



MILWAUKIE

Dogwood City of the West

To: Mayor and City Council

Through: Bill Monahan, City Manager

From: Beth Ragel, Program Coordinator

Date: January 22, 2013 for January 29, 2013, Work Session

Subject: Milwaukie Mural Arts Program (MMAP) Assessment of Discretionary Review Process

ACTION REQUESTED

Provide guidance on next steps in establishing a mural program in Milwaukie—dubbed the “Milwaukie Mural Arts Program” (MMAP) by the Milwaukie Arts Committee.

This report outlines two review and permitting options.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

History of Prior Actions and Discussions

November 6, 2012: Beth Ragel, Community Services Program Coordinator, and the City attorney, provided a briefing to Council during a work session regarding the broad free speech protections afforded by Article 1 Section 8 of the Oregon Constitution and the possible implications for reviewing and permitting murals. The City attorney advised Council that providing grant funding for a mural program could reduce the risk of free-speech related claims.

September 25, 2012: The Milwaukie Planning Commission held a public hearing and recommended approval of Zoning Text Amendments to the Sign Ordinance (File #ZA-12-01). The amended regulations, if adopted by City Council, would exclude public art murals from the definition of ‘sign’ in Subsection 14.04.030, Definitions in Title 14, Sign Ordinance. Given input from the City attorney following this hearing, staff determined it should be presented at a work session to City Council.

May 22, 2012: Beth Ragel, Community Services Program Coordinator, briefed the Planning Commission on the proposed Milwaukie Mural Arts Program at a work session.

April 3, 2012: Staff briefed City Council on MMAP community outreach and reported the results from the mural survey. Council directed staff to continue work on developing the MMAP program, including developing the code language to take to the Planning Commission for review.

September, 2011: City Council gave staff the approval to start public outreach and to begin drafting the MMAP program and code language.

2006: When the Planning Commission updated the Sign Code in 2006, the difficulty of permitting murals as signs was acknowledged as a problem yet to solve. Murals were not defined in the code and, as such, would be allowed only if they complied with sign code regulations—which would limit their allowed size.

Why Code Changes are Needed

The Arts Committee believes that the presence of murals in Milwaukie will help make Milwaukie distinctive and contribute towards economic revitalization and tourism—as murals have done in other towns (See Attachment 1—Appendix.)

Currently, staff is aware of five groups that desire to place murals in Milwaukie: The North Clackamas School District, Milwaukie High School, Dark Horse Comics, Spring Creek Coffee and the Kellogg Wastewater Treatment Plant (on the back clarifiers along the park trail to mitigate graffiti/tagging that is occurring). The Arts Committee would also like to find a location for the historic mural painted by Larry Kangas that was located on the side of Chopstick's Express and removed by the property owner about two years ago.

These groups cannot place murals in Milwaukie unless they apply for and receive a sign permit and comply with sign regulations, which limit size. Under the City's current code, standards applying to murals are the same as those applying to signs. Murals must be permitted under the same standards as other wall signs, and are subject to the same size regulations, which limit sign face area to 20% of the total wall area in most zones. This limits the ability for murals to function as public art, since most murals use all or a significant percentage of the total wall area.¹

¹ In 2006, the sign ordinance was revised to be consistent with court rulings regarding sign regulations and free speech protection. The key concept in the court rulings that necessitated the amendments is that the government cannot regulate signs based on their content. Instead, the regulations must be limited to physical aspects of the signs such as the time they are display, the places where they are displayed, and the manner in which they are displayed. The resulting amendments removed language that exempted, prohibited, or required different levels of review based on the message of the display or sign.

Given the limitations of permitting murals as signs, Council gave staff the approval to begin conducting community outreach and research in order to develop a program proposal about two years ago. During the initial exploration phase, the Milwaukie Arts Committee had many discussions about the potential benefits and risks of allowing murals in Milwaukie. The Arts Committee came to the conclusion that a discretionary review process that would evaluate murals based on set criteria such as artistic merit and community support was most desirable. The effort to establish a review and permitting process was dubbed the “Milwaukie Mural Arts Program”—or MMAP.

The Milwaukie Arts Committee engaged in broad outreach for the MMAP, including discussions with each of Milwaukie’s Neighborhood District Associations (NDAs). The Arts Committee also conducted a survey which received 78 responses. The community expressed high levels of support for such a program.

Early in discussions, the MMAP proposed *one* review process and permitting path for murals—a discretionary review process. An ad hoc mural review committee would review the mural on set criteria and make a recommendation to the Milwaukie Arts Committee, who would make the final decision. The MMAP would allow approved murals to be placed in commercial and industrial zones and on community service use properties. Broadly, the review criteria suggested included artist merit, feasibility, context and demonstrated community support.

Since staff was aware that reviewing content is generally problematic—and specifically, that reviewing the content of signs was deemed a violation of Article I, Section 8 of the Oregon constitution—staff also proposed to require a public art easement signed by the property owner, as is done in Portland. This was determined to be a key feature of the proposed program, as the public art easement signed by the property owner was believed to be one way to mitigate the risk of free speech claims that could arise from the review of a mural’s content. The City of Portland attorney and the Public Art Manager at the Regional Arts and Culture Council (RACC) indicated as such.

However, after the City attorney’s office reviewed draft code language with program goals, it was suggested that the public art easement alone did not provide sufficient protection to the City. At the November 6, 2012 Council Work Session, staff presented several options for how to proceed with creating a mural program in Milwaukie—considering the broad free speech protections afforded by Article 1 Section 8 or the Oregon Constitution. Staff recommended, with input from the City attorney, that *two* mural review and permitting options be developed. One review process would be discretionary

The permit exemption for murals was removed because it would require the evaluation of content for the presence of a written message and to determine if the display was a decoration or embellishment as opposed to being a standard sign. The amendments to remove content-based regulations in the sign code had to be accomplished expediently to avoid legal challenges, and staff did not have the time during the Sign Code update to explore alternatives to permitting murals.

(review content) and provide grant funding and the other would be objective and handled through the Planning Department with a required permit fee. Providing two mural review and permitting paths should mitigate some of the risk of free-speech related challenges and make the effort most enforceable.

These two review and permitting options are based on the model pioneered in Portland resulting from legal challenges to the Portland sign code (which had not exempted murals from sign regulations prior).

The two Portland models are summarized as follows.

1) Discretionary Review of Murals—Murals as Public Art with Grant Funding

- The content of the mural is reviewed by an ad hoc committee that makes a recommendation to the Public Art Advisory Commission (advisory to Portland City Council), who makes the final decision.
- Murals are considered as works of public art. The mural is either on a public building or on a building where the owner grants a public art easement on the face of the wall.
- Public art is exempt from the regulations of the sign code.
- The mural must remain in place for 5 years.
- There cannot be compensation given or received for placement of the mural.
- An arts committee, acting on behalf of the government, has authority for reviewing and permitting a mural. A government may be allowed to evaluate content and style in selecting pieces of public art in a way that is not allowed under sign regulations.
- The program provides some funding for murals. As such, the City is acting not only as a regulator of the art but as a patron. (Given current city budget restrictions, the Arts Committee may need to fund raise in order to help fund such a program.)

The resulting program is the Public Arts Mural Program, which is administered by the Regional Arts and Culture Council (RACC). The City of Beaverton adopted a similar approach for allowing murals in 2008. To date, there has not been a legal challenge to this discretionary review process in either Portland or Beaverton.

2) Objective Review of Murals —Permit Program for Murals

- The content of the mural is *not* reviewed.
- The mural is a hand-produced work of art that is painted or tiled by hand onto a building.
- The mural cannot exceed 30 ft in height from grade.
- The mural must remain in place for 5 years.
- There cannot be compensation given or received for placement of the mural.
- The applicant pays a fee for the permit (around \$200.)
- The size of the murals allowed would be restricted.

Portland developed this second mechanism to allow murals in 2009 called “Original Art Murals” that is managed through their Bureau of Development Services (BDS). It is objective in nature. This program

establishes a type of display called an Original Art Mural that is exempt from sign code regulations. Portland created this process as a streamlined alternative to the RACC Public Art Mural process.

Staff has not discovered any other models in Oregon for permitting murals in a manner that complies, or attempts to comply, with requirements for content neutrality. The table that follows is a side by side summary of the key features of Portland’s two mural permitting programs as they relate to the review of content. Again, the main difference between the two models in Portland is the level of discretionary review for permitting the mural. The Public Art Mural program (run by RACC) allows a high-degree of discretion for artistic merit and other subjective factors and is part of a matching grant program. It reviews content.

Key Features of Portland’s two Mural Permitting Programs as they relate to review of content

RACC Program—Discretionary Review/Grant Program	BDS Program—Objective Review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant funding provided and City acts as patron not just regulator. • Content of mural is reviewed by committee and standards are somewhat subjective. • Public art easement form must be signed by building/property owner. • Compensation to building/property owner is prohibited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant funding is not provided and a permit fee is assessed (about \$200.) • Content of mural is not reviewed and standards are objective. • No public art easement form is required. • Compensation to building/property owner is prohibited.

Proposed model in Milwaukie

Given that the City of Portland has not received legal challenges to either of their mural permit programs and that some level of discretion over murals is desired by the Arts Committee and community, staff recommends that two mural review and permitting options be developed in Milwaukie like in Portland. The options proposed would be very similar to those in Portland.

If the discretionary review process included a matching grant program, it would both incentivize property owners and artists to comply with a discretionary review process as well as mitigate the risk of litigation resulting from a program which proposes to review the content of murals. There are several benefits to providing matching grant funds. First, there is legal precedent that when a City does so, it is not acting solely as a regulator but also as a patron. This provides some legal coverage and mitigates free speech related claims. The City attorney has advised Council that providing grant funding for a mural program could reduce the risk of free-speech related claims. Likewise, it is standard for a granting agency to establish review criteria and use discretion in judging if an applicant has met the set criteria. Providing matching grant funds would also essentially double our money, since recipients would be required to match grant funds with their own cash or in-kind contributions.

Implementing only objective review of murals limits the probability of legal challenge but would not provide the same level of discretion over what is allowed. Since the objective review would only look at

and regulate physical features and not content, this may mean that murals that are objectionable to the community are permitted and placed in Milwaukie.

It is possible that a discretionary mural review process could be challenged, causing the City to have to defend its program or not be able to enforce all or some of the program review requirements. While mural artists generally desire to work with a community to create a mural that is acceptable, and again, while this process has worked well in Portland since 2005, such a process could still be challenged.

CONCURRENCE

This report has been reviewed and concurred with by the following staff:

- Bill Monahan, City manager;

FISCAL IMPACT

Budget considerations will require further exploration. At this time, Council could direct staff to complete and submit the code language and administrative policies for both review and permitting programs and discuss the funding issue later.

If Council chooses to provide funds for a matching grant program this would have a fiscal impact determined by the amount allocated. Given the budgets provided by mural artist Mr. Kangas, it seems that if the City provided \$5,000-\$10,000 for a matching grant program perhaps one to three murals could be funded in the first year of the program. There would be a cap on the amount that would be given per project. Again, the applicants would need to match (or exceed) the amount granted them by the City. Examples from other cities show that it is common for applicants to exceed a strict match by getting donations or through other fundraising efforts. In other words, if an applicant expects their project to cost \$15,000 they may only ask for \$5,000 or, alternately, if the City only provides \$5,000 they must make up the difference in order to make their project work. Again, the Arts Committee may be able to help raise funds for such a program.

WORK LOAD IMPACTS

A program managed through the Planning Department will need to be reviewed by Planning Commission and both program proposals would be brought to City Council for final approval.

Creating two permitting and review options will require some additional staff time in creating forms and updating the code. The objective permitting track will create some new work load for the Planning Department but is straightforward and will require limited staff time. The level of review is similar to the administrative review for a typical sign permit, and the Planning Department typically handles 15-20 such permits each year. We do not anticipate more than 1-2 mural permit applications per year. As such, the mural permit process within the Planning Department will have low work load impacts.

The discretionary track, if coupled with a grant program, will require more staff time than the objective review process. It will establish a new grant program to be managed and will require coordination with an ad hoc review committee and the Milwaukie Arts Committee. The discretionary review process managed by the City Program Coordinator/staff liaison to the Milwaukie Arts Committee will likely require moderate staff time depending on the complexity and number of mural applications processed through this track.

ALTERNATIVES

Council could discuss the funding issue at a later date and direct staff to go ahead and complete and submit the code language and administrative policies for both review and permitting programs (the objective process and a discretionary/matching grant program).

Council could opt for an objective review process only, handled by the Planning Department.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1) Appendix—mural funding and arts programming in other cities

Appendix

Mural Funding and Arts Programing in Other Cities

Mural Funding in Other Cities

City of Beaverton:

In Beaverton, the City has allocated between \$7,000 and \$10,000 annually for their mural program. Individual murals have ranged from \$3,000 to \$10,000 to create. The City requires a match by the applicant in cash or in-kind donations. Three murals have been installed since 2008. The City has also funded other initiatives such as a sculpture program.

Here are photos of the three murals installed in Beaverton:



City of Portland:

In Portland, the Public Art Mural Program managed through the Regional Arts and Culture Council (RACC) provides matching funds up to \$10,000 per approved project. Large scale murals can cost upwards of \$30,000 or more, depending on their complexity, size, location, donations and volunteers, and other factors.

While large scale and complex murals may cost \$30,000 or more, experienced mural artists have been able to install large scale murals in the region for less. Below is a mural that Larry Kangas finished at Parkrose High School. Painted on pelon in his studio and then affixed, the mural wraps around the building. At over 200 feet long, it is the largest mural in the Portland region. The entire out-of-pocket cost came to \$15,000 which was covered by RACC through a “Communities and Schools” grant. (Larry Kangas is the artist that painted the historic mural that was on the side of Chopstick’s Express in downtown. He also painted the mural that is behind Bernard’s garage. He worked with Milwaukie High School Students to plan and install both. He is interested in working in Milwaukie in the future.)

Here are photos of the Parkrose Horse Mural:



City of Sandy:

In 2011 the City of Sandy funded a mural to celebrate its centennial. It is sixty feet long and painted on panels (which includes 24 pieces of composite steel for hanging the work). Painting the mural on panels increased the cost but made the mural moveable should it be necessary to relocate it in the future. The cost was around \$30,000.

Below are photos of the left section and right sections of the mural:



Typical Mural Budget

Larry Kangas, one of the region’s most prolific and well-known mural artists, has provided the following mural budget examples.



To do this 25’ x 35’ mural today on a local building

would cost: Design fee.....	\$ 1500
Primer and masking....	\$ 325
80 hours to paint	\$ 8000
UV coating (applied)	\$ 450
Lift	\$ 1200
Total	\$ 11,475

This is assuming that there was no wall prep like scraping and sealing, and that the artist not get involved with the fundraising



Establishing Milwaukie as a Purveyor of the Arts

There is some legal precedent and the national level that when a government organization positions itself as a patron/funder of the arts, and not just as a regulator, that agency is able to have more discretion in their review of the content of such art. This would also meet Arts Committee goals.

Such efforts could involve partnerships with businesses and organizations already in Milwaukie. The City of Milwaukie is fortunate to have several creative businesses and other arts focused organizations that make natural partners in future efforts. These include, but are not limited to the following:

- Dark Horse Comics
- North Clackamas Arts Guild
- First Friday Art Walk (volunteers)
- The Milwaukie Academy of the Arts (housed at Milwaukie High School)
- Marla Bagetta Studio
- Under 300 Gallery
- The New Century Players
- The Portland Waldorf School
- North Clackamas School District and local schools

Developing more wide-ranging arts programming in Milwaukie is also a desire of the Milwaukie Arts Committee. Recently the Milwaukie Arts Committee (artMOB) met for a planning retreat. The following goals emerged as the committee's priorities for the coming year:

- Establish and enhance Milwaukie's identity as a center and incubator for arts and culture;
- Establish the Milwaukie Mural Arts Program;
- Raise the awareness and recognition of artMOB in the broader community, with key leaders and with artists.

Economic Benefits of Arts Programming

In Estacada, the "Art Back" mural program has encouraged tourism (see www.artbackmurals.com.) Though Estacada is an unlikely hub for tourism, a group of artists working as a co-operative have been installing a new mural in Estacada's downtown every summer for the last seventeen years. This tradition has spawned an annual arts festival in conjunction with the completion of each new mural. The Estacada Arts Festival draws thousands from the region and local businesses report that the event is a boon.

In Lake Oswego, the *Gallery without Walls* sculpture program attracts tourism and encourages walking and shopping (see www.lofa.org.) The City has over 60 pedestals to display sculpture throughout the downtown and half of the sculptures are replaced with new ones every year. The Lake Oswego Arts

Council reports that every July, when the sculptures rotate, the City sees an influx of tourists coming to see the new pieces. The Arts Council also provides walking brochures for self-guided tours and sponsors staff-led tours throughout the summer. These tours attract hundreds. Local businesses report that the *Gallery without Walls* has encouraged more people to get out of their cars, walk downtown and drop into the city's shops and restaurants. This has, in turn, fostered business support for the arts program.

Arts programming and public art have been central to economic revitalization strategies in many cities. In 2005, the City of Hillsboro secured a State grant for "The Downtown Renaissance" project (see www.ci.hillsboro.or.us/EconomicDevelopment/DowntownByDesign/Renaissance.aspx.) This project is aimed at promoting the arts as an integral component of the City's downtown revitalization efforts. The culmination of this project was an Action Plan, adopted by the Hillsboro City Council on May 15, 2007.

According to the Hillsboro Community Development Department, the following are a few of the items have been completed in the last five years to support an arts-based economic strategy:

- Establishment of the Hillsboro Arts & Culture Council
- Creation of a Percent-for-Art Program
- Development of a Funding Strategy for arts and culture related investments
- Completion of the Town Theatre Renovation –the Venetian Theatre
- Creation of an artists' cooperative studio/gallery – called the Sequoia Art Gallery
- Establishment of Grange Hall as a Hispanic Cultural Center Study, and
- Completion of the Hillsboro Artists' Repertory Theatre

Studies demonstrate that the economic benefits of arts programming, as seen in places like Estacada and Lake Oswego, are not aberrations. The *Arts and Economic Prosperity* study done by Americans for the Arts quantifies the economic contributions of local non-profit arts and cultural organizations on their local economies.¹ The study found that almost 1,400 creative businesses employ almost 16,000 people working in creative industries in Clackamas County. A third of these jobs are in traditional non-profit arts and culture organizations. The study also showed that Clackamas County has a higher than average percentage of the creative industry share compared to other places. At 4.25%, Clackamas County is performing better than the rest. The region's average is 3.675; Oregon's is 3.3%; and the national average is only 2.47%.

In Clackamas County, the estimated spending on arts and cultural activities comes to over thirty-six million dollars annually (\$36,377,200). Out of area visitors, or tourists, spend \$38.53 per day when patronizing arts and cultural activities and residents spend \$19.61 per day when patronizing arts and cultural activities. In practical terms, this means that arts and cultural activities have a multiplier effect. Patrons purchase tickets to a play and also go out for dinner at a restaurant or shop locally while there.

In 2012, the *Creative Industries: Business & Employment in the Arts* became the first national study that reviewed data for both the nonprofit and for-profit arts industries. As of January 2012, *Creative*

¹ Americans for the Arts. (2010). *The Arts and Economic Prosperity IV*.

Industries data shows that Oregon Congressional District 1 is home to 3,520 arts-related businesses that employ 14,582 people. These arts-centric businesses play an important role in building and sustaining economic vibrancy. They employ a creative workforce, spend money locally, generate government revenue, and are a cornerstone of tourism and economic development. The creative industries account for 5.45 percent of the 64,535 total businesses located in Oregon Congressional District 1 and 3.1 percent of the 469,826 total people they employ.²

Social Benefits of Arts Programming

In 2008 the Gallup and the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation launched the *Soul of the Community* project with the goal of determining what community qualities attract and retain residents (see www.soulofthecommunity.org.) After interviewing close to 43,000 people in 26 communities over three years, the study found that three main qualities attach people to place: Social offerings—such as entertainment venues and places to meet; Openness—such as how welcoming a place is, and; Aesthetics—physical beauty, public art, and green spaces. They also found that attachment is an important metric because it links to local economic growth (GDP).³

The study has found that, surprisingly, perceptions of the local economy do not have a very strong relationship to resident attachment. Instead, attachment is most closely related to how accepting a community is of diversity, its wealth of social offerings, and its aesthetics. This is not to say that jobs and housing aren't important. Residents must be able to meet their basic needs in a community in order to stay. However, when it comes to forming an emotional connection with the community, there are other community factors which often are not considered when thinking about economic development. These community factors seem to matter more when it comes to attaching residents to their community.

Additionally, while the study did reveal differences in attachment among different demographic groups, demographics generally are not the strongest drivers of attachment. In almost every community, the study found that a resident's perceptions of the community are more strongly linked to their level of community attachment than to that person's age, ethnicity, work status, etc.

At the recent Milwaukie Arts Committee's planning retreat, the Committee discussed the changes that Milwaukie has gone through and will go through in the near future and the need for increased community pride and attachment in Milwaukie. Milwaukie's sense of identity has been fragmented by change. Committee members see Milwaukie as an "undiscovered gem" that many people in the rest of the region don't know about. The Arts Committee believes that promoting Milwaukie through arts programming will help foster Milwaukie's sense of community identity and raise our status within the region. The Arts Committee believes that a sense of community pride is just as important as the direct economic benefits that can come from arts programming.

² Americans for the Arts. (2012). *Creative Industries: Business & Employment in the Arts*.

³ Gallup and the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. (2008). *Soul of the Community*.

Examples of Arts Programs in Other Places

Storefront and Arts Incubator Programs:

Many cities have successful storefront programs with property owners, artists, and small creative business entrepreneurs. Depending on property conditions and owner cooperation, pop-up activities and enterprises can range from passive installation of visual art in windows to temporary retail businesses, such as bookstores, craft shops, and galleries. Such programs bring vitality to otherwise vacant areas that may appear uninviting. This can be accomplished with nominal improvement to property—sometimes with subsidies—and generally at the risk of artist-entrepreneurs or nonprofits. Such programs enhance the entire neighborhood as new enterprises are incubated that remain or take root nearby.

Tacoma, Washington had a struggling downtown for decades with numerous vacant storefronts. Spaceworks Tacoma began in summer 2010 as an initiative of the City of Tacoma, the Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber and Seattle arts nonprofit Shunpike (see <http://spaceworkstacoma.wordpress.com>.)

It has an annual budget of \$50,000: 40 percent from the city, 25 percent in grants, 25 percent in in-kind donations and 10 percent individual giving.

The program matches private property owners with empty retail or office space with artists. The artist pays for utilities and basic maintenance, but no rent for six months. Use of the spaces can range from static installation--such as paintings or sculpture; project based work-space; or a creative enterprise. Many of the matches have ended in marriage—with the artist or creative business deciding to lease the space given the cost savings advantage and the 'learning curve' they acquire through this low risk opportunity.

The results have been impressive. In 2011 alone, Spaceworks supported 18 creative enterprises; exhibited 28 large-scale art installations; activated 20 ground-level retail spaces; supported over 70 events and performances; inspired over 40 articles in local press; and attracted over 16,500 visitors.

Percent for Art Programs:

Many cities fund arts initiatives through percent for art programs. In Clackamas County, the cities of Estacada and Lake Oswego have percent for art programs that fund art as part of the construction of public and/or government projects.

The Multnomah County percent for art program was established in 1975 and since 1980 has allocated 1.33 percent of public capital construction/ improvement projects for art. Typically \$500,000 to \$800,000 a year is devoted to the program. For City projects of \$100,000 or more, and for County projects that are \$50,000 or more, the percent for art requirement is triggered. Currently, the program

is funding art associated with the Sellwood Bridge Project, Portland Streetcar, the Morrison Bridgehead Project and many other large-scale city projects.

Portland also has a voluntary percent for art program through the City's Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Bonus Program. Developers can increase the floor to area ratio they are allowed if they participate in the program. The art budget is up to 2% and there is an allowance of up to 10% of the art budget for management expenses as well as a set aside that comes directly to RACC's Public Art Trust Fund.

Cities have various ways of setting up percent for art programs. Most develop thresholds such as square footage and/or project costs at which the percent for art allocation (1-2% is typical) is calculated. Many cities also allow developers to either incorporate public art into the project as they choose or to pay into a fund that the City can use for furthering public art programs.

Local Grant Programs that may Fund Arts Initiatives

Many arts grantors increasingly recognize the value of arts related "placemaking" projects with the arts as a means of community engagement—not simply decoration. For example, the Oregon Arts Commission "Arts Build Communities" grant program recognizes and supports both the arts in local communities and the involvement of the arts and artists in community development. Support is provided to arts and other community-based organizations to form alliances and partnerships to strengthen communities through projects that connect the arts with local issues and opportunities.

There are a few grant programs in the region and State that could fund arts initiatives. The City could be eligible for grants from a few sources including the Regional Arts and Culture Council, Oregon Arts Commission and Clackamas Cultural Trust. Community groups and non-profits can apply for grants from these organizations and also to private foundations (the City cannot apply for grant funding from private foundations.) A grant could be also be garnered to engage a visioning process and the development of arts and culture plan for the City. Grants range from \$3,000 to \$100,000, with grants from private foundations typically larger than those from public agencies. A few granting programs that could be explored for Milwaukie projects follow.