



California

Cultural

Districts

# FINAL REPORT: CULTURAL DISTRICTS PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

*To encourage the development of a broad array of authentic and sustainable cultural districts that reflect the breadth and diversity of California's extensive cultural assets.*

---

Prepared for the California Arts Council

FALL 2016

Jessica Cusick

Maria Rosario Jackson

## I. PROPOSED PROGRAM PURPOSE, GOALS AND STRUCTURE

The California Arts Council's (CAC) cultural districts program will assist Californians in leveraging the state's considerable assets in the areas of culture, creativity, and diversity, as initially set out in the enabling legislation, [AB 189](#). A cultural district is generally understood as a well-defined geographic area with a high concentration of cultural resources and activities<sup>1</sup>.

The California cultural districts program will have the following goals:

- To encourage the development of a broad array of authentic and sustainable cultural districts that reflect the breadth and diversity of California's extensive cultural assets
- To identify, support, and connect centers of arts and cultural activity throughout the state through the certification process
- To provide increased access to the arts and culture through the development and preservation of cultural centers throughout the state
- To foster increased opportunities for artists, craftsmen, and other small businesses contributing to the creative economy
- To encourage the retention of homegrown assets and actively work to mitigate displacement
- To support enhancements to the built environment and resident's pride and stewardship of place by helping to foster remarkable places
- To contribute to increased public awareness of, and visits to, California's centers of cultural activity

California's cultural districts initiative offers an opportunity to create a program that is tailored to the nature and circumstances of a large, populous, and diverse state. It is recommended that the program be built around three major components: 1) certification, 2) funding, and 3) a resource center, which will be put in place over time. In addition, because of the tremendous interest in cultural districts, and the complexity of tailoring a program to adequately support the full range of types of cultural centers throughout the state, the consultants propose that the program be initiated via a two-year long pilot, where a select cohort of designated districts actively engage in refining the final design of the program. Applications for the pilot cohort will be solicited in early 2017 with the goal of selecting a small group of 10 to 15 districts that represent the many possible manifestations of cultural centers present in California. At a minimum the cohort should include districts from urban, suburban and rural locations, as well as districts with an emphasis on cultural consumption, cultural production and cultural heritage. Further it should include districts that are at varied points in the life-cycle, from emerging to established.

---

<sup>1</sup> See glossary, appendix 1.

## II. RESEARCH AND PUBLIC INPUT METHODS

This report, and the associated recommendations for a state cultural districts program, are based on findings from research conducted by the consulting team, along with the information gathered through a comprehensive public input process that the team conducted in coordination with the CAC staff.

### *Research*

The consulting team engaged in a research process over several months which consisted of literature review, document review and interviews. The team compiled information on cultural districts nationally, including program materials and evaluations from several state programs, and conducted interviews with 25 selected local and national experts and thought leaders in a number of fields. Respondents include arts administrators, artists, community developers, and government officials, among others<sup>2</sup>.

### *Public Input*

Broad participation in public meetings, along with a robust survey response, provide a clear sense of hopes and concerns regarding state cultivation of cultural districts. Specifically, five public meetings, with over 400 participants, were held in Escondido, Fresno, Los Angeles, Oakland and Redding. Preliminary findings from the initial research phase were included in the materials presented at these meetings, and were also used to shape an on-line questionnaire completed by 326 respondents<sup>3</sup>. Participants at the public meetings had the option of submitting comment cards regarding their hopes and concerns for the cultural districts program, as well as providing formal testimony. The consultants also gathered feedback during two panel sessions at conferences for the art and design communities in Sacramento and San Jose. Finally, interested parties were given the option of organizing an in-person feedback session in their community, with a set of standard questions, although no information was received from these sessions.

The geographic distribution of the meetings along with the geographic distribution of survey respondents resulted in perspectives from people in diverse regions throughout the state. Most meeting participants and survey respondents were from the arts and cultural sector; primarily artists and arts administrators, along with a number of business owners and government officials. There was limited participation from developers and elected officials.

---

<sup>2</sup> See appendix 2 and 3 for a list of interviews and sample interview protocol

<sup>3</sup> See appendix 4 for a summary analysis of the survey responses

### III. OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS FROM NATIONAL REVIEW

As of this year, thirteen states have established statewide cultural district programs, while two others, Arkansas and California, have enacted cultural district policies but have yet to launch programs. In addition, several states are considering cultural district legislation. Rhode Island has the oldest program, established in 1998, and the newest, in South Carolina, was just launched in 2014. These programs have certified over 250 districts collectively, although the number of districts per state varies tremendously. In addition to state certification programs, cities throughout the country have mechanisms in place to designate cultural districts at the local level.

The National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NASAA) has developed two comprehensive reports<sup>4</sup> on state mandated cultural district programs, which provide valuable insights into the approaches taken by various states. The following summary of programs by state was developed by NASAA:

| State | Number of Districts (Year Program Began) | Certification Cycle   | Recertification Process                            | Decertification            | Evaluation/Metrics Method  |
|-------|--|---|--|----------------------------|--|
| CO    | 18 (2010)                                | Biennial (pending)  | Yes (every 5 years)                                | n/a                        | Annual report  |
| IA    | 35 (2005)                                | Ongoing   | Yes (every 10 years)                               | No                         | Periodic evaluation by the department of revenue   |
| IN    | 6 (2008)                                 | No policy; in practice about every other year                               | n/a  | Yes, but no formal process | Annual report  |
| KY    | 6 (2011)                                 | Annual  | Yes (each year district files public value report) | Yes                        | Annual report, site visits   |
| LA    | 78 (2008)                                | Annual  | n/a  | Yes                        | Annual report  |
| MA    | 32 (2010)                                | Rolling applications  | Yes (every 5 years)                                | No formal process          | Annual report, site visits   |
| MD    | 24 (2001)                                | Biannual  | Yes (every 10 years)                               | n/a                        | Annual report  |
| NM    | 8 (2008)                                 | Biennial (districts in cities w/ population over 50,000 can self-designate) | Yes (every 5 years)                                | Yes                        | Annual report, site visits   |
| OK    | 7 (2013)                                 | Triennial   | Yes (every 3 years)                                | n/a                        | Annual report, site visits   |
| RI    | 9 (1999)                                 | Ongoing   | n/a  | No formal process          | State tax office collects data on tax incentives; state arts agency has conducted one survey |
| SC    | 6 (2014)                                 | Ongoing   | Yes (every 5 years)                                | No                         | Annual report  |
| TX    | 28 (2009)                                | Annual  | Yes (every 10 years)                               | n/a                        | n/a  |
| WV    | 8 (2005)                                 | Ongoing   | Can be evaluated every 3 years                     | Yes                        | State arts agency evaluation any time after first 3 years                                    |

<sup>4</sup> [NASAA policy brief](#) and [NASAA strategy sampler](#)



The consultants sought to answer the following questions through the national review.

1. *What are the main benefits of cultural district designation?*

While the benefits of becoming a certified cultural district vary by state, most of the programs offer access to selected state resources, from grants to tax credits and other financial incentives, as well as partnerships with various state agencies which take many forms, from expedited permit review to special marketing initiatives. In addition, most of the programs offer technical assistance, including peer to peer learning opportunities such as convening.

2. *What factors contributed to the success of cultural districts in programs throughout the country?*

Some of the contributing factors to a successful cultural district include a pre-existing density of cultural resources in an area with a cohesive identity, which as the legislation notes can take many forms, and range from facilities to programs, and from historic and cultural resources, to creative individuals. One of the best ways to document the density of cultural resources in an area is to undertake a comprehensive approach to the development of a cultural asset inventory<sup>5</sup>; one that goes beyond just cultural organizations and facilities, and is inclusive of the many diverse contributing elements that make for a vibrant cultural center.

Other success factors include clearly articulated goals, such as the retention of artists or an increase in annual visitors; dedicated staff (full or part-time), along with multi-sector leadership, where non-profit organizations have come together with businesses and government to foster and manage the district; partnerships that go beyond the leadership of the district and involve the broader community; and finally, the ability to track and capture data that correlates to the district's goals.

3. *What have been some of the outcomes of a cultural districts initiative?*

Successful cultural districts offer many beneficial outcomes to the geographic area in which they are located and the surrounding community. Nationally, the beneficial outcome that has gotten the most attention is that cultural districts tend to become destinations for both locals and visitors, and as such contribute to economic influx and revitalization. Cultural districts are also being viewed as a tool to assist with the retention of homegrown assets and uses, including artists and arts organizations, as well other culturally and ethnically diverse facilities and uses, and small businesses.

4. *What are some of the challenges that are being experienced in cultivating cultural districts?*

In a review of the evaluations conducted by four of the existing state programs, as well as in interviews conducted with thought leaders, some key challenges to implementing successful

---

<sup>5</sup> See glossary, appendix 1

cultural districts programs emerged. The most often cited, at both the state and district level, is the lack of dedicated leadership and staffing. Another related challenge is the lack of clearly documented objectives and corresponding data. At the district level people cited displacement or the loss of existing assets, with the accompanying loss of authenticity, as one of the primary challenges to anticipate and prevent.

#### **IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR CALIFORNIA'S PROGRAM FROM BOTH THE RESEARCH AND PUBLIC INPUT**

1. *Program priorities vary by geographic area and include access to a broad range of resources, both informational and financial.*

The most desired benefits of certification include recognition, funding, and tools to help preserve existing cultural resources, with a focus on equitable development and ways to mitigate displacement especially in communities that feel vulnerable given rapid development, escalating real estate prices, and other contextual circumstances. Combined these represent the top three categories identified in both the survey and the comment cards. Another priority that emerged is assistance in developing better partnerships with local government, as well as a better understanding of the value and importance of artists and cultural resources.

2. *Community impacts as a result of cultural districts elicit enthusiasm as well as concerns regarding access, competition, and additional pressure on fragile cultural centers*

Benefits associated with cultural districts range from an increased pride of place, to enhanced marketing opportunities for arts and cultural organizations as well as local businesses. Expanded cultural tourism is also frequently cited, in particular by rural and smaller communities.

Survey respondents were evenly split between those with no concerns, and those with concerns, while most participants at the public meetings did submit areas of concern. The most often cited concern is a top down planning approach and the associated lack of equitable distribution of resources. This was also stated as a desire for an inclusive and transparent process; one that does not pit cultural districts in the same town against each other, or arts against heritage, or small rural areas against more developed communities. In the survey 32% of respondents articulated some aspect of this issue.

Of equal importance is the concern that cultural district certification will exert increased pressure on cultural centers, leading to even more rapid gentrification and corresponding displacement. This mirrors the fact that one of the most urgent needs or benefits is access to comprehensive information on land-use controls<sup>6</sup> and other ways of preserving existing 'organic' cultural

---

<sup>6</sup> See glossary, appendix 1

districts. Another key issue across the board is how to ensure that artists and other creatives, who traditionally are the engines of cultural district creation, benefit from the increased attention and resources flowing to certified districts.

3. *Strong and complex demand for the program calls for a two-year pilot approach including an opportunity for program co-design with intended beneficiaries.*

The anticipation initially expressed after the legislation's adoption in late 2015, when the CAC received inquiries from over 400 individuals and organizations, has been confirmed by extensive participation in this initial planning process by people throughout the state. There is tremendous interest on the part of artists, cultural organizations, and local government in the prospect of certification as a state cultural district. The CAC can most likely anticipate a correspondingly large volume of applications, depending on the requirements articulated for certification, and that the initial application process and first group of certified districts will be subject to considerable attention and scrutiny. A pilot program, one that engages a select group of district participants in a well-documented refinement of the certification process and associated requirements, will help to ensure the success of the program over the long-term. By engaging artists, arts organizations, community developers, the business community, and local government representatives in a transparent, community engaged design<sup>7</sup> process, the CAC and the state can benefit from the collective insight of a wide cross-section of disciplines and approaches.

## V. RECOMMENDED INITIAL CAC APPROACH TO IMPLEMENTATION

The following are key recommended elements for CAC's approach to the cultural districts program.

1. *An accessible certification process, refined through a two-year pilot, will be the core of this important new state initiative.*

The cultural district certification process, managed by the CAC, will be the core of California's new cultural district initiative. It will start with a two-year pilot in which a small (10 to 15) representative cohort will actively participate in shaping the final certification process and related benefits and services. This initial group will be selected through an open application process, and will play a critical role in ensuring, through their feedback and experience, that the full program, once launched, is accessible and supportive. And that it works for various types of cultural centers, in a wide variety of urban, suburban and rural settings.

The district typology that is recommended includes the general categories in the table below. It is important to note that in regard to the cultural focus, it is likely that many districts will include

---

<sup>7</sup> See glossary, appendix 1

aspects of each, but will none the less have a higher concentration of one of the three. Districts will be asked to identify according to this broad typology. So, for example, a district might be rural, focused on cultural consumption and established, etc.

| <b>CONTEXT</b> | <b>FOCUS</b>         | <b>LIFE-CYCLE</b> |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| urban          | cultural production  | emerging          |
| suburban       | cultural consumption | mid-point         |
| rural          | cultural heritage    | established       |

The pilot cohort will help shape the final cultural district certification process and as such it is vitally important that they collectively represent all of the possibilities listed above and also include districts with a range of partnership approaches and goals.

Ideally, in order to structure and document the feedback of the pilot cohort to shape the final certification process, it is recommended that the CAC allocate resources to hire a developmental evaluation<sup>8</sup> team that can work with the CAC and the initial cohort throughout the two-year pilot.

It is recommended that this pilot cohort of certified cultural districts receive an array of benefits as part of the process that could include the following.

- Official state certification – each district will enter into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the CAC certifying state designation as a cultural district for a period of five years and granting the district the right to use the state cultural district brand in its marketing
- Branding materials – including the state cultural district logo, as well signage and banner templates
- Technical assistance - including at a minimum an annual convening session, as well as peer to peer and other group learning opportunities given available resources
- Joint marketing support – leveraging resources from state tourism partners
- A stipend – recommended at \$5,000 per district per year, to be used to support participation in the developmental evaluation process that will lead to the refinement of the design of the cultural districts program
- Participation in developmental evaluation – the pilot cohort will receive support from the consulting team conducting the developmental evaluation of the cultural districts program, including at a minimum one site visit per year

2. *Development of a funding stream will be critical to the long-term success of the cultural districts initiative, and ultimately to the state’s ability to effectively leverage California’s extensive diverse cultural resources.*

---

<sup>8</sup> See glossary, appendix 1



Many of the cultural districts programs throughout the country provide grants to support the work of the districts, in addition to access to other resources, such as tax incentives, regulatory assistance, and other forms of support. Each state is providing the support through different methods and sources. Massachusetts and Colorado have particularly large grant programs, in Colorado's case funded through a partnership with a private foundation. In some cases, such as in Texas, certification makes the entity eligible to apply for grants. Maryland and Louisiana focused primarily on tax incentives. Although there are many benefits that the CAC can confer working within existing resources and by partnering with other state agencies, over time one or more funding stream will need to be identified and cultivated for the cultural districts initiative to reach its full potential.

3. *Development of a comprehensive resource center is key to California's ability to foster a wide range of authentic sustainable cultural districts.*

For the cultural districts initiative to be able to properly serve a state as complex as California, with its breadth and diversity, and its corresponding varied needs, the CAC will need to foster a clear understanding of the many different approaches to cultivating and managing diverse types of cultural districts. This can be achieved through the development of a comprehensive resource center, complete with a resident expert staff person, to complement the certification program. This on-line repository of knowledge will be marketed and made available to all interested parties, from diverse policy sectors.

Development of this resource is particularly critical since each cultural district will need to assemble a different group of tools and solutions to achieve its goals, from artist retention to heritage preservation or cultural development. Many of the mechanisms for impacting land use, as well as the development incentives available to foster or preserve concentrations of cultural resources, need to be initiated at the local level. By making available select models and best-practices, along with a compilation of existing land use tools, financial and regulatory incentives, and other information on the development and management of cultural districts, the CAC will be able to support a thoughtful and varied approach to cultural districts throughout the state, one that encourages an organic, locally focused, approach to cultivating and preserving cultural assets. The on-line resources will be complemented by a program, or programs, to facilitate peer to peer learning, such as convening and regional networks.

The documents listed in the bibliography, along with the resources referenced in the glossary can provide an excellent starting point for the resource center. In addition, several states that have cultural district programs have extensive on-line resources. It is recommended that the CAC explore partnering with a university or other educational institution, to develop the full content of the on-line resource center.

The pilot cohort will also play a role by providing a constructive critique of initial resources and by sharing additional models and tools that work in their community. The resource center will

also play a critical role in supporting places and organizations that are interested in becoming certified, but are just beginning to coalesce.

4. *Additional considerations for the CAC as it embarks on implementing the new legislation, in partnership with other state departments, the cultural community and the private sector.*

- a. To ensure that this new program reaches its full potential, it is recommended the CAC dedicate staff to the initiative that can develop the agency's knowledge and expertise in this complex, multi-disciplinary area and take an entrepreneurial approach to partnership development. As the program grows, the associated time requirements could quickly translate to a full-time staff person or equivalent. In addition, the agency will need to identify resources to work with the initial cohort on the two-year pilot.
- b. The critical role partnerships play in effective cross-sectoral work emerged as primary theme in the research, at all levels, local, regional and state; and as such, partnership development will be a critical component of this initiative. The CAC has played an important leadership role over the last few years in developing new programmatic partnerships that foster greater engagement and understanding of the value of the arts within government as well as the private sector. The Arts in Corrections partnership with the California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation (CDCR) is an excellent example of this approach. Staff has begun to cultivate partnerships for the cultural districts initiative, forging official strategic partnerships with Visit California and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) which will provide increased visibility and marketing support for the pilot cohort, and improved understanding and access to Caltrans resources for cultural district events and for local identifiers such as public art or signage, respectively. Given the overlap between the missions of the following agencies and cultural districts, the Office of Historic Preservation, the Office for Business and Economic Development, and the Department of Housing and Community Development all offer substantial opportunities for partnership in implementing the cultural districts initiative.
- c. One of the potential sources of a funding stream for the cultural districts initiative is a partnership with a foundation, or a coalition of foundations, interested in developing stronger, more livable communities. For the last several years, particularly at the national level, there has been a revival of interest in cross-sectoral, comprehensive, place-based strategies to revive disinvested neighborhoods and communities. Alongside this revival of interest has been a heightened interest in the roles of art, culture and heritage as a driving element of community revitalization. This is evident in funding programs focused on creative placemaking<sup>9</sup> and, relatedly, a growing interest in community engaged design. Understanding the possible intersections between cultural districts and these funding and community development impulses is crucial.

---

<sup>9</sup> See glossary, appendix 1

- d. Economic incentives for the development of cultural resources, along with regulatory or land-use tools that can be used to preserve existing cultural centers are two of the most eagerly anticipated benefits of this initiative. While many of these will need to be cultivated and implemented at the local level, the CAC could potentially encourage their adoption by making them a requirement of state certification and encouraging the involvement of community development and urban planning fields in the cultural district development work. Tools that may prove to be beneficial to cultural district development may include business improvement districts<sup>10</sup>, land trusts, community benefit agreements, rent stabilization tactics, small business development programs, and a host of other tactics and tools frequently used by community developers and urban planners. There is also an opportunity to collaborate with planners and community developers to create and experiment with new tools that do not readily exist. This includes the possibility of a cultural impact assessment potentially aligned or embedded with widely practiced environmental impact assessment processes -- possibly as a component of the requirements under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), for example.

## VI. PROPOSED REQUIREMENTS FOR THE INITIAL APPLICANTS

Applications for the pilot cohort will be solicited in early 2017 with the goal of selecting a small group of districts that represent the many possible manifestations of cultural districts present in California. At a minimum the cohort should include districts from urban and rural locations, as well as districts with an emphasis on cultural consumption, cultural production and cultural heritage. A framework for that selection process is attached in appendix 2, with key requirements highlighted below.

Only partnerships will be eligible to apply, ones that include, at a minimum, a cultural non-profit or artist collective, a local business or business association, and a branch of local government and/or a community development corporation. The majority of organizations in the partnership must be located in the district. In addition, to be eligible to apply, the cultural district must have at a minimum completed a preliminary cultural asset survey or inventory, as outlined in appendix 7.

Ensuring that all parties have a good understanding of the full array of cultural assets present in the district will be critical to its long-term success. A comprehensive approach to cultural assets helps to ensure authenticity and the preservation of homegrown assets, both of which were indicators of a successful district based on the research. These were also areas of particular concern for the public based on the comments and survey.

---

<sup>10</sup> See glossary, appendix 1

The application and review process will have three steps, including an open call for initial letters of interest, site visits for semi-finalists, and an invited finalist application. A multi-disciplinary and multi-sector selection panel, along with representatives from other state agencies that are partnering on the initiative, will review each phase and select the pilot cohort.

## VII. RECOMMENDED TIMELINE AND BUDGET FOR THE PILOT

The application and selection process for the pilot cohort could be implemented over approximately six months if adequate staff and financial resources are available. Proposed key milestones include the following:

- **January 2017**
  - Issue notice of opportunity for the pilot cohort and request letters of interest (open for 8 weeks)
  - Issue an RFP for developmental evaluation consultant(s) to support the pilot process
- **February 2017**
  - Conduct application/LOI webinar
  - Develop lists of potential panelists
- **March 2017**
  - Letters of interest due to the CAC
  - Appoint panel
  - Select developmental evaluation team
  - Publish guidelines for the final application
  - Identify site visitors and finalize site visit protocol
- **April/May 2017**
  - Panel selects semi-finalists (late April)
  - Conduct site visits for semi-finalists
- **May 2017**
  - Notify finalists, finalist application period opens
- **June/July 2017**
  - Final applications due (allow a minimum of 30 days from notification)
  - Panel selects pilot cohort

In order to execute the pilot program as recommended, including stipends for the cohort, two annual convening sessions, and the extensive participation of a developmental assessment team, the CAC will need to identify between \$150,000 and \$175,000 per year for the two year period, in addition to dedicating a substantial amount of staff time.

## VIII. CONCLUSION

With the adoption of AB 189, the state legislature put in place an important new tool for the development, support, and preservation of California’s extensive and diverse cultural assets. Implementing the program will require a carefully tailored approach, one that harnesses the creative energy of the many individuals and organizations working in the field, and considers the unique circumstances of California.

As stated earlier in this report, the recommendations for the program’s structure and the selection of the initial group of designated districts are based on research, best practices, and public input regarding the divergent needs of individuals, organizations, and communities throughout the state. Working with a select group of intended beneficiaries to refine these recommendations as they are put into practice offers an exciting opportunity to innovate and craft a program that is truly responsive to, and reflective of, the breadth and complexity of the state. In implementing these recommendations, the CAC has the potential to build a new set of resources and partnerships that will complement the work it and other state agencies are doing to support thriving communities throughout the state.



**LIST OF APPENDICES:**

1. Glossary of terms
2. Selection framework for the pilot cohort
3. Template for preliminary cultural asset inventory
4. List of interviews
5. Interview protocol
6. Summary analysis of survey responses
7. Strategic Partnership Details (Visit California and Caltrans)
8. Bibliography

# CALIFORNIA CULTURAL DISTRICTS

California

Cultural

Districts

## APPENDIX 1

### GLOSSARY

**Business improvement district (BID)** - A defined area within which businesses pay an additional tax or fee in order to fund improvements within the district's boundaries. An example of a business improvement district with a cultural and historic focus is the new Central Avenue Historic District BID in Los Angeles <http://www.centralavenuehistoricdistrict.org/>

**Community engaged design**, as defined by the Surdna Foundation, one of the leading funders of the approach, is when *community members contribute to decisions, policies and projects that impact their lives. We believe that artists, architects, and designers can play an important role in translating community values into design solutions that will benefit the communities where they live and work.* Although most often used in reference to the design of physical resources, it also applies to policies and programs.

For additional information on community engaged design please see this site funded by the Surdna Foundation <http://communityengageddesign.org/about-us/>

**Creative placemaking**, as defined by the National Endowment for the Arts is *when artists, arts organizations, and community development practitioners deliberately integrate arts and culture into community revitalization work - placing arts at the table with land-use, transportation, economic development, education, housing, infrastructure, and public safety strategies.*

For additional information on creative placemaking please see ArtPlace America <http://www.artplaceamerica.org> and the Our Town Program at the National Endowment for the Arts <https://www.arts.gov/grants-organizations/our-town/introduction>.

**Cultural asset inventory** is a compilation of the people, places, organizations, and events that contribute to the history and culture of a neighborhood or district. It can take many forms including a list, a database or a map. Communities throughout the country, and throughout the world, are finding it to be a valuable tool in understanding the unique qualities that they value in a place. In California, the Alliance for Traditional Culture (ACTA) recently completed a 'cultural treasures' inventory for four communities.

For additional information on cultural asset inventories or mapping please see ACTA, <http://www.actaonline.org/content/building-healthy-communities-cultural-treasures> or the

examples available on the National Endowment for the Arts website at <https://www.arts.gov/exploring-our-town/showcase/type/Asset-Mapping> or the comprehensive Australian site <http://camra.culturemap.org.au/>. Two useful handbooks on cultural asset mapping are available at the following links: one from Ontario Municipal Cultural Planning [http://www.ontariomcp.ca/toolkits/CulturalResourceMapping\\_digital.pdf](http://www.ontariomcp.ca/toolkits/CulturalResourceMapping_digital.pdf) and from the Creative City Network of Canada <https://www.creativecity.ca/publications/ccnc-toolkits.php>

**Cultural district** is generally understood as a well-defined geographic area with a high concentration of cultural resources and activities. In AB 189, the legislation that establishes cultural districts in California, the following inclusive language is used to describe districts and the purposes they serve: “*state-designated cultural district*” means a geographical area certified pursuant to this chapter with a concentration of cultural facilities, creative enterprises, or arts venues that does any of the following:

- (1) *Attracts artists, creative entrepreneurs, and cultural enterprises.*
- (2) *Encourages economic development and supports entrepreneurship in the creative community.*
- (3) *Encourages the preservation and reuse of historic buildings and other artistic and culturally significant structures.*
- (4) *Fosters local cultural development.*
- (5) *Provides a focal point for celebrating and strengthening the unique cultural identity of the community.*
- (6) *Promotes opportunity without generating displacement or expanding inequality.*

General information on cultural districts is available from Americans for the Arts at <http://www.americansforthearts.org/by-program/reports-and-data/toolkits/national-cultural-districts-exchange-toolkit>

Examples of cultural districts are available on the National Endowment for the Arts website at <https://www.arts.gov/exploring-our-town/showcase/type/Cultural-District-Planning>

**Developmental evaluation** is an emerging approach to evaluating complex processes that was pioneered by Michael Quinn Patton, and is considered to be particularly applicable to situations where a funder is developing and testing its strategies while it proceeds with a project or program. It is intended to combine the rigor of evaluation with the flexibility required for a project still in development.

Two publications on developmental evaluation are available from the JW McConnell Family Foundation here:  
<http://www.mcconnellfoundation.ca/assets/Media%20Library/Publications/A%20Developmental%20Evaluation%20Primer%20-%20EN.pdf>  
<http://mcconnellfoundation.ca/assets/Media%20Library/Publications/DE%20201%20EN.pdf>

**Land-use tools** are multiple and varied, with the most common being land-use restrictions generally accomplished through zoning. Various articles on land-use written for non-planners are available here at Planners Web <http://plannersweb.com/topics/basic-tools/zoning-land-use-regulations/>. A primer on land-use in California is available through the Office of Planning and Research <https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/StrategiesforSustainableCommunities.pdf>

**Technical assistance** (TA) is the process of providing the expertise needed to an individual or organization in order to assist with a specific issue or to promote greater capacity within the organization. Some of the most common ways of providing technical assistance include one-on-one consultation, peer to peer learning, or through an on-line information resource. A resource for technical assistance in California is the Center for Non-Profit Management <https://cnmsocal.org/>

**Types of cultural districts** - this report proposes a basic typology for cultural districts in California, including geographic context (urban, suburban, & rural), focus (consumption, production, heritage) as well as where the district is in a life-cycle (emerging, mid-point & established).

- **Cultural consumption** district means a district that emphasizes experiencing art, with a concentration of venues and facilities where the public can go and have a range of art experiences. An example might be a theater district.
- **Cultural production** district means a district that emphasizes the creation of art, craft, and other creative products, with a concentration of artist studios, creative workplaces, and other assets focused on production. An example might be an artist studio district.
- **Cultural heritage district** means a district that focuses on a particular culture, tradition or history. An example might be a Chinatown district or a downtown historic district.
- **Emerging** means a district that is just forming or has been in existence, as a partnership or management structure with staff and programming, for less than five years.
- **Established** means a district that has been in existence with a management structure, staff, and programming for more than ten years.
- **Mid-point** means a district, with a management structure, staff, and programming, that has been in existence for between five to ten years

# CALIFORNIA CULTURAL DISTRICTS



## APPENDIX 2

### RECOMMENDED SELECTION FRAMEWORK FOR THE PILOT COHORT

The California Arts Council's (CAC) Cultural Districts program will assist Californians in leveraging the state's considerable assets in the areas of culture, creativity, and diversity, as initially set out in the enabling legislation, [AB 189](#). A cultural district is generally understood as a well-defined geographic area with a high concentration of cultural resources and activities.

California's cultural districts initiative offers an opportunity to create a program that is tailored to the nature and circumstances of a large, populous, and diverse state. It is recommended that the program be built around three major components: 1) certification, 2) funding, and 3) a resource center, which will be put in place over time. In addition, because of the tremendous interest in cultural districts, and the complexity of tailoring a program to adequately support the full range of types of cultural centers throughout the state, the consultants propose that the program be initiated via a two-year long pilot, where a select cohort of designated districts actively engage in refining the final design of the program.

An initial cohort of ten to fifteen districts will be selected through an open application process. Applications will be solicited in early 2017 with the goal of identifying a small well rounded group of communities that are diverse in make-up, geography and purpose, and that represent the many possible manifestations of cultural districts present in California.

The typology of districts envisioned is discussed in the overall report, and is based on a flexible matrix that includes the following.

| CONTEXT  | FOCUS                | LIFE-CYCLE  |
|----------|----------------------|-------------|
| urban    | cultural production  | emerging    |
| suburban | cultural consumption | mid-point   |
| rural    | cultural heritage    | established |

So, for example, a district might be rural, focused on cultural consumption and established, etc. At a minimum the cohort should include representatives of each of these types.



## **A. RECOMMENDED ELEMENTS OF THE APPLICATION AND SELECTION PROCESS**

The selection of the initial pilot cohort will take place through a three phase process, starting with an open call to all interested communities to submit a letter of interest (LOI). A panel will review the initial submittals and select a group of semi-finalists who will receive site visits. Findings from the site visits will be reviewed and a group of finalists will be invited to submit a full application.

At each stage of the process, applicants will be grouped by type, and each group will be reviewed separately to help ensure adequate representation of all types of cultural districts in the pilot cohort and to help ensure a fair and equitable review of all applications. The following are recommendations for the selection process and review criteria that will need to be operationalized by CAC staff in keeping with existing applicable CAC processes, criteria, and conventions.

The application materials and process are envisioned as the first step in technical assistance and will be developed accordingly, with the goal of cultivating widespread understanding of the potential benefits of cultural districts, and the tools associated with the designation, at the local and the state level. For example, the guidelines for the LOI could provide examples of the types of resources each partner might bring to the table in the final application, which would help applicants in both planning and negotiating a final partnership.

## **B. MINIMUM ELIGIBILITY**

The following are recommended as the minimum requirements that would need to be met for groups to be eligible to apply for cultural district certification during this pilot round.

- Only partnerships will be eligible to apply
  - At a minimum the partnership must include a cultural non-profit or artist collective, a local business or business association, and a branch of local government
  - The partnership needs to be formalized, including formal acknowledgement by the local government partner through a letter or resolution by the time of final application.
  - Local community development corporations (CDCs) can serve as a partner in lieu of government, which could be particularly important in low-income neighborhoods and traditional ethnic heritage communities
- The majority of organizations in the partnership must have offices or facilities or conduct a majority of the organization's programming within the area seeking designation as a district.
- There will be two tracks within the certification process, urban and rural, with different eligibility requirements in regards to geographic boundaries.
  - Urban cultural districts are generally expected to be a contiguous geographic area that is walkable.

- Rural districts do not need to be walkable or even contiguous, but will need to make the case for how the participating areas/entities are complementary and synergistic
- Completion of a preliminary cultural asset inventory by the time of the final application. A template will be provided for applicants who have not yet undertaken this process.
  - Ensuring that all parties have a good understanding of the full array of cultural assets present in the district will be critical to its long-term success. A comprehensive approach to cultural assets helps to ensure authenticity and the preservation of homegrown assets, both of which were indicators of a successful district based on the research, including extensive public input.

### C. ACCESS

The staff at the CAC will work to include in the process as broad a cross-section of places and groups as possible, including those that may not initially appear to have the administrative capacity or the structure to apply, in an effort to ensure that the pilot cohort is ultimately as representative of the state as possible. Staff will work with partner organizations throughout the state to notify groups of this opportunity and will provide application support to all interested parties via email and phone and via an online webinar. It is envisioned that designated staff at the CAC will be available by phone to discuss the application process, to clarify requirements and to direct potential applicants to resources on cultural districts. In addition the CAC will encourage nascent cultural districts to utilize available resources materials and to apply for professional development grants that could support the development of the district for future open applications.

### D. APPLICATION

As previously stated, the application process will unfold in three phases, with each phase designed to solicit the information necessary to identify an inclusive and diverse pilot cohort.

#### 1. Letter of Interest (LOI)

The letter of interest phase will be open to all communities interested in receiving state certification in the first round of the program, and in participating in the pilot cohort by helping the CAC finalize the cultural districts initiative. Applicants will be asked to provide the following information for consideration. In addition, applicants will need to provide three letters of support from individual community members or artists located in the proposed district beyond the participating partners. Applicants will also be required to submit a completed eligibility checklist.

- Who are the partners applying for cultural district designation?

- Briefly describe each of the participating entities and the role each plays in the proposed district
- Where is this place?
  - Provide the location and context – including basic demographic and socio-economic statistics (SES), as well as a map indicating the boundaries of the proposed district
- Where is the district in its lifecycle? Is it established, emerging, or some other point? If other, please describe.
- What is the primary focus or emphasis of the district: cultural production, cultural consumption or cultural heritage?
  - What makes the district distinct and sets it apart?
  - What facilities, activities, events, and history shape the district?
- How is this place used by the community currently?
- How will existing residents and uses benefit from the establishment of a district?
- Do the boundaries of the district overlap with other districts or designations?
  - Such as a city designated cultural district or heritage district, Business Improvement District, Main Street, Promise Zone, etc.
- What types of public infrastructure and amenities, such as public transportation, parks, or plazas, support the district?
- Are there municipal or development plans in place or in process that affect the district? If yes, please describe.
  - Such as a general plan, specific plan, transportation plan, cultural plan, etc.
- What types of space for artists, arts organizations, and cultural activities are currently present in the district? If there is the potential or plans for additional space, please describe as well.
  - Such as affordable housing (rental or purchase), studio and performance space; theaters, modular open spaces, live/work space, etc.
- What are the key issues and opportunities facing the district? And what do you seek to achieve with the cultural district designation?
  - For example: Is displacement of artists a current community concern? If so, how will the proposed district address this concern?

## 2. Semi-Finalist Selection and Site Visits

The panel will review the letters of interest, grouped by type, and select a representative group of approximately 30 semi-finalists to receive site visits. The primary purpose of the site visits will be to meet with the applicants and confirm the information provided in the LOI and provide additional insights to the panel during the final application review process. It is envisioned that a majority of the semi-finalists will be invited to submit full applications unless substantial discrepancies are encountered.

At the time of selection semi-finalists will be reminded that all finalists will be required to submit a basic cultural asset inventory, completed within the last three years, as a part of the final application. The CAC will develop and make available a simple methodology for completing an initial cultural asset inventory that will help ensure that districts have a good understanding of the array of authentic cultural resources shaping the district, from places and organizations to people, history and events.

Site visits will be conducted by CAC staff, panelists, or contractors depending on which option proves to be the most feasible depending on the available resources and timeline. Site visits will adhere to the following general protocol.

Site visitors will be assigned a group of applications and will:

- Read the assigned applications and conduct due diligence, including review of select independent sources of information
- Contact the applicants to set up a tour and interviews with the partners as well as other stakeholders or residents of the district
- Conduct a physical tour the proposed district and develop a written and photographic description of the place designed to ascertain the concentration of cultural resources and the physical qualities of the place
- Conduct interviews with each of the partners using a standard list of questions designed to ascertain the commitment of the partners to the project and the capacity of the professionals participating in process
- Meet with additional stakeholders, including the authors of letters of support designed to ascertain community buy-in for the process and authenticity of proposed district goals and leadership
- Complete a site visit report form

Staff will convene all of the site visitors to discuss the findings and identify the participants who will be invited to submit full applications.

### 3. Full Application

A diverse group of finalists will be invited to submit full applications. The CAC will utilize the same application for all, and will include an introductory section designed to allow the applicant to define the nature of the proposed district, i.e. established or emerging, urban or rural, etc. The first section of the application will include a majority of the questions from the LOI, giving the finalists the opportunity to update or revise the original responses.

In addition, finalists will be asked to provide the following information:

- What are the intended outcomes for the district over the first five-year certification period? How will the outcomes be measured?
- What specifically will the district accomplish in year one? In year two?

- Such as programs, festivals, facility development, artist housing, planning or marketing initiative, fundraising, etc.
- What is the district's budget for the first two years?
- Describe what resources each entity brings to the partnership and how they align with the issues and opportunities facing the district?
- What are the roles and responsibilities of staff, volunteers, and partners organizations in planning and managing district activities?
- Do you intend to collaborate with additional district stakeholders beyond the core partners? If so, please describe.
- Will the proposed cultural district impact the affordability of real-estate for current residents and stakeholders? Please explain.
- How will the applicant work to help maintain current residents and uses?
- If changes in residents and uses are envisioned, please explain how the applicant will work to avoid displacement or other negative impacts.

## E. REVIEW

Applications for the pilot cohort will be evaluated based on the requirements and criteria articulated below at each phase of the selection process, as applicable. The overarching goal will be to identify a cohort that is representative of the state in order to demonstrate the potential of the cultural district program to positively impact diverse neighborhoods, cities, and regions throughout California. The pilot cohort will help shape the final cultural district certification process and as such it is vitally important that they collectively represent rural, urban and suburban areas; districts that are emerging and established; districts with a focus on cultural production, cultural consumption, and cultural heritage; and also include districts with a range of partnership approaches and goals.

### 1. Criteria

In evaluating each applicant the panel will consider the nature of the proposed cultural district, and the following aspects of the applicant's engagement in the promotion, preservation, and interpretation of the arts and culture of the district, as illustrated in the application and supporting materials:

- Presence of a high concentration of artistic, cultural, heritage, or entertainment resources
- Clear articulation of the following elements:
  - Vision for the district
  - Measurable goals and defined evaluation measures
  - Achievable objectives for each of the first two years
  - Defined management budget with associated income and expenses
- Quality, diversity, and commitments of participating partners
- Degree to which the partners reflect the broader community
- Demonstrated authentic community engagement from a broad and representative array of stakeholders
- Presence of clearly defined leadership



- Presence of professional personnel dedicated (full or part-time) to district operations and programming
- Anticipated impact of designation

## 2. Review Panel

The CAC will appoint a panel of qualified professionals to evaluate the applications and to select the pilot cohort. In addition to cultural and geographic diversity, the panel will include representatives from different disciplines and sectors whose expertise reflects the varied fields and skills relevant to development of successful cultural districts, from the arts, to cultural heritage and community development. The same panel will serve throughout the selection of the first cohort, from LOI to final application. Ideally the panel will also include representatives from other California departments and agencies, at a minimum those who are partnering with CAC on the program.

## F. RECOMMENDED TIMELINE

The application and selection process could be implemented over approximately six months if adequate staff and financial resources are available. Proposed key milestones include the following:

- **January 2017**
  - Issue notice of opportunity for the pilot cohort and request letters of interest (open for 8 weeks)
  - Issue an RFP for developmental evaluation consultant(s) to support the pilot process
- **February 2017**
  - Conduct application/LOI webinar
  - Develop lists of potential panelists
- **March 2017**
  - Letters of interest due to the CAC
  - Appoint panel
  - Select developmental evaluation team
  - Publish guidelines for the final application
  - Identify site visitors and finalize site visit protocol
- **April/May 2017**
  - Panel selects semi-finalists (late April)
  - Conduct site visits for semi-finalists
- **May 2017**
  - Notify finalists, finalist application period opens
- **June/July 2017**
  - Final applications due (allow a minimum of 30 days from notification)
  - Panel selects pilot cohort

# CALIFORNIA CULTURAL DISTRICTS

California

Cultural

Districts

## APPENDIX 3

### COMMUNITY CULTURAL ASSET INVENTORY *Background, Instructions, and Template*

**What is a Cultural Asset? Professor Ross Gibson, Sydney College of the Arts**

*In every community that manages to sustain or revive itself over time, there are cultural factors that contribute to the vitality and robustness of the people living there. These factors are shared and creative, which is to say they are cultural and they are assets that make life valuable, that make life worth living. These cultural assets can be material, immaterial, emotional, or even spiritual. They can be 'solid' things like concert halls, galleries, gardens, parklands and stadiums. They can be special tracts of the natural environment which encourage particular types of cultural activities. Or the climate itself might be a cultural asset if it encourages special kinds of creative and communal activities that bind people together in a place over time. Stories too might be cultural assets if they are attached to particular peoples and places if they are powerful enough to encourage people to care about and care for their place. In these stories, values can circulate, and special memories often reside in particular locations mentioned in the tales. Thus the places mentioned in the stories can be regarded as cultural assets if people tell of these places and visit them regularly and develop regular practices or rituals or ceremonies to care for them.*

<http://camra.culturemap.org.au/page/what-cultural-asset>

#### BACKGROUND:

One of the best ways to document the density of cultural resources and activities in an area is to undertake the development of a cultural asset inventory; one that goes beyond just cultural organizations and facilities, and is inclusive of the many diverse contributing elements that make for a vibrant cultural center. A cultural asset inventory can take many forms, from a simple list, to a database or interactive map. In this case the product will be a categorized list, with location and notes sections (see attached template).

Ensuring that all parties have a good understanding of the full array of cultural assets present in the district will be critical to its long-term success. A comprehensive approach to cultural assets helps to ensure authenticity and the preservation of homegrown assets, both of which were indicators of a successful district based on the research conducted to develop this program.

#### HOW TO COMPLETE THE TEMPLATE:

Conduct an outreach process to engage members of the community in identifying cultural assets, through an in-person convening, as well as an on-line survey, with the results of both being used to populate your list.

Prepare a list of questions for the survey, and to be used as prompts for the meeting. Possible questions include:

- What contributes to the community's cultural identity?
- Who are the people and organizations that help shape it?
- What places and events give the community its character?
- How does the history of the neighborhood contribute to the community's cultural identity?
- Who are the creative people in the community?
- Where are the places people go to have a cultural experience, of any form?
- What organizations in the community are contributing to the arts and culture? In what ways?

Be inclusive. Reach out as broadly as possible and try and identify partners who will help you reach beyond your organization's usual audience.

Be open to a variety of perspectives. Encourage participants to think broadly about what is important to document and include in the inventory. Include at a minimum the categories in the template, and expand the categories as needed to reflect community perspectives and priorities.

Be sensitive to potential barriers to participation, such as language. Make sure all materials are available in the primary alternate language used in the community, in addition to English. In addition, make sure to include native speakers as translators at the convening.

Additional information about cultural asset inventories or mapping is available through the Alliance of California Traditional Cultures (ACTA) <http://www.actaonline.org/content/building-healthy-communities-cultural-treasures> or the examples available on the National Endowment for the Arts website at <https://www.arts.gov/exploring-our-town/showcase/type/Asset-Mapping> The Artscape website also has a useful toolkit at <http://www.artscapediy.org/Creative-Placemaking-Toolbox/Who-Are-My-Stakeholders-and-How-Do-I-Engage-Them/An-Introduction-to-Cultural-Asset-Mapping.aspx>

# DRAFT: Cultural Asset Inventory Worksheet

*Applicants should use as many pages as necessary.*

District Name:

Applicant Partners:

DESCRIPTION OF THE COMMUNITY PROCESS:

| <b>CATEGORY</b>          | <b>ASSETS</b> | <b>LOCATION</b> | <b>NOTES/ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</b> |
|--------------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. PEOPLE                |               |                 |                                     |
| 2. PLACES                |               |                 |                                     |
| 3. ORGANIZATIONS         |               |                 |                                     |
| 4. EVENTS                |               |                 |                                     |
| a. Historic              |               |                 |                                     |
| b. Current               |               |                 |                                     |
| 5. ADDITIONAL CATEGORIES |               |                 |                                     |

# CALIFORNIA CULTURAL DISTRICTS



## APPENDIX 4

### INTERVIEW LIST

As part of the research process the consultants conducted a number of one on one and group interviews with local and national thought leaders in a variety of disciplines to gather information for the California Cultural Districts initiative.

| First    | Last      | Affiliation   |
|----------|-----------|---|
| Larry    | Baza      | Chair, San Diego Arts Commission  |
| Marybel  | Batjer    | Secretary, Government Operations Agency, State of California                          |
| Ryan     | Becker    | Vice President, Communications, Visit CA  |
| Roberto  | Bedoya    | City of Oakland, Cultural Affairs   |
| Caroline | Beteta    | President, Visit, CA  |
| Ben      | Caldwell  | Artist, Los Angeles   |
| Ada      | Chan      | Project Manager, SoMa Pilipinas   |
| Laura    | Cole-Rowe | Executive Director, CA Main Street Alliance   |
| Teri     | Deaver    | Vice President, Consulting & Strategic Partnerships, Artspace                         |
| Juan     | Devis     | Chief Creative Officer, KCET  |
| Sherri   | Franklin  | Central Avenue Historic District  |
| Kathy    | Gallegos  | ED, Avenue 50 Studios   |
| Margaret | Hunt      | Director, California Creative Industries  |
| Amanda   | J. Ashley | Assistant Professor, Community and Regional Planning, Boise State University          |
| Shannon  | Jackson   | Associate Vice Chancellor for Arts & Design, UC Berkeley                              |
| Kelley   | Kahn      | Special Projects Director, City of Oakland  |
| Amy      | Kitchener | Executive Director, Alliance for California Traditional Arts                          |
| Kelley   | Lindquist | President, Artspace   |
| Libby    | Maynard   | Executive Director, Ink People Center for the Arts                                    |
| Lynne    | McCormack | Director of Creative Placemaking, Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)        |
| Steven   | Oliver    | Oliver and Company  |
| Armando  | Pena      | Armando Pena and Associates   |
| Peter    | Shapiro   | Executive Director, Revenue Authority of Prince George's County                       |
| Keith    | Robinson  | Principal Landscape Architect, Division of Design, Caltrans                           |
| Jason    | Shupbach  | Director of Design Programs, National Endowment for the Arts                          |
| Will     | Shuck     | Deputy Director, External Affairs, Caltrans   |
| Nicole   | Winger    | Deputy Controller for Public Affairs, Office of State Controller, State of California |
| Kristin  | Zaremba   | City of Oakland, Public Art   |

# CALIFORNIA CULTURAL DISTRICTS

## APPENDIX 5

### INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

#### Core Questions

- When you think of “cultural districts,” what comes to mind for you?
- Are there any cultural districts that you know of that you think are particularly successful? Please describe any examples. Why do you think these are successful?
- What are benefits of cultural districts? For whom?
- What are shortcomings of cultural districts? For whom?
- Do you know of funding mechanisms for cultural districts? Other supports?
- Do you personally have any experience in planning or developing a cultural district?
- Who else do you think we should talk with about cultural districts?

#### Supplemental Questions Group 1

- What do you hope a cultural district program accomplishes? Do you have any concerns about a cultural districts program? Please discuss.
- Whose involvement is essential to the success of this program? Why?
- Who, if anyone, do you anticipate, would oppose it? Why?

#### Supplemental Questions Group 2

- How does/has the concept of cultural districts connect(ed) to your national work?
- As it stands now, are cultural districts a significant factor in what you do? If so, how? Why?
- Are you aware of any discussions or debates focused on cultural districts? If so, please describe.

#### Supplemental Questions Group 3

- Could you envision cultural districts serving as a tool for community development? If so, how? If not, why not?
- Do you have any concerns about cultural districts in relation to displacement of vulnerable populations?
- Do you have any insights about how zoning and codes foster or impede cultural districts?

# CALIFORNIA CULTURAL DISTRICTS

## APPENDIX 6

### CULTURAL ARTS DISTRICT SURVEY RESPONSES ANALYSIS NOTES

#### Q1. In what Zip code are you located?

- 326 respondents
- The respondents are evenly represented across geographic areas.
  - 11% or 37 respondents are from “True North” zip codes including Sonoma, Mendocino, Lake, Eureka, Humboldt, Butte, Shasta, Tehama, Siskiyou Counties.
  - 18% or 59 respondents are from “Central Valley” zip codes including Sacramento, Stanislaus, San Joaquin, Fresno, Kern, Tulare and Yolo Counties.
  - 13% or 42 respondents are from a “San Diego region” zip codes including San Diego County.
  - 21% or 70 respondents are from “Bay Area” zip codes including San Mateo, Santa Clara, San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin Counties.
  - 16% or 51 respondents are from “Los Angeles area” zip codes including Los Angeles Counties.
  - 21% or 67 respondents are from “other” zip codes which include San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange, Ventura, Santa Barbara, Monterey, Santa Cruz, Tuolumne, Mariposa and Placer and El Dorado Counties.

#### Q2. Please select the category that best describes your point of view.

- The majority of the 326 respondents (197) describe themselves as either Artists/Creative Entrepreneurs or Arts Administrators.
- Very few respondents were developers or elected officials
- Respondents describe their point of view as follows:

|                                |            |
|--------------------------------|------------|
| Artists/Creative Entrepreneurs | 97         |
| Arts Administrator             | 100        |
| Business Owner                 | 16         |
| Community Activist             | 16         |
| Cultural Tradition Bearer      | 14         |
| Developer                      | 2          |
| Elected Official               | 4          |
| Government Employee            | 22         |
| Private Citizen                | 19         |
| Other                          | 36         |
| <b>Total</b>                   | <b>326</b> |



- Other points of view were mostly related to arts administration and or arts sector and were described by respondents as follows:
  - Executive Director of Downtown Los Angeles Art Walk
  - Arts consultant
  - Architecture Commissioner
  - Teaching Artist/Multidisciplinary Artist
  - Museum Employee
  - owner of an arts marketing firm
  - Museum of Earth Science and Paleontology
  - Employee of a business
  - Board member arts organization and business organization
  - Librarian
  - museum professional - history museum
  - Grant Writer
  - Cultural tourism marketing
  - Archivist
  - Educator
  - History Museum Director
  - City of Selma. Theatre/Visual Arts/Murals, etc...
  - Museums and Cultural Arts Commissioner
  - Student
  - Musician and Administrator of Non Profit Performing Art Space
  - President, Livermore Cultural Arts Council
  - Educator/Art Critic
  - Arts Educator/Arts Board Appointee
  - An Executive Director of a nonprofit arts org and also a restaurant owner
  - Grassroots Filipino American Historian and Preservationist
  - Non profit theatre grant writer
  - Art and jewelry maker
  - Artist; Arts Admin; Business Owner; Private Citizen; Teaching Artist
  - Radio programmer
  - Volunteer for countywide arts non-profit
  - Private citizen, Business owner, artist , community activist
  - Arts Advocate
  - Board Member Folsom Lake Community Concert Association
  - Arts org admin, arts biz owner, community arts activist EQUALLY!
  - Arts Consultant
  - Community Radio Station Manager

**Q3. Are you familiar with any Cultural Districts? Y/N**

- 326 respondents
- Respondents did not indicate high familiarity with cultural districts.
  - 50% of respondents or 160 answered no.

- 50% or 161 answered yes.
- Familiarity with cultural districts was equally spread across California regions.

**Q4. If yes, please name.**

Respondents provided a wide range of examples of cultural districts. The examples clustered within the following broad categories and indicate a varied interpretation of what is considered an “Arts District”.

The examples also reflect the respondents point of view, with the majority of the 326 respondents (60%) describing themselves as either Artists/Creative Entrepreneurs (97) or Arts Administrators (100).

1. **Arts districts/Theatre districts (often downtown).** Examples cited include Historic Theatre District-Seattle; Cleveland's Arts District; Dallas Arts District; Eugene Gallery and Arts District; Downtown Portland; Downtown Los Angeles Arts District ; Broad Street Art and Cultural District-Richmond Virginia; Laurence, KS downtown cultural district; Noho Arts District; Portland Cultural District; San Pedro Water front Arts District; Wynwood-Arts District-Florida; Arts District, Portland Maine; Berkeley Theatre District; Downtown Riverside; Downtown Redlands; downtown San Diego; Downtown Santa Ana; Downtown Ventura; Downtown LA Eastside Arts District
2. **Parks or outdoor/open spaces.** Examples include Hutchins Street Square in Lodi-CA; Joshua Tree; Yerba Buena Garden; Balboa Park-San Diego; Barrio Logan, Chicano park;
3. **Entire Cities/regions.** Examples cited include Berkeley, CA; Boise; Chicago; Chula Vista; Culver City, CA; Davis; Denver; District of Beverly Hills; Escondido, CA; Idaho; Laguna Beach; Los Angeles; Long Beach; New Orleans; Boise; Grandville Island, Vancouver, BC; Laguna Beach; West Hollywood; Los Angeles County; San Francisco; New York; Monterey; Pasadena; Pittsburgh; Providence-RI; Massachusetts; Seattle; Redlands; Reno; San Rafael; Santa Ana; Santa Barbara; Santa Cruz; Santa Fe; Seattle; Sebastopol; Sonoma County; Washington DC; Oregon, Texas
4. **Arts Organizations and their surrounding neighborhoods.** Examples cited include Buffalo Arts Studio; Eugene Gallery and Arts District, Elk Grove Committee for Arts and Multicultural Committee; Elk Grove Fine Art Center; LA County Arts Council; Liberty Station Arts District; Lincoln Center-NYC; Music Center-Los Angeles; Los Angeles Dorothy Pavilion; Lodi Arts Commission; Los Angeles at MOCA, Geffen, Broad; Malonga Center for African Culture; Megijima Eco Arts, Miracle Mile LA Museum Row; Pilchuck Glass School; Regional Arts and Cultural Council-Portland/Vancouver; Riverside Mission Inn; Sacramento Arts Commission; Smac; SOFA; San Francisco War Memorial/Civic Centers
5. **Historical ethnic neighborhoods.** Examples cited include “Little Tokyo”; “Little Italy”; Leimert Park; Brooklyn; “Chinatown”; Chinatown-SF; Filipinotown-Los Angeles; Harlem; Barrio Logan-San Diego; San Jose Japantown; New Orleans French Quarter

6. **Other neighborhoods/ arts and cultural hubs:** Arts and Entertainment district of H Street-NE Washington DC; Arts and entertainment district, Los Angeles Grand Avenue Corridor; Fruitvale Unity Village; Georgetown District in Seattle; Providence,RI; Creamery District, Arcata, CA; Arts District at Liberty Station; Midtown Atlanta; midtown San Francisco; Mission district-SF; Navy Pier Chicago; NE Minneapolis Riverfront; North Beach San Francisco, North Hollywood, North Park-SD; Chelsea, SoHo; East Austin; East Village; Pittsburgh Cultural District; Shell town San Diego; Short North-Columbus, Ohio; Temescal Neighborhood-Oakland; Wynwood -Florida; Uptown-Oakland; Willowbrook-LA County;
7. **Main Streets/Old Towns:** Eureka Main Street; Old town Sacramento, Old town New Hall Cultural Districts; Old Town San Diego; Olvera Street-Los Angeles

**Q5. What makes this cultural district successful?**

Answers are clustered among the following key categories:

1. Accessibility- pedestrian friendly; easy access to public transportation
2. Geographic Concentration of diverse and “complimentary” institutions and cultural activity ( restaurants, galleries, museums, small independent retail shops, farmers market, outdoor venues/open space)
3. Public/Private partnerships/collaborations in support of arts, artists , and broad participation in arts and cultural activity including tax incentives, Cultural Arts Master plan, public art programming, place-making initiatives, open studio culturally events; art walk events)
4. Artist centric support institutions (affordable live work spaces, access to professional development,)
5. Unique/Iconic architecture/public art/built environment
6. Honoring/preserving historically/ significant hub/space

**Q6. At best, what would be the benefits of cultural district designation? List up to three Features.**

- 320 respondents.
- Overall, the listed benefits of cultural district were evenly spread across the 5 suggested categories.

|   | <b>Total Count</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
|---|--------------------|----------------|
| Recognition   | 175                | 20%            |
| Access to funding for district improvements                                     | 259                | 30%            |
| Protection of pre-existing community assets                                     | □□□□□              | 21%            |
| Technical assistance with marketing resources                                   | □□□                | 12%            |
| Convening and connecting people involved in cultural districts around the state | 146                | 17%            |

- Access to funding for district improvements received the most responses, followed by protecting of pre-existing community assets and Recognition.
- Technical assistance with marketing resources received the least responses.

**Q6. Other**

- “Other” examples of benefits provided by respondents are clustered within the previously suggested 5 categories as well as the following three additional categories:
  - Promoting Equity and Social Justice;
  - Providing Opportunity for arts and cultural participation and connection with artists;
  - Promoting economic development and growth via the arts.

| <b>Q. 6 Other Benefits</b>  | <b>Total Count</b>       |
|---|--------------------------|
| Recognition   | 5                        |
| Access to funding for district improvements   | 4                        |
| Protection of pre-existing community assets   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Technical assistance with marketing resources   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Convening and connecting people involved in cultural districts around the state       | 9                        |
| Promoting Equity and Social Justice   | 11                       |
| Providing Opportunity for arts and cultural participation and connection with artists | 10                       |
| Promoting economic development and growth via the arts.                               | 12                       |
| Other   | 2                        |

**Q7. Do you have concerns about cultural district program? Y/N**

- 313 respondents and 13 blank responses.
- Responses were evenly split between “No”: 165 (53%) and “Yes”: 148 (47%)

|                    |            |
|--------------------|------------|
| No                 | 165        |
| Yes                | 148        |
| (blank)            | 13         |
| <b>Grand Total</b> | <b>326</b> |

- Those with no concerns about cultural districts were evenly spread among geographic areas.

| <b>Inquiry Area</b> | <b>No Concerns</b> | <b>%</b> |
|---------------------|--------------------|----------|
| 1-True North        | 20                 | 12%      |
| 2-Central Valley    | 34                 | 21%      |
| 3-San Diego         | 23                 | 14%      |
| 4-Bay Area          | 25                 | 15%      |

|               |            |             |
|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 5-Los Angeles | 24         | 15%         |
| 6-Other       | 39         | 24%         |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>165</b> | <b>100%</b> |

- Of those with concerns about cultural districts, respondents from the Bay Area (Inquiry Area 4) recorded the highest number of concerns: 42 or 28%. This finding is likely associated with the regions high concentration of arts and cultural activity.
- Other respondents were evenly spread among remaining geographic areas.
- It is interesting to note that respondents from the Los Angeles area which could also be characterized as having a large concentration of cultural activity did not indicate a higher level of concern.

| <b>Inquiry Area</b> | <b>Yes Concerns</b> | <b>%</b>    |
|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 1-True North        | 16                  | 11%         |
| 2-Central Valley    | 23                  | 16%         |
| 3-San Diego         | 16                  | 11%         |
| 4-Bay Area          | 42                  | 28%         |
| 5-Los Angeles       | 26                  | 18%         |
| 6-Other             | 25                  | 17%         |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>148</b>          | <b>100%</b> |

- Among the Bay Area respondents, Alameda County had the highest number of respondents indicating concerns (22), of which a little over half (14) were associated with respondents from the City of Oakland.
- Respondents from the County and City of San Francisco recorded the next highest number of concerns (9).
- This finding is likely associated with the cities' availability and concentration of arts and cultural activity and associated experiences/impacts, particularly for low income communities and communities of Color.

| <b>4-Bay Area</b>     | <b>Yes Concerns</b> |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Alameda County</b> |                     |
| Alameda               | 2                   |
| Albany                | 1                   |
| Emeryville            | 1                   |
| Fremont               | 1                   |
| Livermore             | 2                   |

|                             |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Oakland                     | 14        |
| San Leandro                 | 1         |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>            | <b>22</b> |
| <b>Contra Costa County</b>  |           |
| Richmond                    | 1         |
| Rodeo                       | 1         |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>            | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>Marin County</b>         |           |
| Larkspur                    | 1         |
| Mill Valley                 | 1         |
| <b>Sub Total</b>            | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>San Francisco County</b> |           |
| San Francisco               | 9         |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>            | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>San Mateo County</b>     |           |
| Burlingame                  | 1         |
| Redwood City                | 1         |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>            | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>Santa Clara County</b>   |           |
| San Jose                    | 5         |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>            | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Total</b>                | <b>42</b> |

**Q8. If You Answered Yes to Concerns about Cultural Arts Districts, please describe.**

- In general, concerns described by the 148 respondents that answered yes, fell within the following 8 broad categories.
- Concerns about a top down planning/development approach and associated lack of equitable distribution of resources and accountability surfaced as the top concern among the respondents. Respondents were particularly concerned about the selection criteria and possible exclusion of areas as well as competition between districts.
- Concerns about the Arts districts triggering gentrification and displacement of existing residents including low income residents, arts and small non-profit arts organizations accounted for about 25% of the responses.

| <b>Types of concerns</b>  | <b>Count of Types of Concerns</b> | <b>%</b> |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------|
| 1. Gentrification (particularly of existing arts and cultural activity/communities) | 25                                | 13%      |
| 2. Displacement of existing residents including artists                             | 23                                | 12%      |
| 3. Lack of grass-roots focus and community inclusion including artists              | 26                                | 14%      |

|   |            |             |
|---|------------|-------------|
| 4. Lack of comprehensive and sustainable development focus (arts investment at exclusion of or in competition with other opportunities) | 15         | 8%          |
| 5. Top down development, lack of equitable distribution of resources, and accountability  | 61         | 32%         |
| 6. Exclusion of Rural Areas   | 6          | 3%          |
| 7. Lack of funding and broad public support for long term sustainability  | 23         | 12%         |
| 8. Other  | 11         | 6%          |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>190</b> | <b>100%</b> |

- Among the respondents from the Cities of Oakland, San Francisco, concerns clustered around the following key issues:
  1. Gentrification (particularly of existing arts and cultural activity/communities)
  2. Displacement of existing residents
  3. Lack of grass-roots focus and community inclusion
  4. Lack of comprehensive development focus
  5. Top down development
  6. Exclusion of Rural Areas
  7. Lack of Funding

|     | Oakland  | Issue Area  |
|-----|--|---|
| 1.  | Black cultural district will focus on pat nd be a historical district while former Black Oakland residents continue to be displaced and cannot afford to live in a place dedicated to cultural group   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gentrification/</li> <li>• Displacement of Black Oakland Residents</li> </ul>            |
| 2.  | Displacement of existing communities within and at the edges of the district. The speed of the organized shift to a named district is it affects neighboring communities.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Displacement of existing communities</li> </ul>  |
| 3.  | Do not want to stifle thoughtful development particularly in regards to housing and indie retail and other important opportunities for economic development in Oakland.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of Comprehensive development focus</li> </ul>                                       |
| 4.  | Gentrification   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gentrification</li> </ul>  |
| 5.  | I believe this will lead to continued gentrification and displacement of people of color and low-income people in the San Francisco Bay Area.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gentrification and displacement</li> </ul>   |
| 6.  | I love whole communities. The emphasis on "marketing" concerns me because I read it as an external orientation (read tourism or shifting market orientation read: gentrification) do not want to lose the more organic qualities of how cultures evolve. Would like some thinking around how to support communities in being whole - with lived arts and culture. vs. arts and culture being a consumer commodity. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of Grass roots focus/community inclusion</li> <li>• Top down Development</li> </ul> |
| 7.  | My concern is that the district is well funded from the state and federal levels.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of sufficient funding?</li> </ul>   |
| 8.  | Once any program becomes top-down managed, it dies. Gov. assistance comes with strings.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Top down Development</li> </ul>  |
| 9.  | That it would be window dressing and full of useless bureaucratic hurdles instead of being genuine.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of Grass roots focus/community inclusion</li> </ul>                                 |
| 10. | That political considerations and considerations from outside the culture being highlighted will steer the district away from its  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of Grass roots focus/community inclusion</li> </ul>                                 |



|     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
|     | intended purposes  |  |
| 11. | That the authentic arts neighborhoods become replaced by gentrified arts districts (SOHO, DUMBO, etc). That affordable housing not be included with affordable warehouse studio spaces, that industrial lands with manufacturing/maker opportunities convert to residential. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural Gentrification</li> <li>• Displacement of existing communities</li> </ul>          |
| 12. | That the district would become something commercial, lose its identity and price out present homeowners  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gentrification</li> </ul>   |
| 13. | The artists build up the "cultural capital" and then get displaced when market forces take over.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Displacement of existing communities</li> </ul>   |
| 14. | There must be room for creative growth within all cultures and at all levels and ages, of creative development. It will fail the community if it is purely a competitive process for "professionals".  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural Gentrification</li> <li>• Lack of Grass roots focus/community inclusion</li> </ul> |

|    | San Francisco  | Issue Area   |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | After CCA meeting, I am concerned about rural areas in huge geographic parts of state that wouldn't be eligible. They need help to connect.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exclusion of Rural Areas</li> </ul>   |
| 2. | How do we get culture bearers a dedicated venue when we don't have \$ to compete with tech companies buying up everything?   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of Grass roots focus/community inclusion</li> <li>• Displacement of existing communities</li> </ul>  |
| 3. | I care.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ?</li> </ul>  |
| 4. | I'm concerned that it will be taken over by big money interests such a big real-estate, big art "non-profits" etc. and be transformed into a gentrifying rather than one that truly protects the interests of blue collar low income residents of the culture (e.g. Latinos)   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gentrification (commercial and arts)</li> <li>• Lack of Grass roots focus/community inclusion</li> </ul>  |
| 5. | It puffs up overrated, self-interested, charming, and sociopathic Executive Directors who use professional association involvement to inflate their credentials and create barriers to entry for true artistic entrepreneurs, siphoning off funds from artists, and creating a well-connected elite capable of blackballing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gentrification (arts/culture elite)</li> <li>• Lack of Grass roots focus/community inclusion</li> </ul>   |
| 6. | Not enough to develop districts  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of Comprehensive development focus</li> </ul>  |
| 7. | 'place keeping' services and reflecting the culture and arts of folks who live & work in the district instead of 'place making' code for new comers to be made comfortable as they take over neighborhoods and displace the very people whose culture have been essential to the unique features the district.               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gentrification (arts/culture)</li> <li>• Lack of Grass roots focus/community inclusion</li> <li>• Displacement of existing communities</li> </ul> |
| 8. | That a designation could become limiting.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of Comprehensive development focus</li> </ul>  |
| 9. | They must be done in away that will not cause gentrification.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gentrification</li> </ul>   |

**Q9. Do you have any additional comments about cultural districts?**

- 163 respondents

| <b>Inquiry Areas</b> | <b>Count of Q9-Do you have any additional comments on cultural districts?</b> |
|----------------------|---|
| 1-True North         | 21  |
| 2-Central Valley     | 29  |
| 3-San Diego          | 21  |
| 4-Bay Area           | 31  |
| 5-Los Angeles        | 25  |
| 6-Other              | 36  |
|                      | <b>163</b>  |

- Respondents were fairly equally represented among regions.
- In general, respondents to this question were supportive the formation Cultural Arts District and sought more information about the planning and district designation process which needs to be inclusive of all geographic areas of California and seek broad community support
- Benefits and concerns mirrored the categories of benefits and concerns discussed in earlier questions.



# CALIFORNIA CULTURAL DISTRICTS

## APPENDIX 7

### STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP DETAILS

(as of 12/8/2016)

#### Partner: California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

Recipients of the State of California Cultural Districts certification may benefit from access to the following Caltrans resources:

- **Transportation Art and Community Identifier Programs**– Certified Cultural Districts in municipalities where participation in the Caltrans Transportation Art program is feasible will have access to Caltrans liaison services provided by the California Arts Council. These services may result in technical assistance for Districts to navigate the application process for the Caltrans Transportation Art and Community Identification programs. This may include the development of murals and other public art projects as well as aesthetic features on Caltrans properties.
- **Street Closures on Caltrans Properties** – Certified Cultural Districts in municipalities where state highway street closures are proposed for festivals or other public cultural activities will have access to Caltrans liaison services provided by the California Arts Council in order to process closure and access requests.
- **Signage** – Certified Cultural Districts in municipalities where Caltrans signage is feasible per the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) will have access to Caltrans liaison services provided by the California Arts Council. The California Arts Council and Caltrans will work to provide technical assistance to determine if Certified Cultural Districts are eligible for signage based on the MUTCD.
- Other opportunities as mutually arranged by the California Arts Council and Caltrans.

Additionally, a Caltrans staff representative will be invited to serve on the adjudication panel as part of the review and selection process for district certification.

#### Partner: Visit California

- **General Organizational Benefits** – The California Arts Council and Visit California may collaborate in the following ways:
  - Governance – sharing best practices for programmatic and promotional related activities.
  - Advisory – providing guidance for organizational activities and efforts.

- Leverage – utilizing strategic partnership to foster mutually beneficial opportunities as they arise.
- **Evaluation of Potential Certified Districts** – Visit California representative invited to serve on the adjudication panel as part of the review and selection process for district certification.
- **Benefits for Certified Districts** – Recipients of the State of California Cultural Districts Certification may benefit from inclusion in the following Visit California initiatives:
  - Promotion at California Welcome Centers.
  - Inclusion in Visit California promotional efforts as appropriate.
  - Inclusion in Visit California press efforts as appropriate.
  - Inclusion in Visit California public and industry events and presentations as appropriate.
- Other opportunities as mutually agreed upon by the California Arts Council and Visit California.