humanities can provide thoughtful, creative, and respectful ways to meet our complex challenges and to celebrate our basic commonalities.

AHC encourages people to use the tools of the humanities to understand our diverse cultural heritages and to engage in thoughtful discussions about our collective futures. Beyond the grantmaking, AHC also addresses these challenges through our annual Lorraine Frank Lecture, our literature and medicine program, and our book discussions. Our Road Scholars program sends humanities experts across Arizona to speak at the request of organizations such as libraries, museums, and community centers. Host institutions select speakers from a diverse menu of scholars who discuss subjects such as Arizona during the Depression, Chicano art and culture, Arizona place names, religious pluralism, Arizona women artists, archaeology and prehistoric cultures, African American experiences in Arizona, the Arizona Women’s Heritage Trail, and dozens of other subjects. Local community interest in diverse humanities themes drives and sustains our programs.

AHC grants support humanities projects that arise from the interests and needs of organizations from Window Rock to Yuma and Kingman to Bisbee. These grants fund quality programs using the insights of the humanities in multiple formats such as storytelling, symposia, exhibitions, lectures, film festivals, publications, book discussions, oral histories, electronic technologies, cultural festivals, poetry readings, public radio programs, history fairs, and other approaches.

The Museum of Northern Arizona in Flagstaff, for example, presents Navajo, Hopi, and Zuni festivals to highlight the histories, cultures, artistic expressions, food traditions, and other elements of Native American heritage. A recent Zuni festival explored Zuni language and education, emergence and migration, art industry, and the role of mapping in preserving Zuni culture. Perspectives of the Zuni scholars were invaluable in providing opportunities for learning and cultural exchange between native and non-native peoples in this public setting. AHC funded the Hopi Tribe’s Homolovi Podcast Project, which used current technologies to impart traditional Hopi knowledge about the ancient pueblo community of Homolovi, north of Winslow. KNAU in Flagstaff broadcasts five programs on “Arizona Ghost Towns: Dead or Alive,” linking oral histories, interviews, and music to explore the notion of place in Arizona and what we can learn from Arizona ghost towns. Grand Canyon River Guides conducted and widely disseminated oral histories of female Colorado River runners, which greatly expanded understanding of a predominately male field. Such examples suggest the wide variety of public humanities programs arising from communities and institutions on the Colorado Plateau.
A few days after the 9/11 attacks, in demented retaliation, a man shot and killed Balbar Singh Sodhi, a Sikh, who ran a business in Mesa. A few years later, the Arizona Museum of Natural History created the exhibition “Arab Americans in Arizona” to present the history of Arab American immigration and the cultural contributions to the state. AHC funded a lecture series that explored Arabic language and literature, media stereotypes, Islam in the United States, Arabs in medicine, women in Islamic and Arab cultures, and other subjects. Over 65,000 visitors experienced the project, whose goal was to provide information and change suspicious attitudes about fellow citizens from other cultures. Also with the goal of promoting cross-cultural conversation and understanding, Mesa Community College, with AHC financial assistance, has presented annual international film festivals focusing upon individual film directors and the countries in which they work—Mexico, Iran, and Japan, for instance. Reaching wide and diverse audiences, these programs offer opportunities for participants to learn about and to discuss the countries and subjects of the films as well as the goals and challenges of their directors. In Phoenix, Valle del Sol produced the film Embracing America, a non-partisan documentary that explores issues of immigration and immigration reform through the perspectives of residents, political activists, and scholars. A town hall setting provided a neutral and inviting forum to connect and to dialogue with one another and to experience new models for social change.

In southern Arizona, the Arizona State Museum presented “Mexico: The Revolution and Beyond” through exhibition, book signing, and discussions of early 20th century Mexican history and culture. The University of Arizona’s Center for Middle Eastern Studies provided a summer institute for secondary teachers and a parallel program for high school students that focused on the historical, cultural, and religious traditions of the Middle East. The Center for Desert Archaeology in Tucson presents “Archaeological Cafes,” an exploration of the latest archaeological research in the Southwest. These projects reach larger audiences through electronic distribution. AHC sponsors the Smithsonian Institution’s “Museums on Main Street” program in Arizona, and when the exhibition “Between Fences” traveled to Ajo, collaboration among high school students in Ajo, the nearby Tohono O’odham Nation, and students across the U.S. border in Sonoita, Sonora created the most marvelous artworks and dialogues focusing on breaking down physical barriers such as fences and cultural divides.

Many do not know that the United States government interned Japanese Americans during World War II in western Arizona near Parker on the Colorado River. The Colorado River Indian Tribes explored the internment on the Poston reservation through reality and fiction. Cynthia Kadohata, author of Weedflower, the story of a Japanese American female’s experience in the camp, participated as a panelist and the book was discussed throughout the Parker Unified School District. Prominent in the dialogue was a focus on race relations on reservations between tribal and non-native peoples and among the various tribal affiliations: Mohave, Chemehuevi, Navajo, and Hopi. Participants agreed that, even locally, little is understood of this nationally significant event in U.S. history. These few examples from around the state merely sample the extraordinary diversity of presentations and dialogues that utilize humanities perspectives to explore issues of local and national significance. Each in its own way contributes to talking, listening, and connecting, and builds our common humanity toward a better present and future.
Arizona Doing Humanities

Humanities contribute to our prosperity, to our creativity, and to our civility. As our local, national, and global economies suffer, as educational programs are cut, as teachers lose their jobs, “state support for higher education is in decline nationwide.”8 The U.S. ranking as a leader in higher education has plummeted. In Arizona, we witness schools and libraries closing across the state as we scramble to deal with looming fiscal deficits, creating more economic disparities among us. As we ponder the needs that determine the quality of life for all of Arizona’s citizens, we acknowledge that “there is growing social and economic stratiﬁcation between those with access to a quality higher education and those without.”9 Such realities might spell disaster for our individual and collective futures were we not committed to working creatively and together to address both the social and economic impact of these changes.

**Humanities contribute to our economic stability** as “education is a public investment in the nation’s interest.”10 In many fundamental ways, the U.S. cannot compete effectively in a global economy without the humanities; indeed “our edge lies in our creativity, entrepreneurship and innovation,” and “the humanities are particularly good at developing those skills.”11 Arizona State University President Michael M. Crow observes that in order to be globally competitive, today’s students must learn rapidly to be “capable of integrating a broad range of disciplines in a rapidly changing world.”12 Humanities play a vital role in our local and national efforts to discover, to create, to understand, and to innovate.13 It is not surprising to humanists then that “cuts in the humanities are bad for business and bad for democracy... [as] humanities supply essential ingredients for a healthy business culture.”14 We also acknowledge that humanities, science, and technology are inextricably intertwined, not the perceived embattled enemies of progress, prosperity, and personal well being. Recall the signiﬁcant impact of Senate Bill 1070 and the signiﬁcant revenue loss resulting from the failure to recognize both the social and economic ramifications of the law (the impact affected cultural tourism, among other things).15 The humanities can teach leaders to view the world across disciplines and beyond the limits of our own experience in order to better understand and appreciate the experiences and perspectives of others.

**Arizonans Being Civil**

The humanities contribute to social stability and are central to democracy in Arizona; arguably, “you need the study of languages, culture, clarity of expression, philosophy, religions and history in order to create a literate citizen.”16 Arizona has been in the national and international news recently and not always in the best social and political light. Controversial immigration legislation, the ban on ethnic studies, the repeal of equal protection laws preventing discrimination in education, employment and government contracting, and even the story of the Prescott skin-lightening mural have placed our state under a microscope, making Arizona the object of comics’ jokes and of condemnation by United Nations human rights experts.17 AHC knows that these negative images and narratives of intolerance do not paint a complete picture of who and how all Arizonans are. These images and narratives do not reflect the rich history, diversity, and complexity of our many individuals and communities who value and respect difference.
During the past year, AHC has worked strategically to resurrect civility in Arizonans’ communications. From across the state and across various age groups, ethnicities, and backgrounds, Arizonans have come together to talk about competing perspectives on public health care, sales taxes, and immigration through Project Civil Discourse (PCD). These conversations are a deliberate effort to move away from the angry diatribes often reflected in and perpetuated by the media. The goal of PCD is twofold: to demonstrate that it is not necessary to “demonize people who disagree with you” and to bring balance and civility to the problem-solving to address the issues that affect all of us on some fundamental levels.\textsuperscript{18} We are not alone in recognizing the urgency of this mission. Jim Leach, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, is engaged in a 50-state “civility tour” encouraging conversation and understanding of the inextricable connection between humanities, civility, and democracy. This hunger for civility in our national conversations signals a collective call for respectful and thoughtful voices to bridge the cultural and political clashes that continue to divide our state, our nation, and our world. Arizonans embrace this call to move away from divisiveness and towards a new focus on our shared concerns and solutions.\textsuperscript{19} PCD is not the only effort in Arizona to promote civil debate. The University of Arizona has established the National Institute for Civil Discourse that will provide “a setting for political debate that is both frank and civil,” and which will “advance civility through research, debate and educational programs.”\textsuperscript{20}

**Humanities Guiding Arizona’s Future**

Although critical, education alone cannot shape the future of Arizona. The health and vitality of our future depends on Arizonans’ active participation in conversations about what matters. Arizona’s civic health lags behind the rest of the nation because “Arizonans are not as well informed as people in other states, voter turnout continues to decline, Arizonans are not as strongly connected to one another as people in other states, there is an educational divide in citizen participation, and Arizonans feel a growing disconnect with the leaders they elect to represent them.”\textsuperscript{21} Indeed, “only 10 percent of Arizonans feel their elected officials represent their interests,” and “only 12 percent of citizens believe the people in their community care about each other.”\textsuperscript{22}

In many ways, Arizona is at the crossroads. Many of our arts and cultural institutions are at risk of disappearing or being severely cut. If Arizonans continue to support and to re-commit public and private dollars to fill the gaps, if Arizonans continue to contribute their time and talent to participating in the leadership of our state by voting, running for office, and holding our elected officials accountable, this risky state of affairs can change. At the center of reaching any and all of these goals toward becoming and being a better Arizona is our ability to talk to, listen to, and connect with one another. AHC’s responsibility over these nearly forty years continues to be to create “safe spaces” for difficult conversations to take place. AHC cannot do this important work without the commitment and awareness of Arizona’s engaged citizens. As advocates for the range, excellence, and impact of the humanities, our individual and collective challenge is expressed in this urgent and quite fundamental call to action:
Let’s build bridges here and there
Or sometimes, just a spiral stair
That we may come somewhat abreast
And sense what cannot be exprest
And by these measures can be found
A meeting place—a common ground
Nearer the reaches of the heart
Where truth revealed, stands clear, apart
...
Oh, let’s build bridges everywhere
And span the gulf of challenge there.23

Compassionate and thoughtful Arizonans from all sides understanding, embracing, celebrating, promoting, practicing, and preserving this important humanities work here and beyond for our collective greater good can and will make our state, our nation, and our world a better place for all.
Neal A. Lester is professor of English and dean of Humanities in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Arizona State University. With specialties in African American literary and cultural studies, Dr. Lester is an award-winning teacher and the author or co-editor of four books. He has written or lectured extensively on such topics as the “n-word,” black/ white interracial intimacies in popular music, Little Black Sambo as a non-trickster, the race and gender politics of African Americans and hair, African American children’s literature, black masculinities in hip hop music, Disney’s first African American princess, and personal ads as African American autobiography and biography. His writings have covered such authors as Toni Morrison, Alice Walker, Zora Neale Hurston, ntozake shange, Ernest Gaines, bell hooks, Carolivia Herron, and Richard Wright. Dr. Lester chairs the Board of Directors of the Arizona Humanities Council.

Thomas H. Wilson is Director of the Arizona Museum of Natural History in Mesa, Arizona. Previously he was Director of the Museum of New Mexico in Santa Fe; Director of the Logan Museum of Anthropology and the Wright Museum of Art, and Director of Museum Studies, at Beloit College; Director of the Southwest Museum in Los Angeles; and Deputy Director of the Museum for African Art in New York City. Tom Wilson earned a B.A. from the University of New Mexico and his M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley, in anthropology, and a J.D. from the University of Maryland. He was Assistant Professor at the University of Nairobi, Coast Archaeologist for the National Museums of Kenya, and Program Officer in the Museums Program at the National Endowment for the Humanities. He has conducted fieldwork in the American Southwest, Great Basin, Mexico and Central America, and Eastern Africa. Most recently he has worked on museum projects in Yunnan Province, southwest China, and in St. Petersburg and northwest Russia. He currently serves as Vice Chair of the Arizona Humanities Council and on the board of the Mesa Historical Museum. Tom Wilson is listed in Who’s Who in America. His passions, in addition to the humanities, are triathlons and German Shepherd Dogs.

Brenda Thomson, Executive Director, joined the Arizona Humanities Council in March 2010. Thomson brings a wealth of knowledge and experience to the Arizona Humanities Council; specializing in executive management, fundraising, human resources, public speaking, community relations, and strategic planning. Prior to joining the Arizona Humanities Council, Thomson served as the Director of The Center for Law Leadership and Management at the Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law at ASU, and Executive Director of the Maricopa County Bar Association. She earned her bachelor’s degree in English from Yale University in 1983 and her J.D. from Yale Law School in 1989. Thomson also enjoys volunteering with a variety of local organizations that promote education, leadership and diversity including BookPALS, the Diversity Leadership Alliance, Valley Leadership, Florence Crittenton, Glendale Chamber Foundation, Arizona Women’s Forum, Phoenix Rotary 100, and Park Central Toastmasters.
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Key Points

- 90% of Arizonans believe arts education is either important or very important
- Arizona has been a policy leader in being one of eleven states with an arts admissions requirement for our state universities
- Arts education improves academic achievement, creates greater leadership and social skills, enhances critical thinking, and sharpens problem solving skills
- Superintendents rank arts activities in the top four that are most likely to develop creativity
- U.S. employers rate creativity/innovation among the top five skills that will increase in importance over the next five years
- Not weighting arts courses equally with other core subjects creates a barrier for student participation
- The lack of alignment with education curriculum and the Arizona Academic Arts Standards creates a gap between arts education policy and practice

In May, 2009 Arizona State University conducted a public opinion poll on how Arizonans value arts education. Like the more broadly defined American public, 90% of Arizonans believe arts education is either important or very important. In fact, arts education was more highly valued than all-day Kindergarten, which received support from 69% of the poll respondents.

With such a high premium placed on arts education by Arizonans, how are the arts (dance, music, theatre, visual arts) faring in Arizona’s public K-12 schools? What opportunities to study and experience the arts do the arts and cultural community offer to young Arizonans? And what is the role of community leaders, parents, and voters in supporting arts education in Arizona?

This chapter will outline arts education in Arizona and where it stands today, by delving into the results of the 2009 Arts Education Census, presenting some of the policy and research that informs Arizona practice, and highlighting the individuals who deliver and support high quality arts education in Arizona.
Arizona Arts Education POLICY

Public education is governed by federal, state, and local educational policies.

At the federal level, arts education is included as one of the core subject areas in the No Child Left Behind Act, the current version of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, more commonly referred to by its first chapter, Title I. “This act stands as one of the most significant efforts to affect arts education, as the arts are treated as a ‘core academic subject’ and treated equally with reading, math, science, and other core disciplines.”

At the state level, Arizona has long had policy that informs arts education and stands as a leader with the development of early policies which are supportive of arts education. Arizona’s State Board of Education (appointed by the Governor; the State Board also includes the elected Superintendent for Public Instruction) defines what subject areas will be taught in Arizona schools. State Administrative Code requires that common schools (grades K-8) must offer music and visual arts, while the other performing arts are voluntarily offered, and that high school graduation requirements include a shared credit requirement—fine arts or vocational arts. The State Board also defines what will be covered in required subject areas through the adoption of academic standards. Arizona’s academic standards in the Arts were originally adopted in 1997 and were revised in 2006.

Finally, the State Board creates certification requirements for Arizona’s public educators. Arizona has a PreK-12 arts education teaching certificate, adopted in 2008, as well as arts endorsements. Our certification requirements for the arts date back to 1969, and Arizona was an early leader in creating certification endorsements in dance and theatre (dramatic arts).

A separate governing body, the Arizona Board of Regents, sets forth university admission requirements for Arizona’s public universities. The Board of Regents includes one unit of fine arts as an admissions requirement, most recently updated in 2006. Arizona stands again a leader in terms of policy, as we are only one of eleven states with an arts admissions requirement for our state universities. However, the arts are not graded equally with other subjects, nor does the AIMS test measure anything in the arts.

In 1996, the Arizona legislature and Governor Symington added its support to arts education in the creation of the Arizona Arts Endowment Fund (institutionalized as Arizona ArtShare), the state’s public endowment for the arts. Administered by the Arizona Commission on the Arts, one of the outlined goals of ArtShare was to use the interest from the $20 million public endowment to increase education/outreach programs of arts organizations, including the training and implementation of the Arizona Academic Standards in the arts. Unfortunately, recent action by the legislature in Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010, swept the public ArtShare endowment in its entirety as a part of efforts to close significant state budget shortfalls.

Arizona Arts Education RESEARCH

The Benefits of Arts Education
A tremendous body of research exists nationally documenting the many benefits an arts education provides to students including: improved academic achievement, greater leadership
and social skills, enhanced critical thinking and sharper problem solving skills. Studies further suggest that for certain populations—students from economically disadvantaged circumstances, students needing remedial instruction, and young children—learning in the arts may be especially helpful in boosting learning and achievement.

Of note:

- **Student Achievement:** Data from The College Board show that students who take four years of arts and music classes while in high school score 91 points better on their SATs than students who took only one-half year or less (scores of 1070 vs. 979, respectively). In Arizona, increased student achievement has been linked to the Opening Minds through the Arts program in Tucson Unified School District (which is supported by private funding).

- **Lifetime Impact:** U.S. employers rate creativity/innovation among the top five skills that will increase in importance over the next five years, and rank it among the top challenges facing CEOs. Among eleven subjects offered in high school, superintendents rank arts activities in the top four that are most likely to develop creativity.

- **Problem Solving:** “Learning in individual art forms, as well as in multi-arts experiences, engages and strengthens such fundamental cognitive capacities as spatial reasoning (the capacity for organizing and sequencing ideas); conditional reasoning (theorizing about outcomes and consequences); problem solving; and the components of creative thinking (originality, elaboration, flexibility.)”

**Access to Arts Education in Arizona**

With relatively strong state and federal policy supporting arts education in Arizona, and a substantial body of research to support arts learning, what does arts education look like in our state’s schools?

Over the past three decades, arts education practitioners, researchers, and advocates have attempted to answer this question. In the early 1990s, the National Endowment for the Arts reorganized its focus on arts education by encouraging collaborations between state arts agencies and state departments of education. As a result, the Arizona Commission on the Arts, through strategic funding with its partners, created the Arizona Arts Education Research Institute (AAERI), a partnership of the fine arts colleges of the three universities, the Arizona Department of Education, and the Arizona Commission on the Arts.

The Morrison Institute of Arizona State University produced three separate reports outlining arts education in Arizona on behalf of AAERI, beginning in 1988. In all three cases, bellwether districts and personnel were interviewed; however, Morrison did not attempt to survey all schools in the state. The Morrison publications found a high variability in support for arts education, from personnel to minutes available to number of artistic disciplines taught. Over the thirty years of research, some districts and schools increased support while others decreased. Variability remained while strengths and weaknesses shifted in the system. Strong governing board and parental support grew programs while less supportive administrators dismantled others.
As research and data collection became more sophisticated, the arts education field began to ask for more in-depth, school-level data collection and analysis. In 2007-2009, AAERI led the call for a school-by-school census on how the arts are taught in Arizona. Begun with a seed grant from the Arizona Community Foundation, AAERI commissioned a school-by-school census of arts education in Arizona.

Working in partnership with the Arizona Department of Education’s Research and Evaluation Unit, and contracting with Quadrant Arts Education Research (a national leader in arts education data collection and analysis), AAERI launched a school-by-school arts education census in March 2008. The census achieved a 22% response rate, representing schools from all fifteen Arizona counties, and a proportional response rate from charter schools, which make up 25% of all Arizona public schools.

In addition to the voluntary census, AAERI also utilized access to the state’s Highly Qualified Teacher database, where all 1,889 public schools—district and charter—report on highly qualified music and visual arts educators.

**Arizona Arts Education PRACTICE**

**Graph 5.1**

The 2009 Arts Education Census provided Arizona, for the first time, baseline data on the delivery and practice of arts education in Arizona schools. The following section outlines the practice of arts education, based on the census results.

**Availability of Arts Education:**

20% percent of schools offered no courses in any arts discipline. Another 22% offered at least one course in one arts discipline. More commonly, (39%) schools offered at least one course in two different disciplines. Relatively few schools offered at least one course in three arts disciplines (9%) or four disciplines (10%). (Graph 5.1)

**Required Instruction:**

When combining all arts disciplines, 80% of Elementary, 83% of Middle, and 80% of High Schools offered at least one class/course in any of the four arts disciplines. Just over half (55%) of the schools provided instruction in BOTH music and visual arts as required by the Arizona Administrative Code (the Code is not uniformly enforced). 19% offered instruction beyond music and visual arts. The breakdown by arts discipline for the three school types is on the left (Graph 5.2).
Graph 5.2

Schools With at Least One Arts Course by Discipline

- Elementary:
  - Dance: 7%
  - Music: 63%
  - Visual Arts: 9%
  - Theatre: 75%

- Middle School:
  - Dance: 9%
  - Music: 68%
  - Visual Arts: 10%
  - Theatre: 75%

- High School:
  - Dance: 30%
  - Music: 56%
  - Visual Arts: 39%
  - Theatre: 79%

Credit: Quadrant Arts Education Research for the AAERI

Graph 5.3

Adoption of Arts Standards

As of 2009, only 56% of schools reported that their arts education curriculum had been updated to align with the Arizona Academic Arts Standards. Of the reporting schools, 7% had not adopted the state standards while 37% did not answer the question (Graph 5.3).

Graduation Requirements:

53% of responding High Schools reported using the shared credit with vocational arts (which include graphic design, career and technical education, construction, and computer aided design) to meet the state graduation requirement. 36% reported using a stand alone fine arts credit. All totaled, 43% of High Schools meet or exceed the arts graduation requirement set by the state with a stand alone fine arts credit. 4% of High Schools reported no graduation requirements.
Grade Weighting:

61% of Arizona High Schools do not weight arts courses equally with other core subjects and 79% do not weight advanced arts courses equally with other advanced courses, creating a barrier to participation in arts courses for Arizona’s high school students (Graph 5.4).

Graph 5.4

% Of Schools Weighting Arts Courses Equally

Regular Art Courses

- All: 61%
- None: 39%

Advanced Art Courses

- All: 79%
- None: 9%
- Some: 12%

No Access:

134,203 students (or 13% of the total student population) attend school each day without access to Music or Visual Art instruction provided by a highly qualified arts teacher (Graph 5.6 and 5.7).

Schools without HQT:

The federal definition of a Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) is a specialist in the content knowledge of any specific discipline, in this case the arts. Highly Qualified Teachers hold at least a bachelor’s degree, have obtained full state certification, and have demonstrated knowledge in the core academic subjects they teach. In Arizona, a teacher may not need full state certification if teaching in a public charter school.
The number of District Schools without either a highly qualified Music or Visual Arts teacher is 288 (20%) with student enrollment of 77,504 (8%). The number of Charter Schools without either a highly qualified Music or Visual Arts teacher is 315 (70%) with student enrollment of 56,699 (58%). These graphs show the significant disparity in the percentage of schools using the Highly Qualified Teacher database in the arts when comparing District Schools to Charter Schools. This is a significant issue for Arizona (Graph 5.5, 5.6, and 5.7).
Rural vs. Urban:

When reviewing the presence of highly qualified teachers in Music or Visual art in relation to the geographic profile of a community the more rural the community the less likely there was a HQT in the arts. Suburban schools were most likely to have at least one Highly Qualified Teacher in the arts.

Instructional Time:

Students in elementary schools receive Music and Visual Arts instruction for an average of 55 minutes per week. In contrast, Dance and Theatre never exceed an average of fifteen minutes per week. 24% of Elementary Schools offer music for at least one hour per week while 19% offer visual arts for one hour per week.

Arts Enrollment in Elementary and Middle Schools:

General Music and General Art are the two main classes students participate in at the Elementary and Middle School levels. Chorus is the next most popular followed by Band. Orchestra, Dance, and Theatre have little student enrollment with only 1% to 2% of students participating.

Graph 5.8

Arts Enrollment in High Schools:

At the High School level changes in enrollment appear. General Art is the most popular course followed by Dance, Band, Drawing/Painting, and Theatre. There are more students enrolled in Dance at the High School level than there are in Band, Orchestra, or Theatre This is in spite of the fact that more schools offer Music instruction than Dance. The lack of entry level Music courses at the High School level creates a barrier for student participation.

Per-Pupil Arts Spending

Per-pupil arts spending (defined as funds allocated to curricular support materials for the arts divided by student population) is a direct predictor of higher or lower levels of arts education. 79% of schools spend less than $1 per year per student for arts instruction or less than 1/2 of 1 cent per day per student (Graph 5.8).
Budget Allocation:

50% of schools reported having no budget allocated for curricular support materials and supplies for arts education (excluding teacher salaries and one time capital expenses).

External Resources:

All schools reported receiving funding from non-district/charter school sources. The tax credit was the most significant source (52%), followed by Parents Groups (35%), and county/local arts agencies (21%) (Graph 5.9).
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Arizona Arts and Cultural Resources in Arts Education

When ensuring all students have access to an education in the arts, Arizona arts and culture organizations play a role in providing supplemental arts experiences to the school day. High quality experiences support standards-based curriculum, working in partnership with a school to meet their mission and establish clear evaluation and assessment protocols to meet the needs of students, teachers, and community partners. These services, however, serve as a supplement and do not, nor should they, replace a standards based sequential instruction provided by a highly qualified arts specialist in the classroom.
Arizona public schools are providing frequent exposure to professional artists and arts events via field trips even as the current economic downturn began to impact school budgets.

**% of Schools Participation in Arts Field Trips:**

75% of all schools offered at least one field trip to arts exhibitions, performances, or events within the past three years (2007-2009). Of those schools participating in arts field trips music is the most popular subject (81%), followed by Theatre (50%), Visual Arts (41%), Dance (34%), Folk Arts (12%), and Creative Writing (6%) (Graph 5.10).

**Barriers to Participation in Arts Field Trips:**

Of those schools who have not participated in arts field trips in the past three years the number one barrier (45%) to participation was identified as “budget constraints.” However, 26% identified “lack of information” as the main barrier and 47% reported “no obstacles” to participation.

**Multi-Year Partnerships:**

Taking an opportunity to deepen learning opportunities with arts and culture organizations, 57% of schools have formed partnerships with one or more community-based arts organizations. This is significantly higher than in similar state studies across the country. Partnerships of classroom educators, arts specialists, and community arts resources (artists and arts organizations) are playing an integral role in helping to design and deliver arts learning programs that serve the interests and needs of individual schools. In addition, these partnerships are occurring with social service organizations and communities.

Teaching artists are an additional resource in the delivery of arts education. The role of the teaching artist is an integral part of the broader arts education framework, which includes: residencies, arts experiences, performances by professional artists, integrating the arts throughout the curriculum, discipline-specific learning in the arts (visual arts, dance, theatre, music, poetry, etc.), and lifelong learning in the arts through community arts events, classes, and workshops. Teaching artists provide a tangible link between the creative process and learning.
Use of Artist Residencies:

37% of all schools use some type of Artist Residencies. Visual Arts (36%) is the most popular discipline for Artist Residencies, followed by Music (21%), Dance (15%), Theatre (14%), Folk Arts (9%), and Creative Writing (4%) (Graph 5.11).

Graph 5.11

Arizona Arts Education SUPPORTERS

Important steps toward strong arts education policy have been taken in Arizona. The policies create a clear vision of expectations for arts education and a strong foundation for students as they move into postsecondary learning and the workforce. They point out that Arizona has decided that a quality education for all children includes the arts for their intrinsic value, how they illuminate other subjects, and their academic rigor. To ensure that the gap between arts education policy and practice is addressed, further engagement with state and local entities and the active participation of arts education advocates, artists, students, parents, school administrators, cultural organizations, and business and community leaders will be required.
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Tourism and Cultural Heritage: Opportunities for Arizona
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Key Points

- Arizona is one of the most important cultural destinations in the United States
- Arts and culture are critical to the state’s tourism economy
- Arizona’s economy is highly dependent upon tourism for jobs, regional income, and tax revenues
- Arizona is in the upper rankings of states with federally-managed cultural resources
- Cultural tourism can empower communities socially, economically, and politically, while building community pride

Introduction

For centuries, humans have traveled in search of cultural experiences. History indicates that elites of the ancient Egyptian and Roman empires even traveled throughout the known world of the time to visit heritage sites of critical acclaim and to experience the cultural diversity of their geopolitical realms. Among the earliest travel patterns known today as forerunners of contemporary tourism are medieval religious pilgrimages. Later the Grand Tour, between the mid-1600s and mid-1800s, was comprised of aristocratic young men traveling to the famous art cities and high culture capitals of Europe to become cultured members of society. All of these predecessors of modern tourism had cultural heritage at their core.

Living culture and built heritage are two of the most salient resources upon which much of the world’s tourism is based today. Billions of international and domestic trips are taken every year as people search for something different from their ordinary lives. Much of this travel is motivated by a desire to experience cultures, arts, historic buildings, and heritage monuments. There are many places in the world that have become well-known heritage tourist destinations. As well, many rural and urban areas in the United States have evolved into prominent heritage destinations for their national/patriotic past, government functions, arts and handicrafts, museums, and indigenous cultures. Arizona is one such locale, where culture-based tourism is one of the most salient economic sectors in the state. This chapter describes the phenomenon of cultural heritage and tourism in Arizona, its resources and demand, and how it contributes to the state’s economic and social well-being.
Heritage Tourism: Arizona Perspectives

Researchers have defined heritage as anything inherited from the past that is utilized today. Thus, history is the past, but heritage is the contemporary use of the past, including for tourism, education, and conservation. Cultural heritage (as opposed to natural heritage) includes both tangible and intangible elements of the human past, and in most cases encompasses buildings, ancient ruins, music and dance, historic monuments, folklore, battlefields and graveyards, artworks and craft traditions, performing arts and their venues, farms and villages, religious sites, museums, industrial archeology, and cultural events and festivals. These and other resources are the foundations of much of the world’s tourism appeal.

Researchers have identified two primary types of cultural tourist, namely those who pursue heritage places and experiences as serious enthusiasts, and people who simply utilize heritage on the side when they travel for other purposes (casual visitors). From a pure economics perspective, there is little difference between these two types of cultural tourist, because both have enormous economic impacts on the destinations being visited. However, serious heritage tourists tend to be better off financially and better educated, and they have a tendency to spend more per day in the destination than other types of tourists.

Of the estimated 880–925 million international trips taken annually in recent years, approximately half involved visits to cultural heritage sites. Some 55 million international visitors arrived in the United States in 2009, many of whom visited America’s important historic sites and cultural centers. In its 2005 cultural heritage study, the U.S. Department of Commerce found that more than 10.6 million foreign tourists in the United States visited historic sites and cultural events while they were here. Roughly 1.9 billion domestic person-trips were taken by Americans in 2009. The U.S. Department of Commerce also estimated that 81 percent of all Americans traveling within the United States visited at least one historic site and participated in a cultural event during their vacation in 2005. While some of these data are a few years old, they are useful in gauging the importance of cultural heritage as a tourism resource in the United States.
In common with many parts of the country, heritage sites are an important feature of Arizona’s cultural landscape, and tourism based on this heritage plays a crucial role in the state’s economy. Unlike some states, however, Arizona has almost every kind of heritage attraction imaginable. Researchers prefer to categorize tourism phenomena into typologies, or classifications, for a variety of reasons. Understanding different subtypes of heritage tourism enables destination planners and managers to identify niche markets that could be targeted for promotional endeavors. Social scientists who research tourism are better able to collect and manage data, and develop theories pertaining to both supply and demand. In heritage tourism studies, we often break the product down into individual resource types for the reasons noted above. The following subsections examine in more detail various types of cultural attractions and provide examples from Arizona to help contextualize cultural heritage tourism. It should be noted that these categories are not exhaustive, nor are they mutually exclusive. For example, historic buildings might also be categorized as religious sites or museums.

**Archeological Sites and Ancient Monuments**

Archeological sites, including ancient ruins, are one of the most pervasive patrimonial resources for tourism. On a global scale, major icons stand out as prime examples, such as Machu Picchu, Stonehenge, the Great Wall of China, Angkor Wat, and Chichen Itza. Arizona is also home to magnificent archeological sites and ancient monuments. Native American cultures have long thrived in the high and low deserts of what is today Arizona. Remnants of early civilizations are among the state’s most precious cultural resources. The National Park Service recognized this fact early on with the establishment of several national monuments in the early 1900s. The protection of Casa Grande Ruins was established at the federal level in 1892. In 1918 it became a national monument. The ruins of Montezuma Castle were designated a national monument in 1906. Many such places, remnants of America’s ancient inhabitants, exist in Arizona under the protection of the National Park Service, Arizona State Parks, various tribal councils, and even municipal governments (e.g. Phoenix’s Pueblo Grande). These monuments attest to the vitality and ancientness of America’s indigenous people and serve as a critical part of the historical setting of Arizona.

**Museums**

Even within this category there are dozens of kinds of museums, including, but not limited to, those focused on science, art, history, transportation, paleontology, and industry, as well as specialized forms such as children’s museums, folk life centers/outdoor living museums, and even public archives. These are among the most pervasive urban tourist attractions, but they are also commonplace in rural areas as well, particularly as small communities have in recent years sought to distinguish themselves from others and emphasize what is unique about them.

There are hundreds of museums in Arizona, ranging from small community historical displays, to internationally-known museums that function as “anchor attractions” in Phoenix and Tucson. The Arizona Science Center, Heard Museum, the Phoenix Art Museum, the Tucson Museum of Art, and the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum are among the state’s most visited attractions and benefit significantly from their Phoenix and Tucson locations. Even living history museums are not unheard of. While differing in scale from their
counterparts in the east, such as Plimoth Plantation (Massachusetts) or Mystic Seaport (Connecticut), the Pioneer Living History Museum has become an important attraction near Phoenix that depicts many aspects of what life might have been like in the nineteenth century.

**Arts and Performing Arts Centers**

Among the world’s top performing arts centers are the Sydney Opera House and the Grand Ole Opry, which have become important heritage buildings in their own right, and the performances that take place within them are an imperative part of the world’s intangible artistic heritage. Arizona is no stranger to the performing arts. Arizona Classical Theater (Prescott), Orpheum Theater (Flagstaff), Elks Opera House (Prescott), Borderlands Theater (Tucson), Chandler Center for the Arts, Phoenix Symphony Hall, Phoenix Art Museum, and the University of Arizona Museum of Art are just a handful of the many music, dance, symphony, and art centers and spaces in the state. Many of Arizona’s cities and towns have their own dinner theaters, stage theaters, art galleries, and music centers. These are especially popular for local visitors, but many of them also draw tourists from out of town.

**Historic Buildings**

Historic buildings are an important part of the tourism environment everywhere. Arizona is home to many structures of international and national acclaim that create part of the state’s heritage appeal. Frank Lloyd Wright’s Gammage Auditorium, Taliesin West, Soleri’s Arcosanti, the El Tovar Hotel at the Grand Canyon, and La Posada in Winslow are prominent examples. Historic buildings in Tombstone, Tucson, Phoenix, Flagstaff, and many of the state’s smaller cities also contribute to creating a heritage appeal, which in conjunction with other cultural sites, draws tourists to the state.

**Living Culture**

Perhaps the most visible element of living culture in Arizona is the diverse traditions of Native Americans. With 22 federally recognized tribes, there is a rich array of cultures that are commonly shared with tourists. Native American arts and crafts, as well as cowboy culture and poetry, are significant aspects of living culture in the state and are a huge draw for tourists. These range from commercialized cultural performances in casinos, to more traditional ceremonies on reservations. Cultural interpretive centers and festivals are used by several tribes to disseminate cultural information to tourists. Travelers from all over the world have an interest in observing indigenous cultures, architecture, lifestyles, and performances in Arizona.

**Religious Sites**

Sites of spiritual or religious importance are an element of Arizona’s cultural heritage that is often ignored in promotional literature and in public perception. The historic Spanish missions of southern Arizona are part of the state’s colonial heritage but are relevant to its religious past and present as well. Several religious sites have resulted from Mormon pioneer history, including the LDS Temple in Mesa and newer temples in Snowflake and Thatcher. The Shrine of St. Joseph of the Mountains in Yarnell is a pilgrimage destination for Roman Catholics, who pray and follow the Stations of the Cross. Historic churches in downtown
Phoenix, the Tucson area, and other Arizona cities provide an additional heritage appeal for tourists. Likewise, Sedona is uniquely considered the “New Age capital of the world,” where thousands of spiritual pilgrims converge each year to experience earth’s energies, praise Gaia (earth goddess), and participate in Native American rituals at the location where, according to New Agers, the planet’s powers are most concentrated.

**Industrial Archeology**

Although Arizona’s economy has long been dependent on various extractive industries and manufacturing, the most persistent of these has been mining. Arizona produces more copper than any other state in the nation, in addition to many other non-fuel minerals. Mining has a long and folkloric history, and most of the state’s industrial heritage derives from the mining past. Goldfield Ghost Town and Mine caters to visitors along the Apache Trail. Tours of the Queen Mine in Bisbee allow visitors to try to find their own pieces of copper, silver, gold, or turquoise. With the decline in heavy industry, Rosemont Copper Mine, the Vulture Mine, and sundry other mines throughout the state are now involved in tourism as a way of boosting their bottom line and improving relations with surrounding communities. Sites relating to science and technology are also important, and include the Biosphere, and the Kitt Peak and Mount Graham observatories.

**War and Sites of Human Suffering**

There is a current trend in tourism to visit sites associated with death, human suffering, and war. Arizona even has this type of heritage attraction. One of the most interesting is the area around Picacho Peak, where the Civil War’s westernmost battle took place in 1862, when most of southern Arizona (then New Mexico Territory) was on the side of the Confederate States. The area of Picacho Pass is marked with plaques and markers interpreting the events of that fateful battle, where only a few soldiers were killed. Every year in March, the battle is reenacted by Civil War enthusiasts at the foot of Picacho Peak. Another site of interest is the location of the Second World War Japanese Internment Camp in Poston. The area is indicated with a large memorial marker, photograph displays, and interpretive media. North of the marker, some of the original camp buildings can still be seen alongside the highway. A second internment camp was located on the Gila Indian reservation, but this one is not considered accessible to tourists.

**Literary Heritage Places**

Literary heritage broadly refers to places associated with literature figures, novels, plays, or movies. Arizona is replete with such locations that have become a salient part of the cultural landscape. Much of the tourism success of Tombstone can be attributed to the town’s prominence in books, television, and Hollywood productions. Many westerns and other popular movies have been filmed over the years in Arizona, and current movie location guides, online and in book form, highlight a considerable number of places in Arizona where movies have been filmed. Literary places associated with the lives of famous authors, such as Zane Grey, also play a part in the existence of literary tourism. Oak Creek Canyon, where most of his *Call of the Canyon* was written, and the Zane Grey Cabin in Payson are important stops on literature pilgrimages. The nineteenth-century American poet and storyteller, Sharlot Hall, has brought visibility to Prescott, home of the Sharlot Hall Museum.
Heritage Trails

Finally, heritage trails have found currency in today’s tourism market. Themed large-scale trails exist throughout the country, linking cultural sites together into a single, linear product. Several of these exist in Arizona. The Dominguez-Escalante Trail runs near the northern border of the state, documenting the route used by early Spanish explorers in their efforts to find a way between Santa Fe and California. The Old Honeymoon Trail follows the route most commonly used by Mormon pioneers in their migration to Arizona. The Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail, is administered by the U.S. National Park Service and runs from Nogales to Yuma and into California. There are several other important historic trails, Scenic Byways and routes (e.g. Route 66) linking the state’s natural and cultural assets.

Cultural Tourism Demand

The sections above illustrate the rich cultural heritage that helps make Arizona a desirable tourist destination. As already noted, there is considerable demand for Arizona’s cultural elements, and they are critical to the state’s tourism economy. Table 6.1 illustrates visitor numbers at Arizona’s National Park Service cultural properties in 2009. With 2.4 million visits, these sites are an essential part of tourism in the state, and place Arizona in the upper rankings of states with federally-managed cultural resources.

Table 6.1. NPS properties in Arizona with cultural heritage as primary focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Park Property</th>
<th>Number of Recreational Visitors, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canyon De Chelly National Monument</td>
<td>826,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa Grande Ruins National Monument</td>
<td>76,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado National Memorial</td>
<td>106,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Bowie National Historic Site</td>
<td>9,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hohokam Pima National Monument*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site</td>
<td>99,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail**</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montezuma Castle National Monument</td>
<td>601,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo National Monument</td>
<td>77,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Spanish National Historic Trail**</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe Spring National Monument</td>
<td>49,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonto National Monument</td>
<td>60,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumacácori National Historical Park</td>
<td>40,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuzigoot National Monument</td>
<td>106,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Canyon National Monument</td>
<td>128,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wupatki National Monument</td>
<td>233,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,415,895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Currently closed to the public
** Trail use is not counted by the NPS
Table 6.2 depicts similar criteria at culture-oriented state parks. While under 300,000 visits were made to Arizona’s historical state parks in 2008, the economic impact was notable. Over 35 million dollars were generated by historical state parks in 2008 in terms of direct, indirect, and induced spending. Likewise, almost 500 people were employed directly in the parks’ daily operations, not taking into account the indirect and induced employment created via economic multipliers.

**Table 6.2.**
**State Parks properties in Arizona with cultural heritage as primary focus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Park Property</th>
<th>Number of Visitors, 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Verde State Historic Park</td>
<td>15,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homolovi Ruins State Park</td>
<td>15,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome State Historic Park</td>
<td>60,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFarland State Historic Park</td>
<td>4,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riordan Mansion State Historic Park</td>
<td>26,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tombstone Courthouse State Historic Park</td>
<td>52,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubac Presidio State Historic Park</td>
<td>12,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma Quartermaster Depot State Historic Park</td>
<td>11,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma Territorial Prison State Historic Park</td>
<td>67,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>267,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.3.** **Arizona’s top non-public/private heritage attractions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attraction</th>
<th>Number of Visitors, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Bridge</td>
<td>2.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WestWorld of Scottsdale</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tombstone</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawhide Western Town</td>
<td>428,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Science Center</td>
<td>364,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Canyon Railway</td>
<td>289,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona LDS Temple and Visitors Center</td>
<td>271,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale Center for the Performing Arts</td>
<td>236,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Art Museum</td>
<td>201,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard Museum</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson Museum of Art and Historic Block</td>
<td>176,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima Air and Space Museum</td>
<td>145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verde Canyon Railway</td>
<td>89,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell Observatory</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several million tourists and recreationists visit the top cultural attractions in the state each year. Again, though, this does not include the thousands of other heritage attractions that are not listed in the top 14. In addition to the private, state-operated, and federally-operated cultural sites in Arizona, there are more than 1,400 properties and buildings listed on the
National Register of Historic Places, encompassing sites in every county in the state. While total use of these sites is virtually impossible to calculate, they too contribute to the considerable resource base of Arizona that makes it one of the most important cultural destinations in the United States.

**Conclusion**

Tourism has long competed with agriculture and mining as one of the leading industries of Arizona. The economy of the state is highly dependent upon tourism for jobs, regional income, and tax revenues, which help support education, public works, health care, and other public services. The state’s cultural heritage is an extremely important part of its tourism offering, and the diversity of heritage elements is remarkable, ranging from indigenous and settler heritage to heavy industry and farming. Living culture and the arts are also a salient ingredient in the cultural tourism mix. In addition to being important to the state economically, cultural heritage-based tourism has the ability to enrich the lives of Arizona’s citizens. Cultural tourism can empower communities socially, economically, and politically. It builds community pride in the cultural past and creative present, contributing to Arizona’s social and economic well-being.

Dallen J. Timothy is Senior Sustainability Scientist in the Global Institute of Sustainability and Professor of Community Resources and Development at Arizona State University. He is also Director of the Tourism Development and Management Program at ASU. He has authored 22 books and 150 articles on various social science and business aspects of tourism. He is currently in the process of writing a book titled *Tourism, Trails and Themed Routes* and another titled *Contemporary Christian Travel*. Dr. Timothy is the editor of the *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, Visiting Professor of Heritage Tourism at the University of Sunderland, England, and Adjunct Professor of Geography at Indiana University. A geographer by training, his current tourism-related research interests include heritage, immigration, consumerism, international borders and geopolitics, conservation, and religion.
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Key Points

- Members of the Creative Class prefer living in lively diverse communities that support commerce, the arts, and a wide range of cultural opportunities.
- Social Capital’s importance suggests a shift of measures from monetary loss or gain to the arts of life as well as the activities of purpose.
- Layers of society’s institutions and organizations (big and small) and the habitats they need for shelter and activity enable the value of Social Capital to grow.
- When we design and build new places, we are too often guessing at what might work better than what went before.
- New parameters for measuring what we do could inform better solutions and change the way we regulate our built environments.
- The adaptive re-use of older buildings in downtowns with culture built in, encourages more sustainable lifestyles where residents can live, work, and play in one area without long commutes.
- Many of our built environments have a negative impact on our culture, social life, and well-being.

Arts and culture contribute to a strong sense of place and flourish in diverse communities with distinctive visual texture. Arizona would benefit from a more diverse array of lifestyle opportunities, including those in urban settings with access to public transit. Single-family suburban homes whose residents are automobile dependent should not be the only residential option. This chapter considers some of the key cultural, environmental, and economic aspects of creative communities.
Introduction

Today, the word “culture” just on its own has more to do with a coffee shop located in a funky old house than it does the symphony. Main streets and downtowns across the country are experiencing great revivals because people are rediscovering the social lifestyle that comes with knowing one’s neighbor, walking around a neighborhood, and actually knowing the shopkeeper or farmer; all key aspects of quality of life and healthy living. In addition, most of the people Richard Florida refers to as the “Creative Class” are drawn to vibrant, bustling places where ideas are openly shared, unique businesses are abundant, and new concepts are explored. Architecture from the twenties through the sixties found in downtowns across Arizona tend to attract local business owners who want to be located in old buildings along walkable streets. In turn, when several shopkeepers align themselves together in a district of sorts, the density in itself begins to form a destination.

Across the country, certain communities emanate that sense of place that attracts creative new residents and visitors from around the world. Conversely, certain cities are lamented as places with no soul. Arguably, a city thought to have no soul is simply lacking in its place-making design components. Like growth in the economy, city growth to accommodate increasingly mobile populations was a top priority for decades. Growth in a city like Phoenix, for example, was such a priority that design and consideration of the social, cultural, and economic dimensions of place were sacrificed. Zoning laws, along with planning and transportation regulations, were established to enable whole neighborhoods to be designed and built cheaply and quickly with little thought to the way those places would actually make people feel while living in them.

Walled off from each other in cars by day and by fences and garage doors at night, over time many people begin feeling isolated. Humans are by nature social, and therefore, the suburban lifestyle with homes literally miles away from any stores or other arts, commerce, or cultural activities has little appeal to the creative younger classes now taking the stage as this nation’s new generation of entrepreneurs, artists, and professionals. They are well educated, well travelled, and have often direct experience of living in places in other parts of the world that are known for their vibrancy, diversity, and support of commerce, the arts, and a wide range of cultural opportunities—places where the value of Social Capital is very high and the resulting economies are varied and resilient. How will Arizona compete?

A Cornerstone of Social Capital: Habitat

For many years what we built for ourselves—how it is shaped, what it contains, how it supports our culture, and how it responds to climate—has often been relegated to the bottom of the pile as far as what is seen to be important to us and a happy, successful life. We have all seen—and many of us live with—the results of fifty-plus years of uncontrolled sprawl, highways slicing through neighborhoods, and the blighting of many areas of our cities, especially in Arizona. However, the upsurge of interest in repairing our cities and suburbs to make them better places is significant and worldwide, especially in the face of climate change, the prospect of a very different future for the world, and perhaps dramatic changes to the lifestyles we have come to know over the past half century. But the future world we are all looking toward certainly doesn’t have to be uncomfortable or a lesser place.
For centuries, the benchmarks of a society’s success have focused almost exclusively on measures of monetary gain or loss, building on the rallying call of John Maynard Keynes in the 1930s to supercharge the capitalist system—for a limited time—in order to create wealth and eradicate poverty. Even Keynes suggested that there are other things we ought to be concerned about, specifically encouraging and experimenting in the arts of life as well as the activities of purpose. He’s speaking of what we call Social Capital. Building on this to some degree, David Halpern’s work suggests that the success of our economies are impacted greatly—and largely driven by—the simple habits and interactions of everyday life—the basic ingredients of Social Capital. Underpinning these simple interactions that take place by the many billions every hour of the day worldwide, are our urban and rural habitats; the physical spaces and places we inhabit and that in subtle and not so subtle ways impede or encourage the everyday interactions between people that make the world go round.

It is these layers of habitat and the resources needed to make them that link our built environment to our economic and social success. In order to develop better, more sustainable habitats for our species, it is important to illuminate the interplays between and the consequences of public policy, social capital, and the physical environments in which our society operates. In placing greater emphasis on identifying the simple ways in which our physical environments can be improved can make the average person’s experience of our urban habitats a better one than is the case for many Arizonans today. In this way, it is possible to re-shape thinking and action that will result eventually in better, more sustainable habitats for us to occupy and thrive within.

**Figure 7.1**

The layers of society and habitats that drive wealth creation.

- **Business and Commerce (creating GNP, Profits, ROI, Savings, Net Worth, etc.)**
- **Social Capital – the “hidden” economy developed longer term**
- **Habitat – what nurtures and shelters our species**
- **Natural Environments**
- **Natural Resources**

Diagram by Philip D. Allsopp.
It is possible to think of our human society as a layer cake (see Figure 7.1) beginning at the bottom with the natural resources of the planet on which we live and ending with the persistent strategic concerns that drive so many of our daily news headlines. If our built and natural environments are ravaged or blighted through some kind of neglect (benign or otherwise) to the extent that they can no longer function efficiently or support our varied cultures and endeavours at all scales, many other aspects of what we take for granted today as the world we know, would be significantly impoverished; the places we know, the park benches where some meet to talk—the funky coffee shop where the problems of the world are solved; the front porch where we can watch the world go by and think as well as watch the kids playing in the street. For many who become quickly disenchanted with seemingly pristine neighborhoods in the new suburbs or “planned communities” they’ve relocated to, it is perhaps the absence of certain physical things about where they live that tell them that the interactions, friendships, challenges, and opportunities they crave are going to be hard to find. Living behind garage doors—usually the most prominent feature on most houses—on streets with few sidewalks and little shade for our Arizona summers makes it very hard to meet neighbors or discover the nooks and crannies of the footpaths and short-cuts that make up the places we associate with home.

The silver lining in all of this is the old phrase “absence makes the heart grow fonder.” Re-making the cities, towns, and neighborhoods in which we live out our lives by adding back the things we know are missing, should enable us to create great, attractive places in which to interact, meet, and live. As Arizona looks forward to a future where gas will be very expensive and people are actively seeking out places with “culture” built in, we must consider ways to ease the process to open new businesses in old buildings on main streets and in downtowns.

Termed “adaptive reuse,” this kind of in-fill development encourages more sustainable lifestyles where residents can live, work, and play in one area without long commutes. Older buildings tend to have more character than new ones, the environment benefits when we stop filling landfills with perfectly good buildings, and most importantly, older buildings bring the character for “culture”—an important aspect of Social Capital—to thrive. Without places that people want to be in, it’s pretty hard to locate commerce and a host of cultural activities. Great places attract creative minds. Thus by remaking our physical surroundings, the value of our collective Social Capital will likely increase significantly, making it also highly likely that we will strengthen the value of our economy and its ability to create new wealth.

**Shaping Who We Are: Regulating Land Use and Built Forms**

For all of the “rugged individualism” that many say characterizes the typical Arizonan, we seem strangely accepting of the incredibly prescriptive regulatory straight jackets that govern how our towns, neighbourhoods, and streets are planned, designed, and built. A troubling side effect of these regulations is that they tend to create formulas for designing human habitats and land use patterns around going somewhere in a car rather than simply being in one place. Thus, over time, many critical aspects of human habitats that have been developed over many generations—patterns of building, placement and design of things like boundary walls, front porches, walls, gathering places and so on—disappear. Compare what the average small town
street was like in 1940 with what we have today and we can easily see stark reminders of what happens when regulatory formulas take precedence over designing with Social Capital in mind.\textsuperscript{5}
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Figure 7.2 (top): Small town Iowa (1940) on the cover of Everett W. Kuntz and Jim Heynen, \textit{Sunday Afternoon on the Porch: Reflections of a Small Town in Iowa, 1939-1942}, (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2008).

Figure 7.3 (bottom): Suburbia, North Texas, 2003. Photograph by Philip D. Allsopp.
Generally, builders and developers have simply been following the letter of the law and the regulations with which their projects have to comply. In other words they have been benignly carrying out their work and running their businesses providing commercial and residential facilities for others to occupy. While some of the more enlightened developers and builders have been and remain extremely concerned about the quality of the places their projects create—the extent to which they encourage a sense of community and place, the featureless suburban sprawl that has occurred over the past fifty years in the United States is dominated by tracts of style-du-jour homes and malls that to so many of us—particularly our children—are devoid of magic, and lacking any sense of place.

Even for a country with plenty of historic places still in existence, speaking about the great Victorian train station, St. Pancras in London, for example, Columbia University Professor, Simon Schama observed in “A Crisis Too Good To Waste” that:

What we need are] … in other words, places and spaces that somehow can be given a transfusion of new social energy, multi-generational social energy, while preserving economic viability. St. Pancras is an absolute triumph in that respect. Not just because it’s a beautiful station, and works, and is light. But because of the gentle Piazza Navona-like social commotion in that glorious shed. That’s what we should be hunting for.

Old buildings, or buildings that might turn into derelict skeletons like Flushing Meadows, are worth having a vision for. Not just because it might be cheaper, or because people somehow have a shared sense of what might be.

It’s my deep, instinctive belief that all children are wired for memory and narrative. Children want to be part of buildings that talk about where they have come from. They want to walk and live in those kind of places. And take their own children to them.6

So perhaps listening to and watching our children—and asking them how we should be remaking our cities and urban places—would yield tremendously valuable insights into what we ought to be doing next.

**Measuring the Impact of What We Build**

There is a rapidly growing body of evidence that many of our built environments often have a negative impact on our culture, social life, and well-being. This body of research, particularly in the public health field, links the built environment to major diseases such as obesity. In addition to things like stress and poor nutrition, inactive lifestyles feed this growing epidemic. Walkable places—adding back sidewalks and making the act of walking to and from school, for example, a pleasant one even in the scorching summers of Arizona, help people to lose weight and thus reduce the risks of obesity-related diseases such as diabetes. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s “Active Living Research” program, investigates obesity relationships with community design, physical activity, and time spent
in cars. Their research found that each hour spent in a car per day was associated with a 6% increase in the likelihood of obesity and also found that each additional kilometre walked per day was associated with a 4.8% reduction in the likelihood of obesity.

Can we regulate for health, niceness, humaneness, or sustainability? Probably not in such direct ways, given our society’s tendency to want to regulate “how” something should be done rather than the outcomes we are seeking. Such new codes would potentially create yet another set of prescriptive codes for harried builders and developers to deal with. Descriptive quantitative data about our built and natural environments could highlight much of what we’ve given up in our habitats and what we need to be building back into existing, as well as new places meant for us. These measurement tools and research could also enable the development of performance oriented codes in much the same way that energy codes and energy-saving measures set targets for designers and builders to achieve.

Perhaps through such efforts we could achieve a long sought-after and saner balance among commerce, culture, transportation, and environment in the habitats we design and build for ourselves. Perhaps then our built environment would become better understood as the not so invisible hand that shapes so much of who we are.

**Building Arizona’s Future**

Arizona has several things going for it in the market to attract Creative Class entrepreneurs to our communities. First, the very “newness” of Arizona makes it an excellent place to test a new product, business, or idea. We are considered a representative cross-section of America and those in product development agree we are a great starting place for test marketing. Additionally, our land is still relatively affordable. An entrepreneur can find a building to buy, rather than leasing, which is really an attractive proposition to someone coming from, say, New York or Chicago. We also have superior outdoor living opportunities and world-renowned facilities like Sky Harbor International Airport and the Thunderbird School of Global Management.

Our weaknesses include not having enough diverse lifestyle opportunities. We have mastered single family homes, but we need a broader menu of distinct opportunities for creative individuals to live more urban lifestyles that may include mixed use developments, access to mass transit, safe bike paths, access to healthy and locally grown foods, and a vibrant nightlife that includes a local music scene, handcrafted brew pubs, larger-than-life chefs, and a lively arts district. Even dog parks and recycling programs score high marks and the “most desirable places to live” lists for workers under thirty. In addition, our municipalities have been slow to respond to the demand for in-fill and the re-use of older building stock. This sustainable trend could be encouraged and supported if city leaders would look to older cities like Philadelphia and Boston for ideas on how to keep existing buildings not only standing, but in use and vibrant.

Arizona is at a turning point, which includes the arts and culture economy. State leaders in all fields need to consider how it may become a competitive state striving to attract an educated
workforce or if it will continue on the well-trodden path of the boom and bust cycle of sprawl, which studies have demonstrated decidedly does not attract the most creative people to settle in our communities. We now know, in hindsight, that a real estate boom involving explosive suburbanization, plunging urban densities, and the destruction of neighborhoods and the local commerce concentrated there, deprives higher education of the physical and economic environments that nurture and inspire students and faculty alike. Reversing suburbanization’s trend and the incentives that drove it, is critical for creating a solid sense of place that offers diversity, unique experiences, and plenty of culture; attributes that are well known for attracting faculty and students in higher education, and the kind of people—of all ages—who invent new things, who build new industries, and create new jobs. The tools, the research, the know-how, and the passion to do it are already in place.

Kimber Lanning is an entrepreneur, arts advocate and community activist who works to cultivate strong, vibrant communities and inspire a higher quality of life in the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Lanning is actively involved in fostering cultural diversity, economic self-reliance and responsible growth for Arizona. In 2003, Lanning founded Local First Arizona, a grassroots, non-profit organization dedicated to raising public awareness of the economic and cultural benefits provided by locally owned businesses. The organization has since mushroomed to over 1,800 members, and Lanning works extensively with city and state policymakers to create a supportive environment for entrepreneurs of all sizes. Along with an advisory board of dedicated, local business owners and civic leaders, Kimber pursues the dual goal of establishing vibrant and culturally unique businesses at the forefront of Arizona’s identity, as well as creating a sustainable and healthy region through the implementation of diverse local economies. She works to inform, educate, and motivate consumers to support local enterprises, and encourages public policy that enables locally owned and operated businesses to thrive.

Philip D. Allsopp is a writer, speaker and activist about improving the Resilience of our Habitats, Communities and Commerce, the issue at the core of Transpolis Global, the organization Phil co-founded in 2009 with operations in the U.S., the U.K., and the Czech Republic, and serving clients worldwide. Phil was born and educated in the U.K., completing his undergraduate, graduate and post graduate studies at Kingston University, London, and the University of Wales Institute of Science and Technology. He moved to the United States in 1979. After completing his Masters in Health Services Planning and Design at Columbia University, Phil spent two years as a Public Health Service Fellow assigned to both the office of the Surgeon General and the Health Care Financing Administration in Washington, D.C. Returning to the private sector, he has spent most of his career focused on improving business and community resilience and effectiveness. He has held senior leadership positions in corporate America, with prominent management consulting firms as well as in the non-profit world, most recently serving as President and CEO of the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation, based at Taliesin West in Scottsdale, and currently as Chairman of the Arizona Green Chamber of Commerce.


Simon Schama “A Crisis Too Big to Waste,” address given in London to the Commission on Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), 16 September 2009. His talk was on what history can teach us regarding national responses to austerity. http://www.cabe.org.uk/articles/a-crisis-too-big-to-waste


These issues have been fundamental to the mission of Local First Arizona. A non-profit organization founded in 2003, it represents a coalition of locally owned businesses that form the backbone of the Arizona economy and works to strengthen communities and local economies throughout the state of Arizona. Their website has considerable information regarding the Creative Economy, and its economic implications for Arizona, especially regarding the significant environmental, economic, and cultural benefits of strong local economies. Here are some highlights. For every $100 spent at a locally owned business, roughly $42 remains in the local economy, and $32 leaves. For the same $100 spent at a non-locally owned business, only $13 remains. National chain stores contribute to the homogenization of our communities. For every two jobs national retailers bring to a community, three jobs are lost as a result of local businesses closing down. Shopping at locally owned businesses generates up to 75% more tax for communities and state. Independent businesses raise the standard of living in local communities because they take their profits and buy products and services from other local businesses, thus creating more and more tax revenues needed for the community to thrive. Millions of dollars of tax revenue subsidies are given to national chains by financially-starved local governments that drain even more tax revenue from our community and state. Blighted empty shopping areas are created in your community when chain stores re-locate to a more lucrative shopping center, or leave altogether. Hundreds of big stores are abandoned each year across the United States. Independent businesses are unique enterprises that contribute to the character of our community by offering a more diverse selections of goods and services. Independent businesses provide service with a personal touch. It matters to them that you are satisfied and will come back again. Carefully planned predatory pricing practices have allowed national chains to establish virtual monopolies as they drive local competition out of business. And then they raise their prices. See: http://www.localfirstaz.com/ and *Local Works: Examining the Impact of Local Business on the West Michigan Economy,* a Civic Economics study for Local First, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2008: http://www.civiceconomics.com/localworks/
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Architecture:
Defining Our Sense of Place

Will Bruder
Architect, President of will bruder + Partners, Phoenix

Key Points

- Architecture is best measured in relation to the scale of the human and the scale of the landscape
- Architecture is a barometer of how a community expresses social change and renewal over time
- The history of Arizona’s architecture offers lessons of community and sustainability
- Frank Lloyd Wright, Paolo Soleri, and a talented generation of mid-century moderns provided the innovative foundation of what is now termed the “Arizona School”
- A reinvigoration of our cities and neighborhoods calls for bold regional thinking, an understanding of the importance of the local, in-fill and alternative energy incentives

Architecture has a long and significant history in Arizona, and the profession remains an important part of the arts and culture community and a distinctive part of the state’s creative economy. That our notable structures attract visitors from all over the world means that architecture is also an important part of cultural and heritage tourism. How does Arizona’s unique architectural character add value to the lives of our residents and visitors and how can the urban fabric of its towns and cities help move our state forward in a distinctive and sustainable way?

In this chapter I will address these questions and suggest ways that we can protect and sustain our already unique heritage while embracing the challenges and opportunities of an ever-changing cultural and economic reality.

First a definition of terms to clarify the percepts on which my comments will be grounded.

What is Architecture?

The essence of architecture is evident in those structures of human activity that do not merely shelter our bodies but engage all our senses. Architecture challenges our intellect to view the world from a different perspective, a perspective that is grounded in the specificity of time and place. Architecture is a careful balance of the pragmatic and the poetic. It combines that which is functional, logical, and efficient with that which is indefinable, inspiring, and unexpected. Architecture is where the most ordinary of materials are configured in ways that transform them to make places of extraordinary resonance and memory, places where small visceral experiences are as significant as big ideas.
Architecture that is conceived to give the instant wow experience too often is only of its time, while architecture that truly aspires to be of its place and time is that which has the potential of becoming the timeless. Architecture should aspire to engage us, to be grounded in a real experience that wells up in us and takes us over, producing the ‘whooshing up’ described by Hubert Dreyfus and Sean Dorrance Kelly in their new book *All Things Shining: Reading the Western Classics to Find Meaning in a Secular Age* (New York: Free Press, 2011). While architecture is always best measured in relation to the scale of the human, architecture must also be appropriate to the scale of the landscape, both natural and manmade, that it inhabits and the velocity of the world in which it exists. Architecture always reflects how a culture views itself. It is a barometer of how a community expresses social change and renewal over time. Architecture is the most fragile of art forms, as evidenced by the many empty lots where buildings once stood in our cities and towns. Yet architecture leaves the most permanent markers of our cultural heritage.

**What is an Urban Fabric?**

While we often see the architecture of buildings as the key objects that make great cities, it is really the quality of the pedestrian realm, i.e. the sidewalks, the street edges, the landscape, and the spaces between the buildings that make cities enjoyable, accessible, and memorable. A sustainable urban fabric preferences people in its scale, texture, level of detail, and connectivity, not the velocity of the car. When the urban fabric is strong, neighborhoods evolve and thrive. Cities are but neighborhoods and experiences linked together, like a richly textured and animated three-dimensional quilt.

To understand where Arizona is as a place to live and visit it is helpful to survey our built history, a chronicle that holds the keys to understanding our identity and offers lessons we must appreciate as we go forward.

**Arizona’s Architecture: A Brief History**

Arizona’s architectural identity is built on a foundation of sustainable resourcefulness and invention. This ethos has been tried and tested in times of abundance and scarcity. The wonders of Arizona, its geologic history, varied flora and fauna, ever visible defining horizon, and nearly ideal climate have continued to speak of possibility and promise.

Consider as a first architectural invention the early wattle and dab pit houses and earthen and stone walled villages of Casa Grande and Snake Town, supported in the Gila and Salt River Valley by vast irrigation systems, systems that left indelible marks to this day, and perhaps an ominous warning about fragility (i.e. the unexplained disappearance of the Hohokam peoples). Add to these the stone ruins of Montezuma’s Castle, Wupatki, Keet Seel, and Betatakina as well as the living village of Walpi on First Mesa of the Hopi Reservation. They all offer lessons of community and sustainability.

Further along in our time line came the 15th century adobe brick Spanish mission churches and garrison compounds. They were functionally pragmatic structures poetic in their directness of purpose and making, as were the later buildings in support of the ranches, mines, and farms of Arizona’s first settlers in the mid-19th century.
Spanish land grants and the rigor of the grid plan so popular in the West progressively mapped the vast landscape, overlaying the varied topography of the young Arizona Territory. Trail and rail alignments grew and their intersections defined and placed the built forms that have matured into the towns and cities that we know today.

The modern water reclamation projects, the automobile, and the airplane as well as the development of mechanical cooling technology in the first half of the 20th century catalyzed Arizona’s expansive growth and set the stage for the unique and respected character of its architectural identity.

Towns and emerging cities through their architecture started to reflect the pride, aspirations, and optimism of the successful residents and ambitious community leaders who migrated to Arizona. Prescott, Tucson, and Phoenix boasted vibrant main street downtowns by the 1920’s. Phoenix alone could claim fourteen streetcar lines in its downtown in 1921. Through increasingly sophisticated communications news spread of Arizona’s natural beauty and mythical identity. Photography, open-air painting, and journalism revealed and celebrated its sparse and wondrously lush desert and varied geologic history. The quality of light, ever visible horizon, and nearly ideal climate caught the imagination and ambition of many who heeded Horace Greeley’s advice: “Go west, young man. Go west.”

To accommodate and cater to those coming to see the Southwest for themselves hospitality architecture began to emerge. Architect Mary Jane Colter designed for Fred Harvey at Williams, the Grand Canyon, and elsewhere; the gracious Arizona Inn in Tucson by Merrill Starkweather opened in 1929; and Albert Chase MacArthur and Frank Lloyd Wright, the mature internationally recognized master, collaborated in 1928 on the Arizona Biltmore Hotel in Phoenix. These and other early examples gave the state not a unified architectural style but a built reality that reflected the originality and energy of the place with its dramatically surreal landscape, its enticing climate, and the optimism of the adventure. These are the roots of the uniquely regional modern architecture of Arizona.

Indeed, Arizona’s expansive central desert would serve as the canvas for Wright’s hand and imagination as he conceived and modeled his sprawling utopian vision of Broadacre City (1929-1935). The idea of Broadacre City revolved around individual homes placed on plots of modest acreage serviced by futuristic cars and personal helicopters. His diagrams of settlement depicted in seductive drawings extended over buildable land as far as the eye could see. Conceived in the middle of the Depression but optimistic in spirit (every occupant master of his own turf, tilling his own garden), it proved prescient of the suburban reality and America’s post World War II vision of itself. In the late 1940’s, a combination of prosperity, population growth, and cheap, seemingly endless, buildable land connected by possible networks of freeways and shopping centers, as in Southern California, drove and dominated Arizona’s growth. The single detached ranch home on its suburban lot would be the dominant model of residential growth throughout the second half of the 20th century throughout America, but particularly in the Sun Belt region.
However, while Wright conjured up a vision for urban growth in his Broadacre City plans, it was the memorable photogenic reality of Taliesin West (1936-59), his winter home and studio that would truly inspire the modern desert architecture that was to follow. Sited beyond the edge of the sleepy farm town of Scottsdale, at the base of the McDowell Mountains, Wright built a primal desert camp of rustic rubble rock and concrete walls whose angular folds and bends mimicked the mountains that seemed to embrace them and whose simple timber-beamed canvas roofs formed both an image of the ages and one as temporal as a desert mirage.

This architecture demonstrated what truly original desert living could be. It extruded itself cleanly from the land while kissing the sky with a crisp clarity of intent. On the cusp of Arizona’s explosive growth, it provided a challenging model of abstraction and assuredness for all the Arizona architecture that would follow. It suggested a rethinking of possibilities and set down the first truly distinct built identity of the “new” Arizona. No longer mere shelter, these structures spoke to the power and potential of architecture in celebration of this place.

Adding to the mix of the investigations of Wright and his apprentice acolytes was the work of multiple young architects whose housing studies were put forward in the popular *Arts and Architecture* magazine’s Case Study program of 1945-1966. Through this publication alone a new residential architecture was built, tested, and viewed by the eyes of the world. News spread of a new way of living in the West that celebrated the comfortable modernism of dwellings that grew from the inside out and the outside in. In harmony with both climate and lifestyle these experimental Case Study houses refined, and often combined with the heritage of the more traditional courtyard buildings of the region’s Spanish heritage, to give our cities a fresh and appealing character.

From this period a distinct architectural style evolved that was particular to Arizona. New materials appropriate to the time and place made affordability and constructability common to not merely Arizona’s residential architecture, but also to the civic, commercial, and industrial architecture of its communities. Thus the architectural legacy of Wright’s Usonian experiments and the Case Study innovators was digested and refined by a generation of mid-century Arizona design leaders including Blaine Drake, Paul Schweikher, Ralph Haver, Al Beadle, Bennie Gonzales, Arthur Brown, Judith Chaffee, and many others. The image of “built Arizona” was spread far and wide through features in *Arizona Highways* magazine and a growing national and international travel and architectural press.

In the early 1960’s, Arizona’s architectural identity reached beyond the residential to its public libraries, community colleges, state universities, places of worship, banks/savings and loans, shopping centers, schools, hospitals, and industrial buildings. Now this work is being recognized for its historic value at the center of community preservation and understanding by a national mid-century modernist following.

With the prosperity of Arizona’s growth sprawling in all directions, as Wright had divined it would be, his former apprentice, the young Italian visionary architect, Paolo Soleri redefined our considerations of the city through his drawings, models, and writings. From his
experimental Cosanti studio in Paradise Valley these ideas would come to full blossom in the large folio published by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press in 1970, *Arcology: City in the Image of Man* (arcology, a combining of the words architecture and ecology). Beyond a statement of philosophy the book illustrated Soleri’s concept of three-dimensional sustainable cities growing efficiently from the landscape without need of the automobile. These vertical armatures demonstrated Soleri’s thinking and suggested an approach that contrasted sharply with Wright’s Broadacre City model.

In the built experiments at Cosanti, ordinary materials and ideas grew logically and in extraordinarily artful ways from the landscape of its desert climate. Simultaneous to making these built experiments at Cosanti, Soleri laid out in text and sketch his notions about future life imperatives: complexity, miniaturization, and durability. Before Earth Day was ever celebrated, before LEED certification was conceived, before the word “Green” was on everyone’s lips, Soleri was wrestling with the issues of sustainability that concern us so deeply today.

In the last forty years the confluence of architectural talents set in motion by Wright’s work, Arizona’s ample stock of mid-century modern inventions, and Soleri’s experiments have continued to influence, inspire, and form architecture in Arizona as we see it today. Indeed the “Arizona School” has been increasingly recognized for creating buildings uniquely appropriate to the climate and landscape, iconic in their use of materials and light. Overall prosperity and political vision have catalyzed the commission of ambitious civic buildings that have garnered national and international attention, including ASU’s Nelson Fine Art Center and the Burton Barr Phoenix Central Library. From civic to university, residential to commercial, multi-family housing to mixed-use high-rise, architecture of widely recognized distinction and specific community pride has resulted. Indeed, Arizona has become a pilgrimage site for architects, designers, urbanists, and world travelers.

Something special has gone on here, and a maturing line of significant architectural inquiry and practice has been laid down. How do we insure that this “line” continues to be a calling card for our state, a point of pride for residents, and a point of destination for others seeking business or pleasure? I suggest that we move forward in ways that are both bold and fine-grained, but always appropriate to this place and intrinsically sustainable.

**Some Key Issues and Questions**

**What might be the result of big bold regional thinking?** Creative and thoughtful planning is important for urban, suburban, and rural communities in ten, twenty-five, and fifty-year increments. There will of course be overshooting and underestimating, but in order to deal effectively with population growth, a map of possible absorption that is better than “drive until you qualify,” could offer better solutions for our future. Such a map could radiate with vibrant nodes of social and economic density, lively neighborhoods, and distinctive destinations linked by rail and road, bike paths and trail systems.

**What is the value of “Local First”?** Towns and cities across Arizona understand the value of “local.” Supporting efforts to map, develop and mentor neighborhood based public markets,
unique retail, and restaurant opportunities based on local resources and benefiting local businesses will create sustainable communities. The more real it is the more we will want to be here and others will want to join us for a visit or for life.

**What is the value of interconnection?** The Internet and social media connect us on invisible highways. Interconnected neighborhoods will make it possible for us to actually show up, something we humans like to do and probably always will. Integrating light rail and bus is a great start, but let’s also consider less expensive, pedestrian friendly contemporary railed streetcar loops at key junctions in our most vibrant neighborhoods. Tucson is leading the way, with Tempe in close pursuit, in demonstrating what railed streetcar connectivity can mean to a community. If the patterns of mixed use development seen in the downtown of Portland, Oregon, are any indicator, such an investment is catalytic to a myriad of economic and social benefits. From cities as varied as Flagstaff, Prescott, Scottsdale, Glendale, and Phoenix, the streetcar, not the freeway, would transform our lives with vastly improved time/space efficiency.

**How can In-fill incentives be provided?** There are many voids in our midst, and in-fill would help to create and strengthen the urban fabric of our towns and cities. Work with owners of big empty lots to “program” them for temporary uses while vigorously creating community visions and plan for their reuse for live, work and play. Let’s not just stand by and wait. Let’s not just react. Let’s build value. Rather than building on a model of use based zoning that has stifled so many of our cities and neighborhoods let’s embrace “form based zoning,” which values a mixed use environment and puts within our, reach the 24/7 vitality that characterizes great places.

**How may alternative energy be deployed?** Such interventions and innovative shade structures, manmade or soil bound placed in highly visible places could contribute to livable communities: solar panels on parking lots, parasols on pedestrian ways. Dress them in graphics that quantify their “coolness” and “can do” attitude. These will reinvigorate the public realm at the heart of our cities and neighborhoods.

**How can small be better?** Small doable strategically sited, high-visibility, high-quality, locally-grown projects that immediately speak to our place and time and demonstrate that bigger is not necessarily better. By identifying the key places where making such an investment might be viable could inspire the confidence and optimism that is at the core of our heritage.

**Tomorrow is Now**

Arizona is still rich in opportunities and resources. They are close to home and demanding of our highest talents and deepest respect. Let’s learn from our past failures and successes as we build a new, more efficient, livable, and beautiful network of neighborhoods and communities where architecture, culture, and the urban fabric complement the wonders of Arizona’s unique and fragile landscape.
Will Bruder has explored inventive and contextually exciting architectural solutions in response to site opportunities and user needs for forty years. A craftsman in his concern for detail and building processes, he is also a sculptor in his unique blending of space, materials, and light. Self-trained as an architect, Will has a B.F.A. degree in sculpture from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Supplementing his studio education were studies in structural engineering, philosophy, art history, and urban planning, followed by architectural apprenticeships under Gunnar Birkerts and Paolo Soleri. After becoming registered, Will opened his own studio in 1974. With over 500 commissions, his work has celebrated the craft of building in ways not typical in contemporary architecture. Bruder strives to invent form specific to function and client aspiration, and through his creative use of materials and light, and his ability to raise the ordinary to the extraordinary is renowned. His architecture has been widely published and the seventy awards he has received over the course of his career have included the AIA Arizona Architect of the Year (2008), the Governor’s Art Award (2004), Educator of the Year by the Arizona AIA (1996), and the Rome Prize Fellowship (1989). Recent teaching positions have included the Distinguished Visiting Professor of Urban Architecture, Portland State University (2009), Pietro Belluschi Visiting Chair in Architecture, University of Oregon (2009), Frank Gehry International Visiting Chair, University of Toronto (2006), William Henry Bishop Visiting Professor, Yale University (2003 and 2006), and Thomas Jefferson Chair at the University of Virginia (2001). Bruder has worked nationally and internationally, and among his best known Arizona buildings, are the Burton Barr Central Library (1995) in Phoenix, the Deer Valley Rock Art Center (1994), and the Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art (1999).
The Museum Heart

(Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art, 1999)

Alberto Rios

We, each of us, keep what we remember in our hearts.
We, all of us, keep what we remember in museums.
In this way, museums beat inside us.

What we have seen and been fed,
What we have smelled and then wanted,
What hair we have touched
And what hands have touched our own;
What fires have burned red,
What rifles-fire echoes still,
What blue mountains rise
On the horizon’s orange and gray spine;
What day-moon mornings, what June-beetled evenings,
Simple heat moving, finally, into simple coolness,
A single long drink of good water,
My mother’s yes, your father’s chin.

What we remember,
What we have remembered to keep,
Where we put what we keep:
Sometimes in buildings we find
Pieces of the heart.
Sometimes in a heart we find
The shelter of a building.
Chapter 9

A Heritage at Risk:
Historic Preservation in Arizona

Deborah Edge Abele
Historic Preservation Consultant

Key Points

- The Casa Grande ruins were designated the nation’s first prehistoric and cultural reserve in 1892, the first foray into historic preservation by the federal government.
- Significant federal legislation included the National Historic Preservation Act (1966) and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990).
- Their provisions were bolstered by state and local legislation in Arizona. Arizona voters passed a statewide citizen initiative to create the Arizona Heritage Fund to be funded from Arizona Lottery revenues (1990).
- By the beginning of the 21st century, Arizona had one of the best frameworks for the advancement of historic preservation in the nation.
- Studies have demonstrated the economic benefits of preserving historic buildings and areas.
- Proposition 207, passed in 2005 in response to government use of eminent domain, has had a negative effect on historic preservation.
- The recession has eroded state support for historic preservation, put the Arizona State Parks system at risk, and has threatened our fragile historic resources.

As we move toward the 2012 celebration of Arizona’s first one hundred years, it is timely that we look at what we have done to preserve the buildings, landscapes, and artifacts that chronicle that history. While there are many accomplishments of which we can be proud, recent events threaten to undo the balanced protections and support that have been put in place to ensure that the cherished landmarks, historic downtowns and neighborhoods, and iconic symbols of our past eras endure.

Arizona was the last territory of the “Lower 48” to become part of the United States. Although the popular perception is that we are a young state and our future is more important than our past, Arizona actually has had, since its inception, a tradition of preservation. Like other states, Arizona’s interest in preserving its history developed in tandem with its settlement.

When the Territorial Legislature’s first session convened in Prescott in November 1864, among the handful of laws created was an act to charter the Arizona Historical Society. The Historical Society, the 1884 Society of Arizona Pioneers, and the Arizona State Museum were entrusted in the 1890s by the Territorial Legislature to foster care for the Territory and hold its collections and properties. Their creation evidenced the importance placed by early leaders in the documentation and preservation of the new settlement’s history.
During the same time, Arizona was the site of the federal government’s first foray into historic preservation. One square mile of the Territory surrounding the remains of a 13th century Hohokam farming village, was designated in 1892 by President Harrison as the “Casa Grande Reservation,” the nation’s first prehistoric and cultural reserve. This was over a decade before the enactment of the 1906 Antiquities Act, Public Law No. 59-209, which formalized protections for other nationally significant “historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures and other objects of historic or scientific interests” as National Monuments. The Act resulted in a mandate for the preservation of a substantial collection of sites on federal lands in Arizona.

In 1927 Arizona passed a similar state law, the Arizona Antiquities Act, ARS 41-841 to 41-846, which prohibited unauthorized excavation or defacing of historic, archaeological, or paleontological sites and the collection, alteration, or destruction of artifacts owned or managed by state agencies.

As the twentieth century progressed, Arizona saw the organization of numerous local historical societies and the creation of small museums filled with historic objects, photographs, papers, maps, and other memorabilia. The museums were intended to educate about the life and times of the settlers and instill pride about past accomplishments. Most were geographically based, while others focused on local industries and the role of the railroads and the military in the state’s growth and development. They commemorated the contributions of important families or individuals and chronicled those of the state’s many cultural, religious, and ethnic groups.

As the growth of tourism brought visitors to Arizona interested in the stories of “Cowboys and Indians,” Native American museums and heritage programs were organized. Local historical societies and museums primarily rely upon private funding and support by volunteers. While their work is limited to preserving artifacts, historical accounts, and community traditions, they have been and continue to be a small, but nevertheless a mainstay of the state’s preservation efforts.

In 1966, Congress passed the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Arizona quickly joined other states in establishing the federal-state partnership and program directives of Public Law No 89-665. In 1967, Governor Sam Goddard designated the Arizona State Parks Director, Dennis McCarthy, to fill the required position of the “state liaison officer” with the federal government. This was a logical choice as the State Park Board Law of 1957 had given the Parks Board the responsibility for selecting, managing, operating, and developing areas of scenic beauty, natural features, and historical properties as state parks and historical monuments. Although federal appropriations for historic preservation were not available until 1969, McCarthy budgeted state monies for FY 1968-69 to draft enabling legislation for a state historic preservation program.

An Assistant Director of State Parks was reassigned to become the state’s first State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and a “Governor’s Historical Advisory Commission” was appointed. Pursuant to the NHPA, an Interim Plan for Historic Preservation was completed in August, 1970.
At the national level, the initial focus was on completing a comprehensive inventory of the historic properties in each state and nominating properties to the newly created National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The NRHP criteria for deciding what was historically or architecturally important was based upon criteria which had been crafted by a wide array of scholars and disciplines to guide the 1930s New Deal Historic Sites Survey program work to document the nation’s most significant historic and architectural resources. Arizona had thirty-five properties recorded through this program. McCarthy worked with Arizona State University’s School of Architecture to conduct a statewide inventory effort to identify additional properties eligible for listing on the NRHP and/or the Arizona Register of Historic Places. Not just limited to properties of national significance, this survey compiled information about districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of local, state, and regional importance as well. Incentives for historic preservation were soon added to supplement the State’s survey and nomination efforts. The State Parks Board Law was amended in 1977 to allow for a special tax classification for designated historic properties that reduced or limited for a time period property taxes owed on the property.

The earliest local ordinance specifically related to historic preservation was in Tombstone in 1956. It was precipitated by the construction of a state highway through the town’s historic center. In 1972, Pima County amended its Zoning Code to establish overlay zoning requirements to protect cultural resources within historic districts. The County’s ordinance established a mechanism to define these districts and review demolition, new construction, and renovation plans for development that was funded by or under the direction of Pima County. The Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission was created in 1974. In 1985, Pima County’s zoning policies for cultural resource protection were extended to apply to private sector development.

Concurrent with the expansion of the scope of the national historic preservation movement, preservation activities in Arizona grew as well. A statewide preservation group was organized in the late 1970s to advance advocacy and private sector involvement. During Bruce Babbitt’s tenure as Governor, a task force was convened to assess how Arizona might benefit more from preservation activities which had increased the availability of affordable housing, the growth of tourism, energy conservation, and gave high rankings for the “quality of life” in communities in other states that had an enhanced identity that came from preserving a sense of time and place.

The 1982 Governor’s task force’s recommendations did not call for the creation of new institutions or agencies but sought instead to remove the barriers to effective cultural resource management. An immediate outgrowth of the recommendations was the State Historic Preservation Act of 1982, ARS 41-861 to 41-864. This act put in place at the state level, many of the same procedures of the NHPA and the 1971 Executive Order 11593. This state law directed state agencies to consider the impact of their actions on historic properties and utilize historic properties for state facilities whenever possible. It also strengthened the state tax incentive programs and established the Historical Advisory Commission and the Historic Sites Review Committee.
In the eighties, the National Historic Preservation Act was amended to create the Certified-Local-Government (CLG) program. The CLG program formally involved local governments and citizens in decisions made by other governments that affected the historic properties in their communities. To become certified, a municipality had to have local laws that provided for the designation and protection of historic resources, a citizen Historic Preservation Commission, a program for survey and inventory and public participation in all aspects of its work. Further, 10% of the annual federal funding for each SHPO was required to be “passed-through” to CLG’s. Not surprisingly, this funding spurred many local communities to become CLG’s. Florence became the state’s first, certified in September of 1985. Within a year Prescott, Jerome, Yuma, Globe, Williams, and Kingman followed. Today there are twenty-eight CLG programs in Arizona.

Protection for the State’s archaeological resources has always been a key part of Arizona’s preservation efforts. As noted, 1927 and 1982 state laws were passed that that mirrored the federal standards and procedures to be used for archaeological resource study and protections. Per the 1982 State HP Act, an Archaeological Advisory Commission was established. This citizen group assists the SHPO in conducting public education about the ethical issues of dealing with cultural traditions, properties, and artifacts, and developing enforcement mechanisms to stem pot-hunting and vandalism of archaeological sites. One of the most important outcomes of this group’s efforts was the 1988 creation of the Site Steward program that enlists volunteers statewide to monitor archaeological sites.

Important and far-reaching federal procedures for the appropriate treatment of archaeological resources were created with the 1990 Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). Public Law No. 101-801, requires all federal agencies and museums receiving federal funding to inventory their collections for human remains and associated funerary objects and notify culturally affiliated tribes to allow reclamation and repatriation. As with earlier federal legislation, Arizona quickly followed with the enactment of the 1990 Burial Protection Act and an amendment to the 1927 Arizona Antiquities Act to address the proper and respectful disposition of human remains. It also created an “Acquisition and Preservation Fund,” which uses monies from criminal fines assessed from violations of the law to defray the cost of the removal and repatriation of the remains.

Effective historic preservation programs are clearly tied to having formal protections in place. Historic preservation efforts that are successful, as well as effective, are those that have an array of financial, community, and political support as well. Throughout Arizona’s first century these components for success were systematically put in place. First federal, state, and then municipal laws were enacted to recognize selected buildings, areas, and resources as worthy of special protection and treatment, and financial incentives for their preservation were developed early on.

Additional revenue sources were created in selected communities with the passage of bond propositions which provided dedicated monies for such things as the acquisition of threatened buildings and cultural landscapes; emergency stabilization, repair, maintenance or adaptive reuse of historic properties, and the enhancement and interpretation of community landmarks.
Residents of Phoenix passed the city’s first historic preservation bond in 1989, allocating $15 million solely for historic preservation purposes. In 1990, voters passed a statewide citizen initiative to create the Arizona Heritage Fund from Arizona Lottery revenues. Up to twenty million dollars of lottery proceeds were approved for annual allocations to Arizona Game and Fish and State Park departments to fund conservation and preservation efforts. For close to two decades, approximately $1.7 million has been distributed annually statewide to support a wide array of community preservation projects. Pima County mounted a campaign for an Open Space and Historic Preservation Bond in 1997. Overwhelmingly approved by the voters, $6.4 million was provided to protect significant archaeological and cultural properties through acquisition, rehabilitation, restoration, or interpretation.

As Arizona moved into the twentieth-first century, the state could boast of having one of the best frameworks in the nation for the advancement of historic preservation in the nation. Almost all its cities and towns had historic preservation programs with ordinances that fairly balanced preservation protections with property rights. Local and state incentive programs generated a desire by property owners for local designation and/or listing buildings and neighborhoods on the NRHP.

Historic neighborhoods prospered, attracting buyers and increasing in value faster than non-designated areas. Preservation crises were few and far between, despite big projects such as the construction of the light rail system in metropolitan Phoenix and the continued increase of the intensity and density of in-fill developments in urban areas. Taking into account historic properties, as part of the planning and development process, had become internalized by the private and public sector and tools were available to make most alternatives that provided for the preservation of cultural resources feasible.

While historic preservation programs enjoyed popularity and few problems in Arizona during the 1990s, this was not the case in many other parts of the country. A growing discontent with government intrusion in people’s lives had given rise to a number of nationally funded efforts to limit government powers. Use of eminent domain by government was widely opposed and targeted for repeal through ballot initiatives. Arizona had dealt with this issue in the case of Bailey’s Brake Shop and in 2004 the Arizona Court of Appeals had set strict parameters as to when and how eminent domain could be exercised.

Nonetheless, an initiative was placed on the 2005 election ballot, funded by an out-of-state group. This initiative was promoted only as a curb on the use of eminent domain. However, unknown to most, Proposition 207 also contained language that required government to compensate an owner for any governmental action that diminished the value of the property. When Prop 207 was approved by the voters, its consequences went way beyond the use of eminent domain. In Arizona, state law requires that zoning is used to officially designate a property as historic.

After the passage of the proposition, any property owner could petition a government for compensation if they believed the designation had diminished the property’s value. While the owner was responsible for proving the diminution had occurred and there is ample statistical data showing that designation of historic homes actually increases their value, most cities put in place procedures that required owners to waive their ability to seek compensation under
Proposition 207 before the City would consider rezoning a property for any purpose. Not surprisingly, asking an owner to waive his or her property rights has severely curtailed interest in being designated as historic. Consequently in the last five years only a handful of properties statewide have been added to local historic registers, even though a growing number of post WWII properties and neighborhoods are becoming eligible for the protection and support to preserve them provided by municipal historic preservation programs.

Perhaps the simplest answer to what has eroded Arizona’s support for historic preservation is: the economy. As the city and state revenues have dramatically declined, there have been continual cuts in staffing and programs that support historic preservation at all levels of government. Despite the fact that there is substantial evidence as to the economic benefits of preserving historic buildings and areas, historic preservation has not fared well in competing for the shrinking pool of public funding.¹ Nowhere is this more evident than in the demise of support for the Arizona State Parks system, an important steward and owner of many of the state’s most important historic and archaeological resources and the department which houses the SHPO. As detailed in the Morrison Institute for Public Policy’s 2009 report, the Arizona Legislature and Governor’s Office has steadily eroded support for the state park system by reducing its General Fund appropriations, “sweeping” cash from dedicated Park funds, and requiring the agency to survive on park and user fees.² Since its creation, there have been repeated attempts by the State Legislature to “raid” the Arizona Heritage Fund to use the monies for purposes different from which the voters dedicated the fund. These attempts were successfully countered time and again by the citizenry until the 2010 session when the legislators voted to allocate all lottery revenues to the state’s General Fund, forcing the shutdown of the Heritage grant program.

During this same session, there was a concerted effort to repeal the state property tax reduction for historic homes. While the repeal failed, it shows a lack of understanding of the significant pay back of the balanced approach to preservation that had developed in Arizona. While some maintain that all government incentive programs should be abolished, this one produced clear benefits. Thus in a few short years, Arizona has gone from actively expanding its recognition and protection of cultural resources in large and small communities statewide and offering a wide array of tools and support for saving, reusing, and enhancing them, to a standstill.

In today’s world keeping historic buildings and areas as vital parts of our communities will not just happen by itself. This is particularly true for Arizona as it has relied primarily on new development and growth for its prosperity. For historic preservation efforts to be successful, there needs to be a framework that provides for proactive planning as to what should be preserved. There should be informed decision-making and consensus about what is important and worth saving, and both carrots and sticks used to accomplish preservation goals. The need for a multi-faceted, balanced approach to preserving our cultural resources was realized early on in Arizona and just such a system was put in place at the state and local levels. Now it is being dismantled without an understanding or concern for the consequences which will occur.
Secondly the fragile and tenuous nature of our historic resources must be acknowledged. When historic buildings are lost, they can never be replaced. The fractured, short-term fixes that are being concocted today to address the current economic woes may be suitable solutions for some circumstances. But when historic resources are gone because protection, technical information, or other assistance was not available to help sustain them, they cannot be recovered when revenue streams resume.

In the early sixties, leaders from communities across the nation came together to advocate the development of a national preservation program. In a powerful book which they commissioned, With Heritage So Rich, they urged that America should take its place among the great civilizations of the world and become proper stewards for its material culture. They were successful and the National Historic Preservation Act was passed and preservation partnerships, such as that which developed Arizona, flourished. Today Arizona’s heritage is genuinely threatened as we discard the practices that have worked successfully for decades. This challenge cannot be met with something as simple as writing a book. But, just as was done then, we must again persuade our citizens and leaders—in a meaningful way—of the imperative for preserving our past. It will be a difficult task, but one we cannot ignore or shirk.

Deborah Edge Abele has worked professionally in the field of historic preservation for local and state governments, businesses and community organizations for the past thirty years. Her firm, Akros, Inc. provides a range of historic preservation consulting services related to the recognition, protection and enhancement of historic and architectural resources. Abele also serves as the Executive Director of the Papago Salado Association, a non-profit organization that facilitates the promotion and preservation of the cultural resources of the Papago Salado region in metropolitan Phoenix. Abele has taught graduate and undergraduate courses in historic preservation as an Adjunct Faculty member of Arizona State University since 1990. She has a B.A. Degree from Vassar College and was a Graduate Fellow at The George Washington University.
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Something From Nothing: Artists and the Revitalization of Downtown Phoenix

Greg Esser
Director of Civic Art, Los Angeles County Arts Commission
Founder, Roosevelt Row CDC

Key Points

- Artists are drawn to a “vacuum of affordability” in blighted areas avoided by other developers, businesses, and residents
- Artists can be catalysts for redevelopment
- The revitalization of Roosevelt Row was a creative public/private partnership between the Artists Issues Task Force and the City of Phoenix, which resulted in an Arts, Culture and Small Business Overlay
- Artists represent a significant percentage of property ownership in downtown Phoenix
- Modest investment resulted in a decrease in reported crime rates, new in-fill development, huge growth in the monthly artwalk, new businesses, and increased sales and property tax revenue
- Arts and culture are good economic investments

“Anybody can do something with a million dollars. But it takes someone really special to make something out of nothing.”
—Grandma Tressa Prisbrey, creator of Bottle Village in Simi Valley, California

In January 2010, the New York Times ran a short profile of downtown Phoenix.\(^1\) The piece did not focus on the voter-approved bond financing that made the downtown Arizona State University campus possible, the $750 million investment in the expansion of the convention center, or the opening of the first twenty-mile segment of the new Valley Metro light rail system, itself a $1.5 billion investment. These are not uncommon infrastructure investments for cities to make under the broad formula of economic development.

The article focused instead on Roosevelt Row, an area of downtown Phoenix defined by a grass-roots, artist-driven economic revitalization that has increased sales tax and property tax revenues and significantly reduced crime, all without a direct expenditure of tax-payer dollars.\(^2\) The arts have played an unquestionably pivotal role in the recent revitalization of downtown Phoenix. In-fill housing, new businesses, national media coverage, enhanced public perception of urban living, and a growing number of visitors and residents have followed. What seemed like an overnight success was more than ten years in the making.
**Vacuum of Affordability**

What sets artists apart from other professional occupations?

Artists don’t typically clock in and clock out, counting down the hours to the end of the work day or the years left until retirement. Rather, they are driven by a deep-seated passion for their creative work and most make great personal sacrifices, working often unrelated jobs to support their professional development and practice as artists. As a group, they are motivated, dedicated, and patient.

Artists, visual artists in particular, need cheap space to create and exhibit their work. Not surprisingly they are drawn to a “vacuum of affordability”—blighted areas that other developers, businesses, and residents choose to avoid. These areas typically have been crime-ridden inner city urban areas, but they also include remote rural areas and small economically struggling towns as well.

Artists have been at the vanguard of re-using discarded materials for new purposes for centuries. They tend to approach problem-solving differently, thinking outside of the box, or ignoring the box altogether. Artists see potential where others do not, and are accustomed to working on nothing more than a shoe-string.

Artists are used to creating something from nothing.

**Arts and Economic Development**

In 1999, East Roosevelt Street between Third and Seventh Streets was known largely as a place to buy drugs and as a hangout for transvestite prostitutes and their clients. This was the neighborhood where Danny Bonaduce made national news for assaulting a transvestite.

As artists begin to populate derelict neighborhoods like Roosevelt Row in the late nineties, they also begin to attract audiences for their work (Figure 10.1). These audiences, in turn, begin to attract other businesses. Small coffee shops, bars, and restaurants opened. As these businesses grew and drew new audiences, the surrounding neighborhood began to transform.

**Figure 10.1**

Before and after: Sixth Street Studios was the most blighted property in the neighborhood in 2003 and was converted to affordable artist live/work space.

Photographs by Greg Esser.
The pattern of artists serving as a catalyst for redevelopment and then getting priced out of the areas they contribute to is fairly common. As real estate values begin to increase, artists gradually move on to more affordable areas. In New York, this process of revitalization, or gentrification, unfolded over several decades in SoHo that has now become among the most expensive retail real estate in the world. Artists have also been leaving Williamsburg in New York in favor of more remote and more affordable areas.

**Breaking the Rules**

Downtown Phoenix provides an unusual case study of this phenomenon fueled by artists. The revitalization of downtown Phoenix has been uncharacteristic for two important reasons:

1. Artists as a group represent over twenty percent of commercial property ownership in the Roosevelt Row district.

2. Revitalization and redevelopment has occurred far more rapidly than in other similar urban environments, in part due to competing priorities for the areas to which artists were attracted, and other significant concurrent public and private investments.

Both of these factors were the result of coincidence rather than foresight and planning. Artists were indirectly encouraged to purchase properties after being displaced as tenants when first the basketball arena and then the baseball stadium were constructed downtown.

Infrastructure improvements were not made in the areas along East Roosevelt because the area was viewed as a future economic redevelopment site, one where existing buildings would be demolished in favor of new higher density construction. The entire area was re-zoned for high-rise development in the 1970s, resulting in a high percentage of single-story building demolitions over time. This has subsequently resulted in a lingering issue of blight caused by entire blocks of vacant undeveloped land.

In spite of other official plans, artists slowly began to purchase and occupy buildings within proximity of one another. They unintentionally began to reshape an entire community. Many of the activities and uses that artists brought to numerous vacant or under-utilized structures in the area were technically, according to the letter of existing laws, ordinances, and regulations, illegal. Rather than simply breaking these various and sundry rules, artists and the City of Phoenix worked collaboratively to write new rules, ones more appropriate to the specific context and desired outcomes.

**Whose Bright Idea Was This, Anyway? The Artists Issues Task Force**

In September 2005, City Manager Frank Fairbanks charged Phil Jones, Director of the Office of Arts and Culture to convene the Artists Issues Task Force, a new constituent group comprised of downtown stakeholders, primarily in the arts, to develop solutions to the numerous challenges that had emerged as the nascent downtown arts districts evolved. Jones was empowered to include in each discussion appropriate staff from the numerous city departments with jurisdiction or enforcement authority regarding respective issues.
For almost two years, this group met twice monthly to discuss issues and formulate methods of addressing or solving the concerns that the City of Phoenix could support through changes in policies and procedures.

The Artists Issues Task Force, working in tandem with city staff from more than a dozen city departments, developed a tool-kit of policy recommendations. Among others, the policy changes recommended and eventually adopted by the City of Phoenix included:

1. The Arts, Culture and Small Business Overlay

2. The Development Services Department Office of Customer Advocacy

3. Increased flexibility in the interpretation and application of Building Code and Fire Code standards

The common theme among most recommendations was relief from development standards to encourage adaptive re-use of existing vintage and historic buildings rather than encouraging their demolition.

**Arts, Culture and Small Business Overlay**

The Arts, Culture and Small Business Overlay (ACSBO) is the first more permissive overlay ever adopted by the City of Phoenix. Most overlays, such as those for historic preservation, are more restrictive in terms of allowable uses and building modifications.

The overlay was initially developed by City of Phoenix staff based upon input and recommendations from the Artists Issues Task Force and was later refined through a public hearing process. From recommendation to adoption, this took three years to accomplish.

The overlay adds greater flexibility in terms of allowable uses within its boundaries, and represented the significant recognition that development standards for adaptive re-use in urban areas shouldn’t necessarily be the same as those for new construction in suburban areas. The overlay was mapped to capture the emerging arts districts along Roosevelt Street and Grand Avenue.

The overlay is the only area in the City of Phoenix where A-frame signs, or sandwich boards, are allowed. It also reduces the on-site parking requirements when a change of use occurs in an existing building. All the recommendations that were finally adopted in the text of the overlay were developed in response to challenges encountered by the numerous stakeholders represented by the Artists Issues Task Force.

The Arts, Culture and Small Business Overlay was recognized in 2008 with an Award of Merit from the Valley Forward Association for contributing to livable communities.³
Development Services Department Office of Customer Advocacy

The development process can be difficult to navigate for seasoned developers and is even more daunting, draconian even, for the newcomer. When artists or other small business owners begin the process of obtaining building permits, the challenges can be confusing and overwhelming to the point of halting a promising new business venture. In order to address the myriad challenges often encountered when non-professionals approach unusual building renovation projects, the Development Services Department established the Office of Customer Advocacy, a new single point of contact for the development process.

While this office has city-wide benefit, it was particularly critical for the urban core where adaptive re-use has become far more common than in-fill and new construction. Many buildings downtown may have had commercial zoning that allowed a range of uses, but only a residential occupancy under the building code. Even explaining the differences between zoning requirements and building occupancy requirements introduced a new measure of customer service for the city.

The Office of Customer Advocacy serves an important role in researching and consolidating the requirements from the numerous different city departments, regulations, ordinances, and codes that might apply to small projects such as converting a residential structure with commercial zoning to a retail garden shop or changing a commercial auto body shop into a photography studio.

**Increased Flexibility in Building Code and Fire Code Standards**

Without sacrificing public safety, the Development Services and Fire departments both have made efforts to increase the flexibility of building and fire code requirements as they relate to small adaptive re-use projects.

A new definition for “live/work” space was added to the City of Phoenix building code. Previously, these two different uses were not allowed within the same building space under the same building occupancy. An artist was not legally allowed to live in an industrial or commercial space. The option to use the International Existing Building Code, in addition to the International Building Code was also adopted.

Artists created working studio space in a number of small formerly residential buildings. Once or twice per month, these spaces were opened up for the public to enter to view artwork in progress. Artists referred to these spaces as “galleries.” This new use was subject to both zoning and building code requirements. The gallery use was only allowed in commercially-zoned properties prior to adoption of the ACSBO.

An “art gallery” is also defined in the International Building Code as an “assembly” occupancy. Many of the art spaces in downtown Phoenix, under this definition, regardless of square footage, would have been subject to prohibitive higher on-site parking requirements and other standards more appropriate to significantly larger venues. An interpretation was
issued by the Building Official to allow for smaller art venues to be considered the same occupancy as retail stores rather than assembly occupancy based on size, exiting requirements, and other factors.

Under the Bret Tarver Sprinkler Ordinance in Phoenix, any change of use automatically triggers the requirement to install an automatic fire sprinkler system in any building. If a commercial automotive repair shop is converted to a residential or retail use, an automatic fire sprinkler system is required. The Fire Department allowed an exception to this for buildings under 1,500 square feet, an allowance that meant an entire district of small, formerly residential structures occupied by artists could have a change of use without each requiring a new automatic fire sprinkler system.

These interpretations permitted additional flexibility and consideration in the application of building code standards without sacrificing public safety. There was also a clear economic benefit, as they spurred the growth of a flourishing urban district that added new sales tax revenue to the City of Phoenix supporting municipal services including police and fire protection.

These zoning and other policy modifications are “green” in that they allow greater flexibility in the preservation and adaptive re-use of existing buildings. This means less material consumed for new construction and less material diverted to landfills. More importantly, it enhances a distinct urban neighborhood character that builds on an authentic sense of place, one that newer developments often seek to replicate.

**Rate of Return**

The policy changes and new programs adopted by the City of Phoenix didn’t just allow an emerging artists district to hang on where it might have otherwise been regulated out of existence. Some of the other outcomes of these relatively modest investments in fostering the creative community in downtown Phoenix include:

1. More than a fifty percent decrease in reported crime rates with no direct additional cost for police services between 2000 and 2010. The total actual reduction in criminal activity was even higher since many drugs sales, assaults, and other crimes common in the area were often not reported. More eyes on the street and people walking at all hours discouraged many activities whose perpetrators prefer less public visibility.

2. Attraction of new in-fill development. Artisan Homes, LLC designed a new in-fill housing project on Roosevelt Street to include the first live/work units in Phoenix to mirror the active cultural district in the historic structures on the south side of the street (Figure 10.2). The arts district was also an element of marketing the development that sold out prior to construction with an average waiting list of three people for every available unit.
Figure 10.2

Photographs by Greg Esser.

3. Exponential growth in attendance at the free monthly artwalk. Downtown Phoenix has hosted a free monthly artwalk for more than twenty years. In 2000, the event attracted fewer than 100 people to East Roosevelt Street in an entire evening. People were, in fact, afraid to walk around the area after dark. In 2010, the event has grown to become the largest free monthly artwalk of its kind in the United States, attracting as many as 20,000 visitors according to City of Phoenix Police Department estimates.

4. Dozens of new restaurants, bars, retail shops, and other businesses have opened. The decision on the part of business owners to locate in the area was influenced in large part by the audiences drawn by artists for the monthly artwalks.

5. Increased sales tax and property tax revenue. This added revenue supports vital government services that are important to everyone including public safety, libraries, parks, senior services, and after school programs.

6. Increased property values.
Artists foster creativity, diversity, tolerance, and innovation in their communities, all of which are critical to economic competitiveness under Richard Florida’s rubric. Artists, drawn to the vacuum of affordability, often play a pivotal role in community revitalization. Some artists don’t like to consider themselves part of the machinery of capitalism, but the reality is that arts and culture are tremendously good economic investments.

The City of Phoenix played an important role in fostering the largely grass-roots and sweat equity evolution of the arts community in downtown Phoenix. City leadership could have just as easily enforced existing regulations and eliminated most of the nascent activity that has since garnered positive national media coverage and encouraged greater investment in the area. An open process of on-going community input and dialogue resulted in a number of key policy solutions. A successful public/private partnership created something from nothing. A million dollars, however, could still be put to good use.

Greg Esser is an artist, advocate and arts administrator. Currently he serves as Director of Civic Art for the Los Angeles County Arts Commission. He is the founder and former executive director of the Roosevelt Row Community Development Corporation, a non-profit organization focused on community revitalization through the arts and creating pedestrian-friendly urban neighborhoods. He established several contemporary art venues and businesses in downtown Phoenix including eye lounge, 515, MADE art boutique, and Sixth Street Studios. He previously served as Director of Public Art for the City of Phoenix from 1996 to 2004 and as Director of Public Art for the City and County of Denver from 1991 to 1996. Following these posts, he influenced policy in the public art field nationally as manager of the Public Art Network for Americans for the Arts in Washington, D.C. He received his B.A. with honors from Oberlin College and his M.F.A. with honors from Arizona State University where he also received the Nathan Cummings Foundation Fellowship. His artwork is included in numerous public and private collections.

---

1 Michael Tulipan, “Reviving Phoenix Through Art,” *New York Times*, 31 January 2010: “Boarded-up buildings and empty lots in the shadow of office towers hardly seemed a promising foundation for an arts district in rapidly growing Phoenix. But once-neglected and dangerous Roosevelt Row, on the north side of downtown, turned out to be an irresistible lure for artists looking for cheap spaces in which to live and work. Galleries, restaurants and a farmers’ market soon followed.”

See: http://travel.nytimes.com/2010/01/31/travel/31surfacing.html. While this chapter focuses on the model provided by Roosevelt Row, artists have also been key players in the revitalization of Ajo, Bisbee, El Mirage, and Jerome.

2 See: www.roosevelttrow.org

3 Founded in 1969, the Valley Forward Association brings business and civic leaders together to convene thoughtful public dialogue on regional issues and to promote cooperative efforts to improve the environment and livability of Valley communities. Their goal is to make the Phoenix metropolitan region among the best places in America to live, work, learn, and recreate. The group dedicates its resources to enhancing Valley communities. See: http://www.valleyforward.org/
To Preserve, Adapt, Restore, or Build: 
Arts and Cultural Facilities in Arizona

Shelley Cohn
Community Volunteer and retired Executive Director, Arizona Commission on the Arts

Key Points

- Arizona’s arts and cultural facilities reflect a community’s values and sense of civic pride. Housed in both historic buildings and new architecture, these venues provide opportunities for increased visibility and program advancement for arts and cultural organizations. The very existence of these facilities have become tools for attracting both business and tourism.
- Over the last thirty years Arizona has made a tremendous public and private financial investment in arts and cultural facilities of more than $750 million (not including university and public school facilities); the financial support for ongoing operations for the organizations within these buildings has not kept pace.
- The City of Mesa and the City of Tempe creatively included a plan for sustainability into capital construction costs; City of Phoenix bond-funded projects provided leverage for arts and cultural organizations to raise additional private funds for programs and endowments.
- Many of the facilities funded by voter-approved taxes included provisions for commissioning public art.

Arizonans have a long history of participating in arts and cultural activities; and of investing in facilities to nurture and house them for the benefit of future generations. Facilities investments have been both for new architecturally significant buildings and historically preserved and adapted facilities. The focus of this chapter is limited primarily to those facilities that offer public programs and are owned and operated by non-profit arts and cultural organizations or by city governments, sometimes with a long-term lease to the organizations. The research for this chapter involved collecting information and interviews from about 100 Arizona facilities. It is important to note that this chapter is representative of selected facilities rather than an exhaustive assessment or survey of all arts and cultural facilities in the state (Table 11.1). For instance, Arizona State University (ASU) alone houses eighteen specialized museums. Alternative spaces for presenting arts and culture are also important, but beyond the scope of this chapter.

Over the decades, arts and cultural institutions have dealt with the regular and incremental growth in their annual operations and their abilities to serve greater demands from their audiences. As they grew, they realized the need to develop both visions and plans for new and expanded facilities. The vision and development of arts and cultural facilities has evolved over time to become creative homes for arts and culture, based on the particular and peculiar needs of the specific art forms and the communities in which they are located.
Table 11.1 Arizona Arts and Cultural Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AA Facilities</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Adaptive re-use</th>
<th>Historic New construction</th>
<th>Renovation restoration/expansion</th>
<th>Original construction/architect/cost</th>
<th>New or renovated Dates finished/architect</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocates for Latino Arts and Culture</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amerind Foundation</td>
<td>Dragoon</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1930-1961</td>
<td>1992 Tempe</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Historical Society comprised of 15 facilities</td>
<td>Tucson/Temppe</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2000 Saemisch Di Bella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Museum for Youth</td>
<td>Mesa/Temppe</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1951 Martin Ray Young Jr.</td>
<td>2004 BPLW, 2010 Historic Streetscapes</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1937 Mesa City Hall with WPA funds</td>
<td>Expansions in 1983, 1987 and new wing in 2000 Saemisch Di Bella</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Science Center</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1994 Tucson</td>
<td>1992 Tempe</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State Museum</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1893, established by Arizona Territorial Legislation, moved many times</td>
<td>1977 the Museum moved to 1926 UA Library Building</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASU Art Museum/Galvin Theatre</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1964 Frank Lloyd Wright 2.5m; 1959 Kerr Cultural Center</td>
<td>1993-2004 technical upgrades</td>
<td>1988 Antoine Predock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASU Gammage Auditorium/Kerr Cultural Center</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td></td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisbee Mining and Historical Museum</td>
<td>Bisbee</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1897 Copper Queen Consolidated Mining Company (Phelps Dodge Corporation)</td>
<td>1971 became a museum</td>
<td>2001 Orcutt Winslow/2006 Michael Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver Museum and Cultural Center</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1926 School</td>
<td>2001 Orcutt Winslow/2006 Michael Baker</td>
<td>1926 School; 1949 cafeteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Creative Photography</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1989 Burris Silberschlag</td>
<td></td>
<td>2001 Orcutt Winslow/2006 Michael Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler Center for the Arts</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1989 10.2m SGS Architects</td>
<td>2010 WRL Design</td>
<td>2010 WRL Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Museum of Phoenix</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1913 School</td>
<td>2008 Fore Dimensions</td>
<td>2010 WRL Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobre Valley Center for the Arts</td>
<td>Globe</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1907 Gila County Courthouse</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino Center for the Arts</td>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010 WRL Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>Green Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1989 Howard, Needles, Tammen and Welch</td>
<td>2010 WRL Design</td>
<td>2010 WRL Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curley School Artisan Lofts</td>
<td>Ajo</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1919 Spanish Colonial Main Building; 1937 Ranch Style school; 1949 cafeteria</td>
<td>1937 Ranch Style school; 1949 cafeteria</td>
<td>1937 Ranch Style school; 1949 cafeteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del E. Webb Center for the Performing Arts</td>
<td>Wickenburg</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td></td>
<td>2001 Durrant Architects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Botanical Garden</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks Opera House</td>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1905 J.R. Minor</td>
<td>2010 WRL Design</td>
<td>2010 WRL Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Tucson Theatre</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1930 art deco movie palace Eugene Durfee</td>
<td>1999-2005 Erickson Leader</td>
<td>2010 WRL Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Arizona Puppet Theatre</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1929 LDS Church Burton</td>
<td>1999 Gerald Doyle</td>
<td>2010 WRL Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard Museum</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1983, 1999</td>
<td>2010 WRL Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herberger Theater Center, formally Phoenix Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1989 Howard, Needles, Tammen and Welch</td>
<td>2010 WRL Design</td>
<td>2010 WRL Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice House</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
<td>2001 Durrant Architects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa Arts Center</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2003 BOORA and DWL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2001 Durrant Architects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Contemporary Art</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1970 William Wilde</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Instrument Museum</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1900 Normal School classrooms, dorms</td>
<td>1991 Orcutt Winslow</td>
<td>2010 Richard Varda and RSP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAU Art Museum</td>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1900 Normal School classrooms, dorms</td>
<td>1991 Orcutt Winslow</td>
<td>2010 Richard Varda and RSP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Mason Pulliam Rio Salado Audubon Center</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1927 Lescher &amp; Mahoney 750k</td>
<td></td>
<td>1927 Lescher &amp; Mahoney 750k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orpheum Theatre</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1972 Edward Starr</td>
<td>1972 Edward Starr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrons of the Arts/Hilltop Gallery</td>
<td>Nogales</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2007 Westlake Reed Leskosky</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007 Westlake Reed Leskosky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria Center for the Performing Arts</td>
<td>Peoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2007 Westlake Reed Leskosky</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007 Westlake Reed Leskosky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phippen Art Museum</td>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>159-1965 Alden Dow, 1.5m (1m City of Phoenix bonds, 1m construction, 5m endowment)</td>
<td>1994, 2006, 2010 Williams/Tasler, 2000 Vern Swaback</td>
<td>1994, 2006, 2010 Williams/Tasler, 2000 Vern Swaback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Art Museum</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1923, Heard family Carriage House/1951 Alden Dow 120k</td>
<td>2001-present Substance Design Consortium</td>
<td>2001-present Substance Design Consortium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Theatre</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1923, Heard family Carriage House/1951 Alden Dow 120k</td>
<td>2001-present Substance Design Consortium</td>
<td>2001-present Substance Design Consortium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott Fine Arts Association</td>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1896 Sacred Heart Church</td>
<td>1969, gallery renovated in 2010</td>
<td>2001-present Substance Design Consortium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo Grande</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1974, 750k</td>
<td>1995 CCEG</td>
<td>2001-present Substance Design Consortium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Creek Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>Queen Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1975 Binnie Gonzales, original construction funded by bonds and federal redevelopment funds; galleries added in 1996, 4.9m</td>
<td>1995 CCEG</td>
<td>2001-present Substance Design Consortium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale Center for the Performing Arts</td>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1975 Binnie Gonzales, original construction funded by bonds and federal redevelopment funds; galleries added in 1996, 4.9m</td>
<td>1995 CCEG</td>
<td>2001-present Substance Design Consortium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Arts</td>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5 discount theaters</td>
<td>2000 Will Bruder</td>
<td>2000 Will Bruder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedona Arts Center</td>
<td>Sedona</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1940 peach packing shed/repurposed in 1960 as arts center</td>
<td>1994 Design Group</td>
<td>1994 Design Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Adaptive re-use</td>
<td>Historic construction</td>
<td>Renovation restoration/ expansion</td>
<td>Original construction/architect/cost</td>
<td>Dates finished/architect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharlot Hall Museum</td>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoki Museum of American Indian Art and Culture</td>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1935 Christopher Totten, no major upgrades; transferred in 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steele Indian School Memorial Hall</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>1922 School Auditorium</td>
<td>2008 Swan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempe Arts Center</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005 Barton Myers/Architecton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple of Music and Art</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1927 Arthur Hawes 200k</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999 Glendale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bead Museum</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1986 Prescott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rialto Theatre</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1920 movie house Curlett &amp; Son</td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubac Center for the Arts</td>
<td>Tubac</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson Children's Museum</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1901 Carnegie Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>1991 became the Tucson Children's Museum; no major renovations since restored in 1989 to 1938 configuration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson Museum of Art</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1975 William Wilde 1.5m</td>
<td></td>
<td>1988 Richard Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson Music Hall and Leo Rich Theatre</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>1977, no significant renovation since 1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA Centennial Hall</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1936 Roy Place 221k</td>
<td></td>
<td>1985 John L. Mascarella and Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA Poetry Center, Helen S. Schaefer Building</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007 Line &amp; Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA Stevie Eller Dance Theatre</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gould Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Youth Theatre</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1930 Retail Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999 CCBG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma Art Center and Historic Theatre</td>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1912-1932 Brooks and Cargill</td>
<td></td>
<td>2004 Van Dijk, Reed, Leskosky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To continue to produce and present the highest quality programs, the organizations needed dramatic improvements in the facilities that housed them. With these new homes there was the expectation for higher quality programs within these new and renovated buildings, and growing operating budgets to realize those expectations. At the same time, cities became more aware of the value of arts and cultural facilities as a symbol of community pride and a tool for economic vitality and an enticement for tourists. New and expanded facilities were expected to attract growing audiences to arts and cultural activities. In recent times the design of these facilities has included gathering spaces and restaurants, making them civic gathering spaces.

The chapter documents the different approaches that have been used for the preservation of historic buildings, adaptive re-use of facilities that had been used for other purposes into arts and cultural facilities, the renovation/restoration of existing arts and cultural facilities and the design/construction of new facilities.

### Historic Buildings

At least twenty-four arts and cultural facilities have been placed on the National Register of Historic Places, including:

- Ajo: Curley School Artisan Lofts
- Bisbee: Bisbee Mining & Historical Museum
- Flagstaff: Museum of Northern Arizona, Northern Arizona University (NAU) Art Museum
- Globe: Cobre Valley Center for the Arts
- Phoenix: Carver Museum and Cultural Center, Children’s Museum of Phoenix, Great Arizona Puppet Theater, Orpheum Theatre, Pueblo Grande Ruins, Steele Indian School Memorial Hall
• Prescott: Elks Opera House, Prescott Fine Arts Association, Sharlot Hall Museum Governor’s Mansion and Iron Turbine Windmill, Smoki Museum of American Indian Art and Culture
• Scottsdale: Kerr Cultural Center
• Tempe: ASU Gammage Auditorium
• Tucson: Fox Tucson Theatre, Temple of Music and Art, The Rialto Theatre, Tucson Children’s Museum, University of Arizona (UA) Centennial Hall
• Wickenburg: Desert Caballeros Western Museum Shride House
• Yuma: Historic Theatre

The restoration and renovation of historic buildings have made effective homes for the arts. The most common former uses of these historic facilities were as schools, churches, movie houses, and homes, notably:

• Schools: NAU Art Museum (1900), Children’s Museum of Phoenix (1913), Curley School Artisan Lofts (1919), Steele Indian School Memorial Hall (1922), Carver Museum and Cultural Center (1926)
• Churches: Prescott Fine Arts Association (1895), Great Arizona Puppet Theater (1920)
• Movie Houses: The Rialto Theatre (1920), Fox Tucson Theatre (1930)
• Homes: Heard Museum (1929), Desert Caballeros Western Museum (1932, 1940, 1960), Amerind Foundation (1936), Kerr Cultural Center (1959)
• Other uses: Bisbee Mining & Historical Museum, former headquarters of the Copper Queen Consolidated Mining Company that became Phelps Dodge Corporation (1897), Tucson Children’s Museum in the Carnegie Library (1901), Cobre Valley Center for the Arts in the Gila County Courthouse (1907), The Ice House in Phoenix used for exhibitions and performance art is an actual ice facility (1920), Arizona State Museum in the former UA library (1926), Arizona Museum of Natural History from Mesa City Hall (1937).
• Phoenix’s Orpheum Theatre (1927), Tucson’s Temple of Music and Art, permanent home of the Arizona Theatre Company, (1927), Prescott’s Elks Opera House (1905), and Yuma Theatre (1912) were originally designed as venues for the arts.

Adaptive Re-use

Additionally, arts and cultural organizations have been innovative in finding unusual spaces to make over for new uses: Arizona Museum for Youth in a Bashas’ grocery store, Tucson Museum of Contemporary Art in an old fire house, Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art in a 5-plex discount movie theatre, Sedona Arts Center in a peach-packing shed from 1940, and Valley Youth Theatre in retail space from 1930.

New Construction

Arizona has been fortunate to see a range of architectural designs of both local and nationally-known architects resulting in new facilities construction projects. These include: Arizona Science Center (Antoine Predock), ASU Art Museum/Galvin Theater (Predock),
Green Valley Community Performing Arts Center (Paddock), Desert Botanical Garden (John Douglas), Herberger Theater Center (Howard, Needles, Tammen and Bergendoff and Gould Evans), Musical Instrument Museum (Richard Varda and RSP), Nina Mason Pulliam Rio Salado Audubon Center (Weddle Gilmore), Peoria Center for the Performing Arts (Westlake Reed Leskosky), Phoenix Art Museum (Williams/Tsien), Scottsdale Center for the Performing Arts (Bennie Gonzales), Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art (Will Bruder), University of Arizona Stevie Eller Dance Theatre (Gould Evans), Tucson Museum of Art (William Wilde), Tucson Music Hall and Leo Rich Theatre, University of Arizona Poetry Center Helen S. Schaefer Building (Line and Space).

**Funding Overview: Three Decades**

Over the last thirty years there has been a tremendous financial investment in arts and cultural facilities from both public and private funds. It is believed that a 1965 City of Phoenix bond provided $1.5 million for the Phoenix Art Museum building. Since then almost $400 million of public funds have been invested across the state; with the three most recent City of Phoenix bond projects ($186 million), City of Tempe ($70 million), and City of Mesa ($94 million) leading the way with significant contributions. Other cities that have supported facilities with bonds or capital construction funds include Peoria, Ajo, Yuma, and Scottsdale, and the County for Green Valley. School district bonds in Chandler, Wickenburg, and Queen Creek have totaled more than $9 million and leveraged an additional $7 million of private investment. The universities have also invested their funds and raised additional private funds for the creation or renovation of facilities.

From the private sector about $350 million has also been invested. Organizations such as the Phoenix Art Museum, the Arizona Science Center, the Children’s Museum of Phoenix, the Elks Opera House in Prescott, and the Mesa Arts Center have leveraged their public contributions with additional private money.

And there have been significant private contributions that have supported arts and cultural facilities without support from the public sector. The leader in private fundraising is the Musical Instrument Museum that raised over $150 million for its facility. This institution alone accounts for about half of the private funds raised for facilities development. Organizations whose capital projects have been supported solely from private sources include the Desert Botanical Garden, the Desert Caballeros Western Museum, the Heard Museum, the Museum of Northern Arizona, the Nina Mason Pulliam Rio Salado Audubon Center, and the Tucson Museum of Art. Other smaller organizations have also exclusively raised private funds for their facilities.

**Bond Projects**

Public sector initiatives have resulted from communities identifying needs to support arts and cultural programming. These new facilities are a source of pride for their communities.

An early public sector initiative combining city bond funds and federal redevelopment funds was the Scottsdale Center for the Performing Arts that opened in 1975 on the Civic Center
In 2000 the City of Scottsdale designated the Scottsdale Cultural Council to manage the arts and cultural programs and facilities for the city. Thus, the operations moved from being a city agency to a private non-profit. In 2009 after over 30 years of operation, the performing arts center was upgraded and renovated to keep pace with the new construction projects throughout the valley.

Significantly, in 1988 Phoenix passed one of the largest municipal bonds in the country, voting over $1 billion to enable the creation, expansion, or renovation of many arts and cultural projects including the Arizona Science Center, the Orpheum Theatre, the Phoenix Art Museum, the Phoenix Theatre, the Phoenix Symphony Hall, and the Phoenix Museum of History with $61 million of public funds. A second cultural bond in 2001 in the amount of $66.2 million supported eleven cultural facility projects including the Arizona Science Center, the Carver Museum and Cultural Center, the Children’s Museum of Phoenix, the Phoenix Art Museum, the Phoenix Theatre, the Phoenix Symphony Hall, Steele Indian School Memorial Hall, and Valley Youth Theater. The third cultural bond in 2006 in the amount of $58.6 million provided support for eleven projects including the Arizona Opera, the Arizona Science Center, Ballet Arizona, Black Theatre Troupe, the Carver Museum and Cultural Center, the Herberger Theater Center, the Phoenix Art Museum, Phoenix Theatre, and Steele Indian School Memorial Hall. The Orpheum Theatre, Phoenix Symphony Hall, and Steele Indian School Memorial Hall are owned and operated by the City of Phoenix. With one exception all the other facilities supported through the bond program are owned by the city, but operated by independent non-profit organizations responsible for their own annual operating budgets. The Phoenix Art Museum, the Children’s Museum of Phoenix, and the Arizona Science Center have been the most pro-active in using bonds as leverage to generate additional private funds to augment bond-funded capital improvements, to grow their endowment, and to support expanded programs and the increasing operational costs of larger facilities.

Other Arizona communities have also become aggressive in their development of arts and cultural facilities and passed bonds to support the capital construction of either renovated or new buildings.

Mesa and Tempe were both visionary and creative in combining a plan for sustainability into the capital construction costs. The projects were grounded in a mission of community building. Operating funds within the tax initiatives have been vital in helping these publicly-financed centers establish a solid foundation for sustainability. The continuation of the sales tax that provided for the construction has been critical to their overall operations. However, those tax funds do not totally support their operations, and they must also generate both earned and contributed income

- Mesa Arts Center was created by a public election that passed a half-cent sales tax in 1998; the project, opened in 2003. One-half of the original sales tax continues in perpetuity to partially underwrite the operations.
- Tempe Center for the Arts resulted from the passage in 2000 of a .1 percent sales tax to design and build the facility. The tax continues until 2020 to support a portion of the annual operations.
Curley School Artisan Lofts in Ajo demonstrates that community activism by the International Sonoran Desert Alliance could protect and preserve the 7.5 acre school and campus. The renovated spaces provide thirty live/work spaces for artists. The renovation cost $1.5 million with most of the funds coming from CDBG and HOME Bonds. The operating costs are paid primarily from the earned revenue from the rental spaces for live/work spaces for artists, which have generally been at close to 100% occupancy.

The Yuma Art Center and Historic Theatre was created and renovated through a City of Yuma bond program; the annual operations are supported by the City of Yuma general fund and/or a voter approved hospitality tax. The Antoine Predock designed Community Performing Arts Center in Green Valley was built with county bonds; however, the organization is now responsible for the annual operating budget. The Peoria Performing Arts Center, the home of Theatre Works (which is responsible for the annual budget), was funded from City of Peoria bonds.

**Non-Profit Organizations Within City Facilities**

Another model for arts and cultural facilities is cities and municipalities that arrange long-term leases and receive rent from the non-profit organizations who occupy these spaces. The non-profit organizations are responsible for their ongoing operations, but are provided space, generally at lower cost than in a privately-owned building. Funding for facilities improvements has most frequently been raised privately by the organizations. Among those with this kind of arrangement are: Advocates for Latino Arts and Culture (Phoenix), the Coconino Center for the Arts (Flagstaff), the Peoria Center for the Performing Arts where Theatre Works is the twenty-year managing partner, the Bead Museum (Glendale), the Rialto Theatre (Tucson) which has a fifty-year lease with the Rio Nuevo Multipurpose Facilities District, and the Tucson Children’s Museum.

- The Museum of Contemporary Art (MOCA) in Tucson was selected in fall 2009 to undertake the renovation of a City of Tucson-owned 1970 architecturally significant and historically important building designed by William Wilde that had been most recently the headquarters of the Tucson Fire Department. In an unbelievable eight and a half weeks, MOCA renovated the 25,000 square feet facility; with private funds of only $115,000. The completion of this project demonstrates how a bold vision with small but significant funding can quickly transform a creative, energetic organization.

**Private Sector Initiatives**

Many capital projects for arts and cultural facilities have been undertaken totally with private funds, including small grass roots organizations that have developed innovative strategies to finance their facility needs.

- The Musical Instrument Museum (MIM), opened in 2010, is the newest and the largest cultural facility project in Arizona. It demonstrates the will and determination of its founder to undertake this effort with the highest possible quality. The museum has 75,000 square feet of exhibition space and a state of the art performance space with 299 seats.
• The Museum of Northern Arizona recently completed the Easton Collections Center, a state of the art facility for the safe, clean, and environmentally controlled storage of its collections, which also provides access to scholars, tribal constituents, and the public. Tribal representatives participated in the planning of the facility and appreciate the museum’s respect and stewardship. It was also recognized by the U.S. Green Building Council with a prestigious Platinum Leadership in Energy and Environmental Award (LEED) for its environmental building standards.
• The Desert Botanical Garden, established in 1937, has undertaken two recent campaigns to upgrade its community buildings, research capabilities, and public garden spaces.
• The Nina Mason Pulliam Rio Salado Audubon Center was also recognized by the U.S. Green Building Council with a Platinum LEED award. The environmentally sensitive building provides an introduction to the wildife and nature of the Rio Salado riparian area.
• The Amerind Foundation (Dragoon), the Patrons of the Arts/Hilltop Gallery (Nogales), the recent expansion of the Phippen Art Museum (Prescott), the Sedona Arts Center (Sedona), and the Tubac Center for the Arts, are projects, totally funded by local donors. The Ice House (Phoenix) presents exhibitions and performance art, and was purchased, renovated, and financed through a mortgage by the non-profit organization.

Tribal Museums and Cultural Centers

American Indian communities have been active in recent years in creating homes for their collections of artifacts, sacred objects, and art. These centers range from one-room facilities to the recently expanded Navajo Nation Museum of 54,000 square feet of exhibition space. These centers include the Hopi Cultural Center, the White Mountain Apache Cultural Center and Museum, the Salt River Pima Maricopa Museum (Huhugam Ki), the Tohono O’odham Nation Cultural Center and Museum, the Gila River Cultural Center, the San Carlos Apache Cultural Center, the Ak-Chin Him-Dak Eco-Museum, and the Quechan Indian Museum. The Navajo Nation Museum, created in 1961, was expanded in 1998 into a much larger contemporary facility. Arizona tribal cultural centers have also expanded in response to repatriation, whereby they reclaim and preserve their sacred objects and artifacts. Financed primarily through tribal governments, they are responsible for the preservation and presentation of language, archaeological, anthropological, ethnographic, archival, and artistic collections. As a result of gaming and the creation of casinos, some of the tribal communities have created commercial performing arts spaces.

History

The Arizona Historical Society is responsible for overseeing its fifteen properties statewide including the flagship Arizona History Museum in Tucson (88,000 square feet) and the Papago Park Museum in Tempe (82,000 square feet). This institution relies for most of its funds from a direct appropriation from the Arizona State Legislature. The Sharlot Hall Museum, the Prescott Historical Society Museum, is an independent state agency. Mesa and Tempe operate their own historical museums outside of the state system. The Arizona State Museum on the University of Arizona campus (established in 1893 by the Territorial
Legislature, it is the oldest Arizona museum) is part of University of Arizona. The Bisbee Mining & Historical Museum is housed in the former headquarters of the Copper Queen Consolidated Mining Company that became the Phelps Dodge Corporation. Other anthropology and history-oriented museums include the Amerind Foundation (Dragoon), the Pueblo Grande Museum (City of Phoenix), and Arizona Museum of Natural History (City of Mesa).

**Partnerships With Public Schools**

Chandler, Wickenburg, and Queen Creek have been imaginative in identifying community needs for performing arts facilities and recognizing that neither partner had the financial capacity or usage to undergo and sustain a project on their own. Each project changed to support community priorities.

- The Chandler Center for the Arts/Chandler Unified School District (1989), is funded 50/50 between school and city bonds plus sharing in the operating costs, with program costs funded by contributed and earned income. The building renovation was completed in 2010.
- The construction of the Del E. Webb Center/Wickenburg School District (2001) was funded with school bonds and private funds, with operating costs from contributed and earned income.
- The Queen Creek Performing Arts Center/Queen Creek Unified School District (2003) funded construction by partnering with the city and supporting the annual operating budget after the building was built.

**University Projects With Significant Community Impact**

- ASU’s Gammage Auditorium was designed in 1964 by famed architect Frank Lloyd Wright and remains one of the iconic cultural facilities in the Arizona.
- The ASU Art Museum and Galvin Playhouse, completed in 1989, is a model of an arts campus with the museum and theatre that encouraged collaboration between departments.
- The Stevie Eller Dance Theatre at the UA is a new facility designed specifically for dance. The structure provides a window into the dance rehearsal process so that people passing by are able to look into the glass-walled studios. It has received numerous design awards including three from the American Institute of Architects.
- Center for Creative Photography on the UA campus houses the collections and archives of major national photographers as well as providing exhibitions for the public.
- UA’s Centennial Hall, completed in 1937, and renovated in 1985, is listed on the National Register of Historic Buildings. It is managed by UApresents.
- The NAU Art Museum, built in 1900, was placed on the National Register of Historic Buildings in 1986, and was renovated as a museum in 1991.
Public Art

Many of the facilities that were funded by voter-approved taxes included provisions for the commissioning of public art. These projects included

- Three City of Phoenix Bonds
- Special taxes for facilities from Mesa and Tempe
- Capital improvement funds for the Scottsdale Center for the Performing Arts

The public art projects have been both free standing art pieces, as well as works integrated into the design and architecture of the facilities. At the Tempe Arts Center, this included the carpeting design and an indoor/outdoor fireplace. The Mesa Arts Center commissioned artists to design the window treatment for the west side of the building, the floor and skyway glass railings, and a water feature. Although details and descriptions of these projects are beyond the scope of this chapter, they have been well-received both by the organizations using the facilities and the general public.

Future Planning

The strained economy has not kept communities and arts and cultural organizations from continuing to plan for future facilities. The Black Theatre Troupe has recently closed on a building that will be their new home, funded with $2.3 million from the 2006 City of Phoenix Bond and funds from the sale of its previous building. The design and plan for the renovation and expansion of the Phoenix Center for Community Arts is ready to move forward with funding of $8.7 million from the 2001/2006 City of Phoenix Bond. The Winslow Arts Trust/Route 66 Art Museum/Gateway to Roden Crater is a private sector initiative in the planning stages to restore four facilities built in the 1930’s in Winslow with about 20,000 square feet of exhibition space to showcase contemporary artists of regional and national standing. Funds will come from the revenue generated from the La Posada Resort and interested nationally recognized artists. On the drawing board in Scottsdale include the private sector initiative of the Museum of the West and the public sector Desert Discovery Center. Other projects are being planned in Ajo, Anthem, and Kingman.

Study Overview

Arizona has a number of large facilities that provide venues for major commercial performers, including the Celebrity Theater (2,650 seats), the Comerica (formerly Dodge) Theatre (1,900-5,000 seats), the Cricket Wireless Pavilion (8,000 seats), Jobing.com Arena in Glendale (20,000 seats), Tim’s Toyota Center in Prescott Valley (5,100 seats), the U.S. Airways Center (18,000 seats), and the Wells Fargo Arena at ASU (14,000 seats). On a smaller scale Broadway Palm Dinner Theater in Mesa converted a grocery store in a strip mall.

Arizona is home to many commercial art galleries, and one of the highest concentrations outside of New York or Santa Fe may be found in Scottsdale. The economy has been hard on many of these businesses, and over the last year some have become virtual rather than facility-based galleries. Artist-run galleries on Phoenix’s Roosevelt Row and Grand
Avenue have been key components in the revitalization of those neighborhoods, as have artist-developed galleries and spaces in Tucson and Flagstaff.

Schools and school districts have created many outstanding performing arts venues. For the purpose of this chapter only those with a purposeful collaboration with community organizations have been included.

New architecturally significant libraries with performing and visual arts spaces have been built throughout the state; they are many and are beyond the scope of this review. University and community college facilities are included only when they provide significant programs for the public at large, not solely for students.

Organizations whose venues are used primarily for education programs, classes, and rehearsal space are not profiled: the Bisbee Central School Project, Free Arts Arizona (Phoenix), the Phoenix Boys Choir, the Phoenix Conservatory of Music, Rosie’s House (Phoenix), the Scottsdale Artists School in the renovated Loloma School, The Drawing Studio (Tucson), and the Tucson Arizona Boys Chorus. Childsplay’s Sybil B. Harrington Campus of Imagination and Wonder, a 33,000 square foot former 1970’s school was purchased from the City of Tempe for $10 and was renovated with $4.7 million of private resources into a state of the art production and education space. Two projects resulting from the most recent City of Phoenix Bond will provide administrative and education spaces for the Arizona Opera (in the former Circles Record Store on Central) and Ballet Arizona.

Some organizations rent or lease their space for public programs from commercial entities. These include the Patagonia Creative Arts Center (Patagonia), Xico (Chandler), and Young at Art (Phoenix). Using rented facilities for which they have raised significant private funds to turn them into usable theatre spaces are Phoenix’s Theatre Artists Studio (96 seats), Tucson’s Invisible Theatre (80 seats, has been in a renovated Laundromat for many years), Tucson’s Beowulf Alley Theatre (95 seats) and The Rogue Theatre and ZUZI Dance Company (housed at the Historic “Y,” which has 100-150 seats). It is significant that small non-profit organizations have been resourceful in turning rental spaces into facilities that serve their needs but have been limited in their capacities to own those very buildings.

The economy has provided some positive opportunities. The West Valley Arts Council has formed a unique partnership with developer DMB to house its offices, gallery, classrooms, and concert series free of charge. The Council also has formed partnerships with commercial developers to use empty retail space as galleries. The ASU Art Museum (“Open for Business”) and Scottsdale’s public art program (“In Flux” made use of vacant store fronts in the downtown area for temporary installations) have done similar things in their respective cities. The West Valley Arts Council has been operating a gallery in Glendale since 2009, and is in the process of developing similar partnerships with developments in Surprise and Goodyear. There are many more examples of arts groups using alternative spaces to present the arts throughout the state.

Conclusions

The public and private investment of more than $750 million in non-profit or municipal arts and cultural facilities over the last three decades has been substantial. The venues
accommodate audiences ranging from small and intimate to large and expansive. Organizations have been creative in developing additional revenue streams to support the increased operating costs resulting from expanded facilities. Certainly, the cities of Mesa and Tempe realized the need to invest in a funding mechanism to provide for the ongoing operating expenses of their capital investments. The Phoenix Art Museum, the Phoenix Children’s Museum, and the Arizona Science Center were pro-active in leveraging city bond funds to raise additional dollars for programs and endowment. Facilities expansions have also included adding gift shops and cafés/restaurants as another source of earned income.

Both the public and private sectors have been forthcoming and generous in providing funds for the creation of new buildings, the renovation of existing buildings, and the adaptation of historic buildings. Often it is stated that Arizona is overbuilt with arts and cultural facilities. However, a study published in 2004 by Maricopa Partnership for Arts and Culture (MPAC) noted that the Valley placed last among benchmark regions in the number of non-profit organizations and last in the number of arts and cultural establishments per 100,000 residents.

Designing, securing funds, and completing facilities projects is only the first step. The biggest challenge for the arts and cultural organizations of all sizes is the ongoing and growing need for annual operating funds to creatively and effectively program and manage the facilities and to make the highest quality programs available to the largest range of the public.

Lastly, in addition to the operational costs needed to fulfill the excitement, promise, and expectation of programs to be delivered in new or renovated spaces, there are also other questions to consider. Are there gaps in the current inventory? Are there certain kinds of spaces, whether large or small, that are not available for some of the arts and cultural resources to program and present their work? Is there a balance between presenting facilities, arts centers, and facilities for local organizations? Have communities with new or renovated facilities been the catalyst for the economic development that was hoped? Are there models that can be replicated or adapted? What are the regional and statewide planning opportunities to consider holistically in the state?

Shelley Cohn retired in October 2005 as the Executive Director of the Arizona Commission on the Arts, having served in that capacity since 1984. She was involved in seeing the appropriation of the Arts Commission grow from 14 cents per capita to 80 cents per capita and in developing special funding initiatives including the Arizona Arts Trust Fund and Arizona ArtShare, the Arizona arts endowment fund. She oversaw the creation of entrepreneurial programs that supported artists and arts organizations to connect with their communities in effective and meaningful ways. After retirement she served one year as the interim CEO of the Scottsdale Cultural Council overseeing the work of the Scottsdale Center for the Performing Arts, Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art and the Scottsdale Public Art Program. She has provided consulting work for several state and local arts agencies and teaches an arts and public policy class and arts entrepreneurship class for ASU. She has explored new adventures outside of state government, including the desert landscaping school at the Desert Botanical Garden, the Melton Program for continuing Jewish education, teaching, consulting work, yoga, and bicycling. Ms. Cohn currently serves on the boards of the Arizona Community Foundation, Desert Botanical Garden, Childsplay, Alliance for Audience, and the Bank of Arizona. She holds a masters degree in Humanities from Arizona State University and an undergraduate degree in English from Washington University.
Arizona’s Public Libraries: Advancing Culture and Community

Laura Stone
Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records

Key Points

- Public Libraries are among the oldest cultural institutions in the United States
- Arizona has 215 public libraries and tribal library buildings, housing nearly nine million books
- Libraries are community centers that offer free access to information to people of all economic and social levels
- Libraries enhance communities and contribute to our quality of life
- At the state level, Arizona provides modest direct support for public libraries
- Libraries bolster downtown and suburban cultural and commercial activity by driving foot traffic and enhancing retail and cultural districts
- The current economic climate has challenged libraries to meet growing community needs with fewer resources, fewer staff, and reduced hours

On the Thursday before Halloween, a tiny cowgirl in pink boots peered at books on a low shelf in the children’s section of Avondale’s Civic Center Library. Her mother knelt beside her, talking with her about the books she had selected. Nearby, a little dragon peeked out from behind the stacks as his mother kept an eye on a stroller holding a smaller sibling in a bumblebee costume. Soon enough, they were joined by superheroes and princesses, all waiting for the library’s WiggleWorm Story Time to begin. The Thursday program is designed for 3- to 5-year-olds; younger brothers and sisters can participate in a Toddler Story Time or Books & Babies. By sharing books, puppets, songs, and language play, these programs reinforce early language and literacy skills and gradually help move the children in the audience toward reading.

The little cowgirl and her costumed friends probably didn’t realize they were engaging with one of the oldest cultural institutions in the United States. Public libraries, which date back to colonial times, have continually reinvented themselves, reflecting both national and local issues and concerns. “Public libraries have always been about making sure that citizens have the information they need to lead full lives in both the public and private sector,” says GladysAnn Wells, Arizona state librarian and director of the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records. “How libraries have met those needs has continually changed, but the core mission remains as critical to our nation as ever.”

Today’s public libraries provide diverse services to meet the needs of their communities. Most libraries:
• Offer free access to information and help in locating information, and serve as repositories and purveyors of language and literature. Arizona’s public libraries house almost nine million books, but also offer newspapers, magazines, audio tapes, CDs, and DVDs, as well as access to online subscription research material, digital books, databases, and more.
• Are located in almost every community. Arizona has 215 public and tribal library buildings; there are more than 16,600 across the United States. The buildings often are architectural symbols of community pride.
• Provide free, community-wide programming, including cultural offerings.
• Attendance at library programs in Arizona totalled 1.2 million in 2009.
• Serve as community centers and gathering places for people of all economic and social levels to share resources and ideas. Almost thirty million visits are made to Arizona’s public libraries each year, and more than four million Arizonans have a library card.

In Avondale, as at most Arizona libraries, programs are not limited to the pre-school set. The city’s two libraries, Civic Center and Sam Garcia, have just under 100,000 fiction and non-fiction books, including special collections of Spanish, teen, and children’s materials. The libraries offer computer instruction, host a weekly Needle & Thread Club, and a Master Gardener Class. About 100 people visit the libraries every hour they are open. Earlier in October, the libraries hosted the Avondale Writers Conference, a packed day of workshops, networking, and activities for professional and aspiring writers. Mystery writer J.A. Jance headlined the group of national and regional writers who worked with the local participants. The event proved so popular that registration closed before a planned advertising campaign even started; it drew almost 200 people. “The Avondale Writers Conference was truly a community driven event,” writes Ava Gutwein, Avondale Public Library manager. “Local residents responded eagerly to previous writing programs we offered and began asking for more. Their enthusiasm motivated us to pursue opportunities for them to explore the writing marketplace and improve their skills.”

About 150 miles west of Avondale, the Yuma County Library District worked for the successful passage of a $53.7 million library bond in 2005 to build four new libraries and remodel the former Main Library. Before the bond vote, a number of focus groups met to discuss the project. Dick Waters, who put together the meetings and presented to the Board of Supervisors, challenged the community to think expansively about the project, asking, “If people have always had hamburger, how will they know to ask for steak?”

Yuma library staff researched and toured numerous libraries before, during, and after selecting VCBO Architecture of Salt Lake City to design the new flagship library and other architectural firms to design the new Foothills, Wellton, and San Luis library buildings, the enlarged Somerton branch, and the renovated Heritage Branch, each reflective of its own community. All of the new facilities are modern, state-of-the-art buildings. The Main Library, which opened in May 2009, is 75,000 square feet with expansive views and natural lighting. Across the entrance to the children’s area is a large-scale replica of Yuma’s Ocean to Ocean Bridge across the Colorado River. Adult reading areas, computer classrooms, an Arizona
Room, and even a café are other highlights of the new facility. “The passing of the bond election and the resulting new facilities exemplify the importance Yuma County has placed on library services, and those facilities serve to enhance the communities where they reside. The libraries belong to all of us, regardless of age, background, interest level, or subject, and they have the potential to significantly contribute to our quality of life,” writes Susan Evans, Yuma County Library District Director.

Newly remodeled, the former Main Library is now the Heritage Library, serving Yuma’s downtown neighborhoods. Encased in this 22,000-square-foot building is Yuma’s Carnegie Library, which opened in 1921 with 1,053 volumes and seating for twenty patrons. Yuma was the fourth of four libraries that the Carnegie Foundation funded in Arizona. Carnegie libraries had opened in Tucson in 1901, Prescott in 1903, and Phoenix in 1908. Prior to that, Arizona’s earliest libraries were collections of reading materials provided by private businesses, often primarily for the use of their employees. Library groups, often with the support of Women’s Clubs, had supported the development of libraries in Tucson, Phoenix, and Prescott prior to 1900.

Today, there is a library in almost every incorporated community in Arizona, as well as in many unincorporated communities. Unlike many other states, funding and governance vary for each library in Arizona. Some library systems, such as those in Phoenix, Prescott, and Sierra Vista, are primarily funded and run by their municipalities. Arizona Revised Statutes provides for the creation of a county library system, and 12 of the state’s 15 counties have created these secondary tax entities. Some of these counties, such as Apache, Mohave, and Yuma, provide all of the public library service in their counties. Others support direct service in rural or unincorporated areas, such as Cochise and Yavapai counties. Still other counties, such as Gila, Navajo, and Pinal, provide library support services to the libraries in their counties, but do not directly operate public libraries.

At the state level, Arizona provides modest direct support for public libraries. Through the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records, the state distributes $650,000 annually, about ten cents per person. The State began funding library extension work in 1957, spurred by the promise of matching federal funds through the federal 1956 Library Services Act. One of the legacies of limited funding and rapid population growth in the state may be that in 2007 Arizona had the smallest per-capita public library square footage of any state, as well as comparatively few library buildings.

Yet, according to a study by the Urban Libraries Council, “public libraries are highly regarded, and are seen as contributing to stability, safety and quality of life in neighborhoods. They are bolstering downtown and suburban cultural and commercial activity.” Libraries drive foot traffic, are stable tenants, and enhance retail and cultural districts.

Although the statistics are still being compiled, budget and staffing cuts have been the story across Arizona for the last several years. At the Phoenix Public Library, the largest public library system in Arizona, the budget shrank between fiscal years 2008 and 2010. The number of degreed librarians dropped from 94.3 to 71.7 positions. Overall staffing is down
from 443 full-time equivalents to 330. Over this same period of time, hours have been reduced by a total of nearly 48 percent.

The Phoenix Public Library’s mission statement is “We connect today’s community to a world of possibilities.” They address that mission through their 16 locations and extensive collections designed to meet community needs. Budget cuts mean the library is now focusing almost all its programming on youth and workforce literacy, including ESL, GED, computer classes, and similar programs. According to Phoenix City Librarian Toni Garvey, “Our greatest challenge is to meet growing community needs with fewer and fewer resources. Over the past decade, we have worked to achieve efficiencies that have helped us provide excellent customer service in this more restrictive budget climate.”

A 2007 Northern Arizona University Social Research Laboratory, “Survey of Arizonans’ Attitudes About Public Libraries,” funded by the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records, indicated broad support for public libraries. The random telephone survey found that 98 percent of respondents agreed that “public libraries are needed because they provide free information” and that 94 percent agreed that “public libraries are essential for maintaining a productive community.” Almost 75 percent of respondents reported visiting a public library in the past year. Despite that broad public support, Arizona’s public libraries were funded an average of $30.77 in 2008 for each person in their service area, compared with a national average of $38.62. Andrew Carnegie, whose philanthropy spurred the growth of public libraries at the beginning of the last century, wrote, “I do not think that the community which is not willing to maintain a Library had better possess it. It is only the feeling that the Library belongs to every citizen, richest and poorest alike, that give it a soul.”

Although budget cuts have reduced the number of programs at many libraries in the past year, cultural programming has long given soul to libraries. Scottsdale Public Library has offered a rich assortment of programs over the years, and still maintains an art gallery at Civic Center Library. The library gallery has scheduled five exhibits for the upcoming year, including “Focus on Conservation, McDowell Sonoran Conservancy Photography,” “Charles Schulz: Peanuts at Bat,” and “Zap! Pow! Bam! The Superhero: The Golden Age of Comic Books, 1938-1950.” As Kathy Coster, the library’s manager of support services, points out, “The Gallery @ the Scottsdale Public Library exemplifies the cultural importance of the public library in the user experience—we are not only about the transformation offered by reading, but also by viewing, hearing, and experiencing many worlds of expression available to us as human beings.”

In 2008, Scottsdale Public Library partnered with the Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art to design and implement “Picture Books and Museum Looks.” Each library branch hosted a series of five storytimes that tied in visual and verbal literacy opportunities. Laminated posters of art work and sixty-two pieces of museum-quality soft sculpture created visual connections to rhymes and songs used in the programs. “This project highlighted benefits of introducing children to the arts at a very young age,” writes Marsha Greene, the project director and a Scottsdale librarian. “Many families remarked they felt their preschoolers were too young to bring to an art museum. Thanks to the collaboration between SMoCA and
the Scottsdale Library, we were able to change this perception in a large number of families. Children were able to learn new vocabulary to express art concepts and families were able to connect with community organizations to provide positive outcomes for their children.”

Connecting with other community organizations is only one way that libraries help build community. “Libraries are the gathering place where people come to connect, share, and learn,” explains Nancy Ledeboer, director of the Pima County Public Library. The Pima County system serves residents from Ajo to Arivaca, and multiple locations in Tucson proper, with twenty-six branch libraries. Ledeboer has many stories about the role of the library as a gathering place “and a place where lifelong learning is front and center.” When the Green Valley library was closed for remodeling, the regular patrons found they missed structuring their day or week with a visit to the library, Ledeboer notes. The library is the place they meet friends, find out what is happening in the community, attend programs, socialize, network, and connect with their community. They volunteer, they attend programs, they teach others, they share their stories, and yes—they check out books.

In Arivaca, she adds, people gather inside and outside the library, where there is a Star Night in the parking lot each summer with families bringing food to share while everyone looks at the stars through giant telescopes. “Amateurs of all levels gather to share their love of the stars with children and adults. And a lot of talking, sharing, and community building goes on,” Ledeboer explains. The Friends of Arivaca started a “home tour” to raise money for the library. It was so successful that they now “loan” this event to a different organization each year.

In the heart of Tucson, the Martha Cooper Library has become a gathering place for new refugee families who are learning about their new home. The neighborhood association also meets at the library, where it has welcomed these new families into the community. People come to attend literacy classes and to volunteer as tutors—the library helped build community with a Refugee Health Fair, with more than 1,000 people attending the event.

The Bear Canyon and River branches serve very different neighborhoods. “Most people in these neighborhoods have computers and many purchase their own books but they still enjoy coming to the library where their neighborhood associations meet, art classes are taught, book clubs discuss books, and a sense of community is prevalent,” Ledeboer says.

While recognizing and celebrating the unique attributes of each of its communities, Pima County also is addressing issues faced by libraries across the country. More people than ever are visiting libraries, many to use the library’s computers and free internet. Although large numbers of Americans have internet access in their homes, libraries are helping to bridge the digital divide for those who do not, especially as people who have lost their jobs are finding that the only way to apply for a job or complete a government form is to do so online. Pima County offers free internet computer time at all its libraries, and has dedicated job help at a number of its branches.

Just south of Pima County, Suzanne Haddock coordinates library services for the Nogales-Rochlin Public Library and small branches in Sonoita, Tubac, and Rio Rico. She balances the
needs of the busy border community of Nogales with those of the retirement communities in the northern part of Santa Cruz County. Haddock says that people come to the library knowing they will be taken seriously and get the information they need. As in many libraries, she sees near constant use of the library’s public access computers. “Having public computers has changed many lives here including getting employment applications submitted, taking tests for school, emailing friends that are far away, and taking traffic school tests,” she says.

At a time when libraries are stressed with budget cuts, greater demands for services, and rapidly changing technology, Haddock makes sure her library is still the heart of the community. “Every day,” she says, “we have a group of viejos [old gentlemen] who sit at a table and read the papers and then discuss politics. They know they can stay as long as they like and don’t have to buy anything. They are pleasant and we welcome their company.”

**Questions to consider:**

- How can public libraries support diverse, free programming when budgets are being cut?
- When considering a library construction bond, Yuma was challenged: “If people have always had hamburger, how will they know to ask for steak?” Is it important for public buildings to inspire us?
- What is the role of libraries in a virtual world?

**References:**
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Key Points

• Urban open space has been a strong element in the psyche of American urban dwellers.
• Natural areas provide relief from urban stress, as well as inspiration for creative expression.
• Desert Parks are an integral part of the region’s unique urban identity and sense of place.
• South Mountain Park is the largest municipal park in the United States.
• Piestewa Peak is the most popular municipal summit trail in the country.
• Three major threats to the desert parks are decreased funding, encroaching urban development, and open space fragmentation.
• Connectedness is an essential part of preserving an ecological system, and the Metropolitan Phoenix desert parks can become a Turquoise Necklace, linked by a network of linear open spaces.

“The desert should never be reclaimed. They are the breathing-spaces of the west and should be preserved forever.”
—John Van Dyke, The Desert (1901)

The Genius of the Place

Consult the genius of the place in all;
That tells the waters or to rise, or fall;
Or helps th’ ambitious hill the heav’ns to scale,
Or scoops in circling theatres the vale;
Calls in the country, catches opening glades,
Joins willing woods, and varies shades from shades,
Now breaks, or now directs, th’ intending lines;
Paints as you plant, and, as you work, designs.
—Fifth stanza, from “Epistles to Several Persons: Epistle IV, To Richard Boyle, Earl of Burlington,” by Alexander Pope (1688-1744)
When Pope published these lines in 1731, he was drawing from a legacy of human belief in the spirit of place reaching back thousands of years. Genius derives from the Greek word meaning *to be born*. In Roman mythology this concept evolved into a spirit that guides a person from the moment of birth and helps him or her become the person they are meant to be. Places were also believed to have genius, a natural way of being that needed to be considered when changes were proposed. In light of the origins of the idea of genius, Pope’s words give a poetic rephrasing of the obvious: Place matters.

When Pope urged landscape designers in this poem and in his other writings to “consult the genius of place,” his interests were mainly aesthetic. His concerns and attentions were embedded in ideas of picturesque theories, notions of beauty, how a place looks, or how it makes one feel while gazing at it. In considering the genius of place within the context of desert open space in Metropolitan Phoenix, the authors argue for a more expansive interpretation of genius, one that acknowledges the deeper physiological connections between people and the natural environment. As David Orr points out in *Ecological Literacy*: “A sense of place requires more direct contact with natural aspects of place, with soils, landscape, and wildlife.”

Natural places have an intrinsic quality that human beings have the capacity to connect to and by doing so elevate their own spirits, bodies, and minds. Natural places make people feel good. This is their genius.

**A Note on Maricopa County**

The parks that are the focus of this chapter are located in Maricopa County, and their history is distinct from those in the Tucson area. Though metropolitan Tucson shares similar urban issues, it is outside the scope of this essay. The terrain and proximity to Saguaro National Park has given the metro Tucson area more land that is less vulnerable to urban sprawl. The region has excellent open space access and the Tucson operations budget for parks is twice that of Phoenix. And the city of Tucson has a long history of preserving land. For instance, Tucson Mountain Park (20,000 acres) was established in 1929. It should be noted that Arizona’s parks regularly host cultural events and art exhibitions.

**Sonoran Desert Parks and the Genius of Place**

“The want of such occasional recreation where men and women are habitually pressed by their business or household cares often results in a class of disorders the characteristic quality of which is mental disability, sometimes taking the severe forms of softening of the brain, paralysis, palsy, monomania, or insanity, but more frequently of mental and nervous excitability, moroseness, melancholy, or irascibility, incapacitating the subject for the proper exercise of the intellectual and moral forces.”

Since the early planning phases for New York’s Central Park that began in the 1850s, the cultural significance and use of urban open space has been a strong element in the psyche of American urban dwellers. In examining the meaning and use of metropolitan Phoenix’s evolution of desert parks, a pattern emerges that differs from that of eastern industrialized cities. This may be seen specifically, in the decision to set aside large tracts of
desert land as preserves, such as South Mountain Park, before the development of more traditional urban recreation-based parks, such as Encanto Park (established 1935). This chapter not only examines the reasons for this pattern of development, but also considers the influence of the desert parks on the sense of place in metropolitan Phoenix.³

Although the desert parks of this region provide similar relief from urban stresses as envisioned for Central Park, they also create opportunities that Frederick Law Olmsted saw in the larger, more rugged National Parks. In his report on Yosemite, he noted: “It is a scientific fact that the occasional contemplation of natural scenes of an impressive character, particularly if this contemplation occurs in connection with relief from ordinary cares, change of air and change of habits, is favorable to the health and vigor of men and especially to the health and vigor of their intellect beyond any other conditions which can be offered them, that it not only gives pleasure for the time being but increases the subsequent capacity for happiness and the means of securing happiness.”⁴ In other words: Natural places make people feel good.

The urban fabric of the Salt River Valley emerged from an existing agricultural landscape, a vast patchwork of orchards and fields stitched together by the complex of irrigation canals. Access to open space was an everyday part of life during the early years of development. Crowded living conditions, coal-burning pollution, and long hours confined within factories that were common in industrialized American cities were not part of the history of urban development in Phoenix. As such, the compelling arguments for providing “lungs for the city,” that substantiated the building of Central Park in the 19th century did not exist in this region, not then nor well into the twentieth century. So why did local citizens and municipalities make a concerted effort to preserve large tracts of desert? What was the motivation? And what has been the evolution of desert parks as the urban conditions and structure has shifted to what it is today?

When South Mountain Park, the first of the large desert parks, was established in 1925, the primary incentive was to preserve prime local hunting grounds for the nearby city dwellers of Phoenix. Park advocates wanted a place to get away from the city and hunt. While the hunting interests have long since vanished from the minds of park users, at least with regard to South Mountain, the notion of escape has not.

By the 1960s, when Papago Park was established and other mountain regions within metropolitan Phoenix were being considered for preservation, the Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department published the Maricopa County Regional Park System Plan. This plan established a precedent for considering the outlying urban desert open space as a network. It initially identified four parks to be included within the regional park system: Estrella Mountain (19,840 acres), White Tank Mountain (30,000 acres), McDowell Mountain (20,942), and Lake Pleasant (23,643 acres). In addition, five semi-regional parks—Cave Creek (2,592 acres), Usery Mountain (3,048 acres), Buckeye Hills (3,627 acres), Casey Abbott (which has since been absorbed into Estrella), and Thunderbird (720 acres)—that were more developed and had amenities, such as golf and ball fields, more common to traditional urban parks. A major intent of the plan for the regional parks was to provide nearby desert for escape and isolation from the city. “Regional parks are urgently
needed in our increasingly urbanized, mechanized and over-organized culture to function as a retreat, an escape from the bustle of modern living, a place to ‘get away from it all’ in the quiet of solitude”5

As a similar response to burgeoning urban growth, in the early 1970s, the city of Phoenix published *An Open Space Plan for the Phoenix Mountains*. The document acknowledged the value of escape from urban tensions as a major component and impetus for establishing desert preservation areas within the urban environment: “Here, almost entirely surrounded by mountains and open desert, it is easy to forget one is in a metropolitan area of nearly a million population.”6 This sentiment was echoed in 1998, when the city of Phoenix published the *Sonoran Preserve Master Plan*: “The Phoenix Mountain Preserve is an example of an urban preserve that provides urban dwellers much needed places to recover from mental fatigue associated with increasingly urban lifestyles.”7 With the current population of Metropolitan Phoenix exceeding four million and still growing despite the economic decline, this need for relief is even more vital. The ill effects of urban growth felt in the mid-19th-century are felt even more urgently today, and the concerns voiced in the 1970s *Open Space Plan* still ring true: “Loss of identity and empathy with one’s community, infrequent contact with nature, and lack of environmental variety, are contributing to the uneasiness, tension, and violence which is increasingly characteristic of urban life.”8 While desert parks may not have the capacity to cure all urban ills, they can contribute to the healing process and offer preventative relief.

In the past decade, the city of Scottsdale has begun to plan for and acquire land or easements for desert open space in the McDowell Mountains that form an eastern backdrop for the city. In addition, the Maricopa County Parks Department has produced a new master plan for the regional park system. Taken together, all of these desert parks are major components to the sense of place and continue to provide rich and accessible contact with nature. Taken together, the desert parks are an integral part of the region’s unique urban identity.

**Brief Profiles of the Municipal Desert Parks in Metropolitan Phoenix**

“Strong evidence shows that when people have access to parks, they exercise more. Regular physical activity has been shown to increase health and reduce the risk of a wide range of diseases, including heart disease, hypertension, colon cancer, and diabetes. Physical activity also relieves symptoms of depression and anxiety, improves mood, and enhances psychological well-being. Beyond the benefits of exercise, a growing body of research shows that contact with the natural world improves physical and psychological health.”9

This section provides some factual information for each of the major municipal desert parks. They are listed by date of establishment, beginning with the earliest park. Because of the scale of the regional park system, with ten parks and over 120,000 acres, and the brevity of this paper, the county parks are not included in the profiles. Resources noted at the end provide detailed information for all the parks.
**South Mountain**

Date Established: 1925  
Location: The long narrow mountain spans just west of the I-10 to 51st Avenue and separates South Phoenix from Ahwatukee.  
Acres: 16,000  
Highest Elevation: 2,690 feet at Mount Suppoa

Significant Features:  
- Largest municipal park in the country\(^{10}\)  
- 3 million visitors each year  
- 51 miles of trails  
- Many structures built by 4,000 Civilian Conservation Corps workers from 1933-1940  
- Environmental Education Center (which was closed for budgetary reasons on April 5, 2010)

**Papago Park and Adjacent Tempe Parks**

The most urbanized of the desert parks, Papago Park includes more developed amenities, such as golf courses and baseball training facilities. However, the unusual geological features and preserved and restored desert landscape aligns it more with the larger desert parks than the traditional urban parks with regard to the concept of genius of place.

Date Established: 1964  
Location: In Tempe and Phoenix, the park complex includes Phoenix’s Papago Park and Tempe’s Moeur Park. The desert land is roughly bounded by 52nd Street to the west, Oak Street to the north, the Cross-Cut Canal and College Avenue to the east, and Van Buren, Mill Avenue and the 202 on the south.  
Acres: 1,200 for Papago Park and an additional 346 acres for the Tempe parks  
Highest Elevation: 1,700 feet

Significant Features  
- Hole-in-the-Rock  
- Big Butte  
- Phoenix Zoo  
- Desert Botanical Garden  
- 2 municipal golf courses  
- Cross-Cut Canal

**Camelback**

Camelback serves as an example of strong citizen involvement in open space preservation. The park land was purchased in part with funds raised by school children during the Save Camelback Foundation campaign in the 1960s under the leadership of Lady Bird Johnson and Barry Goldwater.
Date Established: Late 1960s with enlargement in 1971 and 1980s  
Location: Camelback Mountain separates Scottsdale from the Arcadia District of Phoenix, running east-west from 4th street almost to 44th Street.  
Acres: 426  
Highest Elevation: 2,704 feet

Significant Features:  
- Echo Canyon  
- The Monk, the unusual rock formation that sits atop the camel’s nose  
- Challenging hiking trails  
- Picturesque topography

**Phoenix Mountain Preserves**

The fifth largest municipal park in the country, the Mountain Preserves include significant ranges in North Phoenix with Piestewa Peak, Shaw Butte, and North Mountain. The mountain preserves include the North Mountain Preserve, Lookout Mountain Preserve, and the Phoenix Mountain Preserves, though from an ecological perspective they need to be considered as one large patch within the urban network. The easiest way to comprehend the mountains within the Preserves as a contiguous range is to look at an aerial view. Like a giant swimming through an ocean, the mountains reach up from the surface of grey urban development, an arm made by Camelback stroking south toward the Papagos.

Date Established: 1972  
Location: Bounded north and south by Greenway and Lincoln, the mountains span north-west to south-east from 19th Avenue to Tatum.  
Acres: 7,500  
Highest Elevation: 2,608 at Piestewa Peak

Significant Features:  
- Piestewa Peak (formerly known as Squaw Peak), with over 500,000 hikers each year is the most popular summit trail in the country and provides a challenging climb and beautiful vistas.  
- Dreamy Draw Recreation Area

**Phoenix Sonoran Preserve**

The Sonoran Preserve is a significant departure from the historical practice of preserving desert mountains, most of which are contained within the Palo Verde biotic community. The Sonoran Preserve plan adopted a more ecological approach to determining land preservation so that a complete mosaic of local biotic communities is included within the preserve. Similar to the concept applied in developing the Emerald Necklace in Boston, the plan links existing open space within the city. The preserve is still under development and to-date 6,680 acres have been acquired within the preserve.
Date Established: 1998  
Location: Predominately in North Phoenix between 67th Avenue and Cave Creek Road above the CAP canal and as far north as New River. Additional areas adjacent to South Mountain have also been acquired as recommended in the *Sonoran Preserve Master Plan*.  
Acres: 25,000 planned, 6,680 acquired to-date  
Highest Elevation: 2,269 feet at Pyramid Peak

**Significant Features**  
- Cave Creek, Apache, and Skunk Creek washes  
- Pyramid Peak  
- Union Hills  
- Links to Cave Buttes Recreation Area, Deem Hills, and Reach 11 Recreation Area

**McDowell Sonoran Preserve**

In 1990, citizens of the city of Scottsdale developed a study boundary of 36,400 acres within which a desert preserve would be established. In the twenty years since this initial effort, the city has adopted an ordinance establishing the preserve and citizens have repeatedly voted to raise acquisition funds through taxation. While much of the land still remains within the State Trust system, much of it has been reclassified for conservation. The city recently expanded acquisition by 2,000 acres. It is currently, reported at 11,250 acres, ranked as the third largest municipal park in the nation.\(^\text{13}\)

Date Established: 2000  
Location: McDowell Mountains adjacent to the city of Scottsdale  
Acres: 36,400 acre study boundary within which 14,000 acres are actively being acquired for the preserve  
Highest Elevation: 3,852 feet

**Significant Features**  
- Lost Dog Wash Trailhead  
- McDowell Mountain Range  
- Adjacent to McDowell Mountain Regional Park, part of the Maricopa County parks system  
- Potential for connection to Tonto National Forest

**Threats to the Genius of the Desert Parks**

“Very often the intangible values of beauty, refreshment, awareness of the past, and the opportunity to enjoy nature yield to the formidable economic pressures for profitable development.”\(^\text{14}\)

Despite the inherent value of the desert parks, there are a number of factors that threaten their integrity and quality. Currently, three major threats to the parks are: decreased funding, encroaching development, and open space fragmentation. The newer desert preserves are still in the acquisition phase of development, so for these parks to be fully realized, funding support needs to continue. Development and management for all the parks is also a
pressing concern. The current economic decline has already begun to impact parks in the region, and across the state and nation. The interpretive center in South Mountain closed indefinitely this year, due to budget cuts. Park hours have decreased. Municipalities are considering charging additional fees for entry, a cost beyond what tax-payers have already given to acquire, develop, and maintain the parks to date. While doing more with less is a tenet of sustainability, so is the old maxim that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Sustaining the support of existing desert lands is far more economically sound than paying to try to recreate later what has been lost from decreased management and development now.

Since the mid-20th century, urban development in the Sonoran Desert has continued to erode the desert park system’s ability to offer opportunities for escape. Natural areas provide relief from urban stress, but they can also offer inspiration for creative expression. Artists throughout the centuries have, like Pope, “looked to the genius of the place” as subject and muse. When John Van Dyke, an art history professor and critic roamed the Southwest while writing his 1901 book *The Desert*, he recognized the beauty of the natural desert landscape. Speaking in the language of the Picturesque, he recognized the beauty in the desert’s inherent vastness: “Is it not true that bulk and breadth are primary and essential qualities of the sublime in landscape? And is it not the sublime that we feel in immensity and mystery? If so, perhaps we have a partial explanation of our love for sky and sea and desert waste. They are the great elements. We do not see, we hardly know their boundaries are limited; we only feel their immensity, their mystery, and their beauty.”

But a desert vista can only provide artistic inspiration and mental relief, if one can see it. A tract of desert landscape can only provide escape if the visitor feels separated—physically or psychologically—from whatever he or she is trying to escape. Encroaching urban development threatens both the visual and the physical access to the desert parks system. It has also created fragmentation, particularly with respect to the older mountain parks which began on the outskirts of the city but over time have become enveloped in the growing metropolis of Phoenix. All of the county regional parks, South Mountain Park, Camelback, and the Phoenix Mountains were established when they still abutted non-urban development. These large tracts of desert could still function as an ecological network, because they remained linked to undeveloped land. The distinct municipalities were separated from one another by farmland or natural desert. These cities have long since connected into a contiguous ocean of urban and suburban sprawl, leaving the preserved mountains to peak out like an island archipelago.

The more recent Sonoran Preserves in Phoenix and Scottsdale are a response to this trend of fragmentation. These efforts have taken a more ecological approach to determining open space form, boundaries, and distribution. Connectedness is an essential part of preserving an ecological system. The precedent method of saving isolated mountains has created a challenge in this regard. When Olmsted developed the master plan for the Emerald Necklace in Boston (1878-1896), he recognized the existing large open space, but the greatest contribution of the plan was in seeing these fragments as jewels strung along a system of linear parks. The large desert parks have the potential to be seen as Olmsted saw the Back Bay Fens or Jamaica Pond. Taken together, the desert parks of Metropolitan Phoenix can become a Turquoise
Necklace in which the gems are linked by a network of linear open spaces—such as the Salt River, the Canals, and washes that still are part of the valley’s urban fabric.

**Additional Resources**


PROS Consulting and Ollson Associates et al (2009). *Parks and Recreation Strategic System Master Plan*. The Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department makes this document available online at:

http://www.maricopa.gov/parks/PDF/strategicplan/MaricopaStrategicSystemMasterPlan.pdf


Papago Salado Association:

The Papago Salado Region is a desert island in the heart of the Valley’s metropolitan area where the cities of Phoenix, Scottsdale, and Tempe, Arizona meet.

http://www.papagosalado.org/

**Online Sources for Desert Parks in Metropolitan Phoenix:**

**Phoenix Parks and Recreation Department:**

http://phoenix.gov/recreation/rec/parks/preserves/index.html

**Scottsdale McDowell Sonoran Preserve:**

http://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/preserve.asp

**Maricopa County Regional Parks:**

http://www.maricopa.gov/parks/

Joseph Ewan is Assistant Director and Associate Professor in the School of Architecture + Landscape Architect, part of the Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts at Arizona State University. He is a licensed and practicing landscape architect and co-author of the *Sonoran Preserve Master Plan* for which he was awarded the National American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) President’s Award of Excellence, the association’s highest professional award.

Rebecca Fish Ewan is an Associate Professor in the School of Architecture + Landscape Architecture, part of the Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts at Arizona State University, where she teaches the history of landscape architecture. In addition to an M.L.A. from the University of California at Berkeley, she holds an M.F.A. in creative writing from ASU and is the author of *A Land Between* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000).


These Tucson and the other mountain parks of the region are included in the *Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan*. Also, while this essay is focused on urban desert parks, the authors want to acknowledge the current concerns regarding the Arizona State Park system, and recommend the Morrison Institute document regarding this issue: Grady Gammage, Jr., and Nancy Welch, *The Price of Stewardship: The Future of Arizona State Parks* (Phoenix: Morrison Institute for Public Policy, Arizona State University, 2009).
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Trust for Public Land (TPL), 2009 City Park Facts (Published through the TPL Center for City Park Excellence, 2009). http://www.tpl.org/content_documents/CityParkFacts_2009.pdf

Ibid.

Burke and Ewan, *Sonoran Preserve Master Plan*, p. 4.

Trust for Public Land (TPL), 2009 *City Park Facts*.

Van Cleve.

John Charles Van Dyke, *The Desert* (Forgotten Books, 2010 [1901]).
5 Tiffiney Yazzie, *Untitled*, 2009 Archival Inkjet Print, 11”x14”.
Chapter 14

The State of the Arts in Native Arizona: Arts, Culture, and the Economy

Wendy Weston
Director of Special Projects, Heard Museum

Key Points

- There are 22 federally recognized American Indian tribes in Arizona, 16 of which have a museum or cultural center
- The 2000 census reported more than 250,000 American Indian residents in the state, 95,000 of whom live off reservation, including 50,000 in Maricopa County
- American Indian land holdings comprise more than a quarter of state lands
- Art and culture are the foundation of community self-definition and self-determination for Native people
- Artists play an important role in reservation economies
- Limited information exists regarding the impact of Native art businesses on state and local economies

Introduction

Arizona is home to twenty-two federally recognized American Indian tribes, with as many separate reservations. The 2000 census reports that more than 250,000 American Indians reside in our state. American Indian land holdings comprise over a quarter of Arizona’s lands. Each tribal community has a distinct language, governmental structure, social and cultural organization.

Of significance and unlike many other tribal communities throughout the country, tribal languages are still spoken on an everyday casual basis in many of Arizona’s American Indian communities. Art and the concept of art is one that is interwoven into everyday life. In many Native languages, there is no one word that is a literal translation for art. Instead, using the arts as a means of passing tradition through stories, songs, dance, and the creation of material objects is still widely practiced.

Sixteen of the twenty-two tribal communities have a museum and/or a cultural center, many of which receive funding through tribal allocations. However, such assistance is minimal as tribal communities struggle to serve their constituencies in the areas of health, education, and social services.
Native Inclusion in Arts Programs in Arizona

There has long been a disconnect between native communities and many of the art support organizations across the state. This is not a new issue and is compounded by complications relating to both culture and communication.

Currently there are no Native artists on the official Artist Roster maintained by the Arizona Commission on the Arts (ACA), a valuable resource for presenting organizations and schools. Another ACA funding category is the Artist Project category. In 2009, only one Native artist received an Artist Project grant. Grants provided have a direct relationship to grant applications. The Arts Commission continues to work with native leaders on and off of tribal land to grow participation in their grant programs. Most recently Arts Commission staff conducted a workshop on the Navajo nation about new opportunities for product sales.

In FY 2010 the Hopi Cultural Center and Museum, the Quechan Tribal Museum, the San Carlos Apache Cultural Center and Museum, and the White Mountain Apache Tribal Museum received general operating support from the Arizona Commission on the Arts. In FY 2011, only the Quechan Tribal Museum and the White Mountain Apache Tribal Museum received general operating support. The challenge in working with tribal museums is often the tribal leadership does not support the application and in some cases has attempted to divert funding to other tribal needs beyond the arts.

Since 1973, eight Native people have served as Commissioners for the Arizona Commission on the Arts, but there has not been a Native Commissioner since 2006. These individuals are appointed by the Governor and serve non-salaried 3-year terms.

The Tucson Pima Arts Council (TPAC) serves the arts community in the southern part of the state. While there are no Natives that serve on the Board or staff, a partnership with the First Peoples Fund, a national organization that supports the advancement of American Indian arts through grants, fellowships, and professional development has partnered with TPAC to present the Native American Artists Professional Development Workshops. Designed specifically with Native artists in mind, these uniquely tailored workshops will be conducted in January, 2011. Native artists who are residents of Arizona will be able to receive the tools and support they need to manage a small entrepreneurial business and tips on how to realize economic success. The goal is to enable Native artists to make a living from their art through sales, thus allowing them to sustain themselves, their families, and their communities.

The Community Foundation for Southern Arizona helps to connect individuals with causes they wish to support to make a positive impact in their community, but at present, only one Native person sits on the CFSA board.

There are several arts organizations in Coconino County that serve the arts community. Currently, there are no Native people who occupy a seat on any of the boards. Yuma County does not have Natives on any of their arts commissions either.
The Arizona Humanities Council (AHC), based in Phoenix is not a state agency but the Arizona affiliate of the National Endowment for the Humanities. It developed and is guided where pertinent, by an initiative that recognizes American Indian elders and traditional teachers as scholars when involved in projects that are focused on their particular culture. The organization’s database of 234 humanities scholars includes nine American Indians, and one Native person serves on the AHC Board of Directors.

One of the current initiatives at the AHC is Project Civil Discourse, where lectures and community discussions serve to create a respectful and proactive dialogue on issues such as education, healthcare, race, immigration, religion, and transportation. At present, there are no Native organizations participating in the program and, as a result, a mechanism whereby a Native perspective might be shared has not been included.

According to the 2000 Census, 95,000 American Indians live off of the reservations. It is estimated that over 50,000 Natives live in Maricopa County and the Phoenix metro area. The City of Phoenix’s Office of Arts and Culture works to advance the growth and development of the arts and culture community. It currently has no Native people on its staff, serving as a commissioner, or on any of their committees. Occasionally, Native people serve on grants review panels.

**Strengths**

For Native people, art and culture are the foundation of a collective self-definition and self-determination. Native artists are not only individuals who are expressing themselves in their space and time, but also members of a cohesive community who acknowledge their responsibility as carriers of cultural knowledge. Artists play an important role in local reservation economies, attracting tourist dollars and visitors from all over the world. They also play an essential role in the non-Native art world, participate in the production of every art form, and work in every facet of the arts industry in our state.

The languages spoken in our communities, the songs and rituals that still take place, are all a form of art, art that artists and cultural workers are striving to preserve through innovative programs and educational projects. Native arts are integral to indigenous culture and life as well as to identity and community. There is a deep connection to art and culture, but that does not mean that only traditional arts are authentic or hold more significant meaning in tribal communities. Contemporary paintings, sculpture, and ceramics, things one might see in an art museum, are just as vital to the Native art scene as our traditional crafts.

When speaking with Native people from all over the state, three common threads always emerge: land, language and family. To this end, Native communities rely on this sense of belonging to help guide their citizens in their artistic endeavors, thus improving the quality of life in their community.

The Arizona Office of Tourism places significant importance and value on the unique arts and cultural experiences available to visitors through interactions in our tribal communities and with Native people. Tribal tourism is a significant contributor to our state’s economy as observed through visits to reservations and attendance at the more than fifty American Indian art shows, tribal fairs, and cultural gatherings.
Challenges

The economic conditions of Arizona’s tribal communities are such that many people are unemployed and do odd jobs or curio type art work to support their families. Indian communities lack adequate infrastructure to support small business operations and all that it entails. These small cottage industries are a day to day operation with the proceeds from the previous day’s sales going to fund basic needs such as food, gasoline for travel to sell their wares, and to purchase additional raw materials in order to maintain a competitive inventory.

Given the fact that there are large urban American Indian populations in our state, many Native artists endeavor to work in a genre that is outside of the stereotypical paradigm. In choosing this career path, they find it difficult at times to maintain a true and constant connection to their grassroots communities.

No arts service organization dedicated to promoting Native arts or artists exists in Arizona. In the past, Atlatl, Inc., provided technical assistance to Native artists, advocated for their inclusion in mainstream art projects, and convened local and national conferences that produced written materials on issues that would serve to move critical thought on Native art forward. Sadly Atlatl, Inc., closed due to mismanagement and lack of funds.

Currently there is no targeted mechanism in place in the state to inform Native artists of opportunities to apply for fellowships, grants, and awards. As a result, in many of the long lists of awardees, the names and work of Native artists are not present. Geographical distance from urban centers and unreliable internet service has made it more challenging make Native artists aware of opportunities to apply for fellowships, grants, and awards, and to urge them to apply. This is one of the contributing factors for the dearth of Native artists on the lists of awardees. Efforts have been made to change this. The Arizona Commission on the Arts works to inform native artists of opportunities through the commission, the Department of Tourism has a native staff member who works to connect with tribal nations, and the Berlin Gallery at the Heard Museum is an innovative sales program focused on contemporary native art.

There is very limited statistical information on how individual Native art businesses perform or how they impact and interface with the state and local economies. Such a lack of accurate data makes it difficult for non-tribal organizations, municipalities, and institutions to become educated about this topic. Lacking reliable statistical resources has presented challenges in the promotion of Native arts and culture.

Opportunities

Several venues host large annual American Indian art shows that not only produce revenue for the state and local economies, but for Native artists as well.

The Heard Museum in Phoenix has the largest Indian Fair and market in the state. Held the first weekend of March for the past fifty-two years, this internationally acclaimed event showcases the finest works of over 600 American Indian artists from all over the country, including Arizona.
Since 1976, the Pueblo Grande Museum in Phoenix has presented an annual art market on the second weekend of December. More than 150 Native artists typically show their work. The West Valley Arts Council sponsors an American Indian Market, and Litchfield Park also hosts a Native American arts festival.

The annual Southwest Indian Art Fair is presented each February at the Arizona State Museum on the campus of the University of Arizona. Over 200 Native artists show and sell their creations.

The Museum of Northern Arizona sponsors festivals during the summer months that celebrate the Hopi, Navajo, and Zuni cultures. A highlight of the program is that it offers both traditional and modern cultural presentations and visual arts. The West Valley Arts Council sponsors an American Indian Market, and Litchfield Park also hosts a Native American arts festival.

In the White Mountains, the Pinetop-Lakeside community sponsors a Native art festival at the White Mountain Apache’s Hon Dah Casino each June. Over fifty Native artists share their art and culture with the public.

Smaller museums that present exhibits dealing with Native art and culture are the Amerind Foundation in Dragoon, the Phippen Museum in Prescott, the Smoki Museum in Prescott, and the Mesa Arts Center. Several of the casinos feature extensive art displays and casino revenues have funded new art centers on some reservations.

**Funding Issues**

In these tight economic times, it is always a challenge to secure funding for small non-profits, art spaces, and cultural organizations. For American Indian communities, it remains an additional challenge to identify individuals from within a tribal community or organizations who have the adequate skill set and expertise to secure any funding that may be available. This observation is reflected in the small number of grants that are awarded to Native organizations or tribal communities as described above. In addition, tribal leadership has to be in support of applications to funders related to arts and culture grants.

For the individual American Indian artist who is operating a small cottage industry from the reservation, it is difficult to obtain enough extra cash to secure a space at an art show in one of Arizona’s metropolitan areas, in addition to the travel expenses they incur.

In many of the rural reservation communities, internet service is not readily available, thus creating another hurdle for an artist who is seeking to submit proposals and applications online.

**Role of Arts in Economic Development**

The Intertribal Council of Arizona has a Cultural Resources Working Group within the structure of the Policy Development component of their Working Groups and Advisory Councils. This is a forum for tribes to share information and new initiatives, addressing areas
of common concern and providing input on policy decisions made by state and federal agencies. This is the closest a large tribal lobbying organization comes to including the arts in their agenda.

Native Americans for Community Action in Flagstaff, administers the Oak Creek Vista Overlook Program. Developed in partnership with the United States Forest Service, Coconino National Forest, in 1988 as an economic development project, it enables Native artisans to sell their arts, crafts, and jewelry at the prime tourist locations in the Oak Creek Canyon area. The program has grown in popularity and in reputation each year. To date, 280 vendors have registered to sell their work, and for many, the money they earn through the Overlook Program is their major source of income.

In the Navajo Nation, the Navajo Arts and Crafts Enterprise is a large non-profit that is owned and operated by the Navajo Nation. In addition to the main site in Window Rock, there are five satellite sites throughout the Nation. The enterprise seeks to provide Navajo vendors with raw materials to purchase in order to create their art work. In turn the enterprise then purchases the merchandise wholesale for sale to the public. Many locations on the Navajo Nation are tourist destinations and the sales of Navajo arts and crafts remain steady during the summer months when tourist visitation is at a high level.

Established in 1996, Tohono O’odham Community Action (TOCA) is a community based non-profit organization dedicated to creating and sustaining a culturally vital community within a tribal Nation. TOCA incorporates food systems and wellness, basketry, intergenerational programs, and arts and culture revitalization to realize a successful model of engaging community through an integrated approach to the arts. They currently operate a gallery stocked with art created by local artisans and the Desert Rain Café in Sells that serves traditional foods harvested from their community gardens.

**Conclusion**

The twenty-two tribal communities in Arizona are vibrant and steeped in tradition, while advancing in today’s world. By strengthening partnerships with tribal communities, the Arizona Office of Tourism has a marketable product to sell to the local and international traveler. Tribal communities are still considered separate political, social, economic, and cultural entities by a majority of Arizona’s arts stakeholders, a situation that is mostly due to lack of adequate education and training regarding the state’s tribal communities.

The arts in Native Arizona are thriving, and their success is due to the creativity and tenacity of the artists themselves and to the work of cultural advocates and leaders of Native arts and culture organizations. But, there are too few such leaders, and the demands placed on them are many.

Continued growth and vitality in the Native arts sector requires renewing and re-energizing current leaders as well as recruiting and developing new ones.
Several key questions emerge:

- As workers in the field, we must ask ourselves, how can we further the development of key leadership roles in Native arts in the state?
- What motivates businesses in our state to promote the work of Native artists and encourage the practice of Native arts?
- What institutions and organizations are available for doing this work?

Wendy Weston was born and reared in the Four Corners area of the Navajo Nation in the community of T’iiisNaasbaas. She has devoted her career to advocating for Native artists and having the Native voice represented in public arts and culture programs. She is a strong supporter of and advocate for Native artistic expression, be it in traditional form or a progressive cutting edge genre. Her work with cultural and arts programming has increased awareness of and respect for Native arts throughout the world. Currently, Weston serves as Director of Special Projects at the Heard Museum in Phoenix. Prior to joining the staff in 1996, she served as Program Coordinator for Atlatl, Inc., a national service organization for Native arts, and spent several years as a Roster Artist for the Arizona Commission on the Arts. She holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Political Science from Arizona State University and has completed graduate coursework in Museum Studies and Cultural Anthropology.
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Four Centuries and Counting:
Contemporary Latino/a Arts in Arizona

Ann Seiferle-Valencia
Curator of Latin American Art, Tucson Museum of Art

Key Points

• Latino/a arts have a rich, well-established history within the state of Arizona, extending back to the 16th and 17th centuries
• Latino/as represent a growing demographic in Arizona
• Latino/as remain an untapped resource for support and patronage of the arts
• Arts education can make a unique and positive impact in the educational success of young Latino/a students
• SB 1070, signed into law in 2010, has had a significant economic impact on Arizona’s Latino/a art community

Introduction

A number of terms exist by which Latino/a people refer to themselves. Terms such as Latino/a, Chicano/a, Hispanic, Mexican, and Mexican-American have meanings that often overlap. Many of these terms have additional connotations, some emphasizing national identities (Mexican, Mexican-American) while others identify cultural or social identifications (Latino/a, Chicano). Others are primarily demographic terms (Hispanic or Latino/a). Some individuals or communities prefer to identify themselves with the state or countries they or their ancestors originated in. The overlap in these terms demonstrates how definitions of ethnicity change over time. It is difficult to identify one single term that all people of Mexican, Mexican-American, or other Latino/a descent would be comfortable using. The generalized term used in this chapter is Latino/a, an umbrella term under which more specific forms of identity are included.1

This chapter considers the strengths and challenges Latino/a artists face in working in both traditional and modern media, drawing on a culturally rich heritage and using a striking range of artistic styles. Several themes are highlighted:

• History: Latino/a arts have a rich, well-established history within the state of Arizona, extending back to the 16th and 17th centuries
• Demographics: Latino/as represent a growing demographic constituent of the population of Arizona
This history and demographics have several implications for the arts:

- Latino/as remain an untapped resource for support and patronage of the arts
- Arts education stands to make a unique and positive impact in the educational success of young Latino/a students
- Funding and grant opportunities as well as exhibition spaces and gallery interest will increase the visibility of Latino/a artists

History of Latino/a Arts in Arizona: A Brief Overview

The current lively diversity in Latino/a arts within the state of Arizona continues a long artistic tradition, and its history is tied to a rich cultural and historical legacy. The state of Arizona was acquired by the United States in 1848 as part of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Prior to that date, however, the territory had been explored and settled by Spanish explorers, Jesuits, and Franciscan friars for nearly three hundred years. The land we now refer to as Arizona was part of Mexico until the mid-19th century.

During that time, the arts developed similarly to that in other parts of early colonial Mexico, much of which was closely tied to Roman Catholic liturgical traditions. Additionally, there was a strong emphasis on the cultivation of artistic talent within the context of the home. From the outset, Latino/a arts have included both public and private spheres of artistic expression. By the 19th and 20th centuries, Latino/a arts in Arizona had flourished and diversified to include Spanish and English language theatre, music, literature, crafts, and folk art, in addition to religious arts.

The Chicano Movement of the 1960s brought art to the forefront as a powerful means of expression in an era of political, racial, social, and economic transformation. As part of the broader sweep of the civil rights movements of that decade, the Chicano Movement highlighted art produced by Mexican-origin artists. During this period, artist-activists became widely recognized both within Arizona and nationwide, and the Chicano Movement was integral to establishing Latino/a art as an important area of contemporary artistic expression, as well as for laying the foundation for contemporary artists. More recently, there has been a gradual movement from communal to individual artistic expression. For example, in the 1970s, groups such as the one in Tucson led by Antonio Pazos painted large communal murals that had clearly articulated political messages. Tucson is home to 133 murals painted by Mexican-origin artists.²

The incredible diversity of Arizona’s contemporary Latino/a artists, particularly those in the visual arts, gives voice to many different experiences and definitions of cultural identity within the state. Broad themes of community and family continue to be of central importance, and artists blend high and low art themes, satire, popular culture, multi-ethnic and religious symbolism and bright colors. The work produced often exhibits a striking combination of self-awareness, humor, and vitality, and is innately interwoven into a broader cultural context (Latino/a, Arizonan, and American) that reinforces, challenges, and reinvigorates individual and communal senses of identity. Latino/a artists and performers are proud of their cultural history and give voice to themselves as well as to their communities.
Demographics, Education, and the Arts

The Latino/a population in the United States has experienced tremendous growth in the past decade; within Arizona, it grew by 45% between 2000 and 2007. Latino/a individuals comprise roughly 30% of the population of the state, and represent a tremendous untapped resource in terms of support for and patronage of the arts. Bilingual supplementary materials, increased exhibition support, and community outreach are all potential ways to increase support of the arts within this community.

This growing demographic constituency undoubtedly means that more Latino/a artists can be expected to make their debuts in the coming decades, and the work they will produce will explore further what it means to be a Latino/a in the state of Arizona and in the United States at this particular moment in history. Support for these emerging artists, via non-profit agencies, galleries, and museums will be critical to ensure that this rich cultural legacy continues to be supported during a challenging economic period. There are a number of organizations in the state of Arizona that provide grant opportunities for artists, including the Arizona Commission of the Arts, the Tucson Pima Arts Council, the Arizona Art Alliance, the Arizona Latino Arts and Cultural Center (ALAC) in Phoenix, and the West Valley Arts Council.

Arts Education: Latino/a children accounted for nearly 87% of the total growth in the enrolled K-12 population over the last ten years. More than 75% of those under the age of six live in poverty. While there are many challenges to ensuring that Latino/a children receive the same education as their peers, it is clear that arts education, which has a great impact on children of any ethnicity, is poised to make a dramatic impact in the lives of Latino/a children by enabling them to directly engage their heritage. Such changes may be met with resistance. For example, in the summer of 2010 a mural at an elementary school in Prescott became the focus of heated debate. The artists who painted the mural were asked to lighten the faces of a Latino/a and African American depicted in the mural. The use of racial slurs and inflammatory language characterized the “debate.” Issues of ethnicity and the arts within our public schools are hotly contested. But increasing the diversity of artistic traditions included in educational programming, either within schools themselves or by museums, holds an enormous potential for positive impact.

The Law, The Arts, and The Economy

Recent legislation has had a strong impact on the Latino/a community, including those involved with arts and culture. On April 23, 2010, Arizona Governor Jan Brewer signed the Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods Act, most commonly referred to SB 1070, into law. The broadest and strictest immigration measure in decades, it has spurred controversy and protest at the state and national level, catalyzing and polarizing the debate about immigration issues within the state and nationwide.

The state and national response to this legislation put Arizona in the spotlight and greatly impacted its tourism industry. Organized boycotts of the state have had a direct and detrimental impact on the tourism economy, with some estimates suggesting that the city of Phoenix could lose up to $90 million in the hotel industry alone. Other reports suggested
that the losses from cancelled meetings and conventions cost the state $141 million in direct spending and that the economic impact of the legislation over the next two or three years would be $253 million in economic output.\(^5\)

This economic impact extends to the arts and cultural sectors of Arizona, including the Latino/a arts community. A direct example occurred in 2010 when the Glass Art Society (GAS) cancelled its annual conference shortly following the passing of SB 1070. The conference was originally intended to have a Latin American focus and the initial explanation for the cancellation included a concern about issues directly pertaining to the legislation, though explicitly mentioned that the cancellation was not a boycott of the state. The GAS later clarified that the primary concern was economic.\(^6\) In either case, the impact of this decision had a direct impact on the Arizona art community, as the conference focus on Latin American glass would have brought an international group of artists to the state. Since Latino/a arts specifically pertain to an ethnic group differentially affected by the recent legislation, it stands to reason that they have also been differentially affected by the social and economic impact of recent legislation.\(^7\)

Artists responded directly to SB 1070, using social networking sites such as Facebook to provide a forum in which Arizona artists could communicate with their counterparts in other states. Ernesto Yerena of Los Angeles organized an art campaign in response to SB 1070 that he called Creative Resistance!, posting images on a web site (AltoArizona.com). Some artists have responded by asking their colleagues to continue to perform and exhibit in Arizona, rather than boycotting the state. In 2010, ALAC organized “SB 1070: An Artist Point of View.”

Although little statistical information has been published, SB 1070 has affected Arizona’s Latino/as communities as it has the rest of the state. But the situation also represents an opportunity, and Arizona’s Latino/a artists are uniquely poised in this historical moment to make a significant contribution to the dialogue about immigration.

**Arizona’s Contemporary Latino/a Arts and Culture Community**

Latino/a arts and culture has a strong presence in contemporary Arizona, as seen in the visual arts, theatre, and dance. A few examples will serve to illustrate this.

In the visual arts, strong communities of artists are well established in Phoenix and Tucson. Work by these individuals has been presented at museums and galleries. In 2009, when the Phoenix Art Museum hosted “Phantom Sightings,” an exhibition of Latino art originated by the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, PAM curator Sara Cochran put together “Locals Only” to showcase the work of a dozen Chicano and Latino/a artists living and working in the Phoenix metropolitan area.\(^8\) Founded in 2000, Tucson’s Raíces Talller is a community Latino/a based nonprofit cooperative art gallery and workshop.

Tucson’s Borderlands Theater (founded in 1986) is recognized nationally and internationally for programs that reflect the diversity of the voices of the U.S./Mexico border region. Although its core voice is a Latino/a/Chicano/a one, Borderlands interacts with all of the voices of the region, recognizing the “border” as both a physical and a social landscape;
border people, in the best sense of the word, are citizens of the world. Also in Tucson is the Latina Dance Theater Project, a collaborative ensemble of multidisciplinary artists whose performances explore controversial issues impacting the global community, and reflective of the diverse Latin culture of today. In Phoenix, the Teatro Bravo, founded in 1998, produces plays that promote a complex portrait of Arizona’s Latino/a and/or Latin American populations. It also seeks to develop the talents of Latino/a actors, directors, playwrights, designers, stage managers, and administrators. The Ballet Folklorico Mexicapan of Phoenix has been performing since 1981.

Finally, in December 2009 the Arizona Latino Arts & Cultural Center opened in Phoenix following the closure of the Museo Chicano in January 2009. (http://www.alacaz.org/). A consortium of Latino/a arts groups and independent artists, ALAC’s goals include networking, professional training, advocacy, funding, and arts education, as well as fostering understanding between Latino and non-Latino artists, art organizations, media, and communities.

Ann Seiferle-Valencia, a Chicana from New Mexico, holds a Bachelor’s degree from the University of Arizona and Master’s and Doctorate degrees from Harvard University with specialties in pre-Columbian material culture and early colonial pictorial manuscripts. Prior to becoming Curator of Latin American Art at the Tucson Museum of Art in 2010, she was a lecturer in the Department of Anthropology and a postdoctoral research fellow at the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University. Her research interests are centered on the uses of Mesoamerican iconography, both in pre-Columbian art and by contemporary Latin American artists, as a means of self and communal representation. Her approach to Latin American art is rooted in an anthropological perspective, seeking to contextualize art in the social and cultural context in which it was created and how this context changes through time.


See http://washingtonglass.blogspot.com/2010/05/glass-arts-society-cancels-arizona.html,

On May 12 2010, Governor Brewer signed HB 2281, which prohibits a school district or charter school from including in its program of instruction any courses or classes that promote the overthrow of the United States government, promote resentment toward a race or class of people, are designed primarily for pupils of a particular ethnic group, and advocate ethnic solidarity instead of the treatment of pupils as individuals. The legislation targeted the Tucson Unified School District which had a program offering specialized courses in African-American, Mexican-American, and Native-American studies.

See Gary D. Keller and Mary Erickson, and Pat Villeneuve, Chicano Art for Our Millennium: Collected Works from the Arizona State University Community (Tempe: Bilingual Press, 2004).
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Cultural Institutions Outside the Metropolitan Mainstream

Arizona possesses many cultural treasures outside of the metropolitan areas of Phoenix and Tucson. Anyone who has traveled throughout the state has experienced the happy surprise of discovering such places, which often represent an Arizona that has been erased elsewhere through the vigorous development that has destroyed many of the tangible reminders of our rich history. The five essays that comprise this chapter have been written by the directors of Arizona institutions in Flagstaff, Wickenburg, Bisbee, Dragoon, and Window Rock. Collectively they map the geography of our large western state. Further, they convey the challenges of presenting and preserving the arts and culture of Arizona in more remote locations. They struggle daily with how to sustain their communities, how to make significant state heritage relevant to new generations, and how to do so in a challenging economic climate.

Preserving the Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Colorado Plateau
Robert Breunig, Executive Director, Museum of Northern Arizona

The Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA) in Flagstaff, is an outstanding example of a place based museum, a regional institution. The museum is devoted to the study and interpretation of a specific part of the world, in this case the 130,000 square mile Colorado Plateau, which encompasses northern Arizona, southern Utah, and parts of western Colorado and New Mexico. The museum was founded in 1928 by citizens of northern Arizona who were concerned about the growing loss of the natural and cultural history of the region. Even some of the scientific expeditions of the time created concerns, as archaeological sites and materials were excavated by scientists from eastern U.S. institutions (such as the Smithsonian Institution) and were sent back East, never to be seen in Arizona again. The primary founders of the museum were a remarkable couple from Philadelphia who began visiting Flagstaff in 1912 and who settled permanently in northern Arizona in 1926. Dr. Harold Sellers Colton was a scientist, and his wife Mary-Russell Ferrell Colton was an artist and an art educator. Together, they built an institution devoted to both science and art—and to their interconnections.

Since its founding, the museum has engaged in three principal activities: research on the geology, paleontology, archaeology, ethnology, biology and ecology, and art of the Colorado Plateau; exhibits and educational programs that “tell the story” of the region, and the building and preservation of collections that document these various disciplines. MNA’s collections contains more than 560,000 individual items plus bulk collections and archives, 9,000 sq. ft. of bulk material and archival documents and photographs. The majority of these collections are now housed in the museum’s new Easton Collection Center, a 17,000 square foot state of the art Platinum LEED facility completed in 2009 with
private funding from one individual source. The museum has also had an active publications program for both lay and professional audiences. MNA is (and was among the first to be) accredited by the American Association of Museums; as a model regional museum it maintains a tradition of excellence that draws upon universal concepts, principles, themes and standards to accomplish its mission.

Recent MNA research initiatives have included the excavation of nine archaeological sites along the Colorado River corridor in the Grand Canyon; the ancient biodiversity of the 93 million year old Cretaceous Interior Seaway as revealed in the Tropic Shale of the Glen Canyon region; continuity and change in Hopi iconography over the past one thousand years; and the biodiversity of springs on the Colorado Plateau, with an emphasis on the management of springs on tribal lands.

In its exhibits program, the museum strives to maintain a balance of science and art exhibits, looking at the Colorado Plateau from diverse perspectives, and featuring the work of native and non-native artists, and the research results of MNA scientists. The high biodiversity inherent to our geography provides us outstanding opportunities for biological research. Likewise, the exposed stratigraphy of rock layers on the Colorado Plateau provides outstanding opportunities for both physical geology and paleontology studies. And because the museum is adjacent to the largest U.S. populations of American Indian descent, it stands in a unique position to collaborate with Apache, Hopi, Navajo, Pai, and Zuni peoples—and since its inception those who have supported the museum have found tremendous joy and satisfaction/accomplishment in focusing on the art and culture of this diversity.

The 2011 exhibits will feature Zuni Map art, in partnership with the A:shiwi A:wan Museum at Zuni Pueblo, which looks at Zuni perspectives on their own traditional cultural territory. The museum will host four festivals of arts and culture that annually draw over 10,000 visitors: the 78th annual festival with Hopi artists and cultural leaders, 57th for Navajo, 5th (reinstated) festival for Zuni, and 6th Celebraciones festival for our region’s Latino/Hispanic community. These “Heritage Festivals” provide some of the best opportunities for cross cultural exchange in the region. A special art exhibit of painter Bruce Aiken and science exhibit on MNA’s recently completed 5-year archaeological project in the Grand Canyon demonstrate the museum’s commitment to presenting and interpreting the science, culture, and art of the region. The museum will also continue its tradition of publishing outstanding bulletins and magazines for both scientific and lay audiences.

Perhaps the greatest challenge for the Museum of Northern Arizona is providing funding for a significant, multidisciplinary, private regional museum in a town of 60,000 people. While projects in research, collections management, publications, exhibits, and education are recognized as having national and international, as well as regional significance, most large private foundations do not accept funding applications from institutions located outside major metropolitan areas. In MNA’s case this is particularly frustrating as a large percentage of visitors are from the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Additionally, state and federal agencies as well as private foundations have, in recent decades, largely limited funding to new initiatives rather than operations. Recent deep cuts to the few unrestricted sources of operating grants that have remained, along with shrinking private funding in the current economy, have forced
major cuts in staffing and general funding at MNA, despite MNA’s commitment to a diverse funding program that includes gifts and grants from individuals, public agencies, private foundations, earned income, and performance contracts.

Looking to the future, MNA believes that institutions that connect people to real places and which hold and preserve the physical evidence of our natural and cultural heritage will become more important in a world that is increasingly enamored with the general and the virtual.

Presenting Western Heritage in a Seasonal Community
W. James Burns, Executive Director, Desert Caballeros Western Museum, Wickenburg

While located in Maricopa County, Wickenburg can hardly be considered urban, with a population of roughly 6,400 year-round residents. One of the challenges of running a cultural institution in Wickenburg is the transient nature of its residents. The same is undoubtedly true for many rural communities in Arizona with visitors and residents who spend anywhere from a few weeks to a few months at best each year in residence.

Permanent and part-year residents alike in Wickenburg talk about “the season,” which runs roughly from October through April. The community—and the institutions in it—revolves around the season, a situation that presents some opportunities but also some challenges. There is a distinct buzz among the cultural institutions in town during the season, but ultimately resources must be allocated to operate all year long.

How does one run a cultural organization when a majority of the members, trustees, and volunteers are half-year residents and attendance fluctuates significantly between summer and winter? To sustain our organizations through the summer cultural organizations scale back and try to do more with less. As so many have had to do in these tough economic times, sacrifices are made.

Arts organizations in Wickenburg concentrate the bulk of their programming during the winter season, infusing the town with a rich cultural life usually found in much larger cities. The community takes pride in the Del E. Webb Center for the Performing Arts and Desert Caballeros Western Museum, which celebrated its 50th anniversary in 2010.

These institutions focus on cooperation and collaboration to maximize their limited resources. The museum and the center rely on a similar, limited pool of donors and volunteers. When possible organizations work together and forge partnerships with others in town and throughout the metro area.

Some of the challenges faced are to expand our audiences, funding sources, and membership beyond Wickenburg. Success in expanding audiences and attracting new patrons has implications for the town as well. Wickenburg possesses a fortuitous location on the well-traveled highway between Phoenix and Las Vegas, but getting travelers to stop is a challenge.

If travelers do stop they tend to shop and eat, which translates into tax dollars for the community and sales for local businesses. The museum has been successful in attracting over
56,000 visitors a year, nearly 75% of those from outside Wickenburg. That represents a significant contribution to economic development in a community that has very little industry.

While prominent, the cultural institutions in Wickenburg face a challenge in building bridges with business owners and residents in the community. Cultural institutions struggle to meet the needs and appeal to the interests of full-time residents as well as part-year residents and visitors. Figuring out how to serve all of those constituencies is a daily challenge.

In this tough post-Great Recession economy, cultural organizations seek more than ever to create relevant connections with their communities. Some are doing so with half of the pre-recession human and financial resources, largely through the spirit of volunteerism that is particularly strong in rural communities.

**Telling Stories**

Carrie Gustavson, Director, Bisbee Mining & Historical Museum

Arizona possesses a remarkable landscape, which framed by the borders of our geographically large state, has created its distinctive sense of place. But it is not defined by a single community, be it a Phoenix or a Bisbee, but rather by the startling diversity of its places and people, each of which has a distinctive story to tell. These chronicles represent a multitude of voices and narratives which are celebrated by the many cultural organizations located in rural Arizona.

The rural Arizona of a place like Bisbee, distant from the state’s major urban centers, derives its identity neither from the many legislative decisions made by government officials in metropolitan Phoenix nor from the headlines randomly picked up by state or national media. The experience of rural Arizona is more immediate, an intrinsic part of our lives. We are all—past, present, and future—part of the story.

The Bisbee Mining & Historical Museum is a community history museum, and like other rural institutions throughout the state, plays a significant role in interpreting how Arizonans understand their shared heritage, assess the present, and plan for the future. As common tradition fades, Arizona’s hundreds of smaller rural museums assume the stewardship of teaching communities the importance of not only preserving history, but of understanding the nature of the history we seek to preserve, and the lessons it offers for today.

Community museums are, in essence, in the front line of the history business, and collectively such histories of which they are guardians are the foundation of our image as a state. But community museums could improve their impact by looking beyond their local communities to weave their local and regional stories into an understanding of the collective experience of Arizona as a whole.

The story of Bisbee’s mines is anything but a local one. Arizona is known as the copper state, and mining was the transformative industry of the American West, with Bisbee as an important arena in which social and economic issues of statewide and national importance were played out. Some of the richest copper mines in the world were located here, and it was once the
financial center of the Arizona territory. Bisbee was typical of the commodity-producing towns that once defined vast areas of the American West, and this is a remarkable story to celebrate.

As cultural institutions, we can be central players in the economic well-being and revitalization of our respective communities—a responsibility key to the survival of rural museums need to assume in order to survive. Mining has always been a volatile enterprise, and with the closure of most of its mines during the mid-twentieth century, Bisbee reinvented itself by capitalizing on its history, aligning itself with the growth of Arizona’s tourism industry. Today’s Bisbee prospers because of this transformation and the lively diversity of its residents, whose creative energy is rooted in a powerful blend of historic preservation and the arts.

Underlying the Bisbee Mining & Historical Museum’s conceptual framework of preserving and promoting a vibrant cultural heritage is the hardrock reality of economic sustainability, both for local institutions and communities. In Bisbee, residents work together to both enhance the tourism experience, and to sustain the unique sense of place of the community. Such collaboration preserves the unique rural heritage of Bisbee, while adding to a shared sense of belonging.

A Well-Kept Secret
John A. Ware, Executive Director, The Amerind Foundation, Dragoon

The Amerind Foundation was established in 1937 as an archaeological research institute dedicated to the advancement of knowledge about the Native Peoples of the Americas. The Amerind campus is located on a 1600 acre former cattle ranch in Texas Canyon, northern Cochise County, about sixty miles east of Tucson. Amerind’s founder, New England industrialist William Shirley Fulton, chose this location because he wanted Amerind’s research efforts to be far from the distractions of a major metropolitan area.

During its first fifty years the Amerind conducted excavations at over two dozen archaeological sites in the Southwestern Borderlands, culminating in the multi-year Joint Casas Grandes Project in northern Chihuahua—one of the largest archaeological projects ever conducted in the Southwest. The nature of archaeological research and funding for basic research began to change in the 1960s and by the late 1970s it was no longer possible for small research centers to compete for scarce federal research dollars. As the discipline changed, the Amerind adapted by modifying its mission. Since 1980 the Amerind has supported the basic research of others through advanced seminars, a visiting scholar program, and professional publications. Today, the Amerind sponsors up to ten advanced seminars a year through an active collaboration with the Society for American Archaeology, the University of Arizona, Arizona State University, and other regional universities.

Within a few years of its founding the Amerind established a museum and art gallery to exhibit its growing collection of art and artifacts. Open to the public only by appointment, the Amerind Museum would eventually house one of the finest private collections of American Indian art and material culture in the country, but it remained, by design, a closely kept secret during its first fifty years. In a letter to a colleague in the 1960s, long-time Amerind director
Dr. Charles C. Di Peso said that they were lucky to have had only two visitors to the Amerind Museum that month, so there were few distractions to getting an important research project written up!

In 1984 the Amerind opened its museum and fine art gallery to the walk-in public and visitation steadily rose to the current level of 12-15,000 visitors a year. The Amerind is truly a rural museum, and there are advantages and disadvantages to being in the “middle of nowhere.” Other than the spectacular rock formations of Texas Canyon and the beautiful sunsets of southeastern Arizona, visiting scholars and advanced seminar participants have few things to distract them from their important work. On the other hand, the Amerind is an hour’s drive from Tucson and Sierra Vista and twenty minutes to the nearest restaurant, grocery store, or pharmacy. Moreover, Cochise County has very little wealth, few corporations, even fewer non-profits, and almost no history of philanthropy. Without a solid community of support, fund raising for new programs and capital improvements is difficult, to say the least. As the Amerind approaches its 75th anniversary in 2012, its biggest challenge will be to transform a closely kept secret into a household name and popular visitor destination. As a cultural attraction, it will contribute to the economy of this remote location.

**Tribal Museums: From Display Cases to Cultural Preservation**
Manuelito Wheeler, Director, Navajo Nation Museum, Window Rock

A current trend in museums nationally is to be more in tune with their communities and not operate as empirical institutions. The Navajo Nation Museum, for example, operates by this trend. The Museum opened in 1961 with the help of the Navajo Council, and initially and for some decades it functioned as an anthropological museum having historical exhibits and displaying artwork. Currently the Navajo Nation Museum’s mission statement is “Striving to achieve hozho through contemporary and traditional exhibits, programs, and tours; To promote our Diné culture, language, history, and sovereignty.” (hozho is a Navajo word meaning harmony, balance, spiritual beauty).

Tribal museums throughout Arizona are evolving into cultural preservation centers. Topics of language preservation, traditional religion retention, and public display appropriateness are some issues at the forefront of tribal institutions. It was unforeseen that tribal museums would be in positions of cultural preservation and salvation.

Supporting local artists is another obvious goal of museums, tribal or not. This task is a little more complicated for tribal members because the definition of Native art is fuzzy and sometimes controversial. Traditional art and contemporary art for Indian people carry with them rules of what is appropriate. These issues are to be kept on the periphery but we must not lose sight of supporting local artists. Many artists who live on the reservation have little experience dealing with museums, assembling a portfolio, or even visiting museums and galleries. Many of these talented reservation artists remain undiscovered.

At the Navajo Nation Museum, having Navajo staff members has the benefit of the inherent understanding of Navajo culture, which is as diverse as its people with regional beliefs, politics, and minor linguistic differences. Thus the staff can share common cultural knowledge as well as deferring to traditional specialists for more sacred knowledge.
Being one of the twenty-two tribes in Arizona, the Navajo Nation is infused in Arizona’s history and pride. The capitol and home of our state government is Phoenix. Such geographic distance seems to cause a disconnect from Navajo people and the state capitol and its residents. Opportunities exist to create an institution that will excite and encourage Arizona to hear and learn as we tell our own stories. Each tribe has its own story, and they are centuries-old oral histories that now manifest themselves in our tribal museums. Tribal museums continue to play a central role in preserving tribal cultures.

Robert G. Breunig is Executive Director of the Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA). Since returning to MNA as director in 2003, Dr. Breunig has overseen the development of the $7.5 million Easton Collection Center, a state of the art collections repository; major improvements to the campus of the Harold S. Colton Research Center; reaccreditation by the American Association of Museums; and significant growth of the museum’s endowment funds. Dr. Breunig earned a Ph.D. in Anthropology from the University of Kansas, in 1973. In the 1970’s and early 1980’s held several positions at the Museum of Northern Arizona including Museum Educator, Curator of the Museum, and Curator of Anthropology. In 1982, he became the Deputy Director and Chief Curator of the Heard Museum in Phoenix. He has also served as Executive Director of the Desert Botanical Garden (1985-1994), the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History (1994-1997) and the Lady Bird Johnson Wildflower Center (1997-2003). In 1991, President George Bush appointed Dr. Breunig to the fifteen-member National Museum Services Board, the governing board of the Institute of Museum and Library Services. In 1994, President Bill Clinton re-appointed him to this board, on which he served until November 2002. Dr. Breunig currently serves as a Commissioner of the Arizona Commission on the Arts.

W. James Burns is Executive Director of the Desert Caballeros Western Museum in Wickenburg. He holds a B.A. in History from the University of Arizona, an M.A. in Public History from Arizona State University, and a Ph.D. in Educational Policy Studies from Georgia State University. His M.A. thesis (1994), *Gateway to the Colorado Plateau: A Portrait of the Museum of Northern Arizona* was an institutional history of MNA. His dissertation, *We Must Grow Our Own Artists: Mary-Russell Ferrell Colton, Northern Arizona’s Early Art Educator* (2010), focused on the contributions of the co-founder of the MNA to the progressive education movement and the Native American arts and crafts movement. Burns is a graduate of the Museum Management Institute at the Getty and has worked in history, anthropology, and art museums since 1990 at institutions in Arizona, Georgia, Virginia, and Louisiana, including the Museum of Northern Arizona, the Booth Western Art Museum, the Louisiana State Museum, the Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation, the Tempe History Museum, and the Atlanta History Center. Burns’ research interests include the cultural, social, and environmental history of the American West. He has served on a number of state and regional museum association boards and currently serves as the Vice-Chair of the Curators’ Committee of the American Association of Museums and as a peer reviewer for the Museum Assessment Program.

Carrie Gustavson grew up learning about other cultures and people around the world through the United Nations IAEA program. Returning to the United States, she received her advanced degrees in Near Eastern Studies from UCLA/University of California, Berkeley, and the University of Toronto. Based in Europe, her archaeological career focused on the Chalcolithic cultures along the Fertile Crescent through the Mediterranean littoral in the Middle East. Twenty years ago, she returned to the United States and completed her graduate certificate in Museum Studies at Arizona State University. As the Director of the Bisbee Mining & Historical Museum, she has led it to state and national recognition for museum excellence and award-winning interactive exhibitry. Also under her leadership, the Museum became the first rural affiliate nationwide of the Smithsonian
Institution’s Affiliation Program and was nominated by Congress to the Library of Congress Local Legacy program. As founder of the Cochise County Museum Association, she designed the small museum, professional development curriculum for Cochise College, and currently co-chairs the Cochise County Arizona Centennial Committee. She served fifteen years on the Museum Association of Arizona governing board, is a member of the Arizona Humanities Council governing board, and the Arizona Centennial Legacy Committee.

John Ware, a fourth-generation Arizonan, is an anthropologist and archaeologist whose research and teaching focus is on the prehistory and ethnohistory of the northern Southwest, where he has worked for nearly forty years. Ware earned his Ph.D. in anthropology from the University of Colorado in 1983 and has taught anthropology at Southern Illinois University, the College of Santa Fe, and Colgate University in Hamilton, New York. In addition to teaching, Ware has held research positions at the Museum of Northern Arizona, Arizona State Museum, Colorado State Museum, and School of American Research, and he was director of the Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe. Since 2001 Ware has served as executive director of the Amerind Foundation in Dragoon.

Manuelito Wheeler was born and raised on the Navajo Nation and is currently the Director of the Navajo Nation Museum in Window Rock. He is Tsi’naajini (Black Streaked People), born for Ye’ii Tachii’nii (Red Running into Water People). Since 2008 he has served as the tribe’s museum director. In collaboration with the other museum staff, they have completed more than eight exhibits, all produced in-house. He has over twelve years of exhibit development experience that includes concept, design, construction, and installation. Prior to his current position, Wheeler spent more than ten years working at the Heard Museum in Phoenix, and rose through the ranks from carpenter’s assistant to creative director. While at the Heard, he installed more than 75 exhibits, including traveling exhibits from the Smithsonian Institution and the Autry Museum. He is a graduate of Arizona State University and resides in Fort Defiance, Arizona with his wife and two sons.
Public Art:  
Placemaking, Community Engagement, and Economic Impact

Edward Lebow  
Public Art Program Manager, Phoenix Office of Cultural Affairs

Valerie Vadala Homer  
Director, Scottsdale Public Art Program

Key Points

- The first American city to establish a public art program was Philadelphia in 1959
- Arizona’s first piece of Public Art was Solon Borglum’s 1907 memorial to Bucky O’Neill in Prescott
- Public Art has invigorated urban infrastructure
- Art and culture, including Public Art, are key ingredients of urban vitality
- Communities that have invested in Public Art have made them better places to live
- Public Art creates a sense of place, strengthens civic identity through memorials and monuments, and contributes to community engagement
- Public Art projects provide 50 times the economic impact of events in traditional venues.
- Public Art generates jobs and visibility for Arizona workers and firms

Public Art: Some History

In 1959, Philadelphia was the first city in America to establish a public art program. During the seventies and eighties public art programs proliferated and sprouted up in nearly every state in the nation. Today there are more than 350 public art programs across the country. Communities have invested in public art to make them better places to live, work, and visit.

Phoenix, Scottsdale, and Tucson all adopted public art ordinances between 1985 and 1989. Phoenix’s public art master plan noted that the city was considered by many to be a “cultural desert” and that the perception was resulting in business and industry locating elsewhere to more hospitable, culturally rich environments.

Historically, public art programs have been funded with a percent-for-art mechanism. Such funding results when one percent for a building project—a new library, a roadway, a municipal facility—is earmarked and set aside for artwork that is then sited within or near the project. More recently cities outside Arizona have opted to fund projects at an even
greater level: 2 - 2 ½ percent. As we move into the next decade we must consider whether the percent based funding model is still viable. Many of the cities that adopted ordinances in the seventies and eighties are reaching build-out and are no longer constructing new facilities and infrastructure at a rate that can continue to support such a proliferation of art. Accordingly, new program models and funding mechanisms will need to be developed if we want to ensure sustaining a cultural and arts legacy for future generations.

Public Art and Infrastructure

Cynics joke that public art is neither; that it has no audience, and that an art presumably shaped by compromise isn’t worth seeing. Yet, this oft-repeated cliche doesn’t explain why thousands of people turned out in Scottsdale last December to dedicate visionary architect Paolo Soleri’s new bridge across the Arizona Canal, or why, on a warm summer day in 1907, thousands thronged the square outside Prescott’s Yavapai County Court House to welcome the arrival of Arizona’s first formal work of public art, sculptor Solon Borglum’s memorial to Bucky O’Neill and the Rough Riders. Repeated whenever communities gather to celebrate expressions of common purpose, these events and the works they celebrate belong to a cultural continuum that may be older than any other in Arizona. Stretching back more than a millennium to the petroglyphs that indigenous artists chipped into the dark faces of hard rock, public art has evolved over the past century into a wide-ranging barometer of community vitality.

Like all things public, this evolution has come with plenty of debate. Touted by some as worthy monuments to history, bravery, and community resolve, or as symbols of cultural advance and catalysts of new thinking about urban design, public art in Arizona, as it is elsewhere, has also been derided as a waste of money, and an imposition of unwanted taste.

Yet, in the past forty years, the nay-saying has done little to stifle the advance of new, innovative, and award-winning public expressions here. Evolving far beyond Borglum’s bronze horse and rider that began the field’s modern cultural charge, Arizona’s array of public art has involved artists in designing everything from highway sound walls and pedestrian bridges, bicycle paths, city streets, parks, and bus shelters to transit systems, canal trails, airport terminals, recycling centers, waterfronts, urban furnishings, and more.

Fueled by municipal percent-for-art ordinances enacted in the 1980s, this wave of investment—more than $35 million in Phoenix alone—has amounted to the most ambitious effort to involve artists in public works since the WPA murals program of the Great Depression. The results have earned Phoenix, Scottsdale, and other Arizona cities praise as national models for merging art with infrastructure to make its communities more beautiful, interesting, and livable.

One doesn’t have to look very hard to see the extent to which artists have shaped our urban landscapes. Prescott’s Bucky O’Neill and the Rough Riders, Glendale’s recently unveiled Public Safety Memorial, and Tucson’s figures of Doc Holliday and Wyatt Earp outside the city’s old train station, show public art’s traditional power to commemorate the history of people and place.
Rosario Marquardt and Roberto Behar’s extraordinary *Magic Carpet* of terrazzo in the Biltmore underpass at Camelback Road, Teresa Villegas’s sparkling terrazzo floor at Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport’s Terminal 3 baggage area, both in Phoenix, the spectacular tile of the Miracle Mile bridge along Interstate 10 in Tucson (1993-94), and *The Path Most Traveled* (2001), Carolyn Braaksma’s elaborate, desert-inspired images cast into six miles of sound walls along the Pima Freeway in Scottsdale highlight the sensuous detail that public artists have returned to public design.


The striking aspect of these and other notable recent works of public art is that they attempt to change more than just the appearance of things. They alter and expand the functions of them, raising questions and expectations about what the experience of public infrastructure should be.

This shift of creative emphasis from merely making or decorating things to inventing or expanding functions is hardly new. It has long been a central tenet of American industry, where, as the digital age has proven, the discovery of new functions has meant the development of new needs, inventions, demands, and, potentially, new markets and economic growth. The benefits in this arc of progress and profits have been quantifiably clear ever since Thomas Edison’s leap from oil lanterns to light bulbs sparked the search for products and systems to meet the needs and exploit the opportunities of modern illumination.

The quality of the vitality and pizzazz that public art brings to our cities is far more difficult to measure. But the questions—and answers—it brings to the design of public places have been fairly clear.

- Should a road be designed exclusively to move cars? Or should it accommodate shaded sidewalks and bus shelters for pedestrians and transit users, as have a number of streets projects designed through collaborations with artists and landscape architects?

- Does a bridge need to follow a formula proven and repeated elsewhere, or could it offer an iconic new form to pique the public imagination, as have many of the bridges that Phoenix, Scottsdale, Tucson, and ADOT (via transportation enhancement funds) have designed through artist and engineer collaborations?

- Should a recycling center be built solely to handle trash, or could it double, as the 27th Avenue Solid Waste Management Facility was intended, as a public education center of “green” thinking?
All of these questions amount to an impertinent, “What if?” What if beauty, delight, multiple use, and other qualities that make great places tick were added to the design of public works? These, in fact, were the questions raised when public art programs were enacted back in the 1980s. They weren’t the brainchild of artists. They were fueled by the widespread feeling among civic, community and corporate leaders that too many of the region’s resources were going into raw growth, too few into the cultural amenities and life that attract new talent and businesses, and make cities livable and great.

This was especially true in Phoenix, where, between 1950 and 1980, development had transformed the city from a modest seventeen square miles with 106,000 residents to a sprawling 329 square miles with a population of nearly 800,000.

The notion that art and culture were key ingredients of urban vitality got a boost from separate studies of the city by urbanists Herman Kahn and Neal Peirce. “Essentially, they said that this could be a great place to live,” recalled Athia Hardt, a former Arizona Republic writer and volunteer in Phoenix’s successful 1988 bond election campaign, which fueled the city’s cultural investments. “The weather is great. The scenery is great. The air is still not too bad, but the city lacks the underpinnings of society and culture that make companies and people want to stay here for the long haul.”

In his report, published in the Arizona Republic in 1987, Peirce zeroed in on the region’s longstanding failure to support and invest in the arts, saying that its scorn for the high arts was a rejection of “what Western Civilization for centuries has found to be one of the great frontiers of the human spirit.” This was causing the city to turn its back on its chance to become a world-class city.²

Now a fixture in most of the state’s major cities, public art has helped to fill the void of cultural indifference that Peirce identified in the Phoenix region. The projects range from temporary to the permanent, from passing installations along the waterfront in Scottsdale and performances at Glendale’s Annual Jazz & Blues Festival to freeway walls in Scottsdale and Tucson, Scottsdale’s Loloma Transit Center (1997) by artist Vito Accorci and architect Doug Syndor, and James Turrell’s contemplative Knight Rise Skyspace (2001) at the Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art.

In the coming years, Phoenix’s public art program will add major new artworks as part of the Tres Rios Wetlands project, large-scale terrazzo and glass works for the planned PHX Sky Train, which, in 2013, will begin carrying travelers between the terminals at Sky Harbor Airport to the region’s light rail system station at 44th Street and Washington, and a new artist-designed entrance to the Pueblo Grande Museum, across the street from that light rail stop.

Beyond these ambitious projects lies the question of how public art and its reputation for innovation in Arizona will fare as the municipal budgets fueling it shrink. The question isn’t exclusively local. It challenges public art programs nationwide. Part of the answer exists in developing the kinds of public/private partnerships (Scottsdale has an Art in Private Development ordinance, as does Tempe and Avondale) and event-based programming that the Scottsdale Public Art Program is pursuing.
What Does Public Art Do for a City?

Placemaking: When we think of great cities we think of great art and cultural markers: memorials, monuments, public sculpture. New York’s Statue of Liberty (dedicated 1886) and Paul Manship’s golden Prometheus above the ice skating rink at Rockefeller Center (1934), the Chicago Picasso (1967), the St. Louis Gateway Arch (1963-65) by Eero Saarinen, and the great monuments of Washington—the Lincoln Memorial (1914-22), the Washington Monument (1848-84), and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

In 1969, Grand Rapids, Michigan, used percent for art funding, the first National Endowment for the Arts grant for Art in Public Places, and contributions from local philanthropists, businesses, and individuals to commission Alexander Calder’s La Grande Vitesse. The decision was bold, visionary, and highly controversial. Today the sculpture is inseparable from the city’s identity and a strong point of community pride. Since the seventies, public art programs have been the main impetus and funding source for such public sculptures, monuments, and memorials.

Memorials, Monuments, Shared Histories: In 1980, twenty-one year old Yale undergraduate architect Maya Lin was selected from nearly 1,500 submissions to create a memorial to those lost in the Vietnam War. The spare, elegant, minimal memorial was the subject of so much controversy that it seriously threatened its realization. Since that time “the Wall” has grown to be one of the most revered memorials in the world. It is the site of pilgrimages of families and friends and countless others, making it one of our nation’s most sacred places.

Cultural Identity: To celebrate and strengthen civic identity, Portland commissioned sculptor Raymond Kaskey to create Portlandia in 1985. The monumental allegorical figure of Commerce, a classically styled woman with a trident, was inspired by the official city seal. It is the second largest copper sculpture in the country—the largest being the Statue of Liberty. The sculpture arrived amid much fanfare and was carried on a barge down the Willamette River. Thousands of citizens heralded its arrival, following it as it progressed down into the city. Portlandia has become a new symbol of vitality and commerce for an emerging American city.

Community Engagement

The Hyperbolic Crochet Coral Reef Project: The brainchild of Margaret and Christine Wertheim, the project, which has traveled to different venues, was created to bring awareness to the overuse of plastic and its toxic effects on our oceans—in particular its coral reefs—and the larger impact on the planet. The project begins by bringing together community members and teaching them to crochet a simple form. Each crochet is a hyperbolic—a gently curving spiral—form that looks remarkably like actual coral. Thousands of individuals have contributed to create the Institute for Figuring’s People’s Reef that is currently traveling the world bringing awareness to the plight of our oceans. Project participants report changing their behavior by lessening use of plastic and adopting new recycling practices. Project participants also forge new friendships and alliances that continue long after the project is completed. Public art is a vehicle for community engagement that inspires and changes lives.3
Public Art: Investment and Return

In the face of the new economy we must ask: can we still afford to fund public art? Does it provide a good investment and return? In recent years, numerous communities have made significant investments in arts and culture in order to remain vital and dynamic. Public Art Review editor Jack Becker believes: “An average public art project provides 50 times the economic impact of art events in traditional venues, yet the cost to the public for public art is less than 50 cents per taxpayer per year.” It also generates “ten times the media attention that other art forms receive.”

Public art also generates jobs and visibility for Arizona workers and firms. A survey of 32 recent Phoenix public art projects revealed they supported 1,200 jobs, 1,133 of them in Arizona. The Janet Echelman sculpture *Her Secret is Patience*, at Phoenix’s new Downtown Civic Space Park, alone involved nearly 150 workers. As with many other public art projects, they covered the gamut of engineering, construction, and fabrication trades.

The appeal of the art projects, said Kyle Peyton of CAID Industries, a large-scale Tucson metal fabricator which oversaw construction of the Echelman sculpture and fabricated the stainless steel metal cladding for Scottsdale’s Paolo Soleri bridge, is that their uniqueness requires engineers and fabricators to raise their own creative bars, solving problems as exceptional as the artworks. Peyton stressed that iconic public art projects also raise the visibility and business prospects of Arizona firms. CAID’s involvement in public art here has led directly to the development of public art projects nationally and overseas.

Dynamic Time Based Artworks

Projects like the *Chicago Cows* (1999) and Christo’s *Gates* (2005) drew international acclaim and attracted visitors from across the world. Such destination attraction projects inspire residents and tourists to engage and explore their environment.

**Chicago Cows**: The Chicago Office of Tourism estimates that the *Cows* generated an additional $100 to $200 million in revenue for area hoteliers, retailers, and restaurants. The project also raised an estimated $20 million for charities including Save the Children and the Special Olympics. No taxpayer dollars were used to support this project.

**Christo’s Gates**: In just sixteen days, according to the office of New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg, Christo’s *Gates* drew 4 million visitors and generated $254 million in tourist and related spending. Cultural and arts based festivals like Toronto’s *Nuit Blanche* are huge revenue generators. During its first year (2006), the festival attracted 425,000 visitors and provided an economic impact of $1 million. In 2009, festival attendance grew to $1 million with an economic impact of $18 million.

**WaterFire, Providence, Rhode Island**: In 1994, artist Barnaby Evans was commissioned to create a one-time art installation to enliven the waterfront in Providence. The project proved so successful that it has become an annual, seasonal event drawing residents and visitors from across the world. Annually, *WaterFire* attracts more than 1 million visitors.
and provides an estimated $45 million economic impact. *WaterFire* is a dynamic installation full of ceremony and drama. Huge braziers set up along the waterfront are lit Olympic style by runners (community volunteers) accompanied by a rousing original musical score. Fires are tended by more volunteers in gondolas. The night is ablaze with sparks that whirl through the air. *WaterFire* invites viewers to slow down and breathe, as it engages them through sight, sound, smell, and touch. The experience transforms the urban environment and the visitor’s perception of it.\(^6\)

**Gathering Places**

**Millennium Park**: In 2004, Chicago redefined itself by commissioning ambitious, signature architecture and art. Through such efforts Millennium Park was born. The 24.5-acre park is the result of a unique partnership between the City of Chicago and a broad philanthropic community. The park has attracted millions of people since its opening, making it one of Chicago’s most popular must-see destinations. During its first year more than 2.5 million visited with an estimated economic impact $1.5 billion. In addition to the architecture of Frank Gehry, who designed the Jay Pritzker Pavilion, the park’s public art is a huge draw, featuring the interactive *Crown Fountain* by Jaume Plensa and the crowd pleasing *Cloud Gate* by Anish Kapoor (the piece is popularly known as *“The Bean”*).\(^7\)

**Destination Attractions**

**Olympic Sculpture Park**: The blighted site of a former fuel storage and distribution facility that leached contaminated ground water into the Puget Sound has been transformed into a nine-acre, dynamic sculpture garden with unparalleled views of the Seattle waterfront and the Olympic Mountains. The collection includes work by some of the most important sculptors of our time: Louise Bourgeois, Claes Oldenberg, Richard Serra, Louise Nevelson, George Rickey, Tony Smith, and Beverly Pepper. During its two weeks in the dead of winter in January 2007, more than 90,000 visited the park. The project serves as a new, ambitious model for contemporary urban development.\(^8\)

**Questions to Consider**

- As the 21st century emerges what art and cultural accomplishments will define Arizona?
- What will our cultural legacy be?
- Can we find a new model and funding mechanism to sustain investment in public art?
Edward Lebow has directed the Phoenix Public Art Program since 2005. Before joining the city’s Office of Cultural Affairs, he was an award-winning journalist, covering government, politics, art, and design for a range of publications. As an investigative reporter for *Phoenix New Times*, he was awarded the 2001 John Kolbe Politics and Government Reporting Award by the Arizona Press Club and a 2000 first-place Unity Award by Lincoln University for political series writing. In 2004, as a reporter with the *Daily Press*, in Newport News, Virginia, he was among a team of reporters given a first place “features series award” by the Virginia Press Association for “No Easy Journey: 50 Years After Brown V. Board of Education,” examining the impact that the Supreme Court’s landmark decision had on Hampton Roads schools and communities. He recently contributed to the catalogue accompanying the national traveling exhibition, *A Chosen Path: The Ceramic Art of Karen Karnes*, which opened at the Arizona State University Museum of Art Ceramics Research Center in September 2010. Also in 2010, Lebow was elected to the Council of the Public Art Network (PAN is part of Americans for the Arts).

Valerie Vadala Homer serves as Director of the Scottsdale Public Art Program and is responsible for the administration and supervision of the city’s Public Art Program and fine art collection. She served as the Interim Director of the Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art in 2001. Vadala Homer has worked for the Cultural Council since 1989, where prior to joining the visual arts staff, she served as the Assistant Development Director. Before joining the Cultural Council, Vadala Homer was a Faculty Associate in the English Department at Arizona State University where she taught writing. Her other work experience includes serving as a Technical Systems Administrator for America West Airlines; and management of a number of special educational projects for the Arizona State Department of Education based at Arizona State University, Phoenix College, and Phoenix Union High School. In 1995, Vadala Homer, along with artists Debra Hopkins and Mayme Kratz, was selected to create a permanent public artwork for Phoenix’s Juniper Library. Titled *An Open Book*, in 1996, the project won a Valley Forward Merit Award for public art. Vadala Homer has authored several catalogs and essays including: *The Story of Love: The Life and Work of Robert Indiana* and *Path to the Innocent Eye: The Skyspaces of James Turrell*. Vadala Homer has also published numerous essays and poetry. She holds a B.A. in Political Science from Carroll College, in Helena, Montana, and a M.A. from Arizona State University in English Literature and an M.F.A. in Poetry. Vadala Homer lives with her husband and son in Scottsdale.

---

3 For more information on this project, see the website: http://crochetcoralreef.org/.
6 See Waterfire website: http://www.waterfire.org/.
7 See Millennium Park Website: http://www.millenniumpark.org/.
8 For more on the Olympic Sculpture Park, which is part of the Seattle Art Museum, see http://www.seattleartmuseum.org/visit/osp/.
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Planes, Trains, and Public Art in the Valley of the Sun

Lennée Eller
Program Manager, Phoenix Airport Art Museum

M.B. Finnerty
Public Art Administrator, Metro Light Rail, Phoenix

Key Points

- Phoenix has one of the largest airport art museums in the nation
- For many visitors to Arizona, the airport art program creates a positive first impression of the state
- The airport’s exhibitions and collections promote Arizona’s unique artistic and cultural heritage
- The prominence of public art at the airport conveys a sense of place and generates community pride
- Public transit as a staple of urban renewal gained momentum at the same time as public art programs were established
- METRO Light Rail opened in 2008 and has art in all twenty-eight stations
- In enhancing urban areas, public art has contributed to an improved quality of life and livable, sustainable cities

Phoenix’s “Artport” Museum: Artful Oasis in the Traveler’s Desert

More than forty million passengers travel annually through Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport, and first impressions of Arizona begin as soon as a visitor enters the terminal. The Phoenix airport relies on displayed artwork to fulfill a variety of purposes, meet goals, and even fulfill functions. One of the goals is to create a sense of place in our homogenized world that gives travelers, who may only be passing through, a real taste of Arizona. Travel author Pico Iyer succinctly says, “Airports say a lot about a place because they are both a city’s business card and its handshake: they tell us what a community yearns to be as well as what it really is.”1 Airports are now part of the global community, making them a destination as well as a layover.

In the chaotic baggage claim area of Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport, a little girl tightrope-walks on silver lines in the elegant inlay on the terrazzo floor. Under the watchful eyes of her parents, she spins on circles of blue and green and hop-scotches along the botanical designs. One parent watches for luggage while the other engages the child in searching for the silver butterflies and beetles set in the terrazzo around the carousel.2 A frequent-flyer businessman, rolling his single carry-on bag, lingers in front of a display case filled with colorful and funky Arizona landscapes. Whipping out his Blackberry, he Googles
the artist’s name, dials a number, makes contact, arranges to purchase the piece when the show comes down, and trundles off to his gate. A harried mother hushes a cranky baby by pointing out the exquisite colors and fascinating shapes of Arizona “creepy crawlers” and asks the toddler to count the centipede’s legs to see if there are really one hundred of them. Writing in the gallery comment book, a visitor from Aupan, Spain notes, “I like the idea of allowing Arizona artists to showcase their work here at the Airport. It also made my waiting time less boring and tedious and much more interesting.”

Is there any public-transportation facility utilized as often or by as many people as a major airport? And no facility is more obligated to provide space that soothes jangled nerves, fosters a sense of community, and welcomes travelers with a culturally rich aesthetic. The City of Phoenix Aviation Department’s Airport Museum has acknowledged this obligation and risen to the challenge to create what has become a point of pride for Arizona.

One of the largest airport art museums in the United States is located in the heart of Phoenix. The Phoenix Airport Museum is not your garden-variety facility since its exhibitions are mounted in six buildings at three airports: Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport (Terminals 2, 3, and 4, and the Rental Car Center), Phoenix Deer Valley Airport, and Phoenix Goodyear Airport. The museum includes a growing art collection of more than 550 works; it exhibits in twenty-five spaces and maintains the Phoenix Aviation Archive, as well. The Archive collects, preserves, interprets, and shares artifacts, documents, and memorabilia pertaining to the Phoenix airport communities to increase public awareness of important achievements in Phoenix aviation history, and items from the archive are often used for aviation history exhibitions. The City of Phoenix Aviation Department sponsors the museum and supports its mission of creating memorable environments that display Arizona’s unique artistic and cultural heritage. The museum always strives to educate airport visitors about the artwork and objects on display, introduce Arizona artists, and promote the many galleries and museums in the region.

**Collections**

Art collecting in the Phoenix airport system began in the early 1960s with the construction of Terminal 2. The 16’ x 75’ Paul Coze mural, *The Phoenix*, was selected by public vote and has become a City of Phoenix icon. Throughout the years, artworks were added through corporate donation until 1986, when the Phoenix Arts Commission and the Percent for Art ordinance were established. A year later the Aviation Department hired a curator to conserve and evaluate the airport’s collection of twenty-eight major works and to plan for the addition of future public art. The largest structural capital improvement project to date—Terminal 4—opened three years later, and the determination was made that public art was required to create a sense of place and a point of pride in the community. Working together, the Phoenix Art Commission and the Aviation Department selected sixteen artists and commissioned over $2 million in artwork for the opening of the new terminal.

Today that entity, now known as the Phoenix Office of Cultural Affairs (POCA), continues to work in collaboration with the Phoenix Airport Museum to commission and purchase artwork for the collection, using one percent of construction monies or capital improvement funds. The selection and acquisition of this artwork is managed by POCA. Museum staff
is responsible for managing, maintaining, and exhibiting the collection, and overseeing the safe transport and storage of artwork. Today, the collection includes a wide variety of items—large murals and sculptures, integrated architectural work, and studio works, both two and three-dimensional.

The Airport’s collection has a strong focus on contemporary Arizona ceramics that include both functional and sculptural pieces in a wide variety of styles—realist, naturalist, expressionist, surrealistic, and non-objective with Japanese, European, Latin American, Native American, satiric, comedic, and primitive-folk influences. The medium of ceramics was a natural focus for the airport collection for two reasons: first, its relevance to the region and second, its durability. The Southwest has one of the oldest, most complex, and continuous ceramic traditions in the United States. Because of widespread acquaintance with and appreciation of Native American ceramics, southwesterners are especially receptive to contemporary ceramics. Arizona’s three universities are recognized as important national ceramic centers, and its museums and art institutions hold large collections of historical and contemporary work in this medium. Artwork on constant public view is subject to negative environmental conditions: ultraviolet light, temperature and humidity changes, dust, and dirt. Most of the ceramics in the museum collection tolerate these conservation concerns and require very little maintenance.

For years artists themselves have been an integral part of the continuous renovation and construction projects at the airport. Artists, architects, and arts administrators all work together to bring projects to a cohesive conclusion. Currently seven artists are working to enhance the new PHX SkyTrain under construction by designing functional aspects of the 44th Street Station, the East Economy Station, and the Terminal 4 platform and connecting bridges. Artists are using their talents to ornament flooring, wall surfaces, and ceilings in order to create an overall aesthetic that engages travelers.

**Exhibitions**

In July 1988, a very small exhibition in Terminal 3 was the precursor for what today is one of the largest airport exhibition programs in the nation. That unlikely first exhibition of tooth-themed artwork and artifact, *Dental Impressions*, sprang from a request to show student artwork promoting dental sealants. The exhibition included contemporary sculpture from local artists, a dental chair from the Arizona Historical Museum, obsolete dental tools from private collectors, and dental history and trivia—and was extremely well received by airport travelers. Over the years, the numbers of exhibition and exhibit spaces at the airport have grown enormously, but exhibitions continue the tradition of being curated to appeal to a broad audience and focusing on Arizona’s unique artistic and cultural heritage.

The Airport Museum staff collaborates with artists, collectors, and museums to display existing exhibitions or to create new ones. The exhibits may also consist solely or in part of portable artwork from the airport’s own collection. In addition to artwork, exhibition themes may include aviation history or natural-history. Sometimes the “art” may be jewel-like miniature engines, bizarre and beautiful bugs, or elaborate operatic costumes.
Most of the thematically curated exhibitions are on display for up to six months. There are no permanent displays since temporary exhibits keep the frequent traveler engaged. Exhibit cases are spread throughout the terminals in areas with the most public access. The Airport Museum curators make a concerted effort to have all exhibits reflect Arizona’s cultural community, be eclectic in style and medium, and present diverse subject matter. The airport program is dedicated to providing opportunities to all Arizona artists through open competition, and museums statewide are regularly offered an opportunity to enhance programming and self-promotion by exhibiting their collections at the airport.

The Arts-in-Airport movement has blossomed over the last twenty years in that most major airport hubs and even mid-size destination airports now have strong programs and enjoy community support and enhanced public awareness. The American Association of Airport Executives (AAAE) sponsors an annual Arts in Airport Workshop to continue development in this unique and exciting field. Airport directors now understand that airport terminals are not merely functional spaces for processing passengers, but also that members of the flying public have become savvy air travelers with high expectations for attractive, as well as functional facilities, and excelling services.

The Phoenix Airport Museum has been progressive in its approach to art in the airport in both its Public Art collection and in exhibition programming. It is a compliment and distinction that the Museum program has been the prototype used by administrators from more than fifty airports in the United States as they have established art programming, set policy, maintained collections, designed and constructed exhibit spaces, and developed a mission statement for their own facilities. Growing the arts at the Phoenix Airport Museum remains a priority for the airport administration and the museum staff—continuing to demonstrate pride in Arizona’s beauty, culture, and artists.

**Light Rail as a Work of Art**

In October 2008, just months before the official opening of the Central Phoenix/East Valley Light Rail Extension, METRO hosted a celebration of the light rail’s public art program. The event acknowledged the hundreds of volunteers, contractors, staff, designers, and artists who had worked on one of Arizona’s largest public art projects. Significantly, despite the various battles fought along the way for the light rail itself, the art program was mainly seen as the latest in a rich tradition of valley-wide urban design.

Four years earlier, Maricopa County residents were still debating if public transit would really move forward. Proposition 400 was a contentious bill for a twenty-year extension of a half-cent sales tax to support freeways, buses, and light rail, as well as pedestrian routes and bikeways. Funding for the Central Phoenix/East Valley line was assured, but the future of light rail hung in the balance. Perhaps the loudest anti-rail argument was that the Valley of the Sun was a car culture. The suburban and desert sprawl between communities, between work and home, shopping and business was too great, the desert climate too extreme. People would never give up the convenience of their air-conditioned automobiles.
Six years later, light rail’s success, measured by ridership figures far in excess of expectations, came as a surprise to many people. To others, the system’s success, measured not only in ridership, but also in a renewed vitality experienced throughout the area, was just a continuation of an urban design movement. This included public art and transit, which had been around for a long time and was finally coming into its own.

Smart urban design, with its goals of creating livable, sustainable cities, is hardly a new concept to the area. The light rail, in its earliest incarnation—the trolley—was actually introduced in Phoenix as early as 1893. The trolley brought transit to the burgeoning valley, and it also spurred development around the new alignment, defining the downtown corridor as well as eventually connecting different areas of the future city.

Like other systems nation-wide, public transit fell victim to the popularity of the automobile. Urban areas gave way to suburban sprawl and highways became the norm.

In the late 1970’s, despite the growth of the automobile and the decline in American public transportation, there was resurgence in transit investment. In 1981, the first American light rail system made its debut in San Diego. Dozens of new systems soon followed throughout the country.

At the same time that transit was becoming a staple of urban renewal, public art, another component of urban design, was also gaining momentum. Publicly funded art as part of the infrastructure led to the redesign and beautification of public areas: city plazas, parks, streets, buildings, civic spaces, and all modes of public transportation.

The federal government has, to varying degrees, been supportive of this movement, particularly in light rail. In its 1988 Urban Mass Transit Act, they encouraged artists to be involved in the design, without officially funding any art. In Portland, Oregon, the Tri-Met system included artists as “designers,” but it wasn’t until after 1995, when Federal Transit Administration (FTA) policy promoted public artwork as an integral part of transit projects, that artists were able to design and create “art.”

In line with the national trend, Phoenix and its surrounding cities, Tempe, Mesa, and Glendale (partner cities for the original light rail alignment), were adopting percent for art ordinances and resolutions. These created a steady funding source for public art from all new capital improvement projects, and public art became integral to revitalizing the city core, getting people out of their cars and into communal areas. Transit and public art were regularly paired together—successful examples include the Sunnyslope Canal Demonstration Project, the Papago Salado Loop, and the Marina Water Muse. Countless numbers of enhanced bus stops, trails, freeway bridges—all aimed at bringing a human scale back to the community and mitigating, the sterile, hot, inhuman environment of the ever-multiplying lanes of roadway. When the light rail capital improvement project was introduced, with its $1.4 billion budget for the Central Phoenix/East Valley extension, the cities’ percent for art programs were ready.
Furthermore, the sensible approach of including the artists in at the beginning of the project was also embraced. METRO hired an art consultant initially to draft an art program plan and then hired Tad Savinar, a veteran of dozens of light rail projects, and a planning and transit enthusiast as well, to help implement it. Savinar worked with Betsy Moll, the architectural manager, to form a citizens’ commission which would create a set of priorities to guide the station architecture as well as the art program. These Urban Design Guidelines were constantly referred to throughout the process; they were the communities’ wish list. The cities also agreed on one public art manager to administer the entire regional project.

In addition, the Regional Rail Arts Committee (RRAC), made up of community artists and arts professionals, was created to oversee the program. Not only did they monitor it, but they were involved from start to finish in the aesthetic product. They served as critics, sounding boards, and as the last wall of defense against any threats to the principles of the program. The RRAC’s effort was truly laudable, and its members endured multiple meetings lasting for hours.

Five Design Team Artists, selected by the RRAC, teamed with the five architectural firms in a competition to create the station designs. The goal was to provide shelter from the extreme desert climate, a safe refuge to await the train, and a design adaptable to different neighborhoods and locales—the first three principles demanded by the Urban Design Guidelines. A sixth Design Team Artist was paired with the Tempe Town Lake Bridge engineer.

When the station artists came on board, they also worked with the stakeholders and the RRAC to gain an understanding of the neighborhood character at each station. The artists all worked within the context of their station, but the approach to each work was unique. With twenty-eight stations, the diversity of artwork is truly astounding.

Some artists created work that spoke to the history of the area, including Mary Lucking’s Indian School station, Steve Farley’s Central/Washington—1st/Jefferson station, and Victor Zaballa’s 12th Street stations. These artists researched the area, conducting interviews and delving into public and personal archives to find photographs, maps, and stories that could highlight the people and events of each community.

Artworks that related to the institutions and landmarks around them, included Michael Maglich’s piece which is a dialogue between the Phoenix Art Museum, the Burton Barr Central Library, and the historic neighborhoods that flank the McDowell station. Jamex and Einar de la Torre’s multi-cultural Pre-Columbian and Southwest Native American imagery are reflections of exhibits found in the Heard Museum.

At the 38th Street station, Michael Machnic and Stuart Keeler created a solar calendar with an aerospace industry aesthetic reflecting the nearby expanding airport and the student programs of Gateway Community College to the north. Students at Central High School, across from the Central and Campbell station inspired Al Price, a former high school math teacher, to create a hyperbolic parabola sculpture based on the geometry of the stations’ tensile shade canopies. In Tempe, Bill Will and Norie Sato’s station at Rural and University celebrates the amazing size and diversity of collections found on the Arizona State University campus while reflecting the institution’s spirit of wonder and learning.
Some of the artworks are massive in scale, challenging the tiny size of the station platform. Ilan Averbuch, the line section two design team artist, selected the Central and Camelback station’s small triangular plaza to place his eighteen-foot-tall granite ring transected by marching vertical steel figures. And Suikang Zhao’s twenty-one-foot high bronze hands defy all logic for a narrow entryway at Dorsey and Apache. Passengers marvel at the sheer size every time they walk beneath the fingertip arch to reach the platform.

The artist teams brought in color and light, detail and wonder to each of the twenty-eight stations. Despite initial attempts at a cohesive theme connecting works in each line section, the real unity of the alignment is the architectural kit of parts that allows the artwork to be unique at each station and to address the riders in different ways.

The distinctive artwork at each station is as important as the overall identity of the station architecture. The artwork signals a level of care and personalization—that the passengers are important, that the neighborhoods are important, that the living and working environments are important. If the stations were merely utilitarian, badly designed, or just plain uninteresting, there would still be riders on the train—light rail is now integral to how people get around in the cities—but would it be as popular as it is? Would it be spoken of with such pride and affection? Would there be blogs about it and tours of it and bands playing music on it? Like the public art enhancing the urban areas around the tracks, the light rail public art program is just one more element directed at improving the quality of life.

The artwork on the Central Phoenix/East Valley alignment has been recognized by the Americans for the Arts Year in Review. The bridge has won several awards, and the Federal Transit Administration has cited METRO as a model of successful light rail art programs.¹⁰

One of the positive developments regarding the light rail’s art program was that there was no substantial struggle to have it included. No epic battles raged about the fundamental necessity of art as part of a civic space. It wasn’t that public art program didn’t have its detractors. There will always be those complaining that art money could be better spent on “practical” matters and wondering why their tax dollars support art they don’t like. Those voices were always there, but there were overwhelming forces supporting the art—strong leadership from the design and management teams, and strong agreement from METRO’s partner cities and the understanding of stakeholders that public art is part of a vital city.

The Valley of the Sun has traditionally been defined as a place whose population loves the open road. People who moved West did so for the freedom that comes from car culture. But as urban design replaces urban sprawl, we increasingly redefine our priorities in terms of livable and sustainable communities. We can look back to a not so distant past when transit was an integral part of community building. The trolley and bus system, the recreational use of the canal system, and all of our parks and pathways show that accessible, human scaled places were important to us then and are important to us again. Public art has been embraced in the valley, reflecting our richly varied history, but it also has taken a leadership role in creating a livable environment. Art on the light rail is the latest example of a strong and vibrant tradition of creating livable, identifiable, spaces that reflect our culture and values while exploring our future.
Lennée Eller is Program Manager at the Phoenix Airport Art Museum. Eller established and has managed the Phoenix Airports Museum Program since 1987. She was hired to conserve and evaluate the airport’s collection of 28 major works and to plan for the addition of public art in conjunction the Phoenix Office of Cultural Affairs, Percent for Art Program. In 1989, she established changing exhibitions at Sky Harbor, showcasing museums, galleries, and local artists. Obtaining a B.F.A. degree in 1979 from Arizona State University (ASU), she interned at ASU Art Museum, and took classes in museology. From 1984 to 1986, she was Executive Director of the non-profit organization, Movimiento Del Rio Salado (MARS) Art Space in downtown Phoenix. Active in the museum community, Lennée is a member of the Central Arizona Museum Association (CAMA); the Museum Association of Arizona (MAA), the Western Museums Association (WMA), the American Association of Museums (AAM), the National Association for Museum Exhibitors (NAME), and the Americans for the Arts (AFTA). She has been a member of ArtTable since 2004, a national, invitation-only organization for professional women in leadership positions in the visual arts. Lennée is a visual artist and exhibits her artwork in the Phoenix area. Her artwork, sculpture, screen prints, drawings, and paintings, are in private and municipal collections, both national and international.

M.B. Finnerty was raised in Phoenix, received her B.A. in art history from the University of Arizona and her M.A. in art history from the University of Texas, at Austin. She worked in the City of Mesa’s arts division and public art department shortly before joining METRO as their public art administrator. She is a member of the Americans for the Arts (AFTA) and currently serves as vice-chair of the City of Glendale Arts Commission.

2 Artist Teresa Villegas, terrazzo floor design completed in 2010, Public Art project managed through the Phoenix Office of Cultural Affairs
3 Temporary Exhibition: Driven to Paint: Arizona Landscapes by Mark Zillman, April 24-October 17, 2010, Terminal 2 Security Check Point area
4 Exhibition: Arizona Bizarre and Beautiful Bugs, from the permanent Collection, exhibits throughout various locations in the terminals.
5 For more information on the airport art program, see their website: http://skyharbor.com/community/artMuseum.html. The Tucson International Airport Arts and Culture Program oversees a permanent collection, sponsors changing exhibitions, as well as “Live at the TIA”!, a performing arts program.
6 Smaller than that at Sky Harbor, Tucson’s does not have a public art program.
7 See, Metro Public Art: http://www.valleymetro.org/metro_light_rail/metro_public_art/. There is information on the art works at all 28 stations. For planned extensions, see: http://www.valleymetro.org/metro_light_rail/future_extensions/mesa/.
10 See also, “Light Rail,” Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Light_rail. There is a Light Rail Transit Association: http://www.lrta.org/. Other cities with ambitious light rail/art programs that served as models for Valley Metro include Portland (Oregon), Seattle, Salt Lake City, Minneapolis, Los Angeles, San Diego, Denver, and New York City.
Play On:
The Performing Arts

Cathy Weiss
Executive Director, Del E. Webb Center for the Performing Arts, Wickenburg

Key Points

- Competition for the leisure dollar between fine and mainstream arts is fierce
- Live Nation concerts can give the public unrealistic expectations for their local performing arts center
- Subscription sales nationwide (including Arizona) have stalled
- A typical American receives 3,000-5,000 marketing messages a day
- There is no safety net for presenting new, young, culturally significant performances
- Technology has changed our entire society, and resulting in a realignment of cultural expression and communication
- The economic downturn has forced presenting organizations in Arizona to make significant cutbacks in staffing and expenses

Definitions

Performing Arts:
What is presented in front of an audience at an event. Traditional forms of the performing arts include music, dance, and theatre, referred to as the “fine” arts.

Fine Arts:
Art created for purely aesthetic expression, communication, or contemplation, something requiring highly developed technical skills.

Presenter:
Performing arts presenters are individuals/organizations that work to facilitate exchanges between artists and audiences through creative, educational, and performance opportunities. The job of an Arts Presenter is to bring audiences and artists together.

Mainstream Arts:
Art for the masses. Motion pictures, broadcasting, cable, rock and pop concerts are considered mainstream arts.

Promoter:
Tour promoters (also known as concert promoters or talent buyers) are the individuals or companies responsible for organizing a live concert tour or special event performance. Promoters typically work with mainstream artists.
The Performing Arts Presenter

The organizations that present performing arts are either for-profit or non-profit. There are two different approaches in presenting; one is commercial in nature and the other is curatorial. The commercial approach is more public-centric and economically driven, while the curatorial approach tends to emphasize content, artistic quality, and an artist’s career trajectory regardless of broad appeal. The curatorial approach tends to foster long-term relationships with the audience and the artists.

Generally there are four different types of presenters in the United States:

- Independent arts centers and spaces
- University presenters
- Community-based organizations
- Festivals and event-specific presenters

There are many kinds of presenters; from small volunteer-run groups, to mid-sized organizations, to multi-million dollar institutions. No matter the size, venue, or genre, all presenting organizations share the intention of making their community a culturally richer place to live with diverse arts experiences and opportunities.

Three examples of all-volunteer organizations in the state of Arizona include:

- The Fountain Hills In-Home Concert Series, presenting professional jazz and classical music in private homes for fifteen years.
- Arizona Friends of Chamber Music in Tucson, offering an evening series featuring chamber music ensembles for the past sixty years. In 1994 they created the week long Tucson Winter Chamber Music Festival held each March. In 1995 they added the Piano and Friends series.
- In Wickenburg, the Friends of Music, presenting live music concerts free to the public for over sixty years.

Mid-sized organizations (based on budget or venue capacity) across the state include:

- The Queen Creek Performing Arts Center presents family and community performances.
- The Musical Instrument Museum (MIM) Music Theatre in Phoenix, focuses on traditional, contemporary, instrumental, and vocal music from around the world.
- The Del E. Webb Center for the Performing Arts in Wickenburg presents professional touring artists in a wide array of genres, and in 2009 added a live/workspace for artists, “The Flying E Ranch Residency Project.”
Large presenting organizations in Arizona include:

- The Scottsdale Center for the Arts under the auspices of the Scottsdale Cultural Council.
- In Tucson, the University of Arizona, UA Presents, presents world-class music, dance, and theatre in Southern Arizona.
- In Tempe, Arizona State University ASU Gammage serves as the home theatre for the Broadway Across America and is among the largest university-based presenters of performing arts in the world.

The Promoter

Live Nation Entertainment is the largest promoter worldwide. In 2009, Live Nation sold 140 million tickets, promoted 21,000 concerts, and partnered with 850 sponsors.¹ Their business is promoting “mainstream” artists for profit. Today’s mainstream artists include; Lady Gaga, Rascal Flatts, and Justin Bieber, to name a very few.

Live Nation makes its money on ancillary revenues—ticket fees, concessions, parking, merchandise, premium seating, and the like. Ticket prices are known to exceed $100, and up to $1,000 for VIP seating.

Venues used in Arizona include the U.S. Airways Arena, Orpheum Theatre, Jobing.com Arena, Tucson Arena, Cricket Wireless Pavilion, and smaller venues including the Rhythm Room.

Presenter vs. Promoter

Each performing art form has a purpose and bears further explanation since the competition between fine and mainstream arts are both vying for the same audience and leisure dollar. Performing arts presenters cannot compete on any level with promoters such as Live Nation. However, the general public has no understanding of the difference between a presenter and a promoter; nor should they. Yet Live Nation concerts shape our culture, and leave the public with unrealistic expectations for their local performing arts center. It is safe to say that each day in an art presenters’ career, a community member will state, “You should get Bon Jovi!”

Participation Facts

In 2009 the National Endowment for the Arts published a survey of “Public Participation in the Arts” and compared results from 2002 to 2008.²
In 2008, there were more attendees of musical plays—83 million—higher than any other type of performing arts genre studied. Attendances for musical plays saw little change from 2002 to 2008, which was also true for the number of attendances at “other dance” performances.

Attendance at all other types of performing arts events studied in both 2002 and 2008 had large declines in 2008, as illustrated in Table 19.1. Attendance decreased by anywhere from 15-26% for jazz, classical music concerts, non-musical plays, and ballet. On a percentage basis, opera saw the largest decline in attendance from 2002 to 2008 at 33.8%. Total attendance for Latin music performances—measured for the first time in 2008—was approximately 39 million.
The Series

To build audience participation, presenting organizations program a series of performing arts; multiple performances based around their mission. Whether it is six chamber music performances, five theatre productions, or twenty performances in multiple genres, a series is designed to attract the same audience members to several different performances. It is the old adage “one in the hand…”

Once a patron purchases a ticket for a performance, they have identified themselves as someone who has a propensity for the performing arts. It is much less expensive to market other performances to that individual with a higher rate of return than to a person with unknown interests. Presenting organizations offer discounts for returning patrons in the hope of building trust. Trusting the artistic choices of a presenting organization is paramount when building an audience relationship or patron loyalty.

Patron loyalty begets long term relationships. Audience members who purchase five, ten, or fifteen tickets to performances in a season—known as subscription sales—form the base of a presenter’s ticket sales.

Subscription sales at many venues in Arizona and across the nation have stalled. New gains seem to equal losses, but stalled none-the-less. Is there a loss of loyalty or has our world changed?

The Shift

Post 9/11, there was a collapse of social planning. Seemingly overnight audiences shifted from committing and purchasing tickets two to four weeks before a performance, to purchasing on the day of, or, twenty-four to forty-eight hours in advance of a show.

We are a populace characterized by over-scheduling and exhaustion. This is a time in which 42% of men and 55% of women say they are too tired to do the things they truly want to do. For them, the number one answer to the question of “most eagerly anticipated use of a free evening” is no longer dinner with friends or a movie or a performing arts event, but is instead “a good night’s sleep.”3

Single Ticket Sales

This shift pushed the single ticket buyer to the forefront. Individuals who purchase single tickets (tickets to one event) are expensive and difficult to reach for a presenter with a limited marketing budget.

Trying to attract the attention of potential ticket buyers, arts organizations now compete with between 3,000-5,000 different marketing messages a typical American sees every single day.4

In addition, the single ticket buyer can be fickle. With intentions of purchasing a ticket at the door, single ticket buyers can be easily swayed by a rough day at the office, an irritable child, or inconvenient weather.
Such a buying pattern and indecisiveness will undoubtedly affect programming. Without a strong subscription base, there is no safety net to present new, young, culturally significant performances. Programming has become more conservative.

**Technology and the Performing Arts**

Technology has changed our entire society. We can shop anytime day or night, Google is now a verb not a proper noun, and we can communicate with anyone in the world in an instant. It is reported that in 2007 computer games outsold movies and music recordings combined.

In a recent speech, Ben Cameron, Arts Program Director at the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation in New York, noted the struggle to understand more fully the impact of technology on the live performing arts:

In an age where young people especially access culture on demand through YouTube and iTunes any time they want it and for little or no apparent cost, what will it mean in the future when we ask a potential audience member to pay $100 for a symphony, opera or dance ticket, when that consumer has been accustomed to downloading on the internet for .99 a song or for free?

We are essentially in the midst of a realignment of cultural expression and communication.⁵

**Table 19.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent of Adults</th>
<th>Number of Adults (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classical Music</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Music</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Plays</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Musical Plays</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Credit: 2008 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts
Performances in venues are on set days and times. Attending an event usually requires some planning and cannot compete with “on demand.”

Yet people come to venues to see and be seen, and here is a social context involved. Season ticket patrons sit next to each other and build relationships. Meeting and making friends at an arts event constitutes the same social capital as that of a sporting event.

Electronic Media & the Arts

In 2008, about five percent of adults say they watch or listen to opera via recorded or broadcast media. For jazz and Latin music, the media participation rate is substantially higher—about fifteen percent of all adults, for each type of music—and for classical music it is eighteen percent.

Adult audiences for recorded or broadcast media in 2008 ranged from eleven million for opera to forty million for classical music, as illustrated in Table 19.2. The total audience participating through these media is more than double the number of Americans going to live performances.6

Building Bridges

If more than half of Americans participate in the recorded or broadcast media of fine performing arts than attend a live performance, then how can arts organizations widen their reach?

The Metropolitan Opera in New York did not stand by and watch their audience decline. They took action. On September 7, 2006, the headline in the Arts Section of the New York Times read: “The Multiplex as Opera House: Will They Serve Popcorn?” In an excerpt from that article Metropolitan Opera officials describe their broadcasting strategy.

The Metropolitan Opera announced yesterday that it would begin broadcasting live performances into movie theaters across the United States, Canada and Europe, rubbing shoulders with professional wrestling and rock concerts.

The broadcasts are part of a strategy by the Met’s new general manager, Peter Gelb, to widen the house’s appeal by branching out into new media. “I think what I’m doing is exactly what the Met engaged me to do, which is build bridges to a broader public,” Mr. Gelb said.

Five seasons later the Metropolitan Opera is reaching audiences worldwide with their broadcasts. They offer a new online subscription streaming service with more than 300 full length operas available on command. Sirius XM offers listeners three live performances from the Metropolitan stage each week.

The new Musical Instrument Museum Music Theatre in Phoenix was built with live streaming in mind. Other venues across the state are adding the feature.
Nothing replaces the exhilaration of a live performance but perhaps technology can open up more doors in the performing arts field.

**Collaboration and the Arizona Presenters Alliance**

Serving presenters is The Arizona Presenters Alliance (APA), a state wide professional service organization that is committed to communication, professional growth, development, leadership, and advocacy for the presentation of arts in Arizona. Through this organization and collaborative relationships, Arizona presenters work together to bring artists and artistic companies to their venues.

Several presenters partner to bring artists to Arizona that would normally be beyond their individual financial capacity. Block booking with several venues allows the artist to reduce their overhead travel expenses, thereby reducing the fees to the presenter. The end result is quality artists with reduced ticket prices for Arizona audiences.

**Human Capital and Fragile Infrastructure**

It is well known that the majority of fine performing artists are severely under-resourced. Time, space, and money are scarce. Small and large institutions struggle equally to give professional performances on limited budgets.

Rehearsal time for The Phoenix Symphony is precious. Typically when the symphony rehearses a new classical piece they must be performance ready in four rehearsals. Pops concerts garner only one rehearsal. Ib Anderson, the Artistic Director at Ballet Arizona, has committed his organization to presenting dance with live music. The dancers have two rehearsals with the live orchestra, one of which is the dress rehearsal.

Artists, technicians, and administrators are seldom paid a living wage; certainly not one commensurate with their experience or talent. Many work multiple jobs to support themselves and their families. Health Insurance and benefits are a luxury.

Many independent artists struggle to find an agent or manager to represent them. The agent fees are too high or their roster is already so full, they do not have time to properly represent another artist.

To adapt to the downturn in the economy, presenting organizations in Arizona and all over the country have made significant cutbacks in staffing and expenses. In a field that is generally comprised of financially conservative leaders, these cutbacks have left most organizations without depth. Staff numbers are small, each playing many roles and when one person leaves the organization or becomes ill, there is no understudy or back-up staff member. The importance of human capital must not be overlooked.

Technical Directors, sound engineers, stagehands, fly operators, etc., are highly skilled individuals and a critical component to the live part of the performing arts. Without the
technical crew, even the most beautiful venue in the world is simply one large, dark, quiet space. Lacking appropriate financial resources, the performing arts industry has stretched its human resources as a means of best accomplishing their programming. The result is the public gets exceptionally high-quality presentations without any understanding of what that performance art actually costs. The infrastructures of these organizations are fragile at best.

**Arizona’s Artistic Community**

The performing arts community in Arizona remains dedicated. Promoters, presenters, and companies work diligently to create quality performances and events. Arts presenters take pride in providing fair compensation to performing artists and are held in high regard in the industry. Touring artists performing in the state are welcomed by Arizona hospitality and appreciative audiences. Local artists are revered for their talents; whether preserving our state heritage, entertaining audiences, or educating children. Artists find respect in Arizona, and more often than not—a standing ovation.

Cathy Weiss, Executive Director of the Del E. Webb Center for the Performing Arts in Wickenburg, leads a non-profit organization dedicated to presenting world class performing arts in a 600-seat, state-of-the-art theatre while providing free arts education experiences in classrooms, and through after school and extended residency programs for the 2,100 children in this rural area of Arizona. In addition, the Webb Center produces an arts summer camp for 120 children each June. The Webb Center provides a life long learning arts series for adults throughout the year. Cathy is also the curator for the Flying E Guest Ranch Project that provides a tranquil artist/live workspace for performing artistic companies from all over the world to create new work to add to their repertoire. Prior to joining the Webb Center team, Cathy enjoyed a 27-year career in the luxury hotel business. She is married to Rui Pereira, the General Manager of Rancho de los Caballeros who serves as a member of the Wickenburg Town Council.

---

1 Live Nation: http://www.livenation.com/h/about_us.html
2 nea.gov/research/2008-SPPA.pdf.
3 Ben Cameron, Arts Program Director, Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, “How Technology Is Transforming & Challenging The Live Performing Arts,” 15 September 2010:
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
6 nea.gov/research/2008-SPPA.pdf.
To Keep Them Coming:
Audience Development in an Age of Competing Attractions and Changing Community

Richard Toon
Director, Museum Studies Program, School of Human Evolution and Social Change, Arizona State University

Key Points

- Arts and cultural organizations face challenges maintaining current audiences and attracting new ones
- The number of “high culture” arts organizations has been growing while demand for them has not
- New technologies compete for people’s leisure time, while enabling greater access and interactive participation in culture
- With the Internet, the cultural supermarket has grown increasingly diverse, experimental, and sophisticated
- In addition to concerts, theatre, and museums, many also define cultural activity as sports, expos, and religious functions
- Changing demographics and the economic downturn suggest new strategies for attracting new audiences
- Public art relocates the sites of art and culture

This short chapter outlines key challenges facing arts and cultural organizations in Arizona. Some arise from the increasingly crowded marketplace of leisure time activities and others from changes in Arizona’s population and economy. But in these challenges lie opportunities, some of which are sketched here and some posed as questions for further discussion.

New Audiences for New Media

How can arts and cultural institutions maintain the followings they have and reach out and attract new audiences? That’s the question daunting anyone in the business of promoting the arts, particularly that sector that used to be thought of as “high culture”—museums, theatres, dance companies, opera companies, and symphony orchestras, among others. Nationally, the number of such arts organizations has been growing while demand for them has not.1 One of the main reasons for this, researchers have found, is increasingly crowded competition for people’s leisure time by new technologies—principally the Internet and downloadable, virtual content—and the new ways these technologies enable people to access and interactively participate in culture. The upshot is fewer and fewer people regularly go
out to experience “benchmark” art forms (jazz, classical music, opera, musical theatre, ballet, theatre, and the visual arts). Bad news for bricks-and-mortar venues, but not necessarily a blow to the art forms themselves, since people are enjoying them in different ways.

What may appear the greatest challenge to culture consumption offers methods for addressing the slump in attendance. Increasingly, people don’t watch TV when it’s broadcast but rather click on online sites such as Hulu to see shows when they want. Not only that, Hulu and other providers offer videos depicting backstage life and interviews with writers and producers about how shows are made. The “extras” and “special features” we’ve come to enjoy on DVDs and websites are clues to what people increasingly desire, which isn’t less culture but a more intimate relationship to it. These are people, after all, savvy about making their own videos and posting them on Facebook, YouTube, and Vimeo. The line between the amateur and professional artist grows blurrier all the time, and although sometimes the outcome produces a “dumbing down” of what people consume, more often—because people can select what they want to see on the Internet—the cultural supermarket is growing increasingly diverse, experimental, and sophisticated. The cultural mall rat, too, grows increasingly knowing, exposed, and culturally omnivorous across old high and popular cultural boundaries.

**How Arizonans Spend Their Time**

In addition to all this, Arizona arts organizations are up against their own set of challenges. In 2008, the Morrison Institute for Public Policy conducted a survey to determine how people in the state spend their time, including engaged with art and culture, and the participants, drawn from a representative sample, were allowed to determine what they meant by these concepts. Of the 651 Arizonans questioned, 45% said they regularly attended at least one type of cultural event, but one of the survey’s intriguing findings is the list of cultural activities included professional or college sports, expos and conventions, and religious functions. Fifty-five percent didn’t count themselves regular attendees of any arts and cultural events, which may be tough news for arts organizations at present, but a boon for anyone wishing to cultivate new audiences.

**Table 20.1: Arizona Attendance at Cultural Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regularly Attend</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
<th>Those who attend at least one event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerts</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre &amp; plays</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums &amp; Galleries</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional or college sports</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expos/conventions</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n All=651, At least one activity regularly=295

Source: Morrison Institute for Public Policy
Also promising, among those who regularly attend cultural activities, there was considerable overlap in the most popular kinds of venues they mentioned—that is, concerts, cultural festivals, museums and galleries, and theatre and plays. You can think of this as a “high culture” cluster, and in efforts to reach them arts organizations have considerable potential for collaboration, rather than to see themselves in competition with each other.

Table 20.2: Type of Cultural Event Attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of art &amp; culture event</th>
<th>Festivals</th>
<th>Theatre &amp; Plays</th>
<th>Museums &amp; galleries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerts(^3)</td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals</td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre &amp; plays</td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=189 Source: Morrison Institute for Public Policy

Who populates Arizona’s “high culture” cluster? No surprise here as elsewhere, they tend to be older, wealthier people with relatively higher levels of education. And they are geographically concentrated in Maricopa County (which includes Phoenix) and Tucson, suggesting there are fewer cultural venues outside the state’s metro areas as well as social and cultural barriers to participation within them. Again, the disappointing figures point to potential target audiences.

**Challenges of a Changing Arizona**

Which brings us to the most problematic factor in audience development in the state: changing demographics. While, for many years, Arizona’s population was rapidly growing, it has now ceased to, so population growth, at least in the near and possibly longer term, is no longer a reliable way to increase audiences. In addition, the state has one of the highest ratios in the country of retirees and children to people of earning age, and this may increase in the future, thus further reducing the “paying customer” pool. Add to this the fact that those who are older are predominantly white and relatively educated and those who are younger are predominantly Latino and, statistically at present, more likely to drop out of education before earning degrees. Even if minority education improves and graduation rates rise, the next generation isn’t necessarily attracted to the art forms that appeal to the older group. And while the number of arts venues in the state has increased considerably over the last few years, the question that must be asked is: Are we planning now to attract the audiences of tomorrow?

One more down side before we consider possible solutions: money.\(^4\) Arizona, with its “boom and bust” economy reliant on real estate growth and retail sales, will likely be one of the slowest to rebound from the economic downturn, meaning arts organizations, to avert more cutbacks and possible closures, urgently need innovative plans to preserve and develop audiences.
Strategies for Consideration

Here are some strategies to consider to reconfigure, scintillate, and build audiences.

- **Know your current audience.** Who uses your services and why? What are the tastes, values, and motivations that inspire interest and support? Are there distinctive types of audiences and audience subgroups? Until recently, for every five people who relocated to Arizona each year, three left, which made it difficult for any organization to know and communicate with its constituents. With the current, steady-state population, arts organizations can follow and really get to know who attends. This is the time to talk to audiences and gather feedback in focus groups and surveys. Learn what content visitors want and the forms in which they imagine it being delivered. How much do they want to interact with each other in the space and with the creators of the programs they come to see? What do art and music, for example, mean to them? What would their lives feel like without these experiences? How would they feel if their children didn’t learn forms of self-expression in school? What would happen to their emotional lives and the subjects they are moved to talk about if, suddenly, the arts were eliminated from their lives?

- To spur attendance, several Arizona museums, for example, are experimenting with alternatives to traditional memberships and offering “buy ahead at discount” packages. Others, including the new Musical Instrument Museum, are eliminating memberships altogether. Another alternative to subscriptions, which tie people to a season, is attaching discount coupons for future productions to the first, full-price ticket. We know audiences are more spontaneous in their choices than they used to be. That’s why the ShowUp.com, the web-based resource of the Alliance for Audience is such a successful local innovation. On ShowUp.com’s calendar, which provides timely information on theatres, museums, and outdoor venues in Greater Phoenix, Metro Tucson, Flagstaff, and Prescott areas, users can learn about performances and exhibitions, classes and workshops, venues and artists. The site also provides information about discount tickets and “last-minute” shows.

- **Know your potential audience.** Arts and cultural organizations often have a marketing budget to reach out to new audiences, but this rarely involves researching the barriers—real and perceived—that discourage involvement. Consistently and over many years, for example, the Phoenix Art Museum has presented exhibits with Latino and Hispanic themes, and yet according to audience surveys this doesn’t always register, particularly with Latinos themselves. Maybe that’s because potential audiences want or expect to experience Latino art represented in Latino venues or at least in institutions with broader cultural representation among its staff. Whatever the real answer, these kinds of issues need to be investigated or opportunities for inclusion and wider access will be lost.

- Competition for people’s attention notwithstanding, many still have plenty of time for doing as they please—as much as five hours a day, according to some estimates.
In order to inspire them to enter cultural institutions, we need to research more pointedly the reasons people shy away from them or attend them seldom. We need to understand their values and priorities to lure them across thresholds. It’s not so much “If you build it they will come,” but “If people see a place for themselves they will feel welcome.”

- **Let new media transform your environment and ways of interacting.** Most organizations use the Web, Facebook, and Twitter to communicate with audiences, but the institutions flourishing aren’t simply using new software to deliver messages formerly delivered by snail mailed newsletters or coverage in the local press. Instead, their websites usher users into truly interactive environments. Check out the Arizona Science Center’s website, for instance, an example that could work for performance spaces, too (http://www.azscience.org/). Virtual tours create the first, most striking impression about the actual spaces visitors find. Following the lead of virtual media’s “special features,” real cultural spaces need to part the velvet ropes and offer behind-the-scenes tours, sneak previews, dress rehearsals, involvement in exhibit development, performances of works-in-progress, etc. These elements foster connection and involvement.

- **Relocating art and culture.** Some of Arizona’s most resonant and captivating cultural products are its public art—work that isn’t framed in spaces set aside for the consumption of art such as museums, art galleries, and theatres. The nationally recognized City of Phoenix Public Art Program is a brilliant facilitator, installing art where people encounter the city’s infrastructure—in the canals, trails, freeway and pedestrian bridges, and recycling centers. Not without its controversies, this art reaches millions and thus engages unprecedented numbers in thinking about the place and role of art in our society. Beyond this, Arizona’s natural environment—the physical beauty of place, parks, and open spaces—are key drivers of residents’ sense of attachment to the state. Perhaps not surprisingly, the Morrison Institute survey found a significant correlation between regular cultural activities and regular outdoor activities, strongly suggesting the need to put art where the people are. More public art, more site specific installations, more concerts in the park, more engagement beyond traditional venues. Why not sculpture “gardens” set amid wildlife trails? Public gardens with interactive patchwork plots planted and maintained by volunteer/visitors?

- **Keeping a focus on education.** Kids who are taken to museums by family members are most likely to grow up to become museum visitors. This is the most salient indicator and therefore the core of audience development. Thus there is great value to getting family groups to attend and share emotional experiences in these places. Cultural involvement is a cultural practice, emphasis on practice. It’s something that has to be learned, and we cannot expect the schools to do it alone. According to the Rand Corporation’s 2008 report, *Revitalizing Arts Education Through Community-Wide Coordination*, what is required is: “… sustained leadership, supportive policy, and sufficient resources.” All of which are in short supply in Arizona. While arts education is treated more fully elsewhere in this report, its importance for long-term audience development can’t be overstated.
It has often been said you shouldn’t waste a crisis, and we are in one that won’t abate soon. Here are some questions for mining the opportunity:

- What do we need to know that we don’t already know about existing audiences for arts and culture in Arizona?
- Who are the potential new audiences for arts and culture? What do we need to know about them?
- How do arts and cultural organizations need to change in light of the competition, particularly from new media? How can they generate emotional experience and a sense of “inside knowledge” and connection?
- How do arts and cultural organizations need to change in light of our new economy and our new demographics?
- How are arts and cultural organizations planning for future audiences?
- What new venues, new outreach mechanisms, new niches are still to be developed?
- How can arts and culture be more available where people are?
- How do we ensure a healthy future for the audience building capacity of youth and family arts education?

Richard Toon is an Associate Research Professor at Arizona State University and Director of the Museum Studies Program in the School of Human Evolution and Social Change. He has a Ph.D. in Museum Studies from the University of Leicester, U.K., and an M.A. in Religious Studies and a B.A. in Philosophy and Religious Studies from the University of Leeds, U.K. His research interests include visitor studies, the philosophy and history of museums, and the public understanding of science. He is currently working on a book about the history of human display in museums. He was previously Associate Director for Research at the Morrison Institute for Public Policy at ASU where he developed and carried out a wide range of public policy research projects on issues of concern to Arizonans, including a series of reports on Arizona’s quality of life. Before that he was Director of Education and Research at the Arizona Science Center in Phoenix.
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3. To read this table: Row %, means, for example, that of regular concert goers 34% also regularly go to festivals; whereas for Column %, for example, of regular festival goers 44% also regularly go to concerts.

4. The latest information suggests that even in these hard times three out of four Arizonans give to charitable organizations. See, ASU Loadstar Center for Philanthropy and Nonprofit Management (2010), Arizona Giving and Volunteering 2010: Generosity and Involvement in Challenging Times, Phoenix, Arizona State University.

5. See *The Arizona We Want* (Phoenix: Center for the Future of Arizona, 2009).
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Key Points

- Arizona’s artist community is vibrant, though its infrastructure is weak
- Barriers faced by artists include affordable live/work spaces, health care, a mechanism for the circulation of ideas, cultural intolerance, and limited philanthropy
- Strengths include cultural diversity, community cultural development projects, and the professional-amateur movement
- Emergent art practices include public design, mix/mash-up aesthetics, contemporary traditionalists
- Effective cultural arts policies are an important part of the support system for artists

I dwell in Possibility—
A fairer House than Prose—
—Emily Dickinson

The key to the mystery of a great artist is that for reasons unknown, he will give away his energies and his life just to make sure that one note follows another... and leaves us with the feeling that something is right in the world.
—Leonard Bernstein

Like any artist without an art form, she became dangerous.
—Toni Morrison

To be an artist is to fail...as no other dare fail.
—Samuel Beckett

These quotes by artists illuminate an important qualities of an artist’s life: they take risks, they fail, they learn, they discover, they create, they bring into being beauty, thought, emotions—an engagement with our senses, our feelings of belonging. All of these actions and affects are the results of an artist’s contribution to our society.

To better understand how Arizona artists work, and how their art finds its audience, it is critical to look at the landscape of support for artists, which is the focus of this chapter. This is not an effort to describe how an artist thinks and creates, but rather is concerned with how an artist is supported in their creative explorations, whether it is through friends, family, the academy, the marketplace, heritage traditions, cultural worldviews, community, the land, philanthropy, or cultural policy.
A few years ago I worked with Eric Wallner on a research project that mapped the landscape of support for Arizona Artists for the Creative Capital Foundation (based in New York City) and the Arizona Commission on the Arts. This seminal work which focused on artists developing “new works” undertook an assessment that had not been done before and provide the Arizona Commission on the Arts, The Creative Capital Foundation, and many of our state’s local arts agencies and private foundations with knowledge about the distinctiveness and identity of the Arizona’s artist community—their needs, aspirations, and what could be done to support them.

The Creative Capital report provided an overview summary about Arizona’s cultural ecology. The artists who were interviewed for this report were ones whose explorations dealt with new forms and innovation in their disciplinary fields of practice, rather than interpretative artists (e.g. an opera singer, a Shakespearian actor, a classically trained musician). Yet these findings provide us with base-line knowledge about Arizona’s support system for artists.

Environmental Conditions:

- There is a strong spirit of support and generosity among artist communities
- Relatively affordable cost of living and access to space (high percentage of artists who own property)
- Environment conducive to art-making (light, land, relaxed pace)
- The mythology of the Southwest has a strong influence on market demand, particularly in the visual arts
- Rapid growth and influx of new populations (from second homers to Mexican immigrants) increases demand for diverse cultural manifestations
- Conservative political and aesthetic forces present a challenge for innovation environments
- Word of mouth and peer social networks are important sources of information and validation
- Strong energy around DIY (do it yourself) spaces created by emerging artists

Infrastructure and Networks Conditions:

- There is lack of art service organizations and formal networks, particularly in the performing arts, that can assist Arizona artists
- There is a need for increased venues and opportunities targeting mid-career artists as well as life-long aesthetic growth
- Universities are key players here—both positive and negative—though there is a lack of ongoing training opportunities outside them
- Training programs are not adequately addressing the need for teaching artists business “survival skills”
- Overwhelming deficit of media coverage, particularly art reviews and critical, scholarly discourse for artists across all disciplines statewide
- Limited communication and “cross-pollination” between contemporary, commercial-oriented and traditional/community-based artists communities
• In lieu of formal support, individual advocates play key roles in supporting artists
• Arizona artists have strong, informal networks to places outside the state
  (particularly California, New York, Mexico, and South America), interstate
  connections appear weak

As these assessments reveal, Arizona’s artist community vibrant one, yet the infrastructure for
support of our artists needs strengthening. Building upon this assessment let us look at some
current barriers artists face and the potentialities associated with growth.

**Barriers to Strengthening Arizona’s Arts Community**

**Affordable Live/Work Spaces:**

This is an on-going challenge amplified by the recession. Phoenix’s Roosevelt Row has been
a catalytic force in downtown redevelopment.

Tucson’s Arts Warehouse district has been slow in its development. After a long period of
time and deliberations between the state, local government, and the artist community, a state-
owned warehouse building on Toole Avenue has been secured by the Warehouse Arts Man-
agement District (WAMO) and can be developed as a live/work space. The current challenge
is to secure capitalization funds for its development in this anemic financial environment.

In Ajo, the Curley School Project is a national model on how to create live/work spaces for
artists in a rural setting. The current challenge is how to sustain their success while building
capacity for the school.²

**Health Care:**

Artists are no different than those working Americans who have little or no health coverage,
a fact primarily due to their status as independent contractors. In Tucson, the musicians
community has come together to form TAMHA, (The Tucson Artists and Musicians Health-
care Alliance) which is a coalition of artists and art advocates dedicated to the sustainability
and vitality of southern Arizona’s arts community. TAMHA, which provides information
about healthcare and preventative care resources, has an Emergency Relief Program.³

**Circulation of Ideas:**

Arizona is a good place for an artist to develop their artistic voice. Yet the maturing and
development of these voices is hindered by the lack of means to support their continuing
aesthetic education with the result that many leave the state for the east and west coasts.
Failure to develop an effective mechanism for circulating ideas about art’s purposes,
innovative art practices, or advances in their disciplinary field throughout the state’s various
artists communities may result in the exodus of Arizona’s artistic talent.

An important resource for the development of artists, are artist residency programs where
artists of all disciplines go to work in a retreat setting for an extended period of time. These
programs are innovative research-and-development labs for the arts, providing artists with
time, space, and support. Arizona is lacking in such programs and opportunities.
Limited Marketplace:

If the general public is not engaged with the arts, the economic result is a more limited marketplace for artists. Educating the public to the multiplicity of artistic expression throughout will improve the art market. For example, the marketplace for Native American artists is primarily along the lines of artisan practices, rather than conceptual art.

Cultural Intolerance:

The chilling effort of anti-immigration rhetoric, the assault on Ethnic Studies programs in our secondary schools, and the rise of religious intolerance has belittled our democracy and freedoms through acts of discrimination and bigotry. The response by the artist community to this civic toxicity has resulted in art works that address social responsibility and our humanistic ethos to imagine and envision our lives together in a just society.

Philanthropy:

Arizona has a limited philanthropic community that supports its artists (e.g., fellowship/awards) in comparison to other states. Additionally, funders who have a national mandate to serve the nation, their support of Arizona artists and their support systems is weak.

Ways to Strengthen Arizona’s Arts Community

Diversity:

Arizona’s changing demographics and the growth of Phoenix and Tucson as metropolitan regions has meant that the diversity of artistic expressions within the state has grown as well, illuminating our diverse population. That includes both large and intimate presentations, as well as participatory art practices and the singular experience an individual has with a work of art.

Community Cultural Development:

A developing field of artistic practice for Arizona artists are those who work with the public on projects designed to build civic well-being and community vitality (this is a national trend). A few examples of note:

Diné be’ iiná, The Navajo Lifeway (Window Rock)
The “Navajo Lifeways and the Arts: What Plants Can Teach Us” project supports a cultural preservation effort that incorporates media arts and cultural knowledge about fiber and shepherding arts, through an investigation of plants and documenting their web of interrelationships, recovering stories, traditional practices, and inter-generational sharing at the heart of the Navajo sheep culture. The project maintains cultural values in a contemporary world and cultivates traditional knowledge through community dialogue, exhibits, and a bilingual media arts presentation.4
Finding Voice (Tucson)
Finding Voice works with refugee and immigrant students on how to use autobiographical writing and photography to find their personal voices while providing opportunities for civic engagement to address community issues.5

Gregory Sale (Phoenix)
In collaboration with Arizona State University students, Gregory Sale’s “Bienvenidos here! at the Welcome Diner” project brought together Garfield neighborhood residents, the local art crowd, and the university community over a period of time for the purpose of creating a new public venue for food, art, and community.6

The Pro-Am Movement

Pro-Am stands for professional-amateur. As a result of the rise of new media and DIY culture, there has been a democratization of the arts—more and more citizens are making art. They may or may not call themselves artists, but they are joining choirs and community theater companies; making their own music videos and posting them on the Internet; creating literary blogs, participating in heritage practices like folk dance traditions; or engaging in artisan practices such as weaving or ceramics. The command of their artistic discipline varies, but many of them are of the caliber to have a professional career as an artist, but they don’t. The Pro-Am movement is not focused on making it in the economic marketplace, but is instead concerned with quality of life issues, engaging with the arts not as a passive audience member at a performance or exhibition space, but as makers that build social capital and community well-being.

Emergent Art Practices

Public Design: Building upon artist work in arts based-civic engagement projects, artists are now working with urban planners on the design of public spaces.

Mix/Mash-Up Aesthetics: An out-growth of the musical strategy of sampling in hip-hop and alternative rock, the mix/mash-up has been embraced by artists in many disciplines resulting in flarf poetry, hip-hop theater, spoken word performance, or video DIY practices.7

Contemporary Traditionalists: Arizona has a rich cultural legacy grounded in its Native American, Latino, mining, and ranching culture. Many artists work with these legacies to keep them alive. As contemporary-traditionalists they do this by introducing new materials or subject matter into the traditional forms. For example, the Corrido song tradition, which is strong in Latino and youth culture, requires that the lyrics speak to the issues of the day. Native American basket-makers work with new types of materials that result in new shapes for their basket or saddle makers by using computer design software to create new patterns for their tooling.
Festival Culture: This blends the contemporary with traditional, as seen in the All Soul Parade in Tucson which combines Day of the Dead celebration practices with contemporary aerial and circus art practices resulting in a re-imagined festival practice that honors its source.

Artists and Cultural Policy

Artists do not create in a vacuum, and are strongly impacted by social, political, and economic conditions. To better understand their support systems, to strengthen what is working for Arizona artists, and to address the challenges they face, it is helpful to understand the cultural policies that impact them.

National and state cultural policy is a system of arrangements regarding the allocation of resources and the articulation of value, including the politics of participation, which can be connected to aesthetic judgments, administrative practices, policy research, and stakeholder participation. This prompts a number of questions:

- Whose voices may be privileged or marginalized in policy discourse: the artist, the curator, the arts administrator, the foundation program officer, the board member, the elected official, the scholar, the social science researcher, or the community leader?
- How do each of these stakeholders define, evaluate, and perceive art and culture similarly and differently?
- With regards to cultural policy research, how are policy practices and analysis shaped by research methodologies?
- Does such research reinforce the power of existing policymakers, or do they bring new voices to the table?
- What do democratically informed policy practices look like?
- Where are artists in this system of arrangements?

Cultural policy sometimes can be easy to understand, as with, for example, a curatorial policy to present new works, or an organization’s policy to pay artists a fee for exhibiting their work. At other times its lack of clarity can be a source of conflict, as seen in the debates about arts education, support for individual artists, and strengthening cultural infrastructure programs. Another debate that concerns artists is focused on copyright and intellectual property as it relates to concepts of public purpose, and what is common and what is owned.

Arts administrators are intermediaries engaged in how artistic practices circulate and have an impact. Cultural policy is complex, and affects the livelihood of artists and cultural advocacy. Arts administrators serve as go-betweens who affect how artists are supported, how their work finds an audience, and how an organization honors its mission. While artists can negotiate some of these issues, more often it is arts administrators who do this, a process that comes with its own inherent tensions. As culture is increasingly privatized, how and by whom, is artistic value defined—is it economic, aesthetic or ethical value? What administrative system can best support the needs of artists?
There is a difference between efforts to affect public policy through the arts, and how art in and of itself creates public policy, yet many of the studies examining art and public policy do not consider artists as policy-makers. Art as public policy is a manifestation of cultural citizenship. One example of arts as public policy may be seen in the red ribbons artists created to sound the alarm on the AIDS epidemic, and the subsequent public recognition that resulted in changes in national health policies. Similarly, photographs by Ansel Adams of the American wilderness created broader environmental awareness, resulting in environmental protection policies. In community-based arts projects, artists understand the kind of cultural engagement that can create a sense of community. Thus, artistic practice can be a transformative force by defining the important place of the arts in contemporary society.

Arts administrators regularly attempt to measure the cultural world through surveys, mapping projects, and instrumental portraits of cultural participation. Such efforts produce a better understanding of the sociology of art, and of the practices and institutions that make possible artistic production, resulting in information that can be used to improve the support systems for artists without foreclosing artistic exploration. Both artists and administrators passionately use their hearts and minds to imagine possibilities to encourage public participation. Thoughtful cultural policy has the potential to benefit artists and audiences, to enrich our understanding of the risk, freedom, responsibility, beauty, and poetic engagement with the world, and to foster the mystery and courage of aesthetic imagination in the arts.

The recession has deeply affected the cultural sector, compounding its weak and stressed fault-lines, as seen in the under-capitalization of artist-centered organizations. Cultural administrative systems are being urgently asked to address the growing pragmatic needs of artists in innovative ways. The arts have an ability to push, challenge, and re-imagine the world around them, as well as to advocate for new ways of thinking about society.

**The Actions of Stewardship**

Arizona prides itself in being a thoughtful steward of the land manifest in the preservation of open spaces, as well a responsible environmental steward in how to conserve and manage the state’s natural resources. Citizens are also stewards of a richly diverse cultural heritage, including Native American, Latino/a, the Old West ethos, and mining and ranching legacies. And most important, Arizonans are stewards of the arts, of imagination, and of the creative spirit.

Being good stewards of the arts means many things: celebrating our cultural communities and what they give us, working to strengthen and support artists and arts organizations, and experiencing the arts and culture. This leads to the actions that individuals can take to support the arts during the economic downturn—go to a play, join a choir, visit a museum or a gallery, see a dance performance, sign up for a drawing class, celebrate your heritage, write a poem, make a video and post it on YouTube, play an instrument, share your song and your creative expressions with others—share that art with your family, friend, neighbors, and our community. It is through these creative expressions and passion for life that Arizonans will grow and prosper. Make it, Experience it and Share it. Support your local artists, feed your own creative impulse. Do Art.
What art offers is space—a certain breathing room for the spirit.
—John Updike

Art is both the taking and giving of beauty; the turning out to the light the inner folds of the awareness of the spirit. It is the recreation on another plane of the realities of the world; the tragic and wonderful realities of earth and men, and of all the inter-relations of these.
—Ansel Adams

It is real desert people who lift their faces upward with the first signs of moisture. They know how to inhale properly. Recognizing the aroma of creosote in the distance. Relieved the cycle is beginning again. These people are to be commended.
—From “Proclamation” by Ofelia Zepeda

A Case in Point: Supporting Arizona’s Artists: Local Arts Councils

Julie Richard
President & CEO, West Valley Arts Council

There are currently thirty-six arts councils within the state of Arizona providing services from Ajo to Lake Havasu, and Peoria to Prescott. According to Americans for the Arts, local arts councils are “community organizations or agencies of local government that provide services to artists and arts organizations and/or present arts programming to the public. Each local arts council is unique to the community it serves.” Local arts councils can be non-profit organizations or city-based. Non-profits behave differently than city-based councils and no two arts councils are exactly the same.

Local arts councils are on the front lines of cultural development and arts program delivery in Arizona. Before there were any organized arts organizations in many regions in Arizona, there was the local arts council. Councils are the best place to look for artist services and to get connected to arts and culture when moving to a new region. Arts councils are unique in that they connect the public to every kind of art form from visual art to literary art to the performing arts and many other arts forms in between.

Non-profit arts councils provide many kinds of services to arts organizations including the following: grants, loans, managerial consulting, directories of local artists and arts organizations, calendars of events and programs, marketing services, and advocacy. Councils often take the lead in collaborative programming such as festivals and other large programs such as the West Valley Arts Council’s Big Read—a National Endowment for the Arts sponsored program that encourages the public to read classic literature. The West Valley Arts Council (a regional council that primarily serves thirteen cities in the western suburbs of Greater Phoenix) coordinates over sixty library, school, arts, and other partners across the state of Arizona to deliver more than 150 events during this month-long program each year.
Arts councils can also provide the following services to **artists**: directory listings, training and workshops, exhibition opportunities, participation in open studio tours, participation in festivals, connections to school and other teaching opportunities, consulting, work from direct inquiries for a specific type of artist, advocacy, and networking.

Arts councils can provide the following services to **cities**: public art assistance and consulting, cultural planning, facility planning—building and operations, sub-granting of city funds (Scottsdale Cultural Council provides this service), programming for residents, and, of course, that essential element to create a “livable community” when the council may be the only arts organization serving that city.

At their core, arts councils serve the **community** by being an information resource, by providing programming, through facility management and programming (such as the Scottsdale Cultural Council which manages and programs the Scottsdale Center for the Performing Arts and the Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art), through advocacy information and dissemination, and through arts education services.

City-based arts councils and commissions are different from non-profits in that they are more limited in their scope of offerings. City arts councils can oversee and administer the public art program within the city, provide grants for arts programming, and advocate for the arts in their community. Because they often have limited fundraising ability, they regularly partner with other groups for programming.

Roberto Bedoya is the Executive Director of the Tucson Pima Arts Council. He is also a writer and arts consultant who works in the area of support systems for artists. As an arts consultant he has worked on projects for the Creative Capital Foundation and the Arizona Commission on the Arts (*Creative Capital’s State Research Project*); The Ford Foundation (*Mapping Native American Cultural Policy*); The Ford and Rockefeller Foundations (*Creative Practice in the 21st Century*); and The Urban Institute (*Investing in Creativity: A Study of the Support Structure for US Artists and the Arts and Culture Indicators in Community Building Project*). He is the author of the monograph *U.S. Cultural Policy: Its Politics of Participation, Its Creative Potential*. Bedoya has been a Rockefeller Fellow at New York University and a Visiting Scholar at the Getty Research Institute in Los Angeles.

Julie Richard is currently the President & CEO of the West Valley Arts Council which operates in the West Valley of Greater Phoenix, Arizona. She most recently held the position as Executive Director of the Metropolitan Arts Council in Greenville, South Carolina. Julie earned B.S. degrees in Psychology and Music and a M.A. in Business from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Previous positions include Managing Director of Tulsa Opera in Tulsa, Oklahoma; Managing Director of Syracuse Opera in Syracuse, New York; and Executive Director of the Cayuga Community College Foundation in Auburn, New York. She is a member of the WESTMARC Board of Directors, the City of Surprise Arts & Culture Board, and the Arizona Citizens/Action for the Arts Board. She has held many positions on boards including national Board positions with Americans for the Arts and the University of Wisconsin-Madison Bolz Center for Arts Administration. She has presented at numerous national conferences on topics such as board governance, strategic planning, fundraising, arts education programming, marketing the arts and more.
See, Eric Wallner and Roberto Bedoya, *Creative Capital State Research Project: Findings for Arizona and Maine* (New York: Creative Capital, September 2007). For more on this organization, see http://creative-capital.org/. Arizona was selected as was “uniquely poised to benefit from the sort of intervention that Creative Capital was proposing: ‘Arizona is the second-fastest growing state, witnessing intense development and unprecedented cultural and ethnic expansion.’ Four vibrant urban centers—Flagstaff, Phoenix, Tucson, and Yuma—offer a wealth of nationally recognized art collectives, dance studios, and interdisciplinary presenting organizations, while in rural communities, artists continue to work in both traditional and non-traditional forms. With the rapid growth of Phoenix in particular, artists are eager to make their voices heard in discussions of urban development and urban design.” (pp. 2-3).

For more on Curley School Artisan Lofts, see: http://www.curleyschool.com/


6 For more information on this project, see: http://www.gregorysaleart.com/project_12_h_welcome.html

7 Wikipedia characterizes flarf poetry as “an avant-garde poetry movement of the late 20th century and the early 21st century. Its first practitioners utilized an aesthetic dedicated to the exploration of “the inappropriate” in all of its guises. Their method was to mine the Internet with odd search terms then distill the results into often hilarious and sometimes disturbing poems, plays, and other texts.” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Flarf_poetry). This is related to Spam Lit, Spoetry, and Googilism.
New Voices, New Visions

Arizona continues to attract talented and visionary arts leaders who invigorate our cultural community. The essays in this chapter have been written by five institutional heads in Phoenix, Tempe, Tucson, Mesa, and Scottsdale who are relatively new to Arizona. They address the “what brought you here?” question, the engaging possibilities they saw, how those linked with their own vision for the arts and the institutions they now lead, and what struck them about the opportunities they saw in deciding to come to Arizona. Those of us who have been here many years need new voices such as theirs to make us stand up and pay attention to things that may have gone off our immediate radar. Their visions engage new directions, while refreshing the established institutions whose leadership they have assumed. As the concluding chapter to Capitalizing on Arizona’s Arts and Culture, they echo many of the issues tackled by the other contributors to this report, while offering new perspectives on where to go in future.

Museum as Cultural Tourism Destination
Letitia Chambers, President and CEO, Heard Museum

The Heard Museum has a national and international reputation built over many decades. It is known for the high quality of its exhibits with visual impact and educational content, as well as for the depth and breadth of its collection of American Indian art and artifacts.

I moved to Phoenix in January 2010 to become the leader of the Heard Museum, and was surprised to learn that the over 70% of its visitors are tourists. Cultural tourism is important to the economy of Arizona, and the Heard is a key attraction. It is my intention to work closely with local, state, and tribal government leaders to increase cultural tourism in the state.

As a newcomer to the Valley of the Sun, I have been impressed with the quality of the arts here. Phoenix residents who take part in arts activities are rewarded with the high quality of the experience. Collaboration among arts and culture organizations is also strong here and serves to enrich the cultural life available in the area.

The Heard Museum is primarily supported by revenue that it earns from admissions, memberships, shop sales, and its restaurant. Donors provide approximately one third of its revenues. One of my major goals as the President and CEO of the Heard Museum is to bring financial stability and to build an endowment and capital and operating reserves.

The most successful arts organizations are those that recognize the importance of operating as a business, albeit a nonprofit business. The Heard is adopting a business model to increase its financial viability and assure its future in all economic climates.
The fact that only 30% of the Heard’s visitors are from Arizona means that the Heard needs to reach out to local audiences to take part in the many entertaining and educational experiences offered. We have spent the past year analyzing how we can improve our visitor experience and attract more local visitors to the museum.

The Heard has an important role to play in educating our visitors about the indigenous populations of our region and of the Americas. There is a great need in Arizona for an appreciation of cultural diversity and the commonality of the human experience. The Heard is starting a new advertising campaign as a part of our outreach to Arizona residents that is based on the theme, “More in Common than You Think.” It is important that cultural and educational institutions in the valley play a leading role in raising the level of discourse and understanding.

My hope is to reach more residents so they can enjoy exhibits, performances, festivals, dining, and shopping at the Heard Museum. The Heard is a world-class museum, but it is more than a museum. It is a destination.

**Advancing Positive Social Change Through the Arts**
Gordon Knox, Director, Arizona State University Art Museum

The answer to the “What brought me here?” question is simple: Arizona today offers an exceptional opportunity for the arts to advance positive social change, and working with the arts toward those ends is exactly what I do. The position of Director of the Arizona State University Art Museum was an ideal match.

Art is a verb; it is a way of knowing, a way of telling; it is a conversation. An object in a museum is not “art” by itself; these objects, paintings, and exhibitions become art only in relationship with the viewer, when the conversation takes place, when the ideas embedded in these object are activated by the inquisitive mind of the beholder.

First and foremost, humans are social creatures. Our defining characteristics rest on collective projects and joint efforts—language, for example, is a massive multi-generational, on-going, collective project, as are market systems; tribal, national and religious identities; and the great bodies of scientific and social knowledge we have amassed over millennia.

Our really big and enduring accomplishments are done together. Art is based on this collectiveness—it is a way of exploring the world and communicating to each other what we know. An art museum is a gathering place for these explorations and conversations, an articulation point for the circulation of ideas. A university museum, free and open to all the public and also linked to the full range of research and understandings underway at a university, is a powerful conduit for knowledge, a place for the exchange of ideas and understandings.

We can talk at great length about the problems facing the arts today in Arizona, as they are legion: reduced budgets locally and statewide, a general perception of the arts
as “superfluous” rather than “core,” a general sense of doom and fear (economic dismay or invasion by “others”) that dampens creative risk-taking and intellectual curiosity, a sense that the arts may undermine conservative values.

But perhaps it is more useful to talk about the opportunities for the arts that are present in Arizona today. There is a healthy array of active artist- and community-led local arts programs all over the state, many of them deeply embedded in the communities they serve. Phoenix is a genuinely multi-cultural city, accepting more international refugees every year than the nation of England, creating a social context where visual, musical, culinary, and narrative communication through the arts can be a major unifying force. Scottsdale has one of the nation’s leading public art programs, the Phoenix Art Museum is the brightest light in encyclopedic visual arts between Denver and Los Angeles, and Tempe is home to ASU, which is truly one of the most recognized innovators of accessible excellence in education and avant-garde research in today’s post-disciplinary reality. There is an extraordinary base-culture here in Arizona for the emergence of powerful new art projects to expand our thinking and connect us to each other and our shared roots and values. The collective exploratory nature of the arts, and the embedded qualities of communication and empathy that define the artistic process, reconfirm for all of us that we are more similar than we are different—as a species, we are all here together and interdependent.

Re-Shaping the Histories of Photography
Katharine Martinez, Director, Center for Creative Photography, University of Arizona

What brought me to Arizona and specifically to the Center for Creative Photography at the University of Arizona? Three compelling attributes made this a very attractive position.

First, the Center for Creative Photography is a world-class cultural institution with an extraordinary history. It was founded in 1975 by Ansel Adams, the American photographer who changed how we see the landscape of the American West, in collaboration with the young and visionary University of Arizona President John Schaefer as a center for the appreciation and understanding of creative photography. It is noteworthy that they chose not to name the institution the museum for creative photography. From its beginnings the Center was an archive, that is, collections of the private papers, business records, memorabilia, and photographs of the leading North American photographers, accessible for research and appreciation through its study center, exhibition galleries, and publications. Launched with the founding archives of Ansel Adams, Harry Callahan, Edward Weston, and Garry Winogrand, the Center has grown to become the largest archive in the world devoted to American photographers. Today the Center houses approximately five million photographs and documents and, along with the George Eastman House and the Library of Congress, is one of the world’s leading sites for advanced study in the history of American photography. Through its exhibitions and publications, the Center reaches a global audience.

Second, I wanted to be involved in shaping the on-going history of photography, by nurturing an environment that enables researchers from around the world to study, think, look, debate, and write. As a special collection within a university library, the Center is part of an enterprise that supports inquiry and learning. The Center is about much more
than preserving a collection of collections. It is a gathering place for students and scholars, and a forum for the creation of new knowledge. Expanding the frame of reference for photographs beyond the history of photography is also what I promote. Our collections support research that uses photographs as evidence for the study of social, cultural, and political history. Topics can include the history of war, families and everyday life, science, and in particular the environment, immigration, religion, the Civil Rights Movement, fashion, performance, and entertainment, to name just a few.

Third, I came to the Center to be directly involved in an art form undergoing enormous changes. In the thirty plus years since the Center was founded, universities have created faculty positions devoted to teaching the history of photography, museums have established photography collections and hired photography curators, and prices for certain photographs command the attention of collectors, curators, dealers, and auction houses. At the same time, the line between fine art and other kinds of visual images is dissolving, manifested in museum exhibitions, scholarly publications, and the art market. The greatest shock to the photography world since 1975 is the advent of digital photographs and the means to share them easily and cheaply. Digital photography now makes it possible for anyone to be a photographer, and the Internet allows anyone to promote their photographs without the filter of the marketplace or scholarship. The public looks at photographs in a different fashion. So what is the role of a center for creative photography? What should we be and what should we collect? It is an exciting time to be the Director of this extraordinary place.

A New Home
Cindy Ornstein, Executive Director, Mesa Arts Center

February 2010—My first visit to Arizona. I was mesmerized by the beauty of the mountains and their varied contours sculpted by the sunlight. The palms, cactus, and scrubby trees against desert, adobe, and tan and red tiled roofs presented a truly alien terrain. It couldn’t be more different than the flat grey and brown I’d left behind in Michigan.

Compared to the industrial Midwest, the attention to the built environment was striking—nicely designed walls with embedded designs, carefully landscaped borders along streets. Public art was everywhere—in front of public buildings, on the light rail platforms, on the highway—not only was there a work of sculpture on a pedestrian overpass, but even the road’s retaining wall and embankments were embellished with designs. I was excited by the natural beauty around me and the obvious commitment to design and aesthetics.

I had come to find out more about an intriguing job in Mesa—to see the place and meet the people, to discover if this might be an opportunity compelling enough to take me from a job and community I loved. I had already learned of the strong arts institutions across the Valley, that the silos between the institutions were being broken down, and that there were many quality of life benefits to the region.

I arrived a day early and had the chance to wander in downtown Mesa and at the Mesa Arts Center. What a lovely and civilized downtown—the “bones” were solid, and the potential was
The city’s Arizona Museum for Youth and Arizona Museum of Natural History were amazing resources for the whole region, and the Mesa Arts Center was incredible—a wonderful design in an inviting space. All the ingredients promised a vibrant community gathering place for creative, engaged learning and sharing. Unbelievably, public funds had paid for 95% of the Mesa Arts Center, built five years earlier, and now the largest arts center in the Southwest. What a statement that made about the Mesa community’s commitment to arts and culture!

Ultimately, that is what really brought me to Arizona: the shared vision, the support and the potential. My interview process was thorough, and I met community members and leadership, colleagues and donors. I freely shared my commitment to using arts and culture to strengthen relationships, enhance and stimulate learning, and build the fabric of a community. I talked about the importance of nurturing creativity, and of building an exciting urban center. We discussed the importance of building meaningful and equitable partnerships, and the need for the entire community to feel welcome and engaged—to experience their literal ownership in the City’s arts and culture venues. At that time, and in the months since, these values have been expressed by the broad array of community representatives I have met. We have a shared dream.

There is a heritage of aesthetic values that is still strong here today. Though threatened, the arts are still more present in Arizona schools than in many parts of the U.S. The environment and natural resources create fertile ground for science institutions. The diverse and rich heritage provides lessons for the future, and is sorely needed to heal divides and generate respect for differences. The great diversity of ethnic groups and origins create an interesting and complex populace, and a comfortable place for a displaced Northeasterner. The importance of tourism to the region should help sustain the enlightened self-interest of preserving and creating assets that will appeal to visitors.

Despite the daunting economy and tumultuous times, and maybe in part because of them, the arts and culture have a foundational role to play in creating a stronger, more engaged and more successful Arizona, and I look forward to being a part of it.

**Going East to Come West**
Tim Rodgers, Director, Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art

When I was an undergraduate art history/studio art major at Arizona State University, one of my advisors told me that if I wanted a job in the arts I had to go east to go west. What he meant was that I needed to attend an east coast graduate school in order to secure an arts position in the west. So I went to Brown University where I received my Ph.D. in art history; now I find myself, nearly thirty years later, back in the Arizona. What I learned on this long journey home informs every decision I make in my new position as the Director of the Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art. It also provides a perspective for me that is as informed by the issues of the west as the east.

For example, eastern museums have a grounding in the community that extends back generations. Many of their donors and philanthropists are educated by parents and peers to
give both of their time and wealth. Their social standing is directly tied to their support of their community. The idea that a community, its citizens and its institutions must be supported and maintained for the betterment of all is the basis for many social institutions. Libraries, museums, cultural centers, gardens, zoos, and universities all thrive because of the support and generosity of citizens who believe in the value of these non-profit entities. City, state, and federal governments also recognize the value of these institutions for the citizens and grant them distinct status and assist them with public revenue. All of this aforementioned support has been forged in the east over many decades. In the west, however, this delicate web of support is both relatively new and increasingly fragile.

The reasons for this are many, but in the west a widely-held philosophy grounded in individualism clashes with collective desires and community building. Individualism, as the word implies, focuses on the individual over the group and stresses the importance of self-reliance and independence. Among the many ironies related to this philosophy in the United States is that it is most often articulated and affirmed through collective enterprises and institutions, e.g. public schools, mass media, and other technologies. And some of the people most likely in the past to proclaim and advance the power of the individual were artists such as Oscar Wilde who rebelled against the tyranny and oppression of the majority.

If the attachment to individualism could be set aside, western states could get down to the need to build, shape, and support communities and their attendant institutions. It is my vision for SMoCA that it further develop its role as a builder of community. Our exhibitions and educational programs have always reached out to the public to engage them in intelligent conversation and with stimulating ideas, but our museum spaces, hours, and outreach have sometimes been intimidating and limited. To correct this, I will be changing the hours of the museum to better serve the working members of the community, attempting to eliminate or reduce ticket costs, and transforming one of the museum spaces into a flex use space for educational and leisure activities. I would like to believe that if we can support our western communities and institutions, then we would not need to send our arts enthusiasts east so that they can come back west.
Letitia Chambers is the President and CEO of the Heard Museum in Phoenix, which showcases American Indian art, including both traditional and contemporary works. Its mission is to educate the public about the heritage and living cultures of the indigenous populations of the Americas. The Heard is nationally and internationally known for the quality of its exhibits and programs. Dr. Chambers has previously held senior management positions in the private sector, government, and education. She served as President and CEO of a Washington, D.C., based consulting firm, and later as a Managing Director at Navigant, a global consulting firm. Dr. Chambers headed up the system of higher education for the state of New Mexico where she worked to revamp and reform key aspects of the system. She led the agency responsible for oversight of all public colleges, universities, and community colleges in the state. Dr. Chambers also chaired the New Mexico Educational Trust Board, served as a Board Member of the New Mexico Student Loan and Guarantee Corp, and was an active Commissioner of the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education. She was nominated in 1996 by the President and confirmed by the Senate to be U.S. Representative to the United Nations General Assembly, a position of ambassadorial rank. In that capacity she made significant contributions as a member of the Management and Budget Committee of the General Assembly. In 1992, she served on the Clinton/Gore transition team as Chief Budget Advisor, leading the Budget Policy Group and developing drafts of the President's Economic Plan. Earlier in her career, Dr. Chambers served as Staff Director of the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, which had jurisdiction over education, labor law, and social service programs. She was the first woman to head the staff of a major standing committee of the U.S. Senate. Prior to that she served as a senior staff member on the Senate Budget Committee and the Senate Special Committee on Aging. Dr. Chambers has served on corporate boards, particularly in the financial sector, and on numerous educational and philanthropic boards, many of which have focused on the arts and American Indian arts and cultures. A graduate of the University of Oklahoma, she holds a doctorate in educational research and curriculum development from Oklahoma State University.

Gordon Knox is currently the director of the Arizona State University Art Museum. Previously Knox led Global Initiatives at the Stanford Humanities Lab, where he identified, developed, and implemented international projects that combine the understandings and techniques of the humanities and the sciences, and engage them in on-the-ground efforts to effect social change. Prior to Stanford, Knox was artistic director at the Montalvo Arts center in Saratoga, California, where he designed, developed, and established the organization’s international artist residency program. Implementing his commitment to the open flow of ideas and underscoring his belief that the advancement of civil society requires articulate critical analysis, Knox helped establish Montalvo as an institution recognized for ambitious projects often involving unusual collaborations. During the 1990’s, as the founding director of the Civitella Ranieri Foundation in Italy, Knox envisioned and established a center for the arts designed to advance and widen contemporary cultural practice by engaging the voices and thinking of practitioners from all parts of the world and providing them with excellent conditions to advance their work. Civitella quickly became a new model for international, multidisciplinary residency programs. Knox’s interest in the relationship between the arts and society and in critical, artistic inquiry emerges from his studies in social anthropology focusing on the relationship between ideas and social action. Knox studied anthropology at the University of California Santa Cruz, Cambridge University, and the University of Chicago.
Katharine Martinez is Director of the Center for Creative Photography at the University of Arizona. Prior to this appointment, Martinez served as Director of the Fine Arts Library in the Harvard College Library, where she oversaw a collection of more than 1.5 million photographs and prints. She also served as the Herman and Joan Suit Librarian and oversaw the Harvard Film Archive, with its collection of more than 10,000 35mm and 16mm films and several thousand posters, and robust public film program. She has experience managing photographic collections at Harvard University, Stanford University, Columbia University, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Winterthur Library. Martinez has curated exhibitions for the Cooper-Hewitt Museum, earned fellowships from Harvard University Library and Stanford University Library, served on the editorial board for *American Quarterly* and acted as a member of the Board of Directors of Research Libraries Group (RLG). She is also a past-president of the Art Libraries Society of North America. Martinez earned her bachelor’s degree in art history from the University of Delaware, followed by a Master’s of Library Science degree from Indiana University and doctorate in American Studies from George Washington University. Her areas of expertise are 19th and early 20th century visual culture, particularly the intersection of high art and popular taste and the reception of images. She is currently at work on a book manuscript titled “Craze for Pictures: The Production and Reception of Photographic Images in the U.S. 1880-1920.”

Cindy Ornstein joined the City of Mesa as Director of Arts and Culture and Executive Director of the Mesa Arts Center (MAC) in July, 2010. In addition to leading the MAC, Arizona’s largest arts center encompassing four theatres, fourteen performing and visual arts studios, and the five galleries of Mesa Contemporary Arts, she oversees the Arizona Museum for Youth and the Arizona Museum of Natural History. Prior to coming to Mesa, Cindy was President and CEO of the Flint Cultural Center Corporation in Flint, Michigan, Associate Director of the Allentown Art Museum, Allentown, Pennsylvania, and Executive Director of Mayfair Festival of the Arts in Allentown. Before entering arts administration, she was the Director of Corporate Communications at Rodale Press, Inc., a leading book and magazine publisher, and worked in the public relations agency business in New York and Atlanta, including holding vice presidencies at the world’s two largest public relations firms. She began her career as an advertising copywriter and a journalist, and also worked in theatre as an actor and director in Chicago and New York. Currently, she serves as a member of Arizona’s Cultural Data Project Task Force. She was appointed by Michigan’s Governor to two terms as a Council Member on the Michigan Council for Arts and Cultural Affairs and served on the Executive Committee of the board of ArtServe Michigan. Ornstein earned a B.A. degree in English from Vassar College and is currently completing a Masters degree in American Culture from the University of Michigan.

Tim Rodgers is Director of the Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art and Vice-President of the Scottsdale Cultural Council. He provides executive leadership, curatorial direction, and management for the Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art (SMoCA) and works collaboratively with the other Cultural Council divisions: The Scottsdale Center for Performing Arts and the Scottsdale Public Art program. Rodgers received a Ph.D. from Brown University in History of Art and a B.A. degree (summa cum laude) from Arizona State University. An experienced art academic, writer, lecturer, and curator, first at Brown University and later tenured at Lawrence University, Appelton, Wisconsin, where Rodgers served as the Curator of the Wriston Art Center Galleries and Professor of Modern and Contemporary Art. Prior to his current position, he served as Chief Curator at the New Mexico Museum of Art, Santa Fe.
Chapter 23

Arizona’s Future: The Choice is Art

Robert C. Booker
Executive Director, Arizona Commission on the Arts

Key Points

- Arizona’s fiscal crisis has contributed to a cultural crisis in the state’s arts industry
- The many people employed in Arizona’s arts sector which help build our economy
- Public funding for the arts has decreased dramatically since 2008
- Children who receive art instruction as part of their education have greater success in reading, mathematics, critical thinking, and social skills, and are more likely to stay in school

The Arizona Environment: Where We Are Now

Arizona has long been considered an enterprising and independent state, enjoying extraordinary population growth, vast undeveloped landscapes, and abundant cultural and economic opportunity. Yet there is little doubt that The Great Recession has forced unprecedented challenges on our state.

With notable failures in the real estate and credit markets and because of the homogeneity of its construction-dependent growth economy, Arizona’s fiscal health has suffered greatly since FY2008. For FY2009 and FY2010, Arizona’s budget shortfall climbed as high as 33% of its general fund budget, one of the highest percentages of shortfall in the nation. Current projections indicate continued state budget shortfalls through FY2014.

Legislative budget reductions and fiscal maneuvering have not succeeded in balancing the budget and have resulted in record cuts to public education and health services. We’ve seen mandatory salary reductions for all state government employees. Attempts to balance the budget have included “sweeps” or “raids” of dedicated funds, the sale/leaseback of government facilities, and year-to-year deficit rollovers. In May 2010, voters overwhelmingly approved a temporary increase in the state’s sales tax, a move intended to mitigate further fiscal damage to public safety programs and to education.

In August 2010, the Arizona Department of Commerce reported the state’s unemployment rate at 9.7%, the highest it’s been in 30 years. In September 2010, the United States Census published new data indicating that 21.1% of Arizonans live in poverty, making Arizona residents the second poorest in the nation. According to the Arizona Education Association, our public schools contend with the second-highest student-to-teacher ratio in the nation and attempt to serve the second-fastest-growing student population, yet we rank dead last in per-pupil public investment.
The Arts in Arizona: An Industry that Gives Back

While the current state of the state looks bleak in terms of economic forecasts and legislative initiatives, one clearly bright spot does shine on the potential our arts industry holds for Arizonans. According to Americans for the Arts’ 2010 Creative Industries Report, Arizona is home to 11,600 arts-related businesses and 47,712 persons are employed in the arts sector. More than 600 Arizona non-profit organizations identify themselves as providers of arts and cultural programming. Of these organizations, an estimated 5% have annual budgets greater than $1 million; 15% have budgets between $250,000 and $999,999; 40% have budgets between $25,000 and $249,999; and 40% have budgets of less than $25,000.

A number of Arizona communities continue to be recognized as top arts destinations. In a recent American Style Magazine poll, Tucson and Phoenix were listed among the top 25 large city arts destinations, Scottsdale was listed as a top mid-size arts destination, and Sedona was listed as a top small city arts destination. Phoenix—Arizona’s largest city—hosts one of the longest-running, best-attended First Friday gallery crawls in the nation. Participating galleries are mostly artist-owned, “do-it-yourself” spaces, reflecting Arizonans’ independence of spirit.

The non-profit arts industry in Arizona is as varied as our residents. Currently 235 arts organizations receive funding through the Arizona Commission on the Arts. These organizations, on average, constitute 50% of their annual budget through contributions, memberships, and grants; the other 50% comes from earned income, classes, school residency activities, touring, ticket sales, admissions, and gift shop revenue. Of those same organizations, only about 2-8% of their budgets derive from government funding. While that amount appears modest, those monies often ensure crucial access and provide educational programs to a broad sector of Arizona’s communities.

The Perfect Storm: The Effect of the Economy

The Arizona arts industry has been facing three major reductions in income:

1. Funding from state and local public funding agencies has decreased dramatically since the beginning of the economic downturn in 2008. The Arizona Commission on the Arts is receiving 60% less funding from the state of Arizona, the Phoenix Office of Cultural Affairs is receiving 72% less funding from the city, the Tucson Pima Arts Council is seeing a 70% reduction in their funding, and Flagstaff Cultural Partners are down 5%.

2. Purchasing, ticket sales, memberships, and contributions from individuals are down.

3. Corporate and foundation support has decreased because invested income in both of these areas of support has decreased; income from corporate giving programs has also declined.
These three areas of cutbacks and change have had a profound impact on both the for-profit and non-profit arts industry in our state. Add in the rising costs of doing business, increasing health care costs levied on small business owners for their employees, and an overall downturn in tourism, and the full impact is real, substantial, and increasing—especially among Arizona non-profit organizations, which are already undercapitalized.

The Great Recession has been painfully difficult for the Arizona arts industry. In FY2009 and FY2010, organizations reported decreases of nearly 80% in contributed income; additionally, there have been notable decreases in ticket sales and significant job losses in the industry. Already-meager arts programs in many schools have been further reduced or eliminated altogether and artists have faced the termination of critical grant programs and services.

Similarly, the downturn forced the Arizona Commission on the Arts to do more with less, or—more accurately—to do better with less. In three years, the Commission has lost one-third of its staff, nearly 60% of its budget. Agility has become a significant asset as reductions to available grant funding created other, acute needs in the sector: for technical support, counsel, accountability training, and crisis management guidance. In addition, the Arizona ArtShare Endowment of $20 million, which was built with public funds over a 10-year period by legislative action, was eliminated completely by similar legislative decree in fiscal year 2010. There are currently no plans for renewing those lost funds.

**The Impact of the Economy on the Arizona Arts Industry**

The Arizona Commission on the Arts has aggressively sought to understand the effects of the economic downturn on the statewide non-profit arts industry. To that end, three surveys were administered to Arts Commission grantees large and small, and were analyzed by agency staff. Data gathered from the May 2009 survey provided substantial insight into the challenges Arizona nonprofits are experiencing in the areas of contributed income and fundraising; earned income, ticket sales, and admissions; endowments; and full- and part-time staffing.

**Contributed Income and Fundraising:** Results showed that 74% of organizations reported a decrease in contributions at this point in their season or fiscal year. Organizations are experiencing at least a 10-30% decrease in both attendance to fundraising events and in revenue generated at those events.

**Earned Income, Ticket Sales, and Admissions:** The survey indicated that 59% of respondents are experiencing a decrease in the sales of season subscriptions or memberships, and 51% are experiencing a decrease in single-ticket sales or the sales of participant entry fees for events or programs.

**Endowments:** Some 24 organizations (15% of respondents) have an endowment fund. Of these respondents, four organizations (17%) reported having already made use of part of their endowment principal as a way to address financial issues.
**Full-Time and Part-Time Staff:** Among those surveyed, 86 organizations (54% of respondents) reported employing full-time staff at the time of survey completion. Some 112 organizations (71% of respondents) reported employing part-time staff. Of the responding organizations with an annual operating budget of $250,000 or greater, 38% have made staff layoffs in the past 6 months, while 25% are using staff furloughs, and 50% have enacted hiring freezes. Sixty-three percent of the survey’s respondents have reduced contract services, such as janitorial, print services, design, and other business-related services.

The survey also asked respondents to indicate how many staff members their organization has had to lay off because of the economy. According to this survey, 133 people lost their jobs.

Speaking with organizations and constituents on a regular basis leads the Commission to believe that these numbers represent only the beginning of job losses in the Arizona arts industry, particularly because the survey also indicates that 50% of respondents intend to reduce contract services in response to economic challenges. Since arts organizations often depend upon the contracted services of individual artists in education programs, creative services, production management, design elements, and more, additional losses in employment opportunities as budgets contract, are anticipated.

**Response to the Economic Crisis**

As disheartening and debilitating as the economic news has been and continues to be, the ACA’s arts partners’ fiscal responsibility has responded to the current economic calamity. Ninety-three organizations (59% of respondents) report having reduced their operating budget for the current year. The percentage of reductions made to current year operating budgets ranges from 3-80%. Survey results indicate that the average budget reduction among arts organizations for the current year is between 20% and 30%.

For organizations without paid staff, 61% of respondents reported that they would be forced to cut back on programs and/or exhibitions. The second most common effect that loss of public funding would have on organizations without paid staff is cuts in arts education programs.

**Effects on Programming, Artistic Product, or Services**

In addition to reporting on overall budget reductions and instability in the areas of endowments, personnel, fundraising, and earned income, the survey respondents report on the effects that the economy is having on the way their organizations plan and carry out programming and on how they develop and share artistic products or services. These findings from survey respondents seem particularly noteworthy. They report that their organizations are:

- Delaying new programs
- Struggling to maintain high-quality productions with severely reduced budgets, sometimes leading to exhibits that are more regional in nature
• Offering drastically reduced ticket prices
• Decreasing numbers of programs, thus reducing employment
• Presenting less-expensive shows
• Reducing instructor compensation
• Presenting safer, less-risky productions with smaller casts
• Cutting arts-in-education programs for the current season
• Cutting free musical education concerts for young people
• Cutting outreach programs

The Canary in the Coal Mine: Understanding the Needs of Individual Artists

The strength of any arts industry is directly related to the health of its professional and avocational artists. Issues of fair compensation, a livable salary, health insurance, and affordable living and workspace continue to be at the forefront of any healthy artists’ community. Arizona is no different. Often, urban centers that have the capacity to attract and keep artists are able to do so because of existing arts service groups, professional paying jobs, a critical gallery and museum scene, paying media and theatrical opportunities, and a strong writing community. Nevertheless, with changes in how individuals work and the growth of technology, Arizona sees artists living and expressing themselves throughout our state.

Artists working in the visual, literary, performing, and media arts are the major contributors to any state’s arts industry. That contribution is no different in Arizona; these individuals strengthen the economic, educational, and civic vitality of our cities, large and small. They teach our children, they sing in and direct our choirs at temples and churches, they write the stories that document our lives and history, and they lead the band down Main Street on the Fourth of July.

Artists are—by their nature—information providers; they hold unique abilities to shed new light and understanding on issues, especially in these challenging times. This ability is, of course, not new; the arts have always taken the lead in facing the tough issues head on. From Picasso’s painting Guernica to the poems of Langston Hughes, the arts are not shy, quiet, or reserved.

Mexican printmakers took on the atrocities of World War II through their work long before artists from any other country stepped forward. Photographers showed the effects of The Great Depression in our cities and in rural America, alike. Artists then went on to rebuild America as workers in the Works Progress Administration, the Federal Art Project, and the Civilian Conservation Corps.

To briefly summarize national trends, artists recorded and influenced the civil rights movement with their 8mm cameras, typewriters, and songs. They documented the farm workers’ movement through photography and helped America understand the AIDS pandemic through stories, quilts, and images that spoke to our citizens when governments and the medical industry were silent. Lately, writers sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts have worked with veterans as they have returned home, providing writing workshops as
means to working through personal experiences from war. Additionally, many artists in Arizona and across the country have stepped into the public arena to voice their beliefs regarding immigration legislation. Organizations such as Poets Responding to SB 1070, Alto Arizona Art Campaign, and others have added an artistic voice to the national debate on immigration and the migration of people.

Judilee Reed, the executive director of Leveraging Investments in Creativity, writing for Grantmakers in the Arts, provides the following highlights in her 2010 report, *Artists and the Economic Recession Survey: Selected Findings* related to artists and the industry, generally nationwide:

**Income:** Most artists have relatively low incomes, even though 62% are college educated and hold at least one additional job. Two-thirds said their total income in 2008 was less than $40,000, and nearly one-third of them earned less than $20,000. Artists typically earn either very little of their income from their artwork or almost all of it. Artists who spend more than 80% of their time on their artwork have the highest income levels, while artists who rely on cobbled together an income from a mix of sources are more likely to earn less than $20,000 a year. Some 51% of artists reported a decrease in their art-related income from 2008-2009, including 18% who saw it decrease by 50% or more.

**Day Jobs:** Sixty-six percent of artists hold at least one job in addition to their artistic practice, while 21% hold two or more additional jobs. Fifty-nine percent of artists with other jobs are employed in arts-related fields. Half of artists who work in arts-related fields work in academics, commercial arts (43%), and non-profit arts (42%). One-third of artists who work in non-arts related jobs have also seen their incomes decrease over the past year.

**Recession Concerns:** Seventy-seven percent of artists’ number one worry is loss of income, 70% cite fewer sales, 67% say difficulty finding funding for future projects, 61% indicate rising amounts of debt, 59% report fewer exhibition/presentation opportunities, 59% have received fewer grants, and 59% cite low morale for themselves and others they know. Artists who earn most of their income from art are more likely to be worried than those who earn almost none of their income from art.

Despite those data, the report indicates that 75% of the artists believe this is an inspiring time to be a working artist. Four out of 10 say that the ability to spend more time on their artwork is a positive outcome of the recession, and 32% say they experiment more and are more open to collaboration.

**Arts Education: Building our Future**

A report published by the National Assembly for State Arts Agencies in collaboration with the Arts Education Partnership: *Critical Evidence: How the Arts Benefit Student Achievement*, demonstrates that children receiving art instruction as part of their education have greater success in reading, mathematics, critical thinking, and social skills, and are more likely to stay in school.
The recent census report *Engaging Students, Supporting Schools, Accessing Arts Education: Highlights from the Arizona Arts Education Census Project*, a remarkable dichotomy is revealed. On one hand, we know that there are opportunities for students across the state to access arts education programs, but on the other hand limited or no funding exists to support these programs. Some of our Arizona children are attending schools where they receive limited arts education, and in some cases they receive none at all. The report shows clearly that the arts make a difference, and that the lack of the arts has a negative impact.

Highlights of the report—which also includes recommendations for parents, educators and students as well as for policy changes and adaptations—include:

- 87% of students have access to some dance, music, theater, or visual arts in their schools
- 55% of schools provide the required instruction in music and visual arts while 21% reported no arts classes or courses for students
- 90% of schools with music and 76% with visual arts use Certified Arts Specialists
- 56% of schools have updated curricula reflecting the Arizona Academic Arts Standards
- Only 39% of high schools weigh arts courses equally with other academic subjects, and only 12% weigh advanced arts courses equally with other advanced academic courses
- General music and art are most popular in elementary and middle schools, and general art and dance are most popular in high schools. More high school students are enrolled in dance than are enrolled in band, orchestra, or theater
- Charter schools are significantly less likely to provide arts courses for students or have highly qualified teachers providing instruction than district schools

Perhaps most significant of all, more than 134,000 Arizona students attend schools every day with no access to arts education taught by a highly qualified teacher.

There are positive aspects of the census, but all too often, our young people are not getting the full breadth of arts education mandated in Arizona state policy. Some feel our schools are focused on teaching toward the test and are mired in federal mandates. Testing requirements can skew priorities (for instance, the AIMS test does not measure the arts). Budget issues always play a role in selecting course work as well; indeed, the census revealed that on average 1/2 a penny per pupil per day is spent on arts education supplies.

If local school boards are composed of individuals who themselves never had a solid arts education, they may not personally appreciate the value of a well-rounded education that includes study in the visual, literary, and performing arts. Therefore, our current arts education situation may be setting our state’s broader civic progress up for failure.

Indeed, if this trend is not reversed, we fear we may continue to see young people failing to graduate from high school and to send fewer on for post-secondary education. We are concerned that many leave our education system poorly prepared to face the challenges of today’s domestic workplaces and globally focused economies.
A Time to Plan: Creating a New Standard of Service

The Arizona Commission on the Arts is a 44-year-old agency of the State of Arizona, governed by a 15-member, Governor-appointed board. The agency is one of 56 state and jurisdictional agencies throughout the country. Every state in the Union has a state arts agency. The Arts Commission receives its funding from the State of Arizona and the National Endowment for the Arts, with some support through partnerships with corporations and foundations. The Commission delivers grants, programs, and services to every legislative district in support of Arizona’s state arts industry. Its mission guides them in that service: We imagine an Arizona where everyone can participate in and experience the arts.

While imagination is, indeed, a key component of realizing ACA’s mission of preserving a vital and vibrant arts environment in Arizona, the Commission has necessarily extended that imperative. In order to develop a critically thoughtful and nimble plan for the future of Arizona’s arts industry and of the Commission itself, our staff and members engaged Arizonans in qualitative and quantitative research through community listening sessions, surveys, and literature reviews to develop a four-year strategic plan titled Building an Artistic Future for Arizona.

Listening Sessions: Nine locations hosted community, town hall-type listening sessions: Flagstaff, Lake Havasu City, Mesa, Show Low, Surprise, Tubac, Tucson, Yuma, and Chandler. Sessions were open to all interested participants and registered on a statewide public meeting calendar in compliance with Arizona law. Regional partners—including local arts agencies, city parks and recreation departments, and local businesses—helped host meetings and assist with promotion.

Surveys: A strategic planning survey was developed for the Arts Commission’s broadest constituency—contacts within the agency mailing list and grantee database—about the impact of the arts in their work and personal lives. This survey was promoted on the agency website and blog, through email invitations and social media, and with help from the state-wide partners that hosted listening sessions. Targeted survey instruments were developed for artists, arts educators, and arts administrators, as well as groups typically under-represented in arts sector planning: city managers and mayors, faith leaders, coordinators of faith-based arts programs, and high school and college students.

Listening Sessions and Survey Results

The Arts Commission’s work helps inform key stakeholders of the challenges, barriers, and opportunities facing the Arizona arts industry. Participants overwhelmingly expressed a need for additional funding resources, both earned and contributed. The need for both financial and dedicated programmatic support for arts in education activities during and after the K-12 school day was a primary concern.

The need for a statewide visibility and outreach campaign to showcase arts opportunities in communities across the state and to build public value for the arts is critical. Participants in the survey and those attending the listening sessions clearly understand the need to inform
elected officials about the value of the arts in education, as an economic driver, and as a community development tool. Finally, constituents said they needed more professional development and training.

*Building an Artistic Future for Arizona* was developed in partnership with the Arizona arts industry—in an effort to rally artists, educators, administrators, and advocates behind a cohesive set of strategies to advance the collective cause. The plan does not simply detail how the Arts Commission intends to move the industry forward, but outlines how the Commission believes it can improve the industry’s circumstances altogether.

The plan represents a cohesive set of strategies to advance a collective cause: stability and progress for the Arizona arts industry. *Desired Outcomes* are developed as ideal results for the entire Arizona arts industry:

1. Arizonans can access vibrant, quality arts and cultural activities wherever they live, and have opportunities to participate as practitioners, professionals, patrons, donors, and volunteers.

2. Arizona residents can make healthy livable wages working in myriad facets of the arts. Their contributions are valued and respected.

3. Students have access to quality, robust arts education programs in Arizona schools. In-school arts opportunities are enhanced by meaningful opportunities in out-of-school and community settings.

4. Arts and cultural programs and organizations are considered societal cornerstones and are employed as partners in the revitalization and sustainability of streets, neighborhoods and communities.

5. Recognizing the arts industry’s role in economic viability and enhanced quality of life, Arizona’s for-profit businesses invest in the arts as partners, supporters and champions.

In response to constituent recommendations, the *Building an Artistic Future for Arizona* Strategic Plan FY2011–FY2014 contains a promotional campaign for the arts in Arizona meant to advance the cultural conversation, build public value for the arts, and develop a privately held funding stream (Figure 2.1).

**The campaign is meant to:**

- Advance the cultural conversation in Arizona
- Grow public understanding about the broad-spectrum benefits of arts programs and increase arts participation in Arizona communities
- Fortify the privately held Arizona ArtShare Endowment, whose funds can be used to support statewide arts programs.
The campaign was launched on December 1, 2010 in programs of performing arts organizations and print media throughout the state (Figure 2.1). Further, the campaign was released through a number of social networking programs including Facebook and Twitter. All of the materials direct individuals to an interactive website: www.thechoiceisart.org.

**Figure 23.1**

The message is direct, personal, and pragmatic:

- We want **mayors** to be as proud of their community theatre and their museums as they are of their banks, their hospitals, their shopping malls, and their corporate centers.
- We want our **legislators and congressional leaders** to know that public funding for the arts is a good thing, a responsible action, and a smart move for increasing economic development, community growth, and cultural understanding across Arizona and our country.
- We want **parents** to understand that filling their vans with kids to take them to **music lessons and theater camp** is as important as taking them to the soccer fields and the swimming pool.
• We want **parents** and **grandparents** to challenge their school boards, superintendents, and principals to make sure the **arts have a place in their child’s education.**

• We want **neighbors** to be proud of the fact that living next door to them is a **painter,** an **actor,** a **musician,** a **poet,** or a **dancer.**

Much of what you’ve just read—from the reports of cultural and economic loss in our state to the Commission’s research activity and plans for renewal—can only begin to be re-visioned Arizona’s citizens. Take a moment, now, to recall how you have interacted with the arts. Remember occasions when the arts have positively influenced your life, your education, your development as a businessperson, as a volunteer, as a citizen. Do you still remember a line of that poem you memorized? Where did you see your first play? Who taught you to dance? These memories of arts-infused moments are, indeed, powerful for all of us. With only the slightest variations, the moments are universal. Further, the value of the arts comes from these special moments. It’s intrinsic to them, rather than instrumental or easily calculable. The arts moments you’ve just recalled are the soul-touching, cathartic moments that everyone experiences. Simply, they’re the kinds of moments that are more human, more vulnerable, more powerful—and more lasting—than any statistics, quotations, or analysis could ever hope to be. Then. And now. And always.

Robert C. Booker is the Executive Director of the Arizona Commission on the Arts. Prior to joining the Commission Booker was the Executive Director of the Minnesota State Arts Board. His work for the Commission is focused on building a statewide arts industry that serves the residents and visitors of Arizona, grows programs in arts education, increases cultural tourism, and expands the careers of working artists in all disciplines. Booker received the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Minnesota Crafts Council in 2005 and was recognized for his national leadership by the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies with the 2006 Gary Young Award. Bob serves as a member of the Arizona Governor’s Centennial Commission, Co-Chair of the Arts and Culture Committee of the Arizona Mexico Commission, Arizona Historical Advisory Commission, a trustee of the Western States Arts Federation, and a board member of Grantmakers in the Arts. Booker served as President of the board of the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, as a member of the Minnesota Governor’s Quarter Dollar Commission, and was the Chair of the Minnesota Governor’s Residence. Booker has served on the boards of Arts Midwest, Minnesota Museum Educators Association, the Cable Arts Consortium, Arts Over AIDS, and the Minnesota AIDS Project. Booker is a painter and art collector.
Appendix A

Selected Resources on Arts and Culture

Print Sources


Electronic Resources

Americans for the Arts: http://www.artsusa.org/

Americans for the Arts is the nation’s leading nonprofit organization for advancing the arts in America, and is focused on four primary goals: 1. Lead and serve individuals and organizations to help build environments in which the arts and arts education thrive and contribute to more vibrant and creative communities; 2. Generate meaningful public and private sector policies and more leaders and resources for the arts and arts education; 3. Build individual awareness and appreciation of the value of the arts and arts education; 4. Ensure the operational stability of the organization and its ability to creatively respond to opportunities and challenges. Their reports have included: *Arts and Economic Prosperity III: The Economic Impact of Nonprofit Arts and Culture Organizations and their Audiences.* (2009) and *Creative Industries Comparative Reports* (2010).

Arizona Commission on the Arts: http://www.azarts.gov/

One of 56 state and jurisdictional arts agencies, the ACA supports a statewide arts network whose mission is to create opportunities for all Arizonans to participate in and experience the arts. They deliver grants and support to cultivate sustainable arts communities and promote statewide public access to arts and cultural activities.

Arizona Humanities Council: http://www.azhumanities.org/

The AHC creates opportunities for sharing diverse stories through critical thinking and public discussion, to better understand and appreciate one another, so that we can make informed decisions about our collective future. Founded in 1973, the AHC is a non-profit organization and the Arizona affiliate of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The AHC is not a state agency. The AHC supports public programming in the humanities that promotes understanding of human thoughts, actions, creations, and values.


Foundation Center: Focus on Funding for the Arts: Arts Funding by Location (interactive map): http://maps.foundationcenter.org/arts/FldIntUS.php

Distribution by location of 20,733 grantmakers funding arts and culture. Categories: Arts (general), Historical Activities, Humanities, Media/Communications, Multipurpose Centers/Programs, Museum, Performing Arts, Visual Art. Click on map to bring up individual counties, then click on individual counties to bring up specific grantmakers and amounts. Arizona ranks # 28: 191 grantmakers; Coconino (4),

Maricopa Partnership for Arts and Culture (MPAC). MPAC ceased operating in March 2010, but its reports are available on the website of the Virginia G. Piper Charitable Trust: http://www.pipertrust.org/publications/programspecificpubs.aspx

- A Place for Arts and Culture (2003)
- Arizona Needs Arts and Culture—Education (2009)
- Arizona Needs Arts and Culture—Economic Diversity (2009)
- Arts, Culture and the Latino Audience (2008)
- Comparative Research on Dedicated Public Funding Models for Arts and Culture (2007)
- Cultural Participation Study for Maricopa County (2007)
- Maricopa Arts and Culture SWOT Analysis (2003)
- Metro Phoenix DNA Initiative (2008)
- Metro Phoenix DNA Roadmap (2008)
- Perceptions Matter: Attracting and Retaining Talented Workers to the Greater Phoenix Region (2007)

Morrison Institute for Public Policy, Arizona State University:
http://morrisoninstitute.asu.edu/

Established in 1982, the Morrison Institute for Public Policy is unit within the School of Public Affairs in the College of Public Programs. Examining critical Arizona and regional issues, its research has served as a catalyst for public dialogue and aims to help improve the state’s quality of life. Its mission is to conduct timely, applied analysis that informs, advises, and assists Arizona’s state and community leaders, and its nonpartisan research explores public policies that impact greater Phoenix, the State of Arizona, and the nation. Through publications and forums, its research serves the public officials, private sector leaders, and community members who shape public policy. The Morrison Institute has conducted important work on topics that span education reform, water resources, health care, human services, urban growth, government structure, arts and culture, technology, quality of life, public finance, environment, sustainability, and economic development. Publications include How Arizona Compares: Real Numbers and Hot Topics (Arizona Policy Choices, 2005; The publication offers comparative data and analysis on 10 public policy issues, including Arts and Culture); Vibrant Culture—Thriving Economy: Arts, Culture and Prosperity in Arizona’s Valley of the Sun (Summary Report of the Maricopa Regional Arts and Culture Task Force, 2004); What Matters: The Maturing of Greater Phoenix, Fourth in the Series of Indicators of Our Quality of Life (Section 9: Arts, Culture and Recreation), (2004); and A Place for Arts & Culture: A Maricopa County Overview (2003); and “How Do Arizonans Spend their Personal Time?” Arizona Views (Arizona Indicators Panel), Volume 1, Issue 1, (October 2008): 1-6.
The National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NASAA) is the membership organization that unites, represents, and serves the nation’s state and jurisdictional arts agencies. Each of the 56 states and jurisdictions has created an agency to support excellence in and access to the arts. NASAA’s mission is to strengthen state arts agencies. We represent their individual and collective interests, empower their work through knowledge, and advance the arts as an essential public benefit. We fulfill our mission in three ways. Knowledge: NASAA facilitates the transfer of ideas, helping state arts agencies to pioneer, share, and apply knowledge about serving the public effectively. NASAA’s research and education services inform and inspire, empowering public sector leadership for the arts in every state. Representation: NASAA provides national representation for state arts agencies, ensuring that their policy and resource interests have a persuasive voice. NASAA advances the value of state arts agencies, bringing visibility and recognition to their accomplishments. NASAA also champions the arts and state arts agencies, advocating for a robust public sector role in American cultural life. Community: NASAA connects state arts agency staff and council members, making the collective experiences and wisdom of the field a resource for everyone. NASAA embraces both the differences and similarities among states, widening understanding, and creating common cause. Participation in a rewarding and welcoming professional community strengthens state arts agencies in all corners of the country. NASAA publishes a Public Funding Sourcebook (1970-present).


National Endowment for the Arts: http://www.nea.gov/

The NEA was established by Congress in 1965 as an independent agency of the federal government. To date, the NEA has awarded more than $4 billion to support artistic excellence, creativity, and innovation for the benefit of individuals and communities. The NEA extends its work through partnerships with state arts agencies, local leaders, other federal agencies, and the philanthropic sector.

Art Works: The Official Blog of the NEA: http://www.arts.gov/artworks/

National Endowment for the Humanities: http://www.neh.gov/

The NEH is an independent federal agency created in 1965. One of the largest funders of humanities programs in the United States, it is dedicated to supporting research, education, preservation, and public programs in the humanities. Because democracy demands wisdom, the NEH serves and strengthens our Republic by promoting excellence in the humanities and conveying the lessons of history to all Americans. The Endowment accomplishes this mission by providing grants for high-quality humanities projects in four funding areas: preserving and providing access to cultural
resources, education, research, and public programs. NEH grants typically go to
cultural institutions, such as museums, archives, libraries, colleges, universities, public
 television, and radio stations, and to individual scholars. NEH grants strengthen
 teaching and learning in the humanities in schools and colleges across the nation,
 facilitate research and original scholarship, provide opportunities for lifelong learning,
 preserve and provide access to cultural and educational resources, and strengthen the
 institutional base of the humanities

*Otis Report on the Creative Economy of the Los Angeles Region: The Power of Art and Artists* (Los Angeles: Otis College of Art and Design, 2010). This is the fourth Otis report (the first
was in 2007): http://www.otis.edu/creative_economy/

The NEA blog on the Otis report headlined: “Creativity is Serious Business.”
http://www.arts.gov/artworks/?p=4937

Using 2009 data, the report demonstrates once again that creativity is serious business
in Southern California. Even in these challenging economic times, the creative
 economy is one of the largest business sectors in the region, second only to tourism
 and hospitality. In 2009, the arts, design, and entertainment industries together
 supported one in six jobs in the area, generated $127 billion in sales revenues, and
 were the source of $4.6 billion in state and local tax revenues. These regional
 findings make a national case. They put real numbers to the economic contributions of
 creative professionals and enterprises. Furthermore, the Otis Report data affirm that
 the 21st century is an age of ideas, in which creativity provides a long-range and
 sustainable competitive edge for the U.S. economy. Despite manufacturing downturns
due largely to regional outsourcing of low-skill jobs, creative sector employment is
 projected to grow faster than in other sectors over the next five years and especially
 for high-skill creative jobs. Creativity stays onshore; innovation cannot be outsourced.
 Hard data are but one way to substantiate the economic impact of creativity. In his
 keynote remarks at the Otis Report release event, NEA Chairman Rocco Landesman
 made a most compelling statement: “Artists are placemakers. When you bring arts
 organizations and arts workers into a neighborhood, the place changes to a vibrant and
 sustainable community. The arts complement and complete other sectors of the
 economy.” Through this broader lens, the data in the Otis Report are more than the
 facts of creativity’s economic impact; they are the story of possibilities made real by
 a combination of education, talent, entrepreneurial drive, and opportunities. The lives,
 work, and achievements of creative professionals, such as Otis alumni, illustrate the
 power of the arts and artists in our economy, culture, and communities. Their impact
 and contributions cannot be taken for granted. Vibrant creativity in the U.S. requires
 careful investment—as envisioned by the “Art Works” agenda of NEA.

Western States Arts Federation (WESTAF), Denver, Colorado: http://www.westaf.org/

WESTAF is a non-profit arts service organization dedicated to the creative
 advancement and preservation of the arts. Their website includes a blog, as well as
 annotated arts links to resources on accessibility, arts education, folklife,
 international arts, literary arts, media, presenting and touring, state and regional arts
agencies, and the visual arts. As part of WESTAF’s mission to strengthen the financial, organizational, and policy infrastructure of the arts in the West, WESTAF regularly undertakes research projects on behalf of our member arts agencies and the general arts community. The results of our research are usually presented in position papers, many of which are available to the general public upon request. Papers have been completed on such topics as: economic arguments for the public funding of the arts; opportunities for collaboration among cultural agencies; background information concerning the development of cultural trust legislation; and an assessment of the effectiveness of legislative arts caucuses in advocating for the arts.
Poetry and Art: Information and Biographies

The art works that appear on the front and back covers, as well as those reproduced within the report, reference broader issues that transcend the Arizona’s cultural community.

Janet Echelman’s *Her Secret is Patience* (2009), on the cover, speaks to Arizona’s national leadership in the realm of public art. It is a signature piece of an ambitious vision for the revitalization Phoenix’s downtown, bolstered by ASU’s downtown campus and the light rail system, which opened in December 2008. On the back cover is a work by Matthew Moore. He is the last of four generations of farmers in the West Valley, and his “Urban Plough” series suggest the collision of suburban expansion and development with the state’s traditional agricultural base. The photograph by Mark Klett and Byron Wolfe references a rich landscape history, as well as the fact that with the Santa Fe Railway and the Fred Harvey Company, it was artists who helped both to make the Grand Canyon grand and to sell the Southwest to cultural tourists. Tiffiney Yazzie is a young Navajo photographer, and her image of a shelf of books on Navajo culture records what are widely regarded as important publications on the subject, but whose authors are are largely White. D. Bryon Darby dramatically visualizes the dynamic growth of Arizona’s transportation hubs in his riveting image of seventy flights landing at Sky Harbor Airport in a ninety-minute time span. The tile mural by Cristina Cárdenas of Tucson is embedded in a long tradition of Latina art in the state of Arizona and has deep links to the Mexican muralists. Cowboy poetry by Carole Jarvis and Scott Baxter’s photograph of Sam Udall at the Y Cross Ranch references an important part of Arizona’s heritage.

Scott T. Baxter has been a professional photographer for over twenty-five years. His documentary projects include photographing the indigenous peoples of Chiapas, Mexico. Project Statement: “100 Years 100 Ranchers” coincides with Arizona’s 2012 Centennial and documents 100 Arizona ranchers whose families have been ranching in Arizona since 1912 or earlier. I have always been drawn to people. Regardless of the setting, the human element in a photograph will always give one a sense of place and perspective. The ranching tradition in Arizona is enduring and important, even more so as conditions such as encroaching development, drought, and dire economic conditions have made a difficult way of life even more tenuous. Disputes over water rights, grazing fees, and recreation have also deeply affected the ranching way of life. The intense demanding work involved in running a ranch has led some children to choose not to stay on and pursue this life. Ranchers love what they do, and cherish the land and tradition that has been passed down to them through their families. My goal is to recognize the families that have struggled to survive and persevere in these challenging times. As ranches are lost to developers and poor economic conditions, my work preserves photographically an integral part of Arizona’s tradition and history. I work with black and white large format film as a monochromatic study effectively portrays the spirit of this unique group of Arizonans. Working with large and medium format film slows down the process and allows me to engage my subjects in a more personal, less detached manner. I travel to each rancher’s headquarters in order to get to know each individual and their operations.
Cristina Cárdenas was born in Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico, where she studied architecture at the Instituto Tecnológico de Estudios Superiores de Occidente (ITESO). Cárdenas pursued further training at the Universidad de Guadalajara under Francisco Caracalla and Jorge Martínez, former assistants to muralist José Clemente Orozco. Her draftsmanship, iconography, artistic forms, color, and styles are derived from Mexican neo-figurative expressionism in combination with the academic training she received in the United States, where she studied painting and printmaking with Luis Jimenez, Robert Colescott, Bruce McGrew, and Bailey Doogan at the University of Arizona. Cárdenas earned a Master of Fine Arts degree in printmaking in 1990, and has lived and worked in Tucson for over two decades. Her large and small-scale paintings, lithographs, and monoprints disrupt stereotypes of gender, religion, and culture. More recently she has incorporated photographs and digital images of historical subjects and self-portraits in works on fine art paper and wood panel surfaces. For the last decade, she has also used bark/amate paper produced by the Otomi Indians of San Pablito, Puebla, Mexico. A textured bark paper made using pre-Hispanic methods, amate provides a historical link to her Mexican indigenous roots. Cárdenas combines amate with assorted media such as acrylic and gouache paints, dry pigments, gold leaf, and printmaking techniques. She uses modern techniques on ancient surfaces to create new representations of female archetypes derived from classical Mexican antiquity, contemporary interpretations of female saints, and intimate (auto)biographical portraits of womanhood and motherhood. Her work also explores the experience of unnamed or unknown immigrant subjects from the perspective of a woman artist born in Mexico who lives in a border zone. Her art engages the simultaneous challenges of belonging to a cultural community and forming an individual identity.

D. Bryon Darby has been photographing the ever-changing landscape of the West for the past decade. A life-long inhabitant of the desert, Bryon was raised in Northern Utah where he received a Bachelor of Fine Arts in graphic design from Utah State University. Since completing his undergraduate degree in the spring of 2001, Bryon has supported himself as a commercial artist in the advertising and editorial fields. Presently, he is working on a public art commission with the Phoenix Office of Cultural Affairs while finishing his Master of Fine Arts in Photography at Arizona State University. His current work explores ideas about the power of place on personal experience while expanding on notions of culture and landscape.

Janet Echelman reshapes urban airspace with monumental, fluidly moving sculpture that responds to environmental forces including wind, water, and sunlight. In 2010, she premiered Water Sky Garden at the Vancouver Olympic Winter Games, and in 2009, she completed the largest public art commission in the United States that year, Her Secret is Patience, in Phoenix. This sculpture was recognized by a Public Art Network, Year in Review Award that same year. Her art has been presented in Spain, Italy, Portugal, Lithuania, India, Japan, Indonesia, Hong Kong, Canada, Mexico, and the United States. She graduated from Harvard and completed graduate degrees in psychology and painting. About the art work: Suspended above the two-city-block Civic Space Park, the sculpture is monumental yet soft, fixed in place but constantly in motion, it dances gently in the air, choreographed by the flux of desert winds. The large three-dimensional multi-layered net form is created by a combination of hand-baited and machine-loomed knotting, and is the result of a collaborative effort with an international team of award-winning aeronautical and mechanical engineers, architects,
lighting designers, landscape architects, and fabricators. This work redefines the “art space,” by bringing viewers’ eyes upwards to the sky, focused on a new celestial object. During the day, the sculpture hovers high above heads, treetops, and buildings. The sculpture projects what the artist calls “shadow drawings” onto the ground, inspired by Phoenix’s cloud shadows that captivated the artist from her first site visit. At night, the illumination program changes color gradually through the seasons. Using 20 high-intensity metal halide fixtures at five separate locations, a range of blue and magenta dichroic glass lenses were combined to enhance without overpowering the richness of the net’s integrally-colored polyester fiber. The lighting design also changes what portion of the sculpture is illuminated, leaving parts obscured in mystery, much like the phases of the moon. When traveling to Phoenix for the first time, the artist was “mesmerized by the broad, open sky that seemed to stretch endlessly.” She said she was drawn to Arizona’s distinctive monsoon cloud formations, “the shock of desert winds, whirls of dust, the crash of lightning, and that luminous blue turning to violet and orange, then velvety blue-black.” She was also inspired by the structure and pace of desert flora. “I’m moved by the exertion of the Cereus, a spiny cactus putting down roots in search of water in the desert, her patience in saving up every ounce of energy until, one night, in the middle of the cool darkness, she unfurls one succulent bloom,” said the artist. Another source of inspiration was the local fossil record, which geologists confirmed evidence that this site was once an ocean filled with marine life. The title comes from a quote by American poet philosopher Ralph Waldo Emerson, who wrote “Adopt the pace of nature; her secret is patience.”

Carole Jarvis, who lives on a desert ranch in Forepaugh, near Wickenburg, is the author of *Time Not Measured by a Clock: Cowboy Poetry from the Life of a Cowboy’s Wife* (2003). In 2001, she was the recipient of the Gail I. Gardner Award for a Working Cowboy Poet at the Arizona Cowboy Poets Gathering in Prescott and the 2003 Western Heritage Award at the 15th Annual Cowboy Christmas Poetry Gathering in Wickenburg. As a young girl growing up in southern California, she dreamed of “a ranch, a cowboy, and a horse.” Her dreams came true in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, when she met a handsome cowboy named Dan Jarvis, whom she married in 1957. For 53 years, they lived and cowboayed in Wyoming, Oregon, and Arizona, sharing a life of hard work, horses, and freedom in the beautiful landscape of the American West. Carole remains active on the cowboy poetry circuit, where her poems honor the heritage of the rangeland and the men, women, horses, and cattle who have worked it for generations. As she said in one poem: “I’m glad I still live where there’s cowboys.”

Mark Klett is Regents’ Professor of Art at Arizona State University in Tempe. Trained as a geologist, Klett photographs the intersection of culture, landscapes and time. He established his artistic perspective on the American West landscape as the chief photographer for the Rephotographic Survey Project (1977-79), which re-photographed Western sites first captured by surveyors in late 1800s. Since then, Klett has authored 13 books, including his most recent works, *Saguaros* (Radius Press and DAP, 2007), *After the Ruins* (University of California Press, 2006), *Yosemite in Time* (Trinity University Press, 2005) and *Third Views, Second Sights* (Museum of New Mexico Press, 2004). He has received fellowships from the Guggenheim Foundation, the National Endowment for the Arts, the Buhl Foundation, and the Japan/U.S. Friendship Commission. Klett’s work is exhibited, published and collected both nationally and internationally.
Matthew Moore is a fourth generation farmer whose land and life is quickly being overcome by suburban sprawl. He creates large site-specific earthworks on and around his family’s land, which highlight the grounds on which the urban and rural collide and compete. Moore also works with video and installation art, addressing issues of ecological, cultural, and economical sustainability revealed through his artistic narrative regarding the potential loss of the romanticized American farm. Moore’s work is a part of a traveling show about the contemporary American suburb for the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis, which is being curated with the Heinz Architectural Center at the Carnegie Museum of Art in Pittsburgh.

Artist Statement: I am the last of four generations to farm my family’s land. Within five years, my home (this land) will transform into suburbia. As a farmer and an artist, I display the realities of this transition in order to rationalize and document my displacement from the land on which I was raised. The trials and tribulations of American agriculture, its roles in contemporary globalization, and its questionable ecological practices create a foundation for my explorations. By displaying the past and future of the farm, I have used our land to explore similarities between commercial agriculture and suburbia, which reveal their social, cultural, and economic impacts locally, nationally, and internationally. Documenting the reality of land and appetite from agriculture to suburbia, the decisions of our society reveal consumer models that make us disobedient to our relationship with land and time. By exhibiting this theater of evolution and loss, I have entered a historical dialogue of displacement that reveals my part (in agriculture) in the transformation of my family’s land and identity. Through my artwork, I look at these dilemmas that reveal the impact of the American dream on our society and the land as we transition towards a post agrarian nation.

Alberto Rios is a Regents’ Professor at Arizona State University, and Katherine C. Turner Endowed Chair in English. He is the author of ten books and chapbooks of poetry, three collections of short stories, and a memoir. His books of poems include, most recently, The Dangerous Shirt, along with The Theater of Night, winner of the 2007 PEN/Beyond Margins Award, The Smallest Muscle in the Human Body, finalist for the National Book Award, Teodoro Luna’s Two Kisses, The Lime Orchard Woman, The Warrington Poems, Five Indiscretions, and Whispering to Fool the Wind, which won the Walt Whitman Award. His three collections of short stories are, most recently, The Curtain of Trees, along with Pig Cookies and The Iguana Killer, which won the first Western States Book Award for Fiction, judged by Robert Penn Warren. His memoir about growing up on the Mexico-Arizona border, called Capirotada, won the Latino Literary Hall of Fame Award and was designated the OneBookArizona choice for 2009. Rios is the recipient of the Western Literature Association Distinguished Achievement Award, the Arizona Governor’s Arts Award, fellowships from the Guggenheim Foundation and the National Endowment for the Arts, the Walt Whitman Award, the Western States Book Award for Fiction, six Pushcart Prizes in both poetry and fiction, and inclusion in The Norton Anthology of Modern Poetry, as well as over 250 other national and international literary anthologies. His work is regularly taught and translated, and has been adapted to dance and both classical and popular music.

Byron Wolfe is the David W. and Helen E.F. Lantis University Professor of Communication Design at California State University, Chico. Through photography and digital imagery, he reflects his deep and abiding interest in ideas about place, history, time, perception, representation, and personal experience. His work is the permanent collection of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art; The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston; The Center for
Creative Photography, Tucson; The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles; and the Nelson-Atkins Museum, Kansas City, Missouri. He is the recipient of the Santa Fe Prize for Photography and a Guggenheim Fellowship. He has published three books: *Everyday: A Yearlong Photo Diary*, a photographic narrative about creative practice, place, change, and the meandering flow of life, and two collaborative projects—*Third Views, Second Sights: A Rephotographic Survey of the American West* (with Mark Klett et. al.) and *Yosemite in Time: Ice Ages, Tree Rocks, Ghost Rivers* (with Mark Klett and Rebecca Solnit). He received his M.F.A. from Arizona State University and his B.A. from the University of Redlands in Redlands, California.

Tiffiney Yazzie grew up in Chinle, Arizona. She is from the Yucca Fruit-Strung-Out-In-A-Line Clan and is born for the Salt People Clan. Her maternal grandparents are of the Towering House Clan of the Navajo Nation. She is currently pursuing her Bachelor of Fine Arts degree in Photography and Bachelors of Arts degree in Art History at the Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts at Arizona State University. She is a member of the ASU Student Photographers’ Association and the Society for Photographic Education.