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Abstract
While including public art along transit lines has increasingly been accepted as best practice over the past several decades, there has not been a comparable increase in the documentation and research of its trends or its alleged impacts. What documentation is available exists in the form of case studies and tends to focus on larger rail systems. Using a similar approach, by comparing and contrasting the process, best practices, challenges and creative funding solutions that three transit agencies used to make art within their bus systems possible, this paper sheds some light on a lesser studied form of art in transit - bus art wraps. The three agencies of focus are Asheville, North Carolina; Shreveport, Louisiana; and St. Louis, Missouri.

Among many other points, these case examples show that how a city chooses to incorporate art onto their buses is malleable and the program can be custom fitted to the needs, assets, and goals of the specific agency and community. Though each program proved to be unique in process and project goals, some common elements and lessons can be found. First, it is important to partner with an arts agency that is officially recognized by and has a history of working with the city. This, in addition to using available technologies such as vinyl art wraps and the CAFÉ web portal will facilitate the process. Jury formation and process design should be transparent and open to community involvement. Finally, as with many other studies of art, there is need for better methods of collecting feedback about the projects and for better research about the impacts of public art projects.
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Introduction

Including public art along transit lines has increasingly been accepted as best practice over the past several decades. Numerous reasons are cited for the support, such as public art’s ability to enhance the pedestrian environment and the urban livability around stops, decrease vandalism and crime, and, by providing a more comfortable and welcoming environment, increase ridership, among other political and economic benefits (Federal Transit Administration, 1995; Banyas, 2002; Ewing, nd; Jolly, 2002; Keys, 2004; Sherman, 2007; Blumenfeld and Yatzeck, 1996; CATS, n.d.). Despite this overwhelming and largely uncontested support and an increasing utilization of federal funds for public art projects within transit developments in the past two decades, there has not been a likewise increase in the documentation and research of its trends or its alleged impacts.

Additionally, of the information currently available about public art in transit, a majority is in case study format and a vast majority of those focus on federally funded major rail projects (FTA, 2009). As a result, this report sheds light on a lesser studied form of art in, or rather ‘on’, transit – art wraps on the buses themselves. This approach is distinctive from the other applications of public art in transit because instead of placing and siting the work in a single location in a station or stop, art wraps on buses actively move the art to city residents and exhibit the art throughout the city – mobile murals. While the existing case studies of rail transit art are still of relevance and importance, they do not provide information catered to the unique challenges and opportunities of incorporating public art in bus transit.

This project will investigate the process, the best practices, and the lessons learned from three cities’ experiences of incorporating public art into the city via “art wraps” on buses, Asheville, North Carolina; Shreveport, Louisiana; and St. Louis, Missouri. Taking the form of a comparative case study, this report discusses the process and outcome of each case and integrates multiple perspectives, namely the agencies, the selection juries, and selected artists, to construct a summary of best practices and lessons learned. This information will serve as a resource for systems who are considering incorporating art but are unsure of the financial, social, or political commitment. This report also highlights what variations can be found within the ‘art wrap’ option of public art on bus transit, explores creative funding opportunities, and discusses the elements of process and selection that enable successful project outcomes. Additionally, it will inform the FTA of how some lesser studied agencies are taking advantage of their relatively stronger stance in support of the arts within transit.

Literature Review

Before delving into modern applications of public art in transit, it is important to place it in context of the larger public art realm. Public art, historically, has been a politically charged and convoluted issue. It is takes time and effort to implement in practice, it is difficult to define and understand in theory, and its evaluation is often a subjective and individual experience. This literature review will broadly define public art, provide its historical perspective, describe the introduction of public art into transit systems, and present arguments of proponents who support public art in transit and those who do not.
**Public Art Defined**

While making no attempt to address the timeless and highly contested question “what is art?” defining *public art* is key to understanding its varied applications. Some see public art as simply art that is created as a reflection of the culture, history, or character of the surrounding community (FPAA, 2001). Similarly, others see it as something that can commemorate and memorialize what has happened at a site over time, because the art becomes a part of the built environment (Fleming, 2007).

However, perhaps the most inclusive definition is provided by Cartiere, a contemporary lecturer and author on public art issues. She states that in order to be considered “public,” the art must be “accessible or visible to the public... concerned with or affecting the community...[or] paid for by the public. In other words, it is not located in museums or galleries and, quite on the contrary, must either be in public, in the public interest, in a public place, or publicly funded (Cartiere and Willis, 2008). With these defining characteristics in mind, public art is not the same as site-specific art, works that are a reaction specifically to the topography of a site, installation, works that are not context specific, nor simply sculpture or any of the other many categories of art (Cartiere and Willis, 2008). There are, however, nuances within the practice of public art. Public art can be as large as a fifty foot tall steel sculpture or as small as the detailing on the doorframe of a building, the design of a water fountain, or a low-relief sketch on a manhole cover. With such diverse applications, the above constructs for the definition of public art are important to keep in mind for further discussions.

**Historical Context**

This definition of public art has lead some critics to claim that public art has been present since the days of cave paintings, but the U.S. Federal government first officially funded public art projects in 1935. Created to ease the economic suffering of the Great Depression, the Federal Art Project (FAP) was created under the Works Progress Administration (WPA) established by President Roosevelt. In the years prior to FAP and WPA, Roosevelt also tried to fund public art works through the Public Works of Art Project from 1933-34 (Cartiere and Willis, 2008). These projects set the precedent for supporting public art projects through federal funds.

Since then, there have been several innovations into fundraising structures for public arts projects. The most prevalent is the private percent-for-the-arts ordinance, which requires developers to devote a portion of construction costs to on-site art, cultural programming, or a public art fund. While the most common apportionment is one percent, they can range from .5-2 percent. Downfalls to this program are that it is politically difficult to adopt and it is also contingent on the cycles of the development market. Other common programs include density bonuses, which decrease floor-to-area ratios and require public amenities (such as with public art) in order for developers to be allowed to build at higher densities, or public art funds (Flood, 1989). These programs have been successful in funding numerous public art projects since their inception in the 1980s.
The Transition to Transit

New York City’s Metropolitan Transit Administration was the first to incorporate public art into its transit system in 1904 by adding terra-cotta embellishments and artistic wayfinding signs in its Interborough Rapid Transit line. However, they had deteriorated significantly by the 1940s and 60s (Bloodworth and Ayres, 2006). Since 1981, when San Diego opened the first light rail system in North America, public transit systems have increasingly begun to incorporate public art into their system design. Around the same time the percent-for-the-arts programs mentioned above also began to be widely adopted by communities across the nation (Banyas, 2002). The first transit systems to incorporate public art into their systems were funded via these percent-for-the-arts programs.

In the early 1980s, Federal funding was not yet firmly established for public art projects. The 1980 Urban Mass Transit Act encouraged collaboration with artists during the design phase, but neither offered clear guidelines for funding the actual art. By the mid-1980s, FTA policy allowed full funding for hiring and partial funding for design costs, but would not assist in purchase or commission costs. Considering the amorphous definition of public art at its inception, the FTA and public transit administrations had difficulty agreeing on what could be funded with federal funds and what could not (Banyas, 2002). However, the most current FTA circular on public art, released in 1995, does not seek to define what is or is not art (FTA, 1995; Banyas, 2002; See Appendix A).

Art in Transit Today

Current FTA policy allows .5 percent to 5 percent of a project’s budget to be allocated to the total costs of planning, designing, and construction of public art in the system (FTA, 1995). Due to the funding structure and permanence of rail investments, public art projects in transit have more commonly followed rail and, specifically, light rail projects. By offering a solid stance on funding for public art in transit projects and explicitly stating the reasons and benefits to doing so, the FTA has successfully encouraged and enabled transit systems across the country to incorporate public arts into their systems.

As of 2009, there are several federal sources transit agencies may use to fund public art projects. These sources include Planning Programs, Urbanized Areas Formula Program (at least one percent must be devoted to transit enhancements, of which public art is one option), New Starts/Small Starts/Very Small Starts, Fixed Guideway Modernization, Nonurbanized Areas Formula, Tribal Transit Program, Bus and Bus Related Facilities, and the Paul S. Sarbanes Transit in the Parks Program (FTA, 2009). The most often used for public art projects are the New Starts program, for rail, and the mandated transit enhancement portion of the Urbanized Areas Formula Program, for bus. There are also transportation enhancement funds available, where public art is an eligible use most commonly under the landscaping and scenic beautification category (NTEC, 2009).

Unfortunately, of these funds, the percentage allotted to public arts is often so small that it is often not documented as a stand alone category. For example, within transportation enhancements, public art projects are hidden within ‘scenic beautification’ or other categories,
and are not demarcated at all within New Starts allocations (NTEC, 2009; FTA, 2009). Though public art projects are delineated within transit enhancements under the Urbanized Area Formula, this only represents a small portion of the total federal funding for public art. While this could be seen as an argument for the application of public arts because art projects represent such a small expense relative to other costs, this failure to document federal funding is really a weakness. Without accurate documentation, there is no quantitative metric to understand trends of how FTA funds have been utilized for public art over the years. Without that knowledge, it is more difficult to pinpoint gaps, needs, or surpluses in funding sources.

While many larger capital investments have turned to the FTA for funding assistance, many art in transit projects have surfaced independent of other capital improvements. The art wraps that are covered in this paper fall under this category. They are smaller projects where funds from other sources were leveraged to champion the project.

**Applications of Art in Transit**

The FTA, the Public Art Network, and other organizations offer best practices to ensure the success and acceptance of future public art projects. One of the core recommendations is that the art should reflect or embody the surrounding community, its history, or its culture in some way and make all possible efforts to involve the community in the process. Other guidance addresses the selection of artworks for long term viability, as it should require minimum maintenance, have an impact on mass transit users specifically, be as durable and vandalism resistant as possible, be of high quality, and be appropriate for the site - in regards to scale (FTA, 1995; Flood, 1989).

With the many variations of transit stops, stations, and vehicles across the nation, there are many unique opportunities to incorporate art into transit. They also provide artists the opportunity to work with the community to design and create the artwork. However, some of the most common applications are in the form of murals, sculptures, functional art, performance art, poetry, or posters (Hubbard, Smally, and Hubbard, 2009).

- **Murals/Mosaics** can be large in scale and can add color to the urban environment and celebrate the character of a neighborhood. They can be in a number of media, from paint, to stone, ceramic or metal. New York City’s MTA and Atlanta, Georgia’s MARTA rail stops offer a smorgasbord of high quality mural and mosaic art (Bloodworth and Ayres, 2006; MARTA, 1989). Transit agencies have also temporarily installed murals to mitigate transit construction, such as Portland, Oregon’s Tri-Met use of murals on construction barriers during the Westside MAX light rail extension construction (FTA, 2009). It could be argued that the bus art wraps being covered in this paper are mobile murals.

- **Sculptures** can infuse life and humor into transit stations. At Detroit’s Grand Circus Park station, there is a life-sized bronze statue of a commuter reading the newspaper, which has often caught actual commuters unawares (Walt, 2004). Abstract sculptures, such as that along Charlotte, North Carolina’s LYNX speak to the local history of the surrounding area while giving each station a unique landmark to be recognized by (CATS, nd).

- **Performance art** at stations can become the highlight of some transit rider’s days.
Washington, D.C. hosts the MetroPerforms! series each summer and holiday season since 2007, where DC-based talent auditions for the opportunity to perform at select stations (WMATA, 2010). The Metro has even hosted world renowned violinist Joshua Bell incognito in 2007 (Weingarten, 2007).

- **Functional art** can take the form of benches, light fixtures, or water fountains, as in Charlotte’s LYNX Blue Line, or as enhancements to the bus shelter windscreens (CATS, n.d.). Several agencies, Portland Tri-met being one of the first, have been sandblasting artist designs into the windscreens (Jolly, 2002). Others, such as King County METRO, invited local school children, residents and artists to design and paint sheets of plywood to adorn their local bus shelters (FTA, 2009). There are even instances where the art is the architecture and design of the bus shelters themselves, such as Rochester, New York’s three ARTWalk bus stops (Rochester Art Walk, 2010).

- **Posters** designed by local artists can be printed to fill what empty space there is in advertising areas inside buses. Pittsburg, Pennsylvania’s Port Authority gave the space for local artists to exhibit their designs that expressed the value and centrality of transit as well as the local culture in the city. The project promoted art as well as transit (Art in Transit, 2008). Los Angeles MTA took the project to the next step by turning their designs into cards (Metro Arts, 2010).

- **Poetry** can be displayed on posters as well. St. Louis’ Metro has showcased fifteen local poems on posters inside buses and trains since 2006, along with relevant imagery and design (Metro Arts in Transit, 2010). Charlottesville, Virginia initiated their “Bus Lines” Poetry in Motion program in 2009 with poems composed by city school children. In 2010, the program was expanded to area residents, but 25 of the 36 winning authors were still area students (City of Charlottesville, 2010).

**Opposition to Arts in Transit**

While the benefits and impacts of public art in transit stated in FTA’s circular on public art and design are now generally accepted, there are those who do not believe federal funds should be used to fund those programs (Boaz, 1997; The Cato Institute, nd; Kauffman, 1990; Jarvik, 1997). They are not, however, commentary specifically against including art along transit lines or against the art itself. Instead, they speak of the dangers of combining “art and state” and reasons to cut federal funding for the arts (Boaz, 1997).

The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) is targeted in each of the publications. It is criticized for providing federally funded arts, culture and entertainment to exclusively the mid-and upper-class and funding controversial or sub-par art or even lowering the quality of art. Jarvik, of the Heritage Foundation, calls to question the art works resulting from the federally funded PWAP, where “no true masterpieces” were produced, according to Franklin D. Roosevelt (1997). Though the criticisms are not directly of FTA’s public arts in transit program, similar to the National Endowment for the Arts, funding for FTA’s Art-in-Transit programs come from reallocated tax payer dollars.

With similar funding sources, the concerns translate across agencies. There are cases where the political support has been weak, even in opposition, for public art in transit projects.
Arguments touched upon the difficulties in defining art, the potential public backlash to poorly executed projects, and prioritization of limited funds (Lombardi, P., telephone communication, October 30, 2009). Despite arguments for and in question of public art, given the fact that light rail lines and bus rapid transit projects typically run through city centers and connect main nodes of activity, they could be seen as the backbone, the heart, or the lifeline of a city. As public transit and the public art that now commonly goes along with it are becoming more prevalent and integral elements of cities today, it is a timely and relevant subject for further research. Even if the physical qualities are not be the most important elements in a transit system’s success, its design and aesthetic quality are nonetheless important factors to consider (Jacobs, 1993).

Support for Arts in Transit
The FTA states that the arts can have a “profound impact on transit patrons and the community at large” and publishes the reasons for its support in the Circular on Design and Art in Transit Projects (FTA, 1995). As a result, many of the agencies which have already incorporated or hope to incorporate art into their systems cite the FTA and its reasoning to support their own projects (Banyas, 2002; Blumenfeld and Yatzeck, 1996; CATS, nd.; Ewing, nd; Jolly, 2002; Keys, 2004; P. Lombardi, personal communication, October, 2009; MARTA, 1989; Sherman, 2007; Walt, 2004). These case studies also provide anecdotal evidence to support the validity of the FTA’s claims. Though the benefits are interrelated, they can be summarized in the following:

Art Creates a Sense of Identity
In Philadelphia, artists were asked to have the genius loci, or the “spirit of the place”, inspire the artwork they designed. As having the work mirror or reflect the surrounding community is one of the central best practices for integrating public art, perhaps the most noticeable benefit of integrating arts in transit is the creation of a place that is memorable and personable, not only to the community that surrounds it, but also to those who pass through it. People in NYC have said the transit system was an “organism of steel and stone” but the art gave it “soul” (Bloodworth and Ayres, 2006). By making a place memorable, it also serves the dual purpose of helping people find their way in sometimes disorienting cities. Additionally, it can increase the civic pride people have in the transit system and help to build community.

Art Improves the Rider’s Experience
Art serves to improve the rider’s experience by making the transit stations attractive, interesting, navigable, safe, and, thus, more comfortable. Several case studies have suggested that public art reduces the incidence of vandalism and crime in transit stops (Jolly, 2002; FTA, 1995; Magie, 2005). It also cuts back on the cost of maintenance and cleaning. Portland, OR sandblasted artist motifs onto the glass panels of bus shelters, which normally come at a cost of about $200 apiece to replace. The expected savings from sandblasting instead of replacing scratched panels was approximately $100,000 (Jolly, 2002). The reduction in crime and vandalism, in addition to cleaner and more attractive stations may also make waiting for transit less of a burden. The increased landmarks will also make navigating the system easier.
Art is Good for the Economy
Studies suggest neighborhood beautification increases community activity by 72%, while adding a bike lane during a road redesigning increases activity by only 22% (C. Remedios, Email communication, December 7, 2009). Yet, many studies have stated that as so much of the impact of art on the community is qualitative, the effect of art on the economy of an area is difficult to measure quantitatively (Hall, 2001). Though increases in foot traffic and public accessibility may not be directly attributable to public art, anecdotal evidence would suggest the impact of art is more often than not a positive one. Indeed, there is a need for better formed research and documentation of the impacts of arts and culture on a region (Markusen and Gadwa, 2010).

Art Attracts Attention
With the increase in rider comfort and security from public art, the stigma of transit as being something for poor or low-income residents may begin to fade. New riders from middle and higher income levels may see transit as a place of civic pride and beauty, and no longer as a space for cold, hard, or uncomfortable waiting. Transit may also serve the purpose of attracting tourists and attention from decision and policy makers in the city (FTA, 1995). The increased attention and ridership may yield an increase in funding for the agency. Furthermore, successful transit systems can be at the heart of marketing and promoting a city, since they can improve urban livability through mobility.

Art is Good for the Psyche
Finally, there are those who say that art is good for the mind and the individual as a whole. The impacts can be felt by not just the riders, but also by passersby and the ones who create the art. It exercises nonverbal parts of the brain, enriches the built environment with a human touch, is visually stimulating, and the variety can be psychologically satisfying in an otherwise structured built environment (FPAA, 2001).

Case Studies of Art on Bus Transit
The remainder of this paper describes and contrasts the process, funding, best practices, and lessons learned from three cities – Asheville, North Carolina; Shreveport, Louisiana; and St. Louis, Missouri. Table 4 on page 29 provides a summary of findings.

Asheville, NC
Situated in western North Carolina, Asheville’s transit system has a service area population of approximately 73,000 and a service area of 45 square miles. To serve the city of Asheville and the surrounding suburbs, it has 20 buses in its fleet though only 16-18 are running routes during peak hours. The Asheville Transit System has a fixed route system that operates six days a week (FTIS-INTDAS, 2008). The system offers a fare-free zone in the downtown vicinity and all buses pass through the downtown central station on Coxe Avenue.

The Art-on-Transit Program
Drawing inspiration from Raleigh’s 2007 and 2009 Art-on-the-Move programs, Asheville’s first Art on Transit program was unveiled in March 2010 (Hartell, 2009; D. Ruggiero, personal...
communication, February, 26, 2010). Roll out was originally targeted for the winter months so that it would have the strongest visual impact in the urban landscape – enlivening the generally bleak and leafless city with color and creativity. However, a shifting timeframe resulted in the program unveiling in early spring. Providing a unique venue for artists to showcase their work, instead of acquiring and placing a single sculpture, Art on Transit allows the art to move throughout the city, bringing the art to city residents, rather than asking residents to seek it out. Facilitating this city-wide exhibition, individual buses (such as the three that will have wraps on them) are not tied to specific routes in the city and, instead, they rotate between all the routes. Thus, over the duration of the first phase of the program, where the wraps will be on the buses from four to twelve months, each wrapped bus will travel each route in the Asheville transit system.

The purpose driving the program was simply to bring the best art possible to the city. Submitting artists were not asked to follow a theme and jurors were not asked to critique based on any criteria but to find the best art. Though not the main intent of the project, the art wraps have the added benefits of providing a unique new venue for local artists and increasing the visibility and versatility of transit. They also potentially redefine the image of the transit agency, tying it closer to the already rich culture of support for the arts in Asheville. Furthermore, the program also raises awareness among local businesses of the agency’s relatively new capability to use the exterior of the buses for advertising.

Though it had been proposed by the Asheville Transit Commission several years prior, the city had been unable to implement an art on transit program for a number of reasons. One reason was a lack of funding within the transit system. Additionally, there were regulatory constraints limiting advertising on the sides of buses to framed rectangles underneath windows, otherwise known as King and Queen style bus ads (See Figure 1: Bus Wrap Options).

![Figure 1: Bus Wrap Options](Source: City of Raleigh, nd; Busads.com, nd).
Wrap Options). However, over the summer of 2009, buses became exempt from those limiting regulations – allowing the agency to use the entirety of the bus exteriors to display large scale advertising (see statute 7-13-2(c)(7) in Appendix B and the advertising policy in Appendix C). Once the city had approved advertising on the sides of the buses, it became easy for public art to fit within that same category.

A Collaborative Structure

The project was a collaboration involving the city’s Parks, Recreation and Cultural Arts Department, the Asheville Public Art Board, the Transit Department, and the Asheville Transit Commission. The fact that the project was a collaboration among city offices made it easier to win city buy-in because it was all city offices heading the process and not an outside entity seeking permission to use the buses. The city departments heading the pilot project gave it credibility and dependability, and also made it easier to leverage funds. It is possible that other cities, such as those without a cultural arts division or public art equivalent, would have a more difficult time convincing city council to outsource the project to non-city department organizations due to increased room for error and uncertainty.

However, as this was a pilot program that would set precedent for future projects, the departments were not willing to accept anything but the best or anything but success. As such, they had to make an unpopular, but safer, decision in choosing a company to handle the vinyl wrap printing. The city was required to solicit three quotes before selecting one, so they requested quotes from two local businesses and one based in Charlotte, N.C., two hours east. Since Asheville’s margin for error was non-existent, they gave preference to the Charlotte company because they had produced the vinyl bus wraps for Raleigh, N.C.’s Art-on-the-Move program, even though the business was not local. The local groups had wrapped vans and smaller vehicles, but never a bus.

It had originally been suggested that the Cultural Arts Division use the opportunity to advertise on the sides of the buses to promote Bele-Chere, a free summer music and arts festival in downtown Asheville that draws approximately 300,000 attendees each year. Instead, the Cultural Arts Division chose to display public art. On one end, the transit agency waived the advertising fees for the exterior bus wraps as well as ad space for an interior poster that reinforced the project details. The interior poster had the name of the artist whose work was on the exterior of the bus, an excerpt from their artist statement, and brief mention of the Art on Transit project. On the other end, the Cultural Arts Division handled the call for entries, the cost of production, and managed the jury process. The collaboration of resources and expertise is what made the project possible. As a point of comparison, the cost of a company running a similar ad campaign would cost about $22,000 for one year (J. GeorgeMurr, email communication, April 7, 2010).

Utilization of Funds

The decision for three full side bus wraps was determined based on the amount of funding available. The Cultural Arts Division’s operating budget comes from a one percent allotment of the area’s total capital improvements budget, but since there had not been many capital
improvements in recent years, funding was lower than usual. Regardless, as a result of this funding source, eligible artists had to live in a town in the area and on one of the transit lines, meaning they had to be a resident of Asheville, Arden, Black Mountain, Oteen, Skyland, Swannanoa or Woodfin. The total costs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printing /Administrative Support</th>
<th>Installation (travel, lodging, etc.)</th>
<th>Honorarium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,300/bus</td>
<td>$2,100 (all buses, three days)</td>
<td>$750/bus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost per bus = approx. $3,750

Table 1: Summary of Expenses Asheville Art-on-Transit Program
(Source: D. Ruggiero, personal communication, February 26, 2010).

Interestingly enough, vinyl wraps have an active lifespan of four months to a year, but are maintenance-free for the entire duration. They can be left on the bus for as long as they last.

Other public art projects suggest or require a ten percent budget allotment towards long term maintenance, and other older pieces of artwork in the city, some twenty years old, had been utilizing much of the funding the Cultural Arts Division had been receiving. A regular series of art wraps on buses may become a worthwhile method to provide fresh art on a tight budget.

The Public Process of Public Art

In crafting the program details, the agency remained flexible, but devoted to putting out the best quality product they could. Though ideally, the Cultural Arts Division wanted three full wraps to have the greatest impact, the reality of the matter was that they were too expensive. The next alternative was to produce a half, a full and a tail wrap, but they soon realized that this variety would be harder to manage administratively and harder to jury. The option they decided on was to produce three full side wraps, to have the visual impact of a full wrap, but without the cost for the top, front, or back of the bus. Also in terms of funding structures, the artists’ honorarium was crafted to be as equal to the payment to the out of town printing firm as possible.

As the project utilized public funds, the selection process was open to the artists who submitted work. However, during the five hour jury process, jury members and artists were not allowed to converse, lest they sacrifice the anonymous nature of the process. Of the twenty-nine artists who submitted a total of fifty-eight submissions, fifteen were present.

By city policy, the jury had to be composed of an odd number of no less than five people, a majority had to be artists, and one had to be on the Public Art Board. As a whole the final jury contained a member of the Asheville Transit Commission, a bus driver, a graphic designer, a member of the Asheville Public Art Board, and an artist, and was led by the Superintendent of Cultural Arts. The bus driver’s perspective was especially valuable. Not only does a bus driver have a more intimate understanding of the perceptions riders will have towards the work, but they will also be the first to hear about it if a rider does not like the art. Though the superintendent did not have a vote, that person’s role was especially important in facilitating a
fair and streamlined process by encouraging “honest but respectful” discussion about each submission and with each other.

Powerpoint was used during the actual jury process. Jury members were shown the works all together as thumbnails, but each was considered individually and given a yes/no/maybe distinction with discussion about why each jury member thought it should be so. All of the yes/maybe submittals were looked at again and discussed before moving on subsequent rounds. This process was carried through until the top ten were determined, at which point the bottom four were dropped because they were controversial within the jury and would not have made it to the top six anyway. Three were chosen unanimously as top choices, and three were designated alternates.

One of the elements which facilitated the jury process was The Call for Entries (CaFÉ) online platform (CallforEntry.org, 2010). Started by Western States Arts Federation (WESTAF), a non-for-profit art service organization to advance creative ventures through financial, organizational avenues as well as programming and policy initiatives, CaFÉ provided a portal for all the submittals to be entered and tracked, and also allowed each juror to pre-view the works and artists statements, segregated from the names of the artists, before the jury process. This meant they were already familiar with all the works before having to make a judgment. Notification of selections and rejections was also handled via CaFÉ. Several artists who were not selected commented on how helpful it had been to witness the process and to hear the feedback because it gave them a better idea of what to submit if they were to do it again.

Figure 2: 'Jewel Forest' by Ray Noland (Source: Ashevillenc.gov, 2010).
It was understood from the beginning that the agency was not on a mission to select art that everyone in the city was going to be happy with, a perhaps impossible task to accomplish. Rather, their goal was to deliver the best art to the city they could. Figures 2-4 show the winning entries. True to the agency’s desire to bring color and life to the cityscape, the pieces are full of vibrancy, but also of variety, ranging from the abstract to the photorealistic. Noland’s piece “Jewel Forest”, though the most abstract of the three, still references the familiar. The piece is composed of shapes and lines which play together to take the viewer on a trip into a wild and fantastical forest where unknown treasures may be seen. On the other end of the spectrum is Johnson’s “Farm Fresh Transit,” a collection of photographs paying homage to local farmers and the agricultural lifestyle outside the city. Creating a connection between urban and rural, it also serves as a reminder to city dwellers of where their food comes from. Finally, often nicknamed “the bunny bus”, Furrini’s “Message in a Bottle” depicts a narrative that is as melancholy as it is playful, and as intriguing as it is telling. Viewers can easily empathize with the two creatures floating in oar-less boats with a stormy seas and a breaking dawn. It makes the viewer wonder if the bunnies will ever reach each other, and it is unclear if the piece is hopeful or wistful. The answer, only the bunnies know.

Whimsical, genuine, and endearing, respectively, these three pieces are a reflection of Asheville’s creative character and speak to the caliber of the city’s artists. The fact that the agency did not set a specific theme in the call for entries allowed the artists to let their imagination and creativity run wild. Along the same lines, as opposed to the project being an advertisement with a specific message, it was simply a call for their work. This CFE structure
allowed each artist’s personal style to come through unhindered, though it left the city with a wild card in terms of what kind of art they would receive to jury.

**Roll out and Response**

Each of the three top selections were transferred to vinyl and installed on the buses in March 2010. The artists were invited to attend the weekend wrapping of the buses, and time lapse photography was used to document the process for those who could not attend. In finality, each side of the bus was composed of over a dozen pieces because of the windows. They were wrapped on days when transit service is the slowest to cause the least possible disruption to transit operations. The unveiling ceremony, to which city officials and community members were invited, was held on Saturday, March 27. Each artist signed their work so it would show on the design, allowing room for the wheel cut outs, and a poster was placed on the inside of the buses with their name and a brief description about the Art on Transit project.

Though there has been no formal method of collecting feedback, reactions to the art bus wraps have been garnered from the community in a number of ways. The Citizen Times and Mountain Xpress, local newspapers that each host a blog, have published press releases and articles on the project. Individuals have posted their comments or have written editorials in response. As noted above, while there will always be people who disagree with the use of funds for art, the overwhelming response to the program has been positive (D. Ruggiero, Personal communication, February 26, 2010; Sanford, 2010). In addition to these informal outlets for commentary, there will also be an online portal, and email address, as well as feedback cards placed on the buses themselves. There are also plans to place posters at bus stops to educate passersby that the project is ‘coming to your neighborhood soon.’

**Lessons Learned**

The Asheville Art on Transit project had incredible support and excitement behind it all the way through – from the transit commission and from the city. As a whole the agency would not change the process, but the next project would go far more smoothly. First off, they have a better idea of the time frame it takes to pull together the project. This time, by investing the time to come up with the best options, the project was delayed, and then again due to snow and people being out of town. Even with an extended timeline, the effort was a success.

Next would be to word the Call for Entries more specifically. As this was the first project, the CFE left a number of questions unanswered, such as what a wrap was or how the work would be transferred to the buses. Many individuals thought they might be painting directly on the bus. It is possible that for the next project many of these basic questions would be answered, but a FAQ list would be posted along with the CFE regardless. Additionally, the CFE gave no theme or requirements on the age of the work, so entries could have been of any subject and ten years old. This could have been made clearer in the CFE.

Additionally, a second element that would be changed would be how the CFE was marketed. There was some concern near the deadline that there would not be enough submittals for a successful project. Two days before the deadline, there were only 25 options from about 12
artists to choose from, but by the day of the number had climbed to about 58 submittals. This may have been a result of the fact that many people respond to deadlines at the last minute but also that the agency relied on word of mouth to inform artists of the opportunity. Some artists may be reticent to pass the word along because it means they are willingly increasing their competition, so there would be an increased marketing effort with Twitter and Facebook next time. Additionally, the city would want to use a local printer for the vinyl wraps.

Despite these minor changes, there are several key elements of Asheville’s program that can inform other programs. For one, the interdepartmental collaboration and the importance of a cultural arts or public arts department in the city were extremely beneficial in facilitating such a successful project. The project yielded the added benefit of internal education and provided the opportunity of future collaboration. For example, the transit agency now knows it can write extra funds into grant applications for public art projects. Also, CaFÉ was an efficient tool to collect and enable the submittal and jury process. The only downside to this method comes when working with older generations who are not as tech savvy as younger folks. Additionally, there are two specifically noteworthy decisions that sets Asheville apart. First off, the choice to produce full side wraps increased the amount of visual impact. The agency considered a half side wrap too timid, and they wanted to make a statement with the project. As a result, rather than expending time and resources to wrap the front and the roof, which would have been less visible anyway, they concentrated resources on the full side/window wraps. The next noteworthy element of Asheville’s process was how completely open and honest the selection process was. There were no closed doors or hidden agendas, which increased the legitimacy of the project this time around and future attempts.

One concern might be that as this program raises awareness among businesses about the ability to use the sides of the buses for advertising, some confusion may arise between the Art on Transit program and actual business advertisements. Will city residents mistake their ads for the Cultural Arts Division’s Art on Transit Program, or will there be a clear enough distinction between the two? The city would be wise to find a way to mitigate these potential issues. This could take the form of a design or review process by the city before ads can be placed on the buses.

Figure 4: 'Message in a Bottle' (original submission) by Nina Ruffini  
(Source: Ashevilen.com, 2010).
Shreveport, LA
Located in northwestern Louisiana, the city of Shreveport is home to approximately 200,200 people (U.S. Census, 2006). SporTran, the area’s transit system, has over 50 buses in its fleet and offers 17 routes, serving Shreveport and nearby Bossier City, seven days a week (Sportran.org, 2010). All buses pass through the downtown terminal in Shreveport, and individual buses are fixed to service certain routes.

The Art Buses Program
Inspired by the painted buses and painted bus stops in Mesa, AZ, the Shreveport Regional Arts Council (SRAC) first partnered with SporTran and Shreveport to produce painted buses in 1999 (Mesaaaz.gov, 2009; P. Atchison, telephone communication, March 24, 2010). The charge first came from Mayor Keith Hightower when he suggested SporTran use the buses as a blank canvas for a “quality of life endeavor” instead of as a medium for advertising (Shreveport, Louisiana, n.d.). With the assistance of the city and SRAC, the art bus program was formed. SRAC is the official arts council of northwestern Louisiana, an area including about ten counties, and is funded by the NEA, the Louisiana State Arts Council, and the Louisiana Division of the Arts (SRAC, 2010).

There were several goals of the project, but the first was to highlight the rich culture and vibrancy of the city, which had been named an “All-American City” in three separate years by the National Civic League (NCL, 2007). Additionally, the project was intended to both provide

Figure 5: Rolie Polie Olie bus by William Joyce
(Source: G. Eddy, Email communication, September 23, 2009).
another venue for local artists to show their work and to bring more attention to transit services. The program could provide something to riders as well as non-riders, and it was all about making art open to everyone (Eddy, G., telephone communication, March 23, 2010). As such, each call for entries included four or five Shreveport-based themes created by SporTran, the Mayor’s office, and SRAC that artists could use to inspire their design submittals, such as ‘Life on the Red River’, ‘Shreveport Sports’, ‘Azaleas’, or ‘The Neon Trail’. There was also the ‘Open Category’ where artists could use their own imagination and familiarity with the city to create a design.

Artists had to live within the ten county region of SRAC. They were provided with a full-sized template of the four sides that would be painted, two sides, the roof and the front. The rear of the bus was reserved for the city to give the artist and the program recognition. Entries were submitted by hand, as this was before the time of streamlined online submission portals, and there were approximately thirty entries per year. They were juried by a group of seven individuals, two of which were professional artists, one representative from SporTran, one from the neighborhood the bus would be routed through, one from the Downtown Development Authority, one from the Arts Council, and one appointed by the mayor – often from Public Relations or Public Works. The SporTran position was usually reserved for a bus driver.

The jury process was the same each year, though the individuals on the jury members changed. They would choose the five pieces they liked the best, plus three alternatives. In preparing the work for transferal to the buses, the jury also reserved the right to request modifications to the design three times before choosing a replacement piece. Additionally, since the buses were SporTran property and a SporTran responsibility, the SporTran executive director reserved the right to turn down a submittal if it were deemed inappropriate.

Approximately 20-25 buses have been through this program. Fifteen painted or wrapped buses are still around, ten of which are completely painted buses and are still on the road and four of

Figure 6: Neon Bus by Neil Johnson
(Source: G. Eddy, email communication, September 23, 2009).
which are completely wrapped. Figures 5-7 show some examples of the painted buses.

Shreveport’s art bus program was unique in that the art wraps were seen as an opportunity to promote the city and all that it had to offer, and winning submissions were successful in highlighting elements of either Shreveport’s cultural arts or its southern charm and character. While this did dictate the subject matter of the work, artists could interpret the themes creatively and were still free to express their thoughts in their personal style. In these regards, these moving murals of art and design doubled as advertisements for the city of Shreveport. The Rolie Polie Olie bus (see Figure 5) was designed by Shreveport resident William Joyce, an author, illustrator, filmmaker and creator of the character Rolie Polie Olie. The character is well known in the Shreveport area and is a source of local pride. The Neon bus (see Figure 6) was inspired by the city’s unique neon public artwork, including a bridge lined completely with neon. Similarly, other buses, such as the Quilt bus (not shown), were inspired by the deep quilting culture and annual quilt show held in the city, and the Shreveport postcard bus (Figure 7) all promote Shreveport as a fun and culturally interesting place to go.

Taking a look at the intricate and sometimes detailed designs, it is impressive to remember they were painted by hand (up until a certain date). In terms of craftsmanship, there is an element of continuity between the pieces, because many were painted by the same woman, even though they were designed by different people, and several artists designed wraps multiple times. Regardless, Shreveport’s program playfully redefined what a bus should look like, and, in doing so, they created lasting reflections of their city.

Changes through the years

Because of how the project was staffed, the new bus designs were released in late-summer, with four or five new designs produced each year. The program ran for six years total, and was modified and improved with each attempt to make better use of resources and of time. The agency admits that some of the first buses were “unattractive,” but after a few years they learned what would work as a “moving canvas” and the artists started to prepare more suitable submittals (Shreveport, Louisiana, n.d.). The agency also gained a better understanding of the materials needed to sustain the designs through daily washings and the wear and tear of being on the road daily. As money was not reserved for maintenance, once a bus had reached the end of its aesthetic integrity, it was retired. Each phase of attempts will be described in the following section. A summary of costs and program details can be found in Table 2.

Year One: 1999

The program’s first year was funded collaboratively by the Shreveport Department of Community Development’s Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), contributing $56,000, and SporTran, contributing $20,000. As an eight week summer program titled artWORKS, 25 low-moderate income high school students were selected to work with artist mentors to learn art occupation skills. After working with the artist-mentors, the culminating event was painting the selected artist designs on the five prepared SporTran buses (Crocket, 1999).
Before being painted, the maintenance crew had to strip each bus of its paint and sand it down to get it to a straight white base. Then the students and the artists transferred the design onto the bus, with aid from a projector, and then painted it. The entire process took each bus off out of service for about two weeks, which was too long for the agency's bus schedule. Additionally, the students did not have the level of craftsmanship needed to properly translate the artist designs. The fact that they were painted in a sweltering hot and non-air conditioned warehouse caused issues with the materials. For example, the paint would not adhere or it would be too thick to apply correctly. Given those conditions, each bus had to be stripped back down to white after the students went back to school, and each artist had to start over.

Year Two: 2000
Year two and each year following was funded with Transit Enhancement funds, 80% from the Federal Transit Administration and 20% from the city. This year, operating without the student job training program, selected artists were asked to paint their designs onto the buses themselves. Once again, each bus was stripped down to white, and the artists set to work. Yet, once again, this process took more time than SporTran could bear, as the buses were out of circulation for about two weeks each. Many of the artists had never done such a large scale project before, and had difficulty operating on such a condensed time frame. The best materials for the long-term durability of the painted buses still had not been found, and if the paint was too glossy or too thick, it would come off with routine cleanings. Unfortunately, some of the buses in this year only lasted three months before needing touch-ups. There was variability in what was used, also, because the artists were given a budget to purchase their own supplies and to paint the bus. Painting and materials cost about $2,000, priming and sealing about $1,000, and promotional materials about $200 (Shreveport, Louisiana, n.d.).

Figure 7: “Greetings from Shreveport” bus by unknown artist (Source: G. Eddy, email communication, September 23, 2009).
Years Three through Six: 2001-2004

After learning from the previous attempts, the third year of the program the city hired Shirline Alexander, one of the artist-mentors from the first year with JTPA, to paint all of the selected bus designs. She had also helped to paint a number of the buses in 2000. With experience in the arts as an arts teacher, she was able to translate the designs and ideas of the artists onto the larger buses, and with experience painting on buses, she was able to find the best combination of paints to use. An oil based sign paint proved to be the most durable, though on hot summer days in a warehouse with no air conditioning, the buses could only be painted during the cool parts of the day. Each bus would take approximately 2 or 2.5 weeks to paint. Additionally, two of the five selected designs in 2001 were prepared by an individual with large scale mural experience and another was designed by Shirline herself, resulting in designs that translated well to the large canvases (Meyer, 2001).

Over the next few years, a product produced by 3M was introduced into the mix, making the process more time and cost efficient. Similar to a vinyl wrap, this transparent material could be printed with the artist designs and applied to the bus exterior. As opposed to taking two weeks to cover a bus only to have it fade or flake, the wraps could be printed and applied by a local company in one to three hours. Some of the wraps, such as the Neon Bus, were printed in Dallas, TX. Also, the material was more durable and did not fade. Where a painted bus would have a lifespan of 3-4 years with maintenance, the wraps would last until they were removed.

Introduced to the program in 2002, this addition also allowed the agency to extend the artist designs onto the windows of the bus, where the opaque paints could not be used. If an artist chose to have the design extended to the windows, it cost an extra $750. By the 2003, only 25% of the buses were being painted, with the other 75% being wrapped. Though the amount of direct painting on the bus was reduced over the final years of the program, Shirline was still responsible for overseeing the application of the wraps. When buses were almost completely wrapped and not painted, Shirline was given $2,000 for overseeing the application and the wraps cost about $2,500 each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Honorarium</th>
<th>Paint</th>
<th>Wraps production &amp; Application</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Administrative, Preparations, &amp; Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>donated</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$200+</td>
<td>Additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$200+</td>
<td>Additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$200+</td>
<td>Additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2004</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$200+</td>
<td>Additional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost per bus = $5,000-$6,000

(Source: P. Atchison, telephone communication, March 24, 2010; Shreveport, Louisiana, n.d.).

Costs per bus

Over the course of the program, each bus could be prepared for about $5,000 to $6,000. However, the artist honorarium was always $1500, regardless of the artists’ responsibilities in
the various years or of funding source or program execution. Even though the cost for the
wraps may have been more expensive, it was much more time efficient. Over the years the
project was promoted in the local newspaper, TV and talk radio shows, and a party was held to
unveil the buses. Additionally, postcards were made of each design.

Resident Reactions

The buses have been widely popular with the community and have given SporTran a good deal
of positive publicity. It has become a part of the community and the city’s landscape. Some
people in the community have given the buses nicknames. For example, the “Everything is
coming up roses” bus is just the “Flower” bus, the “Let’s go to the Kokomo” bus is the “zigzag”
bus, and the “Faces of Our People” bus is just the ‘psychedelic” bus. Other people have
favorites, and some bus drivers ask to drive their preferred bus on certain routes. People look
up at the buses when they pass, and some people even smile and wave (Shreveport, Louisiana,

In some form, the art buses have changed peoples’ perception of bus transit from “a 23,000
pound obstructions… [to] venues for art.” Along the same lines, they have also made taking
transit a little more equitable, because people see the buses as more than a last resort to get
from here to there. Taking transit is now a bit “exciting”, because people do not know if they
will get the Rolie Polie Olie bus or the Flower bus (Shreveport, Louisiana, n.d.).

Additionally, some have been retired for old age or wear and tear, and there are individuals
who have expressed interest in buying certain ones. However, as with any art project, there
are some who do not like the buses painted. The local newspaper, the Shreveport Times, used
to have a section for open commentary where anyone could anonymously call in comments to
have published in the paper, and the individuals who were critical were more vocal through this
avenue than those who supported the project. When FTA had to cut back on funding, the city
was unable to make up the difference. Whether the negative commentary weighed into the
decision to cut the program or if it was a result of harder economic times is uncertain.
However, the city has not produced new art buses since 2004. The open commentary section
in the newspaper has also since been cut.

Lessons Learned

Though the program has not been able to procure funding for the past few years, the overall
consensus is that by last few years of the program, Shreveport had figured out how to transfer
the designs quickly and relatively affordably. The learning curve this program experienced
supports the need for better information sharing of the experiences and best practices within
other similar agencies. Information such as proper materials, time estimates, associated costs,
or additional funding sources would have streamlined their process and enabled satisfactory
results sooner.

Though the program had found a method that worked for them, maintenance came up as the
real impediment. The process of touching up faded paints or repainting and replacing panels
entirely resulted in a visually awkward bus, as the new paint did not match the slightly more
weathered existing paint. If SporTran were to do this again, they would set a time horizon to either retire the bus or to repaint it white before it began to look derelict. Otherwise, they would have gone straight for the wrapping material. Additionally, money would be allocated to cover the refinishing to white and other maintenance costs throughout the lifetime of the project.

In terms of design and selection, Shreveport learned that what looks great on a piece of paper does not always work at 50 mph or when it is the size of a bus. The agency and the artists started to incorporate the fact that the art would almost always be moving into the design and into design selection. Making these points apparent in future calls for entries may help artists create their designs appropriately.

St. Louis, MO
St. Louis’ Metro transit system, is operated under the Bi-State Development Agency, including Missouri and Illinois, and serves the entire Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), a population of almost 2,900,000 people (U.S. Census, 2009). The bus system is integrated with two light rail lines, and bus service is offered seven days a week, depending on the route. There are a number of warehouses that house the buses within the system. While buses within a warehouse always return to that warehouse, they are randomly assigned to routes. Thus, they are not fixed and the wrapped buses rotate and can reach a wider population.

The Arts-in-Transit Program
The agency and the city already have a rich history and culture of incorporating art in transit. MetroLink, the agency’s 18-station light rail system, has received wide acclaim for the collaborative process they used in design and construction during the early 1990s. Architects, artists, engineers worked together from the initial ideation phases through to construction to create unique solutions to bridge supports and station designs (Blumenfeld and Yatzeck, 1996). The Art Bus Fleet entered the St. Louis scene several years later in 1996.

Figure 8: Anheuser Busch Green Week 2006 bus by Sarah Frost
(Source: Metro Arts in Transit, 2010; photo courtesy of AIT).
With such a strong arts in transit culture, the Arts-in-Transit (AIT) program began as an idea within the agency. Today, the program is a partnership with not-for-profits (NFP) in the area, such as the Herbert Hoover Boys and Girls Club, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Richmond Heights, and the Missouri Botanical Garden. These organizations partner with Metro AIT to produce art wrapped buses promoting the sponsoring organization at a significantly reduced rate. The costs for the average company to maintain a four-sided bus wrap advertisement for one year ranges from $50,000 to $70,000. However, the costs to implement each bus wrap, $3,500, is covered by federal and state grant funds (D. Allen, telephone communication, March 23, 2010).

As it is a partnership between a NFP and the transit agency, the program strives to promote community and “economic development through excellence in transportation” by creating community partnerships and “community oriented transit environments.” They are also seen as mobile murals that “enliven... the street, bring... art into the daily lives of passengers and passersby, and delight... all who see... them” (Appendix A). The program’s goals are to collaborate with other city organizations, to promote transit, and to promote the arts and community through transit. As described below, the program involves children, families and a number of demographic groups.

The Process

Metro AIT keeps a roster of artists who are interested in participating in the bus project (See Call for Roster in Appendix A) on hand. The roster includes a letter of intent, resume, and slides of work for each artist, and at any given time there are about twelve artists on the list. Though there are likely many more artists in the area, creating bus wrap designs does not interest all artists. For matters of practicality, the artist is always a local one. He or she must meet with the agency on three separate occasions; creation of the design, tracing the design on the bus, and touch up before completion and roll out. As Metro AIT does not budget funds for distant artists’ travel, only artists within 100 miles of St. Louis are eligible.

![Figure 9: Big Brothers/Big Sisters 2008 bus by Steve Edwards (Source: Metro Arts in Transit, 2010; photo courtesy of AIT).](image-url)
While artists are allowed to re-enter their information to the roster for multiple years, most names on the roster regularly change. When a NFP contacts Metro to negotiate a date to unveil a new bus in their name, the Art in Transit Advisory Council selects a suitable artist from the roster. The artist then works with the sponsor to design a bus wrap that addresses the mission of the organization. Artists often have 2-4 weeks to create a design, and the NFP must contact Metro AIT at least three months before they would like to have a bus painted.

Once the design is approved by the sponsoring organization and Metro AIT, then the Metro AIT project manager works with the artist to transfer the design onto the bus. Similar to Shreveport, an overhead projector is used to trace the outlines of the design in pencil, and the artist is invited to create designs for three sides of the bus. The front and both sides of the bus are covered by the artist, and the back is reserved for artist and Metro AIT credits. There are no less than four and no more than six of these buses allowed in circulation at one time, and each one is wrapped for one year, when it will be rewrapped in white vinyl for the next NFP sponsor.

The bus painting is a community project. Once the design has been traced onto the bus’ white vinyl layer, it is up to the NFP to ensure enough people are present to paint it and for finding a suitable facility. Bus painting dates are usually organized in conjunction with another NFP event or gathering the group is having. Having the bus there ends up being just another activity for families to engage in. For the most part, children and families are the ones who paint the buses, and it generally takes about 50 people and three hours to paint each bus. Smocks, tarps, and paints are provided. While Metro AIT does not have a set color pallet requirement for designs, they do supply the paint for artists and families to choose from.

After the community and the children are done painting, the bus is brought back into the warehouse, where the artist touches up the design and credits are placed on the rear of the bus. Typically, the painting occurs in the spring or in the fall, because the weather is either too hot or cold otherwise. Ideally, the buses are painted outdoors and in the shade, as it prevents...
the paint from drying too fast. Average latex house paint is used over the vinyl, and the agency has not experienced any problems with fading or flaking.

Changes over time
The program has become more focused and efficient since its inception in 1996. What started out with painting directly on the bus became painting directly on a white vinyl wrap. Painting directly onto the bus required too much time, because it required the bus be stripped of paint and then sanded down. Additionally, the higher quality sign paint and extra clear coat layer needed to maintain the paint on the bus were more expensive, at a cost of about $1000. Additionally, there was no time frame established for organizations to request a bus. This caused stress within the maintenance crew, because it took a considerable amount of time to prepare a bus for direct painting. The streamlined process used today requires fewer labor hours and less costly materials.

Over the years the program has also become better established and marketed in the community. Organizations are aware of the opportunity, and take advantage of it. Previously, organizations requested the opportunity, but it was not actively marketed. Additionally, artists on the roster now know what works and what generally does not work as a design, and the caliber of the designs has been improving.

Samples of the painted buses from St. Louis’ program are shown in Figures 8-10. Relative to Asheville’s and Shreveport’s program, St. Louis’ final products would be considered more ad design than fine art. The agency is the first to acknowledge that if they were not working with NFPs and grant funding, the nature of the bus wraps would be different. Without obligations to those groups, the designs submitted by artists would likely shift towards fine art. As it stands now, it is ‘applied art’ or art that was created with a particular purpose or message in mind (Allen, D. Telephone communication, 2010).

Over the years, artists have chosen to cover different extents of the buses. On the buses shown in Figures 9 and 11, the wraps cover just the bottom halves of each side, yet in Figure 10, the artist also chose to paint the top strip above the windows. Then, in Figure 8, the artist chose to cover the entire side of the bus.

Figure 11: Herbert Hoover Boys and Girls Club 2008 bus by Steve Edwards
(Source: Metro Arts in Transit, 2010; photo by Steve Edwards).
paint the front as well as around the windows. This may have been a decision of practicality based on what was feasible to paint on the different bus models. While leaving the windows untouched does prevent the design from having the same visual impact of a fully wrapped side, the bright colors and bold designs that have been chosen still make a statement, and are also more affordable to implement. Another reason why some designs have only covered the half-side may be because it is easier to carry out with children, parents, and fifty or so volunteers painting it in the span of a few hours. With the half-sides in easy reach of a child’s arm, one does not have to introduce step ladders into the mix.

More importantly, however, the focus of the program is not on the design, so much as on the message it is sending. The program’s purpose is to promote local organizations and NFPs, and in those regards it is extremely successful. It builds partnerships within the city, advertises the organizations to city residents, and gives members of the community ownership and pride in the project because they helped paint it. Similar to Shreveport, the program has the dual purpose giving artist/designers a new venue and a new challenge, and of highlighting major community organizations and cultural venues.

**Funding Sources**

Metro AIT’s program is funded entirely through grants from the National Endowment for the Arts, the Missouri Arts Council, and the Regional Arts Commission. The grants also cover administrative and project management costs and, as such, costs Metro almost nothing. As this is an ongoing and established project, whenever the agency is writing grants, they know to include requests to fund this project.

Along the same lines, the funding agencies are familiar with the program and understand its value in the community. The program allows community groups a low cost and highly effective way to get their message out to city residents. The total costs for one bus wrap is $3,500. The artist receives a $2,000 honorarium, the wrapping costs are about $900, and the materials another $500. Since the program uses volunteers to paint the bulk of the bus, costs of application are not as high. Also, using the vinyl wraps and basic latex paints over them is a cost effective use of resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorarium</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Vinyl wrap</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>Additional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost per bus = approx. $3,500

Table 3: Art-in-Transit program cost St. Louis, MO
(Source: D. Allen, Telephone communication, March 23, 2010).

**Roll Out and Resident Reactions**

The program has provided a good deal of positive press. However, the fact that it is such a regular program has diminished how newsworthy the program is considered over the years. Another project Metro AIT does, Poetry-in-Motion, still receives a lot of press coverage. Additionally, the arts coverage in the city is not the strongest in the country. The resident art
critic left the paper in 2009 and had not yet been replaced. Regardless, the program creates publicity for the NFP partners and makes transit more visible in the community.

The agency does not have a formal method of collecting feedback from the public, but the Director of the program has never heard a negative review. It may be a result of the goodwill inherent in the program design, or it may be a result of the arts being already well integrated into the transit system in St. Louis. Metro AIT sends follow up letters to the NFPs to ask if they would have done anything differently, and none have.

**Lessons Learned**

A major strength of St. Louis’ program is that it builds community partnerships between organizations and city offices and gets local residents involved in the process. This process gives residents ownership over the project, and may make them more supportive of it in the future. The age of the program and the element of goodwill inherent in the project design, combined with the number of organizations and individuals who jointly benefit from it, makes funding organizations more likely to continue supporting Metro’s AIT program.

While acquiring funding has not seemed to be a problem over the years, one element that might streamline the program design is a self-sustaining funding structure to support the program so they would not have to apply for grants each year. Though a percent for the arts ordinance is one way to pool funds for projects, these programs are still fallible (if they are structured off of capital investments, with no developments in a given time period, there is no funding for arts projects). While St. Louis does have a Percent for the Arts policy from capital improvements, due to Metro AIT’s funding structure, the funds cannot be used for AIT projects. The staff applies for grant financing annually - a time consuming and deadline-laden process.

However, despite the current funding cycle, the agency finds that there is not much they would change about its process of getting the buses painted and out on the road. Over the duration of the program, Metro AIT has trouble shot many elements of the process and streamlined it to a very functional format. One example would be decision to use a white vinyl wrap on the bus and painting over that with latex acrylic paints. Furthermore, with increased advertising and promotions in pervious years and the consistency with which the program has operated, the bus painting project has become a regular part of the community. Community organizations are well aware of the program and take full advantage of the opportunity. The Metro AIT program is a unique solution to building community investment in transit and in building community partnerships through transit.

**Discussion**

This report shows how much variation can be found between agencies that incorporate public art into their systems using art wraps on their buses. While the overall structures of the processes were similar (with a call for entries and selection jury of representative stakeholders), what enabled the project (i.e. legalities, funding sources) and how the project was executed (i.e. materials, timeframe, bus coverage) showed the most creativity and variety.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Program City</strong></th>
<th>Asheville, NC</th>
<th>Shreveport, LA</th>
<th>St. Louis, MO MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buses available</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buses used at peak</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service area population</strong></td>
<td>72,789</td>
<td>200,199</td>
<td>2,879,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of first program</strong></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of program</strong></td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buses modified per year</strong></td>
<td>3 buses</td>
<td>4 to 5 buses</td>
<td>4 to 6 buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage of bus wrap</strong></td>
<td>Full sides</td>
<td>Sides, front &amp; roof</td>
<td>Sides &amp; front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials used</strong></td>
<td>Printed vinyl wrap</td>
<td>Oil based sign paint with clear coat &amp; 3M wrap combination</td>
<td>Latex house paint on top of a white vinyl wrap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost per bus</strong></td>
<td>Approx. $3,750</td>
<td>$5,000-6,000</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total program cost per year</strong></td>
<td>Approx. $11,000</td>
<td>Approx. $30,000</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artist honorarium</strong></td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance Cost</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Reduced with increased use of vinyl</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding sources</strong></td>
<td>City Office of Cultural Arts, Parks, &amp; Recreation public art funds</td>
<td>FTA Transit Enhancements grant</td>
<td>NEA and state art grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jury member make up</strong></td>
<td>5 members (majority artists); representative of stakeholder groups</td>
<td>7 members; representative of stakeholder groups</td>
<td>8 members; Art in Transit Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jury process</strong></td>
<td>Open to artists</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Goals</strong></td>
<td>Bring the best art to the city; provide a new venue for artists; increase transit visibility</td>
<td>Promote the city of Shreveport; provide a new venue for artists; increase transit visibility</td>
<td>Promote local NFPs and cultural amenities; increase transit visibility; build community partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time frame for each series</strong></td>
<td>4 -12 months</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reaction from general public and city departments</strong></td>
<td>Very positive, little opposition</td>
<td>Very positive, little opposition</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal venue for feedback</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key elements of success &amp; unique characteristics</strong></td>
<td>Use of CAFÉ for submissions; open process; official city arts agency</td>
<td>Official city arts agency; bolstered community pride</td>
<td>Built community connections; affordable and unique process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Summary Comparison of Agency Programs  
(Source: FTIS-INTDAS, 2008; respective agency interviews, 2010)
Table 4 summarizes the three agencies and compares and contrasts the key characteristics of their respective programs. Though Asheville had the smallest bus system, the youngest program, and the smallest honorarium of the three, it was also the only one to devote all efforts towards the impact of fully wrapped sides. Shreveport was the only agency that had no set time frame to retire their painted buses (and many are still running) and was also the only system of the three to have to suspend their program for lack of funding. St. Louis had the lowest cost/bus given their program specifications, but also had the least wrap coverage per bus. Each agency leveraged funding from different sources, used similar though slightly different materials, and had varying objectives.

Perhaps a classic case of “form follows function,” as each agency had a different purpose, the final products varied to reflect their objectives. Though each program sought to present the best product they could, the programs were unique in that one was focused entirely on the art, one had the art themed to promote the city, and one utilized the process to build and promote community partnerships. Considering the spectrum from fine arts to design, Asheville’s final products fall clearly in the fine arts category, Shreveport’s rode the line between the two, but leaned towards ad design, and St. Louis’ falls squarely in the ad design or applied arts end of the spectrum.

It is interesting to note that there were common shortcomings between the programs, some of which can be remedied and some of which may just come with the territory of public art. Each program lacked a structured method to collect feedback from the public about the program. Though there may have been avenues open for proactive residents to offer commentary, such as an email contact within the agency, there was no active attempt by the program facilitators to collect feedback. Commonly, blogs, letters to the editor, free press publications, and informal comments to the bus driver or to the city arts offices have been the main avenues of communication.

Similarly, there have been no formal attempts to study the impacts of the program. In the case of St. Louis, one might ask if the bus wraps increase awareness or involvement in local community organizations. This could perhaps be done with a survey of new attendees in the respective organizations to see if they heard about them through the bus ad program. Additionally, in any of the cities, does the program influence city residents’ perception of transit? Making note of how the effects of art are often qualitative and immeasurable, in order to yield conclusive results through these types of studies, they must be diligently crafted.

Second, two of the three agencies reported some opposition to the program. The agency which did not have a more supportive city, a more integrative project design, or may have simply lacked a suitable avenue for city residents to voice their dissent. Common arguments are that the use of public funds and tax dollars for art projects is wasteful and accessory, or there may be disagreement with the aesthetics of the selected art. However, these arguments are similar to arguments against any kind of public funding of art projects, and the counter arguments are similar as well (see above in the literature review). It is also safe to say that most art, and perhaps the best art, is not something that everyone will like or agree on.
Limitations and Future Research

This paper only considered art wraps. There are other examples of creatively leveraged funds by bus systems which host poster/poetry programs that were not discussed (Artintransit.org, 2008; Metro Arts, 2010). This likely not a complete listing of art wrap projects in the U.S. and future research could investigate more systems. In terms of research and documentation of federal funding for arts in transit projects, for both rail and bus, much is left to be desired. More detailed documentation of federal spending for art in transit would yield a wealth of knowledge in regards to trends in practice. The information may, additionally, highlight the need to create a funding program specifically for bus transit, instead of funds that both rail and bus compete for, as rail verses bus is not an apples to apples comparison.

Best Practices & Lessons Learned

Though this paper first sought to compare the experiences of three different art bus programs, each program proved to be unique in process and in project goals. They are each successful and valuable in their own right. Though, as a result, they are almost incomparable, a series of best practices and lessons learned can still be gleaned from the experiences from these programs.

Bus wraps are more sustainable and more manageable than painting directly on the bus.

This is perhaps the primary lesson to take away from the case studies. Even though there may be charm and character in painting directly on the buses, in terms of resources (both time and monetary) and durability, the vinyl wraps were key elements in ensuring a successful and sustainable program. They require no maintenance, take relatively little time to affix onto the buses, and last at a year or more.

Set a timeframe to retire each series of buses.

Although many of the buses that were painted or wrapped in Shreveport are still out on the road, and though some wrapped and painted St. Louis buses from as far back as 2002 are still in service, it is helpful to have a minimum timeframe for each bus. This way, if the paint or the bus were to need maintenance there is a predictable period of time where the agency can set aside repair funds. If the bus lasts longer than the set timeframe, that comes across as a bonus.

Have an official arts agency that is respected and recognized by the city head the project.

This way, there is more legitimacy within the city offices, better familiarity with the local community, and greater opportunities to collaborate creatively with funding and resources. Each program was organized by an office or organization that was either part of the city or transit agency or was already well respected as the official arts agency of the city.

Current technology can play a major role in facilitating the process.

Several of the jury members in the Asheville process commented that the CAFÉ web portal for handling the call for entries was extremely helpful in preparing for the jury session, because they could see the submittals before they had to judge. Also, CAFÉ was helpful from the point of view of the program organizer, because the website is custom designed for Call for Entries and provides services and options specifically designed for handling that process.
Be as specific as possible in the Call for Entries.
As noted above, there are many different ways a program can be designed, and all lead to quite different results. It is important to word the call for entries with as much detail as possible to ensure the work submitted is in line with what the agency wants. Artists also appreciate the detail because helps them understand what the jury is looking for so they craft a suitable submission. Additionally, different wraps (see Figure 1) have different visual impacts, so it is important to know what the vision of the program is and to choose a wrap accordingly.

As this is a public arts project, be open about the process.
As there is room for citizens to contest the project, being open about the process can gain the project legitimacy and support. Citizens who are aware and educated about the process and citizens who are involved in the process are much less likely to oppose the effort. However, there may always be people who do not agree with the program goals or with the art. Promote the program widely, and seek out multiple avenues to try and reach artists to submit. Depending solely on word of mouth may not build enough interest.

Consider how the community can become involved in the process.
Similar to the previous recommendation, giving people the opportunity to become involved with the project, either as a submitting artist or as a painter, will help gain the program legitimacy and support. It will also build ownership within the community. On another level, St. Louis is a good illustration of how an agency can actively incorporate the community into the program. Involvement benefits both the community and the transit agency.

Create a jury representative of all stakeholders.
Also adding to the legitimacy and inclusivity of the program, all major stakeholders should be given a say in the final selections. Often times, this means at least having members from the transit agency and the public arts council. Depending on the program, it should also include a bus driver, as they are more sensitive and aware of how their riders will perceive the work perhaps because they will likely be the first to hear about riders’ reactions – be it good or bad. It should also include artists, or individuals who have experience with the arts, and possibly a representative from the neighborhood the bus will pass through.

Include a method of collecting feedback and document the process.
As noted above, the arts are notorious for not having solid research to support its claims. Collecting feedback for these programs is valuable for the agency and the city in determining how it might improve future programs, and could also add valuable knowledge to the field of public art research and practice.

The above elements outline the key aspects to consider in crafting a successful and sustainable art wrap program, as learned from the experiences in Asheville, NC; Shreveport, LA; and St. Louis, MO. While not an exhaustive list, it is not meant to be. Among many other points, these case examples show that how a city chooses to incorporate art onto their buses is versatile, and the program can be modified to fit the needs, assets, and goals of any agency interested in implementing a similar program.
Appendix A: FTA Circular C 9400.1A
FTA Circular 9400.1A
Subject: Design and Art in Transit Projects
June 1995

1. **Purpose** This circular revises FTA Circular 9400.1, reaffirms that costs for design and art are eligible costs for FTA-funded transit projects, provides guidance for the incorporation of quality design and art into transit projects funded by FTA, and, within recommended parameters, leaves the allocation of funds for art to the discretion of the local transit entity.


3. **References**
   b. 49 U.S.C. U.S.C. 303(a) and 303(b), "Policy on lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges and historic sites" (formerly §(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966).
   c. 49 U.S.C. 5301(e), "Preserving the Environment" (formerly Section 14 (a) of the Federal Transit Act, as amended).
   e. FTA Third Party Contracting Guidelines 4220.1B.

4. **Applicability** This circular applies to Federal assistance under 49 U.S.C. 5309, 5303, 5307, and 5311 (formerly Sections 3, 8, 9, and 18 of the Federal Transit Act, as amended) and note that under the flexible funding provisions of Title 23 U.S.C. funds may be transferred to selected FTA programs.

5. **Policy** The visual quality of the nation's mass transit systems has a profound impact on transit patrons and the community at large. Mass transit systems should be positive symbols for cities, attracting local riders, tourists, and the attention of decision makers for national and international events. Good design and art can improve the appearance and safety of a facility, give vibrancy to its public spaces, and make patrons feel welcome. Good design and art will also contribute to the goal that transit facilities help to create livable communities.

In updating this Circular, FTA articulates its commitment to fund quality design and art in mass transit projects and allows local agencies discretion in developing allocation of funds for these efforts within recommended parameters. FTA will fund the costs of design, fabrication, and installation of art that is part of a transit facility.

To create facilities that are integral components of communities, information about the character, makeup, and history of the neighborhood should be developed and local residents and business could be involved in generating ideas for the project. Artists should be encouraged to interact with the community and may even choose to work directly with residents and businesses on a project.

6. **Areas of Application** While many transit projects can benefit from quality design and the inclusion of art, some areas offer greater potential for such aesthetic treatment. Examples of projects that offer special promise are:
a. **Major Construction Projects** New fixed guideway ("New Starts") projects, bus terminals, intermodal facilities, park-and-ride lots, and other associated facilities that provide bicycle and pedestrian access to the transit facilities have a significant impact on their environs and provide an opportunity to include artists on teams that plan, design, and engineer all aspects of the project. Artist should be part of the initial stages of project development.

b. **Modernization Projects** Fixed guideways, bus terminals, and intermodal facilities periodically undergo modernization and renovation. Such projects offer opportunities to restore valuable historic elements and to include contemporary art that responds to the historic context. Rehabilitation of these facilities and integration of art that respects the original architecture may serve to reinforce the history of mass transit in the modern urban setting. These facilities can also serve as showcases for regional and other exhibits, thereby increasing their identity as important public facilities.

c. **Vehicle and Related Facility Improvements** Rail cars, buses, and paratransit vehicles can be made more attractive through distinctive interior and exterior design and graphics employed in a cost-effective manner by design professionals artists. Many communities have a need for bus shelters to protect riders for inclement weather. These shelters and surrounding areas can be designed by architects, landscape architects, or artists, or a team approach can be taken. In addition, the shelters could provide display cases for posters or announcements of local events.

d. **Construction Mitigation** Temporary art may be commissioned during construction to mitigate the negative economic impacts on businesses and to be used as part of a public outreach program for the community.

7. **Eligibility of Costs for Art in FTA-funded Projects** Although facility design and construction activities are eligible FTA project expenses covered under ongoing planning and capital grant programs, art has not always been an eligible capital cost as a component for these activities. The incorporation of art into all areas of transit projects that are visible to the public is considered to be an eligible capital cost as a part of planning, design, and construction activities. The definition of art can be interpreted broadly for these purposes, from freestanding sculpture to wall pieces to functional elements such as seating, lighting, or railings to artists being part of an interdisciplinary team in which the artists contribute to the overall design and specific art pieces may or may not be created.

a. **Eligibility** In order to promote local determination of appropriate transit-related art undertakings, FTA has established broad, flexible guidelines for including these items in agency-funded projects. In general, such artistic undertakings should conform to the following criteria:

1. Studies and other local activities to develop programs for including art in the planning and design of transportation facilities and to obtain public participation must be included in the appropriate annual planning work programs (the Unified Planning Work Program for planning-only projects and the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Programs for capital projects) that are assisted with FTA funds.
2. Funds spent on the art component of projects should be appropriate to the overall costs of the transit project and adequate to have an impact. These costs should be all-
inclusive and generally should be at minimum one half of 1% of construction costs, but should not exceed 5% of construction costs, depending on the scale of the project. Artists may be paid a fixed fee or an hourly wage with a cap, similar to other design professional services (see FTA Third Party Contracting Guidelines, 4220.1B)

(3) Costs should be included in the relevant budget line items; that is, in planning, design, and construction line items.

(4) Artistic undertakings that promote specific private or corporate business interests are ineligible for FTA funding.

(5) The local transit agency should provide adequate administrative and technical support to professionally develop and implement the art program as well as make a long-term commitment to the maintenance of art, as is customary with other physical assets.

b. Procuring Artists FTA Third Party Contracting Guidelines stipulate procedures for selecting architects for transit projects but do not specifically address the selection of artists. The appropriate artists selection process should vary among projects, depending upon the nature and scope of the project, characteristics of the site, resources of the community, and state and local statutes. Whatever process is used to select artists, FTA recommends that it be structured to assure the following:

(1) A justifiable process, demonstrating appropriate use of public funds, that gives serious consideration to a variety of artists available and capable of working on the project.

(2) Artists, regardless of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age, are eligible for consideration.

(3) Selection of artists and/or artwork recommended to the grantee is determined by a panel of art and design professionals, which may include but is not limited to art administrators, artists, curators, and architects.

(4) The community surrounding the future facility participates in the selection process. This could include all levels of participation, including supplying information, attending panel meetings, and being voting members of the panel. The extent and type of participation should be determined by the commissioning agency and be appropriate to both the project and the community.

c. Criteria for Transit Projects in Which Artists Are Involved It is suggested that the following criteria be used when artists are involved in planning and design of transit projects and/or when individual works of art are commissioned:

(1) quality of art or design,

(2) impact on mass-transit customers,

(3) connection to site and/or adjacent community; art that relates, in form or substance to the cultures, people, natural or built surroundings, or history of the area in which the project is located,

(4) appropriateness for site, including safety and scale,

(5) durability of materials,

(6) resistance to vandalism, and

(7) minimum maintenance
Appendix B: Asheville Excerpt from Sign Regulations
ARTICLE XIII. SIGN REGULATIONS

Sec. 7-13-1. Purpose and scope.
(a) Purpose of sign regulations. The purpose of this article is to provide sign standards and restrictions which allow for the legitimate needs for identification of residential, office, commercial, industrial and other activities while at the same time promoting signs which do not unduly detract from the overall aesthetics of the community; which reduce intrusions and protect property values; which provide for improved public safety by minimizing undue distraction of the motoring public; which provide standards for the erection and maintenance of signs; which provide for the protection and enhancement of the tourist industry by promoting a more harmonious and pleasing community image; which provide equitably for the nature and scale of the activities to be identified; and which generally enhance and strengthen the economic stability of the City of Asheville.
(b) Scope. The provisions of this article shall apply to the erection and maintenance of all signs and sign structures within the jurisdiction of the City of Asheville as set forth in subsection 7-1-3(a), and it shall be unlawful following the effective date of this article to erect, maintain, or alter any sign or sign structure except in conformance with provisions of this article.
(Ord. No. 2369, § 1, 5-27-97)

Sec. 7-13-2. General provisions...
(c) Signs exempt from regulation. Unless otherwise prohibited hereinafter in subsection 7-13-3(a) or section 7-13-6, the following signs are exempt from regulation under this article: ...
(7) Unless such signs are used in a manner prohibited under section 7-13-3 hereinafter, signs displayed on trucks, buses, trailers, or other vehicles which are being operated in the normal course of a business, such as signs indicating the name of the owner or business and which are affixed or painted onto moving vans, delivery trucks, contractors’ vehicles and equipment and the like, are exempt from regulation, provided that, when not being so operated, such vehicles are parked or stored in areas appropriate to their use as vehicles and in such a manner and location on the lot so as to minimize their visibility from any street to the greatest extent feasible. All such vehicles must have current and valid registration and inspection.... [emphasis added]
Appendix C: Asheville Transit Advertising Policy
Revised Transit Advertising Policy
City of Asheville Transportation and Engineering Department

PURPOSE

It is the purpose of this document to establish a Policy pertaining to advertising space for the City of Asheville Transportation and Engineering Department’s Public Transportation Transit Buses and related Facilities.

INTENT

The primary purpose of this Policy is to provide clear standards as to what types of advertising are prohibited on the inside of buses, on the exterior of the buses, on bus shelters and/or on bus benches.

SCOPE

The City of Asheville Transportation and Engineering Department is engaged in commerce as a provider of safe, clean and reliable bus transportation service. The advertising space located inside the buses, on the exterior of the buses, on bus shelters and/or on bus benches constitutes part of this commercial venture, and is a nonpublic forum. To that end, the City of Asheville Transportation and Engineering Department, in managing this commercial venture, has adopted this Policy to further the following interests:

(1) To maximize revenue generated through the sale of advertisements consistent with the provisions of this Policy;
(2) To avoid the appearance of favoritism;
(3) To avoid imposing upon a captive audience;
(4) To maintain neutrality;
(5) To provide a reasonably safe and unobtrusive environment for bus passengers; and
(6) To minimize chances of abuse.

DEFINITIONS

1. Commercial: Advertisements selling one’s own products or services that propose a commercial transaction.

2. Government: Advertisements exclusively sponsored by the federal, state or local government and is being advertised on the government’s own facility(ies) at the time a request is received for advertisement on the City’s facilities.

3. Public issue: Advertisements that are neither commercial nor government as defined herein.
RESERVATION CLAUSE

The City of Asheville Transportation and Engineering Department reserves the right to remove any and all advertisements at any time should the advertisements come into conflict with this Policy.

APPEALS

Any applicant whose advertisement has been denied by the Director/designee may appeal the denial to a three (3) member Advertising Appeals Committee. The appeal must be in writing and submitted to the Director within five (5) business days of the date of the written denial along with any supporting materials as to why the decision should be overturned. The Committee shall consider the appeal and render a written determination within five (5) business days of receipt of the appeal. The three-member Committee shall consist of the Planning and Development Director/designee, the Parks and Recreation Director/designee and the Chief of Police/designee. The City Attorney’s Office shall serve as the Committee’s legal advisor as needed.

If the applicant is dissatisfied with the Committee’s written decision, the applicant may appeal on the record to the City Manager/designee within five (5) business days of the Committee’s written decision. The City Manager/designee shall consider the appeal and render a written determination within five (5) business days of receipt of the appeal. The City Manager’s/designee’s determination shall be final.

Effective, this _8th_ day of _July, 2009._

By:

Concur:

By:

By:
Appendix D: Call for Entries Forms

(Documentation for Shreveport was lost in a fire)
City of Asheville

Art on Transit Bus Graphics Program
Call to Artists

INTRODUCTION

The City of Asheville Parks, Recreation and Cultural Arts Department announces a juried public art competition for the first Art on Transit Bus Graphics Program open to all artists in the City of Asheville and select surrounding towns serviced by the City of Asheville transit system.

Artists are invited to create original 2-D images for one of three different City of Asheville bus graphics. Two dimensional images include (but are not limited to) photographs, computer generated design, paintings, prints, and drawings. Text and letters are permitted when used as part of the overall design.

Although there is no “theme” for this project, it is suggested that designs reflect, at least in part, the ‘canvas’ the art will be displayed on – buses!

ARTWORK

Design proposals and their copyright will belong to the artists. The City of Asheville reserves the right to use images of the designs and information from the written proposals for review and project promotional purposes, and for the final bus wraps and exhibition of the designs.

Please consider the three-dimensional nature of the bus carefully in the creation of your design – especially with the full wrap. Artists must create a design suitable for the final printed bus wrap.

The finished medium for the artwork is laminated, pressure sensitive adhesive vinyl. Artwork will be printed flat using an ink jet printer with solvent ink. The vinyl is then peeled, placed and heated onto the surface of the bus. Please note: if you would like to sign your work, keep in mind the ‘bleed’ for the edges of your artwork, the ‘half-rounds’ created by the wheel wells, and the vents on the rear of the bus. (In other words, we recommend not placing anything crucial in these areas.)

ART DIMENSIONS

The dimensions for the wraps are as follows:
Width: 331” at widest point
Height: 104” at highest point
Height (top of wheel wells to top of bus): 70”
Width (between wheel wells): 140”
Width (of wheel wells): 50”

Templates are available at www.ashevillenc.gov/parks or by contacting the project manager.

HONORARIUM

The three artists selected will each receive an honorarium of $750.

PROJECT SCHEDULE

Application Deadline: Wed. January 20, 2010 5:00pm EST
Finalists Selected: by January 26, 2009
Bus Wrap Fabrication: early February, 2010
Roll Out: February 12, 2010

This project will require artists to work within tight deadlines and be flexible and available to collaborate with the City of Asheville in the process of overseeing the fabrication and installation of the artwork. The City of Asheville reserves the right to alter thses dates as necessary.

ELIGIBILITY

This call is open to artists age 18 years and older who currently live in Asheville, Arden, Black Mountain, Oteen, Skyland, Swannanoa, and Woodfin. Proof of residency will be required.

ARTIST Q&A FORUM

Two opportunities will be available to artists to meet with the Superintendent of Cultural Arts to ask questions about the application process and to view and interact with a bus at the bus garage located at 360 West Haywood Street.

The dates are:
Wednesday, December 16, 10am to noon and Thursday, December 17, noon to 2pm.

Artists will be allowed to take photos and measurements of the busses.

ARTIST SELECTION PROCESS

Completed entries will be reviewed by a five-member jury which will include one member of the City of Asheville Public Art Board, one member of the City of Asheville Transit Commission, one bus driver, a graphic designer, and an artist or arts professional. The jury will be lead by the Superintendent of Cultural Arts for the City of Asheville Parks, Recreation and Cultural Arts Department.
City of Asheville

Art on Transit Bus Graphics Program
Call to Artists

ABOUT ASHEVILLE TRANSIT

Asheville Transit provides bus service throughout the City of Asheville and other local areas with 24 bus routes running from 6 a.m.-11:30 p.m., Monday through Saturday.

HOW TO APPLY

All application materials must be submitted electronically through CaFÉ™ at www.californetry.org. Application closes promptly on Wednesday January 20, 2010 at 5:00pm EST.

There is no application fee to apply or to use the CaFÉ™ online application system.

1. Submit digital images of your proposed artwork

Up to two (2) design proposals will be accepted per individual or team. For the side wrap, artists are permitted to submit either one single design that can be replicated on both sides or two related designs that can be placed on either side of the bus.

Artists working in a team may only submit one proposal and cannot submit work as individuals. All artists must own the copyright of the materials they submit.

2. Submit one copy of a current résumé

If you are submitting a proposal as a collaborative team, each member must submit an individual resume.

3. Letter of interest

Artists and artist teams are required to submit a one-page letter expressing their interest in the project as well as a description of your approach to the project and the proposed design.

4. Image list

Please include an annotated image list including title, artist name, media, image name/number, and any other relevant information.

5. Additional guidelines

Incomplete or ineligible submissions will not be reviewed.

DIGITAL IMAGE PREPARATION

Instructions on how to format images to CaFÉ™ specifications can be found at https://www.californetry.org/image_prep.phtml

CONTACT

Diane Fuggiero
Superintendent of Cultural Arts
City of Asheville
Parks, Recreation & Cultural Arts Department
70 Court Plaza, 4th Floor
Asheville, NC 28802
828-259-5815
dfuggiero@ashevillenc.gov
ART BUS FLEET DESIGN CALL FOR ST. LOUIS REGIONAL ARTISTS
ARTIST ROSTER

PURPOSE
Metro Arts in Transit (AIT) is currently seeking qualifications from artists interested in upcoming Art Bus Fleet Program opportunities. AIT’s community art buses are ordinary fleet vehicles transformed into art on the move. Art Buses are sponsored by community-based organizations that promote artistic, cultural, educational, or environmental awareness. Approximately six Art Bus projects are completed per year. Art Buses are designed by artists who paint them with the assistance of members of the public at community events attended by children, young adults, and their families. Art Buses operate as part of Metro’s regular fleet, enlivening the street, bringing art into the daily lives of passengers and passers-by, and delighting all who sees them.

Artists selected for Art Bus projects will be required to work with Arts in Transit and organizational sponsors to create a bus design to be rendered in a paint-by-number format, for direct transfer onto the bus. The selected artist/designer will also be responsible for applying (with an experienced Metro Arts in Transit coordinator) the outline of the design to the bus. Metro Arts in Transit will organize and oversee the bus-painting event, recruit volunteers and provide all paint and materials. The selected artist/designer must be available to assist with the facilitation of the project, oversee involvement by event participants and post event ‘touch-up’ session(s).

As a community partnership program of Metro, AIT furthers Metro’s mission of “regional economic development through excellence in transportation” by forging community partnerships and creating customer-friendly and aesthetically-appealing, community-oriented transit environments. AIT accomplishes this through a place-making approach that integrates public art and urban design with community and enhancement initiatives. Since its inception in 1986, AIT has completed more than 150 public art projects, installations, and community enhancements.

HONORARIUM
$2,000 for artists commissioned for Art Bus projects.

ARTIST ELIGIBILITY
This request for qualifications is open to artists located within 100 miles of St. Louis. Arts in Transit is not required to make recommendations or selections from the submissions if, in its opinion, qualifications are not appropriate.

APPLICATION CHECKLIST
Artists who wish to be considered should submit one copy of the following:
- Letter of interest (no more than two pages)
- Resume with contact information.
- 10 digital images on CD/DVD in 150 dpi .jpg file format (no more than 11" in length/width)
- A corresponding annotated image list with title, media, dimensions, brief description and date of the work, project budget, and project partners, if any.
- Up to 3 pieces of additional support material (visual or print)

ROSTER TIMELINE
Submissions will be on file through 2012, or when another call for artists is posted. Creation of the roster does not preclude the use of alternative selection processes for certain selected projects.

DEADLINE

Must be received (not postmarked) by 5PM, Tuesday, June 1st, 2010.

SEND TO

    Metro Arts in Transit MS136
    707 N. First Street
    St. Louis, MO  63102-2595
    ATTN: Art Bus Fleet RFQ

Materials will not be returned.
No faxed or emailed entries will be accepted.
For confirmation of receipt of submission, enclose a Self Addressed Stamped Postcard with your submission.

Our Art Bus Fleet can be seen [here](#)!

QUESTIONS

Please contact Hoang Nguyen at (314) 982-1400 x1378 or hnguyen@metrostlouis.org
Interviews:
C. Remedios, Visual Arts Coordinator, Cultural Division, City of Kent. Email. December 7, 2009
G. Eddy, SporTran Manager. Email communication. September 23, 2009.
J. George Murr, Transportation Planning Management. Email communication, April 6, 2010.
S. Alexander, Official painter for SporTran. Telephone communication, April 6, 2010.
Anonymous artists and jurors from each city. Telephone, email or personal communication. 2010.

Reference List


Shreveport, Louisiana. (n.d.). Executive Summary: Art Bus Program.


