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This report examines how a small city in Western Massachusetts known as Easthampton can address provision of artist affordable housing and studio spaces. I draw on the literature and other examples of community provision of affordable artist space as context. The problem as defined by members of Easthampton’s existing arts community is the fear of gentrification. Currently, Easthampton is home to dozens of artists. Rents in Easthampton are reasonable, both in terms of studio space and residential space. However, prices are on the rise. This is happening at the same time as the city is making its own push towards becoming an “arts community,” actively trying to shift its image from an old mill town to an arts town. Given the concern for gentrification expressed by artists, what are strategies that communities and artists can take to maintain affordability and to retain the arts community once it is present?
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Joanne Murphy is a potter in Easthampton, a small town in the Pioneer Valley of Western Massachusetts. She has been there twenty years. She moved there from St. Paul, Minnesota, where she met her future husband in a warehouse building where they both worked as artists. Five years after Joanne opened up her studio space, a large corporation purchased the warehouse building for the purposes of flipping it to luxury condominiums. She and her husband were displaced by the conversion. They searched for another community in which they could work, and they settled on Easthampton. Though there are a myriad of reasons why they chose Easthampton, chief among them was its affordability.

In a 1990 study, a researcher demonstrated price inflation in poorer sections of Chicago followed a decade after artists settled in the area (Ley 2003: 2540). This displacement resulted in artists’ movement to cheaper districts within the city. A similar process was documented in Toronto, where artists who lived in affordable city districts in 1971 have since moved to other sections of town, and in each case price inflation has followed them wherever they chose to settle (Ley 2003). A 1983 National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) study shows that downtown gentrification in cities across the US increases in proportion to the number of artists living there (NEA). An article appearing in Riverwest Currents, a neighborhood publication from Milwaukee’s left bank, characterizes two groups involved in the gentrification process. On one side, there are students, artists and other “bohemians” who settle in depressed low-rent districts
and then are followed by another group, the “yuppies.” The yuppies follow the bohemians and drive them out (Knauss 2002). Using fewer catchy labels, Ann Markusen has acknowledged that higher-income residents move into areas because they are attracted to the “buzz” that artists create in neighborhoods (2005).

These stories tell us that Joanne’s displacement from her warehouse space in St. Paul is not a unique occurrence. Thousands of artists around the country have experienced gentrification in their communities. I believe that this gentrification process is tied to shifts in the economy. The past twenty years are characterized by changes in the US from an industrial-based economy to one that is more fluid. How does this economic shift relate to artist displacement? As industrial or manufacturing plants relocate, they leave behind vacant buildings. These buildings may lie vacant for several years, even decades, during which artists lease out cheap spaces for studio work. The spaces in old manufacturing buildings are large and unencumbered by interior walls, have high ceilings and floor-to-ceiling windows, all of which are perfect requirements for many artists.

At some point, however, due to the overall gentrification of surrounding areas, perhaps due to the presence of artists themselves, the once-vacant real estate that artists occupy becomes more valuable. Developers see ‘abandoned’ old factory buildings as opportunities to bring the land to a higher use, and artists are forced to relocate to other cheap warehouse spaces. Joanne describes this exact process as a ‘basic law of supply and demand.’ She says, “It all just makes sense. I really can't blame anyone for that process, but the artists are usually the ones who lose.”

Some people might disagree with Joanne, saying that artists reap subsidies that crowd out other existing poorer residents (Markusen 2005). Sharon Zukin argues that real estate developers will intentionally subsidize artists’ galleries in or around their developments in order to draw ‘hip’ people to the area and create value (Markusen 2005). There is debate over whether artists act as willing participants in the gentrification process or whether they are victims of it.

Regardless of the intention of artists, however, the relationship between their presence and gentrification has been noted by artists themselves, arts organizations, newspapers – and the
occasional scholar – in specific cities, but is surprisingly absent in current, broader discussions of economic development. A careful analysis of this process is especially important at this time given the weight that planning “for culture” is receiving. Recent trends in economic development are towards attracting new “creative” people to a community in order to spur economic growth. A narrow focus on how to bring new people into a community fails to address the more long-range problem of affordability, which is the central focus of this paper. Let us suppose that communities do successfully bring artists to their communities, and positive economic growth ensues. What happens after, when prices rise beyond the affordability level of the change agents who were intentionally brought in? Are artists simply to be used as a catalyst for change and then abandoned once gentrification takes place?

Easthampton, Massachusetts is a small town in the western part of the state which is transforming itself from a mill town to an arts town. It presents a unique case in that it already has what many communities covet: an arts presence. However, the city is struggling with what to do with the artists that are there. Should the city capitalize on the presence of its artists? If so, how? By marketing the city as an arts community? By offering support to existing artists? By subsidizing artist gallery spaces? In this report, I draw on interviews with artists living and working in Easthampton, as well as lessons learned from other cities and towns that have looked at artists’ space needs, to offer specific suggestions for how Easthampton could plan for artist affordable space. In examining this case, I aim to discover two main questions: what is (and should be) the role of the arts in the city’s economic development? How can the housing and studio needs of artists be met in an affordable and equitable way? My goal is to determine possible solutions to the problem of affordability as defined by artists in this city.

Easthampton is at a critical crossroads. It is affordable to many artists at this time, and based on residents’ perceptions, it seems that more are interested in moving there. It is important that the city, artists, and other stakeholders take note of this juncture and try to cooperatively plan for how artists can continue living in the city. The importance of this planning process is
underscored by my finding, which is that gentrification is tied to the settlement choices of artists. If communities are seriously interested in attracting artists, and in long-term economic viability and social justice, they should invest in strategies to ensure that those artists can afford to live and work well past the positive economic change.

This report is organized as follows: Chapter 2 provides a more in-depth look at current economic development theories that are based on attracting artists and other creative people to a region. The remainder of the report is a case study of Easthampton, Massachusetts. Chapter 3 is an introduction to the city. In that chapter, I present a brief history of the city, focusing in particular on its industrial development. In Chapter 4, I discuss how the city is shifting its focus from an industrial base to an “arts town.” I also discuss the existing planning processes related to artists. Chapter 5 highlights the results of my interviews with artists. In Chapter 6, I make recommendations for key stakeholders to consider which are intended to keep artists in Easthampton. Chapter 7 concludes.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

In this chapter, I hope to offer some insight into the relationship between artists and gentrification processes by looking at how communities have approached the provision of artist space. My analytical approach is to first examine existing economic development theories in order to show that arts and ‘creative people’ are being targeted by communities. I identify the various support structures needed by artists, and focus on housing as a major support structure that communities can use to retain artists and ensure affordability. I then consider other examples of linkage programs between occupations and housing in order to see how communities might offer space to artists. The final section of this chapter focuses on three US cities that have addressed space needs for artists: San Francisco, Seattle, and Boston, and assesses their effectiveness.

Art, Creativity, and the New Economy

“[Arts are] the products of human creativity” is the first definition of art offered by Google’s define feature. Query ‘artist,’ and the first description is “a person whose creative work shows sensitivity and imagination.” Though there may be specific kinds of art, such as writing, pottery, or dance, in order to define art broadly, a concept of creativity is used.

The definitional links between art and creativity are informing modern city planning as well, as promotion of the arts is, for the first time, being considered a viable central economic development strategy, rather than a discretionary element of a more traditional approach.
(Markusen and King 2005: 3). But is it just artists that communities should be attracting? Or creative people? If it is the latter, who are these people? Consider Ann Markusen’s critique of the conflation between the two: “[artists] have been lumped into a ‘creative class’ whose hedonistic preferences for residing in lively, diverse cities are credited with generating economic growth (Markusen 2005).” She reacts in large part to Richard Florida’s theory outlined in his 2002 book, *The Rise of the Creative Class*. In it, he argues that the “driving force” behind industrial shifts from the 1950s to the present day is the “rise of human creativity… in our economy and society (4).” More traditional economic theorists might prefer to describe the so-called new economy as knowledge-based, rather than industry-based. A 2003 *USA Today* article reads, “In the technological age, the importance of the educated and creative to the economy is magnified.”

In all three cases, whether economic development is based on the arts, the “creative class,” or knowledge workers, the strategy for success relies on the qualities of people who do the work. The general theory is that if you can attract people of innovative quality to a community, they will serve as an economic engine. Therefore, communities are considering investments in people rather than investments in firms, which is a more traditional approach. A nuanced examination of these three related schemes of economic development (arts, creative class, and knowledge-workers) follows.

**Arts-based economic development**

The National Governor’s Association describes several economic benefits to having the arts present in a community. The arts serve to promote tourism, crafts, and cultural attractions, revitalize downtowns, create vibrant public spaces, and attract knowledge-based employees (NGA 2001). A willingness-to-pay argument for continued funding of the arts is that while some people may not support the arts by going to an arts gallery or purchasing a ticket to a live
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performance, they nevertheless are willing to pay via taxes to keep the arts going (Peacock 1994: 146). Other less obvious reasons for subsidizing art include people’s desire to ensure the arts for future generations and national prestige associated with the arts (Peacock 146-7).

Even on a community level, the arts are thought to promote social interaction among members of a place, creating a sense of identity and helping to build social capital. Art is also thought to empower communities to organize for collective action. The results of collective action are visible in community participation in local arts groups, civic institutions, and volunteer associations (McCarthy et al 2004: 14). The more individuals participate in such groups, the greater chance of finding leaders who will ensure the continued importance of the arts.

In a 2004 report funded by the Wallace Foundation, McCarthy et al. argue that the existing literature on the benefits of the arts fails to specify how the benefits take place. The researchers use the term “instrumental” to describe the nature of the benefits attributed to arts in communities, and argue that there are deeper, “intrinsic” benefits to the arts that underlie the instrumental benefits. These intrinsic benefits refer to effects one receives in an arts experience that add value to people’s lives. That is, there is something unique about the benefits that accrue from the arts compared to traditional economic advantages. Such benefits stem from the nature of the arts as a communicative experience between artist and audience: the artist moves from an intuitive state to a form of expression which is experienced by the public and interpreted, thus guiding the artist into future endeavors (40). A work of art can also convey a communal feeling or shared community experience. In this capacity, art serves as a way to unite people within that group, transforming a community of place, such as a city, into a community of interest, a group that sees itself in a particular work of art. Researchers at the Funders Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities argue that communities of place are made stronger by communities of interest. The Funders Network uses this thesis to argue for more funding for the arts (ASG, 2003).

The benefits are being presented, and communities are responding. In New England, The Creative Economy Initiative was established in 2000 to “learn about and leverage the growing
importance of arts and culture on the economic life of New England (MMA 2000).” HandMade in America is an arts organization based out of the western part of North Carolina that “works to develop community strategies that will enhance our region's role nationally and internationally within the handmade [craft] field.” The city of Asheville, also in western North Carolina, has created an “urban trail” comprised of over 30 pieces of public art and city landmarks in order to form a spatial narrative throughout the city and increase tourism. It is a successful venture: over 100,000 maps are distributed each year (MMA 2000: 7).

There are many more examples of how communities are focusing on the value of the arts in economic development. This new focus is indicative of an overall value shift from the 1950s-1960s when the arts were seen as a reflection of economic development to the 1980s-present when the arts are becoming more central to economic development (Rantisi and Blackman 2005: 27). The emphasis placed on the arts themselves has been increasing in the past three years as more attention is being given to so-called “creative” occupations overall.

**Creative class economic development**

Though Richard Florida was not the first to come up with the idea for planning for culture or creativity, he was the first to popularize it in the United States. The national attention given to his initial book, *The Rise of the Creative Class*, has surpassed any other recent scholarly attempts at recognizing how and when planning can be focused on cultural development. As is often the case, current research between urban planning and cultural planning seems to have been first identified in Europe, as evidenced by Landry’s 2000 work *The Creative City* and Evans’ 2001 book *Cultural Planning: An Urban Renaissance?* Evans is from the University of North London, and Landry, among other things, is the founder and senior partner for Comedia, a cultural planning
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consulting firm based in England. A researcher describing the importance of culture in Europe writes, “Culture is now seen as the magic substitute for all the lost factories and warehouses, and as a device that will create a new urban image, making the city more attractive to mobile capital and mobile professional workers (Hall 2000).”

Richard Florida and other theorists have given rise to a new language, with creativity as its buzzword. *The Rise of the Creative Class* is divided into several parts. Florida first argues for the existence of something called the “creative class” which he subdivides into two groups: the super creative core and creative professionals. According to him, some 38 million Americans, or 30% of the US workforce, is part of this class of people (Florida 2002: 8). The core class consists of those “whose economic function is to create new ideas, new technology and/or new creative content.” Examples of such people are those “in science and engineering, architecture and design, education, arts, music and entertainment (8).” Outside of this core are creative professionals who “engage in complex problem solving that involves a great deal of independent judgment and requires high levels of education or human capital (8).” These professionals work in business, law, finance, and health care, to name a few industries. The creative class stands in contrast to the working and service classes. According to Florida, the working and service classes consist of people whose key function is to carry out plans. Presumably, there is little creativity involved in their work.

Having identified and separated the creative class from the rest of society, Florida then argues that it is the ‘creatives’ that have been the driving force behind economic development successes. According to Florida, product innovation and shifts in manufacturing methods from the Fordist model of mass production to zero-inventory and total quality techniques can be attributed to this rise in overall creativity-seeking strategies of firms.

These arguments set up Florida’s central theory, which is that it is essential that cities draw and keep people of the creative class in order to fuel economic growth. Instead of looking at

---

3 http://www.comedia.org.uk/pages/home.htm
where companies decide to locate, Florida looks at where people decide to locate, and why they decide to stay. He draws on his experience of his hometown, Pittsburgh, to argue this point: while Pittsburgh is able to draw creative people to its universities, it lacks the ability to retain them. The essence of his theory is that regional economic growth is driven by the location choices of creative people. Such people prefer places that are tolerant and diverse. Communities must therefore have three things in place in order to draw creative people: technology, talent, and tolerance, or, the “3Ts” (249).

Florida is not the only one responsible for lumping people into creative categories. In June 2000, two years before Florida’s work was published, The Creative Economy Initiative was developed in order to explore the relationship between arts and the economy in New England. Their categories are the creative cluster, including nonprofits, business and individuals; the creative workforce, artists, and performers; and the creative community, places in New England where the quality of life is tied to higher concentrations of creative workers and industries (NEC 2000).

Another example is Richmond, Virginia, a city that has used Richard Florida’s arguments to attract creative people: it offers a tax abatement program to anyone who buys and refurbishes one of its downtown buildings. From large cities such as Miami, to statewide efforts in Michigan, community leaders are reexamining their economic development strategies based on the continued appeal of Florida’s ideas.

Because Florida’s work is informing economic development strategies, it deserves a great deal of scrutiny. His message, if taken too far, seems to have great potential for ignoring existing residents in a community in favor of “new people.” This is problematic because it assumes that communities’ existing residents are not sufficient enough to create their own positive economic change, that outside people are needed in order to jumpstart that process. Also, how is the creative class different from educated people? Or the “yuppies”? (a term Karrie Jacobs notes in

her opinion piece, ‘Why I Don’t Love Richard Florida’) Does the creative class variable function differently from other, more traditional economic development indicators such as research and development?

Though Florida does acknowledge that the creative class generally has higher wages than other classes, he seems to ignore the potential for gentrification inherent in his argument. When this new creative class enters a community, they will drive rents up. In some ways this is the phenomenon Florida wants; gentrification is assumed in an upward trending economy. However, one possible result of new people moving to a community is the displacement of existing people. If cities are looking to improve, should they be focused more on luring in a new group or on improving their own residents’ problems? Florida does acknowledge that many of the highest ranking creative cities are also hotbeds for high rents. However, he does not seem to pose any solutions to the problem of high living costs in such communities. Perhaps his assumption is that if creative people are there, they will find creative answers to affordability problems.

Knowledge-based economy

While Richard Florida’s ideas regarding a creative shift are more controversial, most economists agree that the US economy can no longer be characterized by industries. Piore and Sabel, in their 1984 book *The Second Industrial Divide*, were among the first to argue that the industrial model economy was inadequate to describe the economy of the 1980s. They argued that a shift was occurring. The old model could be characterized by predictable behavior on the part of firms (Osterman 1999: 20). Trade unions through collective bargaining strategies were responsible for regulating work (Piore and Sabel 1984: 23). In the new economy, firms are willing to lay off workers, thereby reducing employees’ job security (Osterman 20). There is more direct government regulation of the terms and conditions of employment (Piore and Sabel 23).

Employment is thus more volatile; contingent or temporary work is more common now than it was twenty years ago (Tilly 1996). Though it is under debate, many believe that employers seek higher levels of skills. Technology and knowledge are now considered to be key factors of production.

Ann Markusen accepts these changes and outlines seven factors to argue that communities should be targeting occupational groups in addition to industries. The first reason is that cheap transportation costs and instant knowledge communication mean that firms are under pressure to specialize and export. The ability to specialize and export is based on talent in the local economy, which may derive from the skill sets of individuals in addition to firms. Also, the quality of workers is part of what firms look for when they settle.

The second reason to target occupational groups is that development is less linked to natural resources. The American economy is based more on skilled labor than on natural resource -physical capital. Previously, it was accepted that people moved to settle around firms who settled around physical capital: a mining town is a good example. Considered an input, labor is unusual in that it is mobile; more and more, Americans move from one location to another. Part of what drives their location choice is a livable environment, and one that is not exploited.

The third reason is that job security has lessened as has the relationship between firms and employees. Firms are no longer willing to provide ongoing training for their workers, partly because employees shift to another employer in short notice. In response, firms rely on a larger, regional labor pool, and training becomes externalized. This training could be organized by occupation.

Fourth, employees possess skills which can be crossed-over to other industries. A videographer could produce a film for a medical firm, while an IT professional could create a website for a local arts organization. Skill, function and personal connection, often of self-employed or start-up individuals or companies, are more important qualities than how or whether someone is part of a large organization.
Fifth, the fast-paced economy makes it difficult for new firms to form. The sixth reason is that computers have made it easier to work remotely, which gives greater flexibility in terms of location choice. People are more likely to be committed to a region than to a firm or industry. Lastly, planners may have an easier time identifying occupations rather than industries, especially if they are planning for underserved communities. Thinking about and designing economic development strategies that address socio-economic imbalances may be easier to do from an occupational perspective rather than an industry-perspective, because it relies more on the qualities of people rather than the firms who may choose a particular location.

Together, these seven processes show the vulnerability of having a purely firm-driven economic development policy. The processes delineate the rationale for looking at particular occupations of people (Markusen 2002: 4-6).

Markusen’s argument is not much different from Florida’s, though it is certainly more sophisticated. She makes the point that communities should consider targeting individuals and occupations, but she does not go so far as to suggest that an entire class of people should be targeted. She does offer an occupational approach that communities might take to attract artists as a particular group. In order to do this effectively, she argues, communities need to look at why artists choose to live where they do and what types of supports they need.

**Support for Artists**

Traditional economic theory states that workers follow jobs, not the other way around, though as I indicated above, that assumption seems to be under question. Artists, however, are difficult to locate in either theory, because they are often self-employed (Markusen 2005: 11). A National Endowment for the Arts report notes that self-employment rose for both male and female crafts artists, between the years of 1970 and 1990. The 1970 self-employment figures as reported by male artists was 37%; female artists, 39%. In 1990, the percentages rose to 47% and 49%,
respectively. The performing arts field typically has higher unemployment rates compared to the national average. In 1990, the national unemployment rate was 5.3%; actors’ unemployment was at 13%; dancers, 7%; and musicians and composers, 6% (Alper 2000: 3-5).

Given the volatile nature of the arts industry, it is not surprising that many artists rely on additional sources of funding besides the money they make as an artist. Research into artists’ earnings shows that many artists moonlight, which is the practice of holding more than one job (Alper 2000). In Markusen’s interviews with twenty-two artists in the Twin Cities region of Minnesota, the artists relied on grants, teaching, support from spouses/partners, and other part- or full-time jobs, some related to their work, some not, in order to pay living expenses. Her findings suggest that many artists accepted – indeed, expected – that they would have to live frugal lives because of the work they chose (Markusen 2005: 19). According to a 1983 Current Population Survey, 41% of artists’ earnings came directly from their art; 30.3% from arts-related activities, and 18.6% from non-arts-related activities (Alper 58). It is clear that for many artists, it is impossible to pursue just art; some level of support is needed.\(^6\)

Is support for arts and artists a public necessity? The answer depends on how much art is valued by a society. The past fifty years suggest that people’s perception of the value of art to society is increasing, especially as it becomes synonymous with economic development. Indeed, while the Bush administration in their 2006 budget cut or reduced many government programs, the overall budget for the NEA remained unchanged.\(^7\)

Federal grants for artists are but one form of support structure available to artists. Besides providing affordable housing, the key method outlined in this paper, other support strategies include tax concessions for charitable donations to the arts, health coverage and union presence, and arts organizations. These strategies will be briefly discussed below.

---

\(^6\) It is important to recognize, however, that even though artists may be taking second jobs, it is not necessarily because of economic need. According to a 2000 NEA report, there could be multiple reasons for artists working second jobs, including the satisfaction derived from the actual work they perform at that job (Alper 98).

There are three basic types of tax concessions available for the arts: one for charitable contributions from individuals, corporate income tax deductions, and capital gains tax forgone on gifts of property to artists (Towse 2003: 454). All three strategies are designed to encourage donations to the arts by allowing donors to write-off the expenditure from their taxes. The most commonly used form of tax concession is the individual deduction of a charitable contribution. The act, passed in 1917, represents the greatest federal financial support for the arts in the United States (Towse 454), surpassing the NEA direct grant.

Health coverage is also beneficial to artists, as it is to everyone. What is of particular concern in the case of artists is that many of them are both self-employed and deal with hazardous materials on a daily basis. Research shows that fifty-one percent of all working artists have been exposed to hazards from their work, whether caused by hazardous materials, intense body movements, or ‘props’ (Rosario-Jackson 2003: 33). Only half of the people interviewed in an Urban Institute 2003 study on support structures for artists reported going to a routine physical exam. Fifty-one percent of artists pay for their own health coverage compared to the national average of eight percent (Rosario-Jackson 34). While low in number, arts unions have served as a bargaining intermediary between artists and health care professionals and help to provide coverage at a negotiated rate.

Arts schools and other organizations support artists by providing equipment and space as well as opportunities for teaching. The presence of arts organizations in an area allows artists to network with like-minded persons. The organizations can advocate for the collective interests of individuals (Rosario-Jackson 58). Non-profits dedicated to the arts can provide a source of training and professional development. Examples include the Cultural Arts Council of Houston and Harris County, and the Seattle Arts Commission’s Business of Arts program (Rosario-Jackson 61). Other types of community support include community based organizations such as CDCs, peer-to-peer and mentoring programs, web-based forums for artists, and foundations where artists can apply directly for funding (Rosario-Jackson 62-3). A particularly acute need
identified in the Urban Institute survey is entrepreneurial training for mid-career artists (Rosario-Jackson 63).

In addition to these methods of support, there are various “soft” supports that communities can provide which improve artists’ abilities to do their work. ‘Soft’ supports include promoting art as essential to a community, as opposed to something that is merely frivolous (Rosario-Jackson 9); promoting the existence of local artists and not just large cultural institutions (such as Lincoln Center in New York City) (Rosario-Jackson 10-11); providing opportunities for artists to connect directly with the public (Rosario-Jackson 15); and the existence of arts criticism, because often art is not adequately reviewed in mainstream media (16). In addition to support from the community, external validation is also important to artists. This validation often comes from arts hubs such as New York. Together, these ‘soft’ supports serve to validate artists’ work (Rosario-Jackson 18).

**Housing and Jobs Linkages**

The 2003 Urban Institute study shows that of all the categories of material supports that communities can provide for artists, affordable space is the paramount concern. The study says that “affordable space is a key resource that can facilitate or impede artists in doing their work (45).” The study notes that the research to date has focused primarily on the space needs of arts organizations rather than of individual artists. The needs of individual artists are two-fold: housing and work space. In some cases those can be combined. The question is, if a community pursues the strategy of providing housing support for artists as all of part of its overall strategy to attract and retain artists, how should they go about implementing it?

What are some examples of successful housing support structures aimed at specific occupational groups? In the early 20th century, coal factories would settle new towns around the siting of factories. The firm would serve as the single source for its employees’ needs, including
housing, meals, and clothing.\(^8\) A more recent example is faculty housing. Many colleges and universities provide subsidized housing to members of their faculty. Some universities even guarantee housing for their faculty; more often, universities provide down payment assistance and/or assistance locating a housing unit.\(^9,10\) Finally, the US government’s military housing program is probably the largest occupation-targeted subsidized housing program in the country. The government provides rental vouchers when the housing needs of the military are not met by housing on base.\(^11\) The government also oversees redevelopment of its bases through the Military Housing Privatization Initiative which is designed to attract private sector financing in order to create a more efficient process than traditional military construction would allow.\(^12\)

Can a community address housing needs for its artists using any of the methods employed for other occupational groups? The company town is an inadequate model because it is outdated. The task of providing housing, goods, and services to the public is generally assumed to be given to private sector actors who compete for demand, not to one monopolizing firm. Guaranteed housing for faculty of universities is a model that depends on the existence of an employer. Given that artists are often self-employed, the model is not a perfect fit. However, providing down payment assistance and helping to facilitate artists’ finding affordable studio spaces are two strategies that municipalities may consider, which can be taken from this example. A city could provide subsidies like the US government does for the military, such as rental vouchers, or help to preserve existing affordable housing.

The question then arises, why artists and not other groups? Perhaps the strategy would be more effective if artists were identified along with other ‘key’ occupational groups such as teachers, police, and some segments of the service population, as a first preference in benefiting from affordable housing projects.

\(^8\) [http://www.eh.net/encyclopedia/article/boyd.company.town](http://www.eh.net/encyclopedia/article/boyd.company.town)

\(^9\) [http://www.tc.columbia.edu/housing/](http://www.tc.columbia.edu/housing/)

\(^10\) Data was not available on Columbia University’s practices outside of its Teachers College.


\(^12\) [http://www.acq.osd.mil/housing/mhpi.htm](http://www.acq.osd.mil/housing/mhpi.htm)
However, before narrowing in on key strategies it is first necessary to look at the specific needs of artists as a group. Once again, the 2003 Urban Institute report notes that affordable space issues are central to artists’ concerns about communities. The needs can be separated into live space and work space. The needs of artists’ live space are not unique if artists choose to live in a separate building from their studios. However, given the time dedication that artists spend on their work, many artists prefer a short commute. Indeed, there are some artists who prefer no commute, that is, a space in which they both work and live, known as “live-work” space. The creation of live-work space is but one way in which communities can address space issues for artists. The Urban Institute report found that the most common ways that space needs are addressed are through the following options:

1. passing ordinances or adjustments in zoning regulations
2. creation of formal arts districts
3. establishment of formal and informal artist communities and cooperatives
4. use of available funding programs, such as affordable housing tax credits or housing preservation funds
5. promotion of mixed-use developments

Non-governmental support that addresses artists’ space needs include churches and community centers that provide usable studio space (Rosario-Jackson 48), as well as coffeeshops, bars and local restaurants that showcase local art.

While Rosario-Jackson did not evaluate the effectiveness of these approaches, she did address four themes which cross-cut her research:

1. While arts-focused organizations play a critical role in space needs of artists, the organizations themselves are often weak. They do not effectively advocate for artists’ space needs. Also, the organizations are often located in key downtown areas and are thus threatened by redevelopment and gentrification.

2. Gentrification poses a threat to artists’ spaces and the stability of place-based communities of artists. While artists may contribute to the process they are not the only ones who do. Other factors contributing to gentrification are a low priced area adjacent to high priced areas, good access to public transportation and historic architecture.

3. In most places, opportunities exist to secure suitable places for artists which have not yet been fully explored.
4. The ability of artist communities to organize on space issues is limited (Rosario-Jackson 48-54).

Given the needs of artists outlined above, I will now explore three communities that have purportedly addressed housing for artists: San Francisco, Seattle, and Boston.

Case Studies

San Francisco, Seattle, and Boston were chosen as comparative cases because they have examined, to varying degrees, artists’ space needs. Many cities smaller in size have either not dealt with provision of affordable artist space or do not have this information easily accessible.

San Francisco

In 1979, in response to pressures from a national arts-advocacy organization, the city of San Francisco revised its zoning codes to allow for live-work occupancy. In 1988, the city issued a new live-work ordinance which was done partly to create a specific plan for the “South of Market” (SOMA) area, which by then had an abundance of live-work units. The 1988 regulations defined the type of tenant who could live there, namely, one had to qualify as an artist. Though the ordinance was specific enough to exclude architects and interior designers, it did not specify that tenants needed to earn a living from art in order to qualify. Any person who could show that they ‘participated in art’ was qualified to live in these units. As a result, high-income people who happened to have minimal art supplies or mediocre interest in art, leased out a majority of the loft spaces. According to a San Francisco State University Urban Institute survey taken in 2000, only 27 percent of the respondents actually operated some form of business in their live-work lofts, and only 30 percent were artists (Alejandrino 50). These statistics show that the live-work units did not benefit artists as the city had intended.
Yet they continued to be built. It is estimated that between 1987 and 2001, nearly 2,000 live-work units were built in the city, with 90% of them built within 1997-2000. In 2000, the lofts ranged in price from $300,000-$500,000, well above what was affordable for low-income residents (Alejandro 16). While those prices look high, the lofts were reportedly subsidized by the city (though it is unclear exactly how); those prices reflect 25-33% less than market rate. Not surprisingly, many artists left the area because they could not afford the high rents (Kroloff 1996).

Part of the reason why the units increased in popularity is that they were easy for developers to build. Developers were able to bypass certain fees because of the city’s willingness to promote live-work spaces. In addition, the units were not costly to build because of the open, ‘rough’ spaces required by artists. Because of their “roughness,” live-work units were also considered inappropriate for people with young children, so the affordability that is associated with size of unit does not benefit working class families. In addition, these units were not considered dwelling units, which means that developers were exempt from inclusionary affordable housing requirements. People who were against live-work argued that not classifying live-work units as residential made the affordability problem worse, because developers were not supplying affordable units and were thus driving up prices in the city overall. Also, city monitoring of whether people worked in units was not happening, and indeed, some spaces were being used entirely as offices (Love 2001).

In 2000, propositions K and L were proposed to fix some of the problems of live-work classification. However, both were challenged, and neither passed (Love). Both propositions aimed to place restrictions on office space downtown. Whereas proposition L would have prohibited conversion of live-work units to office, proposition K would have loosened the definition for what qualifies as office, and used the increased revenue from additional office
development to fund arts and affordable housing\textsuperscript{13}. However, proposition K did not address live-work, which critics argued would have exacerbated the problem. So instead, neither measure was passed (Love).\textsuperscript{14}

In response to mounting concerns, in 2001, the then newly-elected Board of Supervisors placed a 12 month moratorium on construction of live-work units. This ban has been extended and is still in place. Its critics argue that it is unclear how banning live-work benefits anyone: thousands of condominiums are being built downtown with sales prices that exceed those of live-work units, and which are no more suitable for children. Monthly condo fees add to costs. One suggestion is to lift the ban on live-work units in areas where condominium construction is allowed. The argument is that it makes no sense to ban a comparatively affordable type of housing and instead promote higher end housing.\textsuperscript{15}

Another possible solution would be to allow live-work construction but classify live-work units as residential units. The residential classification would mean that developers had to include the minimum number of affordable housing units in their developments. Or, the city could create a separate category for live-work units and regulate them in their own specific way, still subjecting them to affordable housing requirements (Love; Alejandrino 50).

The city and various arts organizations have recognized the problem. The Arts Element of San Francisco’s Comprehensive Plan does address this need. It says, “San Francisco’s live/work legislation has paved the way for development of combined living and working spaces for artists. The actual development of those spaces, however, is complex, time-consuming, and expensive.”\textsuperscript{16} It goes on,

\begin{quote}
\ldots in most other cities with live/work programs, those spaces are considered to be ‘affordable housing’ and are therefore eligible for federal and/or state funding. To protect and create artists’ live/work spaces, [c]ity resources should be allocated to support the formal efforts to develop affordable live/work space.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{13} http://www.smartvoter.org/2000/11/07/ca/sf/meas/K/
\textsuperscript{14} http://www.smartvoter.org/2000/11/07/ca/sf/meas/L/
\textsuperscript{15} http://www.beyondchron.org/news/index.php?itemid=1070
\textsuperscript{16} http://www.sfgov.org/site/planning_index.asp?id=24840
The city also recognizes live-work issues in its housing element and identifies artists as a special group requiring special housing; however, the housing element does not contain any concrete suggestions for how to improve the affordability problem. An independent organization, ArtHouse, has stepped in to provide information on live/work listings and give assistance to artists who are searching for housing. ArtHouse does not receive any city funding, as it is not a community development organization per se.

**Seattle**

Seattle, Washington seems to have linked affordability and live-work spaces better than San Francisco. The city funds affordable housing developments specifically intended for artists. From the Seattle Office of Housing website, “working-class artists are a vital part of Seattle's past, present and future. The City of Seattle's Office of Housing recognizes that artists need the same thing other working people need: an affordable home.” The city has funded one housing project, two others are ready to begin construction and several others are in various stages of planning.

Seattle also has an independent resource called ArtsResourceNetwork.org which addresses live-work issues for artists independently of city resources.

Seattle’s Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan addresses live-work units. The housing element reads, “Promote and foster, where appropriate, innovative and non-traditional housing types such as… live/work housing… as alternative means of accommodating residential growth and providing affordable housing options.” Live-work housing is also addressed in individual neighborhood plans for areas. The city’s cultural resources element does not directly address housing needs of artists but does say that Seattle should strive to develop a better

---

18 [http://www.ci.seattle.wa.us/housing/02-LookingForHousing/ArtistsHousing.htm](http://www.ci.seattle.wa.us/housing/02-LookingForHousing/ArtistsHousing.htm)
understanding of how the city’s different arts communities function, assess their needs, and act upon them.

In addition to these resources, the city funded a collaborative effort among staff members to create a manual for artists that would assist them in finding affordable space downtown. This manual is targeted to artists and discusses how to pursue a real estate deal to create affordable spaces. “Space for Artists 2002,” as the manual is titled, also provides sample documents: a studio rental agreement, artist selection criteria, rules and regulations, a noise policy. The manual also includes the Seattle Land Use Ordinance section pertaining to live-work units and sample floor layouts (AHS, 2002).

**Boston**

Finally, Boston, Massachusetts has also recognized the value of arts and artists in the city; however it has done so only within the past two years. The Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) is charged with the task, among others, of providing affordable housing options for artists. According to its website, even though there are over 3,000 artist studios in Boston, less than 300 of them are permanent (either owned by artists themselves or by non-profits dedicated to the arts). That is, the city recognizes that it is poised to lose nearly all of its arts studio space unless it actively preserves it.\(^{21}\)

With the Mayor, the Office of Cultural Affairs, and the Department of Neighborhood Development, the agency is trying to retain existing space for artists and create new ones. The preservation criteria are spaces which are permanently dedicated to artists through deed restrictions, places located in buffer zones between industrial and residential districts or located in other zones that do not support traditional family housing, and that offer live-work spaces at varying prices.

\(^{21}\) [http://www.cityofboston.gov/bra/econdev/EconDev.asp](http://www.cityofboston.gov/bra/econdev/EconDev.asp)
Boston’s zoning code allows artists to live in industrially zoned areas of the city. They are the only group allowed to do so which shows special treatment of a protected class. The BRA recently developed specific design guidelines for developers interested in building live-work spaces. There is a certification process to ensure that only artists occupy such spaces. This certification process requires that artists be certified by a panel of their peers.

The BRA’s economic development website lists various types of housing units that are available or being developed. The City is pursuing rentals, limited equity condominiums, and limited equity cooperatives, showing sensitivity to different housing types. Part of the sensitivity comes from Boston’s efforts at reaching out to the artist community and having it self-identify its needs. Boston hired Artspace Projects Inc., a national non-profit developer of affordable housing for artists, based out of Minneapolis. They conducted a survey of artists living and working in and around Boston to assess their housing and workspace needs, and then devised a plan for space around that the results.  

Evaluating the approaches

Based on these three cities, it seems evident that Boston’s approach was the most comprehensive and addressed Boston artists’ needs the most directly. However, the effectiveness of Boston’s strategies remains to be seen as this process was only implemented within the past two years. Seattle seems to have also addressed issues of affordability. Once again, data was unavailable regarding the actual number of artists who are in the city vs. the number that are being housed.

Finally, while San Francisco was the first of the three to address this problem, it seems to have the least desirable result. San Francisco is perhaps the best case because its program is old enough to be able to see results. The gentrification process resulted from two key failures: the

---

22 http://www.cityofboston.gov/pra/econdev/EconDev.asp
23 I requested hard data from the BRA on number of artists housed vs. on a wait list, but have not received a response.
city’s lax standards on who qualified as an artist, and its lack of controls to ensure affordability. These failures mean that many artists are now priced out of the market. It seems clear that the city recognizes this problem now, but because the real estate market in San Francisco is already so out of control, the city is stuck. The ban on live-work does not seem to be benefiting artists. Councilors are unable to pass any legislation fixing the problem because proposals are shot down as they fail to satisfy all interest groups.

Lastly, all of these examples are from major metropolitan areas. It is difficult to find as detailed information about smaller cities that have planned for artists needs, though there are a few cases (Providence, Rhode Island, and Worcester, Massachusetts). Still, information was not available on a community comparable to Easthampton, which has a population of only 15,000.

While the case information is from cities much larger than Easthampton, Easthampton is comparable to these cities in terms of the ratio of artists in the city to the overall employment. Ann Markusen has collected location quotients for artists for the top 29 US Metro Areas in 2000 by employment. Summary data is provided below in Table 1 (see Appendix A for complete table).

Table 1. Location Quotients for Artists in Selected Top 29 US Metro Areas by Employment (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area Ranking</th>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Performing Artists</th>
<th>Visual Artists</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Musicians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New York, NY-NJ</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>San Francisco-Oakland, CA</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Boston, MA-NH</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US AVERAGE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA-NJ</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO-KS</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO-IL</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Markusen, Ann and Amanda Johnson, 2006, p. 21

24 The location quotient is the percent of employees in the chosen metro area that are employed in a given industry, divided by the percent of employees throughout the U.S. that are employed in the same industry. A value higher than one indicates a higher percentage in that industry than the U.S. average.
Although official data is not available on the total number of artists in Easthampton, it is estimated that there were roughly 100 artists working in the city in 2000, and that this number has doubled in the past six years. Using raw data used to calculate the location quotients above, the estimated location quotient of Easthampton artists in 2000 is 1.65 (US Census 2000a; Schrock, 2006), which ranks between Seattle and San Francisco in terms of concentration of employed artists in the area. It is expected that the location quotient is significantly higher in 2006 due to the fact that the number of artists working in Easthampton is probably closer to 200 at this point.

**Why Artists Locate and Gentrification**

Earlier analysis was based on why communities desire artists; now the discussion turns to why artists desire communities, leading to a more detailed examination of the gentrification process.

What criteria guide artists’ location choices? Existing studies show that cheap studio space, linkages with consumers and suppliers, a downtown arts scene, as well as presence of other arts organizations are key factors (Ley 2003: 194). Why downtowns and not suburbs? Ley quotes two artists effectively. The first quote is from a couple who moved to a small town outside Vancouver but returned to the city:

> We moved right back to the heart of the city. The country is beautiful, and great for puttering, but you miss the intensity. Everyone is retired, even if they're working. It was ridiculous, we needed to come back every week, for openings, for the stimulation. We notice people who moved out, say to the Okanagan, they do less, their work gets stuck in a rut, there’s no innovation. We’ve moved around downtown a lot, and camped out for seven years (quoted in Ley 195).

However, not just any space will do, as another artist indicates:

---

25 Source for estimate: Easthampton Planning Department.
26 Assuming 200 artists in Easthampton and an employed population of 9,500 (which represents a conservative estimate of 5.8% for increase in employment between 2000 and 2006), the calculated location quotient would be 3.12, which is even higher than the highest ranked city among the top 29 metros.
Artists need authentic locations. You know artists hate the suburbs. They're too confining. Every artist is an anthropologist, unveiling culture. It helps to get some distance on that culture in an environment which does not share all of its presuppositions, an old area, socially diverse, including poverty groups (quoted in Ley 195).

While these feelings cannot summarize the attitudes of an entire group, research shows that artists do prefer downtown spaces. However, as evidence from the NEA and other studies show, there is a high correlation between artists settling in these areas and gentrification. Ley argues that the probability of gentrification occurring depends on the degree of affiliation with the artistic community that lives there. The closer the new residents feel to existing residents, the faster the process of gentrification. Thus the first gentrifiers are the “cultural new class” of people in design and advertising, journalism and the media. This group is followed by young public-sector people, and professionals in health, education, and welfare. The last group to arrive bears the highest incomes: doctors, lawyers, and other well-paid professionals (Ley 192).

While this analysis is unfairly stereotyped and based on casual observation, and Ley does acknowledge this, it nevertheless serves as a possible theory behind gentrification. More importantly, the theory has artists at its core. That is, artists are at the center of gentrification with groups who slowly follow. The theory makes sense when you consider the need that people have for comfort in a neighborhood they choose to live in; their need is met in part when residents are able to identify with existing neighbors. Gale, in his 1984 book, *Neighborhood Revitalization and the Postindustrial City*, attempts to characterize gentrifiers based on actual data. From his sample, he finds that gentrifiers are mostly young professionals in their 20s-40s, are single males or females or couples without children. He also finds that arts, design, and crafts are common occupations among first-ring gentrifiers. However, the most significant common trait among gentrifiers was some college education with most (2/3) of his sample having a bachelors degree (Gale 10-11).

There is some speculation over whether artists are displaced from a community or whether they actively promote gentrification and reap benefits (Knauss 2002). As with many
debates, it is dependent on the particulars of the situation. It also seems likely that it is a combination of the two, that artists can be still victims of gentrification and simultaneously be active agents participating in change, perhaps unknowingly. Obviously, artists who have invested in real estate would welcome a rise in prices while those that rented would be concerned about possible displacement. Assuming there are artists of both types in a community, this process has the potential to divide the group.

One way of addressing the issue is to make artist ownership of studio/rental space a priority. This process would involve a deliberate recognition that arts communities are likely to gentrify and a commitment to those positive agents of change. This method brings up ethical dilemmas about advocating for a particular occupational group and subsidizing them in order to allow them to reap financial benefits. Why not teachers? Or firefighters? One way of avoiding the ethical debate is to subsidize all low-income residents, regardless of occupation.

Another alternative is to attach permanent deed restrictions on properties which would require an artist to sell only to another qualified artist, with the city having a right of first refusal on the property to ensure the continuation of the program, similar to the Boston model. These restrictions could be transferred to other properties as long as they met certain locational criteria, i.e. they were located within a larger geographic boundary.

In the end, most of the literature on gentrification, and in particular artists’ roles in it, is purely speculative. Indeed, there is need for further research into why artists choose to live places and what their needs are. As Ann Markusen notes, “A region that desires to nurture its artistic sector should be thinking about why artists might like to live and work in its environs, just as it studies why businesses prefer to locate there (Markusen 2005: 11).” Central to those needs are concerns over space, both in terms of size but more importantly, affordability. In the Urban Institute report, it was noted that little research has been done to date that addresses artists’ space needs, and “virtually none seeks to identify cross-cutting space issues that face artists wherever
they live and work (Rosario-Jackson 47).” Also, she notes that existing studies do not evaluate the effectiveness of responses to space needs of artists.

As the San Francisco case shows, simply because communities recognize and address artists’ housing needs does not mean that it is done well. Seattle’s approach seems more comprehensive, as does Boston’s, but in both cases preliminary research does not yield any hard data which would indicate the relative successes of the community’s approaches. Further research should be done to identify other communities’ concrete strategies towards addressing artist housing needs. In addition, communities should begin to evaluate their approaches and refine them when necessary (or before the situation spirals out of control, as it appears to have in San Francisco).

All of these needs are particularly important as communities seem to be devoting more resources into attracting the “creative class.” In the end, artists are at the core of this group, whether one adopts Florida’s language or not. If a community invests in the philosophy of attracting particular workers, it should look to long-term strategies to address the needs of the new group, and not just strive to bring them in. One could easily imagine a scenario where a community competes for the creative class, the class settles, a gentrification process ensues, and the creative core is pushed out, not to mention residents who are displaced from the start of the process. Urban renewal comes to mind: a lofty, well-intentioned program that had devastating impacts for local communities.

This painting is grim, and it is not necessary. The purpose of this thesis is to say that it is possible for communities to better address these changes through long-range planning processes. I will now turn to Easthampton, Massachusetts, to demonstrate the particulars of how it can plan for its artists.
Chapter 3
Industrial Growth of Easthampton, Massachusetts

Easthampton, situated at the base of Mt. Tom in the Pioneer Valley of Western Massachusetts, is a small town of approximately 16,000 people. It is located in Hampshire County and in the Springfield-Urban Area. It is roughly 90 miles west of Boston and 15 miles north of Springfield. It is bordered by towns on all sides: South Hadley and Holyoke on the south and east, Southampton and Westhampton on the west, and Northampton on the North (see Figure 1). It lies just west of the Connecticut River. The city encompasses approximately 13.6 square miles of land. Most of the land is flat valley against the steep slopes of Mt. Tom which lie along the east (DHCD).

Figure 1. Easthampton City Boundary and surrounding communities

Source: US Census 2000
Easthampton, Massachusetts: Brief History

Easthampton was officially recognized as its own political entity in June of 1785, when it separated from Northampton. It had been settled by Europeans nearly a century earlier. In 1664, early settlers included farmers and sawmill operations who chose to settle close to the Manhan and Pascommuck rivers. Pascommuck is the Nipmuck word for “where it bends;” the bend in the river is now referred to as the Oxbow, a section of the Connecticut River (see Figure 2).

Easthampton formally became a town in 1809 when it changed its charter. In the first part of the 19th century, it continued to be primarily agrarian. The Williston Seminary, now known as the Williston-Northampton prep school, was established in 1841. In 1847, Samuel Williston, the son of the town’s first minister, established the Williston-Knight Button Company (a manufacturer of buttons). The establishment of this company marked the beginning of Easthampton becoming an industrial town.

Other industrial operations began to settle near Nashawannuck Pond. Among them,

- Nashawannuck Manufacturing Company, elastic-maker, maker of suspenders (1852)
- Glendale Company, elastic-maker (1860s)
- The Easthampton Rubber Thread Company settled in order to manufacture rubber strips needed in elastic making (1863)
- The Williston Mills, cloth-maker (1865)\(^\text{27}\)
- George S. Colton Company, elastic-maker, specialized in frilled webs (1866)

\(^{27}\) Williston Mills was located at Lower Millpond (see Appendix C for map showing location of ponds).
Mill workers lived in company built tenements and boarding houses on nearby streets (AHOE). Slowly a town began to form, not unlike the settlement patterns of the coal towns mentioned in the previous chapter. By the mid-1860s, two railroads, one linking to the Boston-Albany line and the other Williamsburg to New Haven, were bringing tourists to the area (Dwyer, AHOE).

The Williston-Knight Button Company faced hard times in the last 1800s and by 1905 it was renamed the United Button Company and then went into receivership. The business was moved to Long Island before it was liquidated in 1922 (AHOE). In contrast, the elastic companies prospered during the late 1800s. By 1900, half of the employed people in Easthampton worked in elastics.

In 1899, two additional manufacturers moved to Easthampton. The first of the two to settle, The West Boylston Manufacturing Company, originally from the Boston area, made cloth from cotton. In 1900, the company built additional mills near the thread mill, eventually creating a complex of factories spread along Pleasant Street. The Hampton Company settled in 1900; they dyed, mercerized or bleached cloth. By 1903, the total number of people employed in these two mills alone was 850.

Easthampton continued to flourish as a manufacturing town of primarily elastics and fabrics through the first half of the twentieth century. During World War I, all of the Easthampton mills were able to secure federal war contracts. The elastic firms produced elastic for gas masks during the war. The West Boylston Manufacturing Company got contracts for tent fabrics, khaki cloth, tire cord, and lacing cord for planes and parachutes (AHOE 62). At the time, the workers were primarily French-Canadian and Polish immigrants.

Some workers experienced layoffs in the years following the war. The West Boylston Manufacturing Company laid off workers in response to losing contracts. In 1946, the company was purchased by United Elastic of Montgomery, Alabama. Needless to say, this was a difficult time for residents of Easthampton. Many people left the town in response to the mill closings.
Those who stayed experienced an economic upswing during World War II. Manufacturers such as Cardanic, General Electric, Textron, and the Campagna Corporation (which made prefabricated housing), all employed workers in Easthampton. Other elastic companies obtained war contracts. This boom lasted until 1962 when the Hampton Company closed. United Elastic kept the West Boylston Manufacturing company in Easthampton as a subsidiary to make yarn for elastic weaving until 1970, when it closed (AHOE 69). The Rubber Thread Company closed in 1987. This left one small elastic-related firm in town. Unemployment rose dramatically in the city. Of Easthampton’s employed population, in 1960, 79% of employed people were working in manufacturing. By 1985, only 49.8% of those working in Easthampton were employed in manufacturing. In 1995, that figure dropped to 43.4%. In 2000, that figure was 32.6%. Between 1960 and 2001, Easthampton lost 1,251 manufacturing jobs (Koteen 2005). By early 1985, there was only one mill still in business on Pleasant Street (EPD 2005).

In 1995, Stanley Home Products, located at 116 Pleasant Street, closed. Stanley Home Products is a manufacturer of home cleaning products, and was founded in 1931 by a couple in Westfield, Massachusetts. Stanley Home bought 116 Pleasant Street just after World War II. By 1960, they were a thriving presence in Easthampton, employing over 600 people. Over 3,000 people visited the factory every year (Koteen, 2005).

In 2005, four companies, Yankee Plastics, Easthampton Dye Works, Tubed Products, Magnat Rolls, and Kleen-Bore Inc. all announced closures and/or layoffs. The shifts have affected about 150 people (Palpini 2005).
Chapter 4
From an Industrial Town to an Arts Town

In 1976, one of the vacant mill buildings, One Cottage Street (see map in Appendix C) containing 168,000 square feet was given at no cost to Riverside Industries, a non-profit human service agency for people with disabilities. Riverside leased a lot of the space that they did not require for their programs to artists as cheap studio space. At this time, over 60 artists continue to lease out space at One Cottage Street.\(^{28}\)

In addition to One Cottage, both the Eastworks and Paragon buildings, located on Pleasant Street, are home to various businesses and artists. The Paragon building currently houses over 35 artists. The Eastworks building is 116 Pleasant Street, the former Stanley Home Products factory, and originally one of the factory buildings that made up the complex owned by the West Boylston Company. Eastworks has over 500,000 square feet of gross building area. It has had the most successful conversion into a mixed-use center. It not only offers artist space but also residential units, office, and retail spaces. The first floor has commercial tenants and provides an active public/retail component to the studios. Among the key tenants are an organic grocery store, a hair salon, a CD store, and a rug store. It is an ideal location for retailers who have an established clientele. It also serves those crafts people, artists and small businesses who can have small vending stations to benefit from foot traffic (EPD 2005a). Public services such as the Department of Motor Vehicles and the CDBG-funded Valley Community Development Corporation Easthampton office have both settled in Eastworks as well. The building was

\(^{28}\) [http://www.rsi.org/oneten.html](http://www.rsi.org/oneten.html)
purchased in 1997 by Will and Paula Bundy, local developers, who continue to develop and manage the building.

Artists are attracted to these buildings because of the low rents, flexible spaces, high ceilings, large windows, and breathtaking views of the mountains. There are a number of arts related organizations that have settled either in or around the mill buildings. These include:

- **Galleries** such as New City Art and Elusie Gallery
- **Arts related organizations**: Guild Studio School, Pioneer Valley Ballet Company & School
- **Pioneer Arts Centers of Easthampton (PACE)** opened in 2001 and produces musical theater
- **Pioneer Valley Summer Theater** moved to Williston Northampton School campus from Mt Holyoke College in South Hadley in 2002
- **Flywheel** is a youth/adult collaboration that puts on weekly performances
- **Schools** VCA and NE School of Architectural Woodworking (EPD 2005)

In 2003, a local paper published a lead story entitled “Destination Easthampton: Hampshire County’s Other Arts Town.” This story was in response to John Villani’s 2001 book *The 100 Best Small Art Towns in America*, which identified neighboring Northampton as the number one best small art town, with no mention of Easthampton.

**Market Overview**

**Population and Housing**

According to projections from the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission, Easthampton is expected to increase in population in percentages slightly above those of Hampshire County in the next 25 years.
### Table 2. Projected Population Growth by Age in Easthampton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>1,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>1,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>1,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>1,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>1,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 64</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 69</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 74</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - 79</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 84</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 - . . .</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,537</td>
<td>15,994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HAMPShIRE COUNTY**

| Total     | 146,568    | 152,251  | 155,183   | 158,057   | 161,353   | 165,210    | 169,418    | 173,634    | 3.9%      | 3.8%       | 4.5%       | 5.1%      |

Source: Pioneer Valley Planning Commission

Easthampton has a low vacancy rate at 3% (US Census 2000b). This indicates that there is a healthy demand for additional housing units. Historically, Easthampton averaged 35-40 new housing units built per year. However, there has been more housing being built in recent years. In 2002, 66 building permits were issued. A new 94-unit development has just been completed.

In terms of affordable units, approximately 106 units (3% of total units) are affordable to low-income households, and, 2,669 units (77%) are affordable to moderate income households.\(^{29}\) (ECDP, 2005) Despite these numbers, Easthampton is well-below the state’s requirements for 10% affordability. Massachusetts has established a statute known as Chapter 40B or the Comprehensive Permit Law, which enables all local Zoning Boards of Appeals to approve affordable housing developments under flexible rules if at least 20-25% of the units have a long-term affordability restriction (MADOC 2005) and if the community has not met the state’s goal.

\(^{29}\) This is according to 2004 data and assuming properties are sold at assessed value.
of 10% of a jurisdiction’s units as affordable. “Affordable units” as defined by the state requires that there be a specific set of subsidies in the units. That is, units that are market-priced at affordable prices do not count in the state’s goals.

The 94-unit development that was just completed in Easthampton includes 31 new affordable units according to state definitions, and indicates that the city is working towards increasing affordable housing. This development, known as White Brook Meadow, combines affordable rental units and homeownership units. It is a unique development: there are 60 rental units; 48 of these are reserved for seniors and the remaining 12 are reserved for foster families who make below 60% AMI. The multigenerational aspect of the development is intended as a support structure for foster families: each senior will volunteer a minimum of three hours per week to support care of the foster kids. On an adjacent parcel, there will be 34 homeownership units. Nine of the homeownership units will be sold to households earning less than 80% AMI with the remaining 25 being sold at market rate.\(^{30}\)

**Studio Spaces**

Although there is no data available on artist studio vacancy rates, the healthy demand at the three main mill buildings as well as the qualitative comments made by the artists indicate that there is a market for studio space.

### Table 3. Known studio spaces in Easthampton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Spaces Available</th>
<th># Spaces Leased</th>
<th># Spaces Leased by Artists or Arts-related organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragon</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastworks</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Cottage Street</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: [http://www.rsi.org/oneten.html](http://www.rsi.org/oneten.html), [http://www.paragonbldg.com/tenants.html](http://www.paragonbldg.com/tenants.html), Diane Sulifz, Office Manager, Paragon Building; Will Bundy, Owner, Eastworks (*Indicates data unavailable.)

\(^{30}\) [http://www.mhp.net/community/ebulletins/12_01_04.html](http://www.mhp.net/community/ebulletins/12_01_04.html)
Part of the difficulty in collecting data on the number of studio spaces that are available in Easthampton, even in just three mill buildings, is because mills have spaces that can be used for a variety of purposes. For example, it is estimated that the Paragon building has a total of 40 available spaces; while they are 100% occupied, only 35 of those spaces are being used by artists. The Eastworks building contains over 32 live-work units, all of which are occupied. Fifteen additional units are expected online this summer and half of them are leased out already. It is clear from the occupancy and absorption rates that there is a high demand for both studio and live-work spaces.

**Mill District Zoning**

Part of the reason why artists are able to live and work in these mill buildings is because the city has flexible zoning surrounding the mills. Easthampton amended its zoning ordinance in 1990 to include a mixed-use/mill industrial district (MI) which includes many of the mill buildings downtown and which specifically includes the Pleasant Street corridor (see Appendix C for zoning map). According to the city’s zoning regulations, the purpose of the MI district is to “provide a comprehensive set of development methods which recognize the mill industrial area’s historic qualities and its capacities as a mixed-use district (CEZO 1990, 9.01).” Among the key purposes of the district is “to allow diversification of existing businesses” and “to provide incentives for new businesses (CEZO, 1990, 9.02).” Although it is not explicitly stated, as the data in Table 3 indicates, many of the existing and new businesses are arts-related.

The restrictions on use within the district are for incompatible uses and certain kinds of residential uses. An example of an incompatible use is one which creates excessive noise or dust in close proximity to a residential area. However, there are no specific spatial guidelines; rather, the Planning Board review process determines whether uses are incompatible (CEZO, 1990, 9.031). Residential uses are allowed in the buildings on the second story or higher. The residential
types allowed are “multifamily dwellings, multifamily housing for elderly and/or handicapped persons, accessory apartments, and bed-and-breakfast establishments (CEZO, 1990, 9.04).”

Finally, the mill district includes a bonus provision which encourages owners and developers to donate public amenities such as parks, benches, plazas, or public access to the mill ponds. As an incentive for these donations, the development may be given a density bonus by being allowed up to 10% reduction in minimum lot area requirements (CEZO, 1990, 9.06)

**Recent Improvements**

In addition to the mill district zoning, the City of Easthampton has supported artists by applying for and receiving several grants to improve key downtown areas, places where many artists work. Both Cottage Street and Pleasant Street are being identified as places that need improvements. A summary of the City’s efforts at improving these areas follows:

- **2001:** Easthampton applied for and received CDBG funds to acquire a private parking lot on Cottage Street, improve it, install sidewalks, and convert it to a municipal free parking lot

- **2003:** Easthampton received $540,000 in CDBG funds to rehabilitate the exterior and interior of the Eastworks building

- **November 2004:** Easthampton received $400,000 in CDBG funds to replace the sidewalks on Pleasant Street and to install period lights to improve the safety and look of the historic street.

- **May 2005:** Easthampton received $632,170 from the Department of Housing and Community Development for additional improvements on Pleasant Street (sidewalks, lighting, burying utility lines)

In addition to these physical improvements, the city has been involved in a visioning process that recently included an arts charrette. The visioning process began in 1998. Three community meetings were held and over 250 residents and business owners participated to determine the needs and strengths of the city and to envision how it would be in the year 2010. In 2003, a group revisited the visioning process to determine how much had been accomplished in those five years
and to set new goals for the remaining five. The 2003 group decided that a working group specifically dedicated to the arts would be needed (EPD, 2005a). The document from the 2003 group states,

In 1998, although the artists’ community was already growing in response to the rehabilitation of the Eastworks building, there was little indication how much impact this movement would have on the economy, identity, and vitality of Easthampton. … Undoubtedly the single greatest change in Easthampton over the past five years has been the phenomenal growth of the arts community. Stimulated in part by the conversion of the old Stanhome building into Eastworks and the consequent availability of affordable studio space, artists have made a significant impact on all areas of Easthampton – its image, its vitality and its economy. Artists are not new to Easthampton; many have been here for decades. But the influx of new artisans and their visibility has given Easthampton a new face – literally! … The Arts have also increase[d] the apparent diversity of Easthampton’s residents, as well as the need for affordable housing. This arena – the newest focal point of Easthampton’s visioning – requires the same on-going commitment and attention as the other formerly identified priorities (EPD, 2005a).

In 2004, the Planning Department initiated a community discussion among artists and arts-related groups regarding the role of the arts in the city’s economic development. The purpose of this meeting was to “identify the needs of the artist community and the opportunities inherent within this community to further the city’s economic development (EPD, 2005a).” From this larger gathering, a smaller group formed known as ACE (Arts, Culture, & Entertainment) Easthampton. The goal of this organization was to map cultural assets through hiring an outreach consultant to identify all artistic and cultural endeavors in the city, establishing a website listing all artists, and producing a hard-copy arts-related brochure which would include a map of these assets and a listing of all artists (EPD, 2005a).

In 2005, the city was successful in receiving grants to initiate work on the website. The Easthampton Cultural Council, which was a coalition of artists, residents and businessowners interested in the arts, applied to and received grants from the Massachusetts Cultural Council totaling $12,500. The Cultural Council essentially matched this amount through local fundraising. All of these funds are being used to develop a website (www.easthamptoncityarts.com) which should be completed by May 2006.
2003 Priorities, 2005 Charrette

The 2003 vision statement was, and still is, “the arts community is recognized as a valuable resource for Easthampton; the city in turn supports and nurtures the arts community (EPD, 2005).” The priorities in the arts section of the vision report include:

- Develop a website
- Promote Easthampton as an arts town
- Integrate artists into business and economic community
- Keep housing and studio space affordable for artist community
- Establish an organized community of artists that communicates with the town and area businesses and is reciprocated
- Establish marketing and promotion of the arts

In order to build upon this initial list of priorities, in September of 2005, the Planning Department organized an arts charrette. “All creative folks (and the people who love them) of Easthampton” were invited. The purpose of the charrette was to “plan for a community that nurtures the creative people and organizations that are reviving the cultural+economic vitality of our City.”  

In his opening remarks at this charrette, the planning director for the city, Stuart Beckley, said that Easthampton in the 1920s and 30s was an industrial town, in the 1990s-2005 a mixed town, and in 2010, an arts town. Posters were hung on the wall and magic markers available to attendees to answer the following questions:

1. What are the arts to you? Science? Leisure? Decoration? Spiritual? Can art change the world?

2. What attributes have been most influential in bringing you to (or keeping you in) Easthampton?

3. How can we ensure that arts continue to grow and thrive in Easthampton?

4. How would you describe Easthampton to a distant friend? (3-4 adjectives)

5. How can arts participation be increased in Easthampton in order to improve the quality of life?

31 Source for quotes is a postcard sent by the planning department inviting people to the charrette.
6. How can the community be a resource for artists?

7. How has the explosion of arts in Easthampton affected the local community?

While many topics were discussed at this charrette, one of the main concerns voiced by artists was lack of affordability of housing and studio spaces. The general feeling was that while units were affordable at this time, housing prices were increasing. At least one person discussed knowing people who had been forced out of their studio spaces in other cities because the building was purchased by a developer who wanted to build condominiums. These statements led me to want to further investigate artists’ experiences with gentrification and find out what they thought about Easthampton as a community. The results of my interviews appear in the next chapter.
Chapter 5
Artists in Easthampton

Methods

This research is motivated by a desire to provide possible solutions to the problem of rising housing costs as voiced by artists at the September charrette. At the fall charrette, I made contact with one artist and we had a phone interview. From there, I used the snowball technique to get names of additional artists. Ellen Koteen of the city planning department also referred me to several artists. In total, I interviewed ten people: six artists, two public officials, one local developer, and one resident involved in arts-related activities. Four of the people I spoke with were male, six were female. All were white. In order to protect the identity of my informants, I have assigned random codes, use pseudonyms where appropriate, and purposefully mask genders. A list of interview questions is included in Appendix B. A lot of information regarding the history of Easthampton was provided to me by the planning department.

In this chapter, I provide summaries of the various viewpoints presented to me by my respondents. I use these summaries to inform my suggestions for strategies Easthampton could take to preserve affordability for its artists, presented in Chapter 6. My assumption is that the city cares about its artists and therefore should take steps to encourage their sustainable presence in the city. A sustainable arts presence can only be achieved when issues of affordability are directly addressed.

32 Data was not collected on age, income, ethnicity, marital status, or sexual orientation.
Key Findings

My aim in these interviews was to identify possible solutions to the problem of affordability in Easthampton. Part of my hypothesis was that artists enjoy working and/or living in Easthampton and that one main reason why it is beneficial is the amount of affordable spaces available in the city. The problem is the potential for being priced out of the market. After attending the September charrette, it was clear to me how much the threat of the city becoming unaffordable weighed on members of the community.

From my interviews, several themes emerged:

♦ The artists in Easthampton are not a cohesive group. Some are more established than others. Artists who have worked in their trade for twenty years do not identify with many of the same needs as new artists.

♦ There is no one housing type that is ideal for artists. Live-work spaces are becoming popular and they are often associated with artists. While live-work spaces work for some artists, they should not be considered the universal solution to artists’ needs. In general, it seems that a live-work unit is better suited for new artists than for more established artists, who prefer the physical separation between their workplace and their home.

♦ Many artists supplement their income from their artwork with other work. Some own units and rent them out, others engage in arts-related activities in order to support their art. Some work day jobs that are unrelated to arts endeavors.

♦ Regardless of their differences, the artists who work in Easthampton love this city and do not want to leave.

In addition to these basic themes, the interviews combined seem to tell a story, similar to many of the same ideas described in Chapter 2. In particular, artists provide considerable benefits to a community. There are cultural benefits, including diversity; community benefits in terms of having a creative town, and artists who serve as role models for children; and direct and indirect economic benefits. Direct economic benefits come from artists’ design skills which can be an important input for industry. Economic benefits are indirect too, as artists’ activities are increasingly attractive to professionals that work in high-end businesses.
Yet, as art grows in popularity, and artists grow in population, there is an increased risk of displacement and gentrification. Artists’ fear of displacement is what drives the need for discussion of affordable space. Despite their concerns, it seems that artists themselves rarely self-organize or drive collective action designed to ensure access to these affordable spaces. This inability to self-organize is almost reflective of the nature of art itself, which is often highly individualized and personal – the artists’ studio seems to be a manifestation of this characteristic. Artists’ unmet needs for affordable space in turn creates opportunities for institutional actors, such as planning departments, arts advocacy organizations, community development corporations, and affordable housing developers, to step in to encourage more sustainable models of arts-based development.

The following sections address this story in greater depth using direct quotations and summaries of artists’ views. The story begins with the benefits artists feel in art-clustered environments, followed by particular benefits the city of Easthampton brings to artists. The benefits of the city lead into a broader discussion about the value of art and artists to a community. Finally, artists’ concerns about rising rents and gentrification are presented. Artists also offer explanations for why it is difficult for artists themselves to organize. The chapter concludes with a summary of non-artists views.

**Benefits of being around other artists**

As noted in Chapter 1, there are many benefits to being around other people engaged in the same trade. It may be especially true of artists. Some specific benefits mentioned were:

- Art work is isolating, much of it is done alone. Working around other artists gives even an isolationist an opportunity to interact with other people, especially those with similar interests.
- Feed off of others energy
- Easy to get feedback and help from colleagues
As one artist says,

Part of it is knowing [other artists are] working. Part of it is that at the time years ago I was doing really large sculptural pieces, it was great to be able to go down the hall and get a group of people to help move something. It was great resource in terms of information exchange. Its always been that. That's been an incredible asset… needing things cut, you can just walk it to someone in the building to do the job for you. A lot of exchange. At different times throughout these years I've done a lot of collaborations with a lot of different artists, which has been really exciting… (05A)

**Benefits of Easthampton**

Many artists saw benefits to being in Easthampton in particular. Some of the reasons people liked Easthampton were,

- The city's character
- Other artists in area/arts community
- Liberal attitude of Northeast
- Availability of affordable studio space
- Willingness on the part of city officials to take the old and blend with the new
- Cooperative kind of feeling to town; small enough to get to know neighbors, business owners
- Quiet community where artists could escape
- Picturesque

In general, it seems that the city provides artists with enhanced opportunities for creative expression. As one artist says,

I like an old mill town. I like how much water there is in Easthampton. I like that its small enough that its easy to meet and talk to people. It seems open to there being local influence. I like that there's a lot of artists here, that its 2 hours from New York (its the mecca of the art world) (06A).

Easthampton is also able to embrace varying lifestyles. As one non-artist said:

I love the fact that its still a place where people can raise their families – or not, and participate actively in decision making. It doesn't feel too big or too full of itself. I like that kind of wild westness about it. It’s still rough around the edges, but there's enough there that you can maintain a pretty full social calendar if you like, or activity calendar…and I love the fact that there's also arts events happening all the time (07R).
Affordability of studio space as well as ease in finding space were topics frequently mentioned. Many people learned about their studio space from word of mouth. Those who had learned about it were able to find space almost immediately – sometimes even in one day – in contrast to prior experiences where it had taken a year or two to find space in comparable parts of the Northeast.

**Why artists benefit a community**

The people I spoke with had varying reasons for how they felt arts benefited a community. Among the benefit artists (not arts) bring, they

- Improve the look of a place with their presence
- Foster creative thinking among a population
- Are “our soul and our spirit”
- Provide people with another way of looking at a familiar environment

One artist speaks to how the value of the arts is decided by the person who receives that art:

> What does the experience of painting or a sculpture add to life? What value does that add to one individual life and experience of life? Hopefully artists and the arts cause non-artists to pause, to look at the world around us in a way that without that object you might not have, to have a deeper experience in life. You can achieve that through literature, dance, through visual arts… The value of art is that it deepens our experience of life (09A).

One artist spoke about how it distresses her that art is sometimes compared to leisure, something “not important” or “extra.”

**Arts and economic development**

Artists had mixed reactions to the value of the arts in economic development. Some were able to articulate a clear link between artists and how they create more desirable communities, and how that attracts businesses. A non-artist, but someone invested in the arts and a resident of
Easthampton, spoke about how she feels that as a general pattern, design is influencing our economy as specialization and the concept of individuality and style are becoming more important. In her words, it is about “the intersection between art and business that I think is the direction of the entrepreneur in the 21st century (07R).” She notes how the development of the internet has transformed the way in which artists do work. No longer are they reliant on “big stores” to showcase their work. Instead, they can sell on the web and also supplement with a small place to show their work (07A). In her view, the arts is at the center of all kinds of economic development, both for artists and communities. Her perspective is similar to one of the arguments made by Ann Markusen to target occupational groups. The idea is, the skill sets of individuals are integral to economic success. Another artist notes the link between arts and high tech:

[The economic value of arts] would be in attracting a certain kind of person. Part of why certain areas became initially very attractive to the high tech market was because of arts… That is one reason why high tech developed in certain areas in Boston, because there was a desire to be around creative people. So I think that the arts and artists can be a draw for other businesses, corporations, because it becomes a more desirable place to live (09A).

The same artist, when asked his feelings about arts and economic development, continued:

I feel a little cynical about it. I think it means you want to use artists to bolster our economy so that rents can be higher, real estate will be of greater value and the artists are the monkeys in the window kind of thing. If you talk about promoting arts for economic development, what does that mean for the artist? One of the [best ways to support] the arts is by buying art. Open up your wallet and buy it. You buy it on whatever level you can afford to buy art. I think the town should be doing that, I think individual citizens should be encouraged to buy art, original art. That's how you support artists. Promoting art for economic development... I don't really know what that means...I really don't know what it means (09A).

Despite having previously articulated why communities may value artists, the phrase “arts-based economic development” was confusing for artists. Another artist I spoke with had a similar reaction. When I asked her what arts-based economic development meant, she said, “[I can tell you what it needs to mean.] What it needs to mean is that you’re promoting the economic development of people that make the art (06A).” The assumption behind this remark is that this is
not what arts-based economic development actually is.

**Gentrification stories**

Many of the artists noted housing and rental prices going up. Some felt that at this point, rent was affordable or barely affordable, and there was some speculation that this would change. One person said that if her rent went up by twenty percent she would have to think about closing down her studio.

Several artists had stories of gentrification. One artist said that “[gentrification] is all I hear about [from my fellow artists].” Chapter 1 opened with the story of Joanne Murphy from St. Paul, Minnesota. She completed her education and a three-year apprenticeship there. Her studio space during this time was in a large warehouse building that was affordable. After her third year working out of that space, the owner informed her that he was selling the building to a developer and that it would be converted into high-end condominiums. At that time, Joanne’s serious boyfriend, also an artist, had just completed his master’s degree from University of Massachusetts at Amherst, and during one of her visits to the area, they both fell in love with the studio spaces available at One Cottage Street in Easthampton. The flipping of her current studio space, his graduation, and their mutual liking of Easthampton seemed fortuitous. They both began leasing out studio space in One Cottage Street: hers was dedicated to the potter’s wheel, his focus was on sculptures. She describes this exact process as a “basic law of supply and demand (12A).”

Two of the artists I spoke with had worked previously in no-rent, mostly vacant buildings in major cities in the Northeast. In both cases, they experienced gentrification. One woman, Claire Henderson, had a studio for five years. Friends of hers had owned it for twenty years. When she moved in, it was 90% vacant and there were drug dealers actively in the building. They allowed her to set up a 500 square foot studio for free to see what she could make of it. She renovated that space herself and used it as a studio. The owners of the building then began to
show that space to potential tenants as a possibility of how the building could be used and transformed. As the building began to lease up, her friends did start charging her rent. In her last year and a half she paid rent, and it increased to the point where it did not make sense for her to work out of there anymore. Now, she says, the building is completely renovated and there are corporate business tenants leasing out spaces. This experience was a motivating factor for Claire to look for affordable studio space in Easthampton.

Other artists, usually newer to the trade, had not experienced gentrification themselves but knew of others who had. Regardless of their personal experiences, nearly all of the people I interviewed, artists and non-artists, recognized that artists could be displaced from Easthampton. One woman described Easthampton’s recognition of the arts as a “double-edged sword.” In her view,

The implication that a lot of artists are afraid of is that [marketing Easthampton as an arts town] is just going to put us on the map, [make us] more visible, and its just gonna be taken away from us like it historically always is. Its exciting that people are hearing about this area but it is scary because it could mean that we will eventually get displaced. Its quite amazing just the number of artists that have moved in the past few years. All the conversions of Eastworks and Paragon… Eastworks is incredibly new but its got a huge population of people now. So its interesting that as [Easthampton] gets more on the map more artists move here too which means that rents go up again because there’s more people. So its kind of a scary thing (05A).

Another artist speaks more broadly about the gentrification process:

…artists will go into a place, they'll clean it up, it'll become more attractive with their presence, and then people with money that aren't artists will follow in their tracks and want to be there because the artists have made it big.

Q: To what extent do you think that artists are change agents? Are there people who do this intentionally? Or are artists victims of gentrification?

R: I don't think we're victims. I just think we're undervalued for the change. Because if people valued [us] then it would be only right for them to do something that supports artists, encourages us to be here…[It’s a] trend, pattern, there's depressed little towns, artists move into them, they come in. They bring light and creativity, and new perceptions and a new way of seeing what was ugly and depressed and it gets transformed…We work as agents of change, we could just leave… and then you're left with sort of maybe a hollow thing that you thought was really happening…we do leave and the prices go up, and you end up with [a] sort of say, hollow gentrified thing that don't have soul anymore.
Several of the people described the gentrification process by comparing Easthampton to its neighbor town, Northampton. Northampton is generally considered an arts town; indeed, as previously mentioned, it was voted number one best small art town in the nation in a 2001 publication. However, according to the artists I spoke with, Northampton experienced gentrification in the 1980s, and now many working class artists who used to have studios downtown cannot afford those spaces anymore.

Artists did not want Easthampton to become like Northampton. One person described Northampton as “a victim of its own success.” This person was familiar with Northampton in the early 1980s before the downtown was characterized by expensive boutiques and restaurants. She says that there is not a lot of real art happening in Northampton with the exception of the Arts and Industry building which is in Florence. There are not a lot of arts studios in Northampton because it is not affordable to rent space. While there are some galleries, they do not carry work by local artists necessarily. She says the difference between Northampton and Chelsea, or Soho, or Provincetown, is that Northampton is not an art mecca. Rather, it is a place for a tourist market and for parents of college children. She admits that while there is nothing wrong with this, it does not make Northampton an art mecca.

The feeling implicit behind not copying Northampton is that Easthampton needs to find its own way. Artists see a lot of potential in Easthampton finding its own way because of the large number of artists who actually work in the city. The logic seems to be if the real artists who are here can be involved in the planning process, they can help guide Easthampton’s development so that it does not become like Northampton. Obviously, this model assumes that the artists in Easthampton will continue to work in the city for many years.
Difficulties organizing

Despite their concerns about gentrification, many artists described one of the drawbacks to preventing displacement is the difficulty that artists have in organizing for collective action. Part of this difficulty comes from artists not being a cohesive group. Some are new artists and focus all their energy in creating a full portfolio so as to be presentable. They have not contracted with specific galleries yet and do not have a steady income stream. Or, they may supplement their small income from art with day jobs or jobs in other arts-related activities.

Other artists may be more established in their trade. Their schedules are determined by outside contracts and meeting those deadlines is their top priority. They do not have as much time, and in some cases, not as much motivation, to involve themselves in new real estate transactions. As one artist says,

Its always very hard to get artists to work cooperatively…part of its financial. A good number of people aren't financially secure, paycheck to paycheck, or sale to sale. So there's not a great stability there, in some cases. In others, its the personality that we're all sitting in our studios alone and working alone and so we're not used to that whole interactive kind of thing that happens when people are in a workplace where after years of working you learn about cooperation. Maybe traditionally there hasn't always been enough to go around for artists and there's been that sense of if you don't get it, I won't get it (05A).

Organizing around co-ownership of a space presents even more challenges:

…it takes a lot of resources, time, organization, capital. What prevents so many of us is the idea that ok, what if the building needs a new roof. What happens then? That scares so many of us. Rents are one thing and you think, I'll build equity by owning something. But you never can account with what goes wrong and who has the resources to cover it, and how do you do that without moving a building or...right, if there was an agency in place that could work as the umbrella corporation. We're not geared towards that kind of organization, planning, or contract or anything like that. Its not in our makeup to have that kind of...

Q: why?

R: Because it takes time, and art takes time, and you have to prioritize in this life and that's not always been on the priority list (05A).

As another artist says,
I've been giving a lot of thought to the concept of whether I want to go into purchase a building with a group of artists. I've concluded that I don't want to. The reason is that there have been times in my life when I've gotten into a business venture with people I'm not related to. Every one of those instances got much more complicated than I would have/did foresee. I started thinking about those experiences... I thought, maybe if I were 30 I'd want to do it but I'm 50 and I don't want to spend my time that way (12A).

This last statement seems to reflect an experience that extends beyond just artists. This person has reservations about entering a risky real estate transaction with people he knows. Organizing for collective real estate development and ownership is not an easy task, not even for developers and professionals who engage in this business everyday. In no way should artists’ inability or lack of organization be seen as a deficit. Rather, it shows that there is a real opportunity for institutional organizations to step in and act as coordinating agencies. Certainly, artists would have a strong role to play in overseeing any project. However, a group that is experienced in real estate development and who can act to organize artists would be an ideal actor to fill this gap.

**Artists’ suggestions to fix the affordability problem**

“Things have happened for whatever reason to draw artists to this poor little podunk old mill depressed factories are leaving rampantly [town]... why not, doesn't it make some sense for long range planning for you to foster this being a creative town, that supports artists, keeps us here, that makes it possible for more to come, that encourages us to have an influence to bear on your children and a higher quality of life for everyone? (06A)”

Besides organizations stepping in and acting as intermediaries between artists and the private market, suggestions offered by artists to support affordability were:

- Making elementary school available for gallery or studio space
- Artist in residency program. Fund a select group of artists for one year, in return they offer a certain percentage of their artwork to the city as public art. Or, they could volunteer in schools, or volunteer at the planning department, according the artists’ specialization.
- 1% for the arts program. Have a 1-2% of all taxes go towards funding public art in the city.
Incentives to landlords like Riverside Industries or the Bundys to keep artists renting in their buildings, such as tax breaks

- Not taxing artists on equipment
- Provide more grant opportunities for artists and streamline the application and approval processes
- Maintaining constant dialogue between artists and public officials

Many artists felt that the solution was largely in the hands of private property owners. In their view, the landlords in Easthampton who rent out affordable studio space do so out of goodwill, and to support artists and arts-related activities. Many artists feel that it is only through having charitable people like these landlords, that artists can find affordable space. As one person says,

"I think it's primarily in the hands of property owners, because unless there are property owners and developers... who really have a commitment to arts and development and maintenance to arts community in place, it's going to boil down to dollars and cents. It's [about the] bottom line and how much money can I get for this space, and there's a green factor that doesn't take into account community. If you have community minded people owning buildings, that's the best tool we have to combat gentrification (09A)."

Another possibility is artists collaborating to own buildings, as mentioned previously.

"The downside of artists owning buildings together is that they are not developers and are not prepared to deal with all the issues that will come up in terms of owning a commercial building, and they will not necessarily have resources to manage a large building. They talk about a bunch of us getting together and owning a building. [Someone said to me]... 'at this point when you are focusing on your painting do you want to be a landlord and deal with issues of old factory buildings?'...and it made me pause. I'm [almost 50], I want to focus on my work, if I were [25], I'd be more inclined to do it. Other artists my age feel similarly, that we just don't want to at this point in our career take on something like that. We want space to work that's reasonable where we can focus on our work and not renting a building (09A)."

Many artists felt that if there were an option for them to purchase a studio space by themselves that would be the ideal option. Some were excited about live work space and others were not. The split between live-work advocates and those who preferred separated spaces was correlated to how long the person had been in the profession. Newer artists, usually though not always younger, seemed more enthusiastic about live-work space than more experienced, possibly older,
A majority of the artists I spoke with felt very strongly about solid communication between artists and city officials. They felt that as long as a constant dialogue between the groups was maintained, that it reflected that the city was taking their needs into consideration.

*Non-artists views*

As previously mentioned, I spoke with four non-artists. One was a resident who was interested in the arts but who is not an artist herself (at this time), another was a local developer, and I spoke with two public officials. Because my sample size is so small, I hesitate to say that these opinions speak to any majority opinion of non-artists on arts-related matters, and I certainly cannot say that the four public officials who were able to share some thoughts with me represent the opinions of the entire city government. However, I will note a couple of interesting points made by non-artists. The reader should take into consideration my limited sample.

One of the public officials I spoke with felt that artists were a subset under the larger category of diversity. In her view, helping artists is furthering the city goal of increasing overall diversity. She did not conceive of artists as a separate group in any way. She said that she would be supportive of promoting the arts or helping artists but only because they helped to increase diversity in the city. In her view, there seemed to be no other benefit, economic or non, to having artists in a community. Her inability to articulate artists’ benefits demonstrates that not everyone in Easthampton understands and appreciates the arts community in the same way.

While this official’s views may be an unusual way of characterizing artists, it seemed to me that in general, the city is and will continue to be supportive of artists being in the city. The city also seems committed to helping artists as long as the methods used are feasible. Some strategies that I suggested to public officials were met with responses largely relating to

---

33 There are four public officials because there are two that I interviewed, as well as the two city planners I have worked with on this project.
feasibility. There was certainly no strong resistance to my suggestions, which leads me to believe that the city is generally supportive of artists. However, there was a lot of caution expressed as to the political, administrative, and financial feasibility of policy alternatives.

In the next section, I combine the suggestions from artists, my research on Easthampton, and my research on other communities that have dealt with the provision of affordable artist spaces to make some specific recommendations to the city of Easthampton. I conclude the section by evaluating the policy suggestions based on chosen criteria, including feasibility.
Chapter 6
Recommendations

In Chapter 4, I gave some examples of how the city of Easthampton is supporting arts endeavors. Briefly, these are: mill district zoning, physical improvements to infrastructure around where artists work; participation in a community visioning process and supporting the growth of arts-related initiatives that grew out of that; and helping to fund and administer an arts-focused website.

In this section, I provide recommendations for how the Easthampton community could provide additional support to artists. Some of these suggestions deal more directly with the main focus of this research, which is providing long-term affordable housing and/or studio spaces for artists. Not all of the suggestions are the city’s responsibility. Some are directed at artists or the private market. The party responsible for each initiative is indicated in the parentheses following the alternative. I first summarize the policy suggestion. I then present an existing model to show how the policy is being implemented. Finally, I make suggestions for how Easthampton could implement the policy. Once the policies have been presented, I evaluate them. The following criteria are used to evaluate policies for accomplishing the objective of supporting artists: effectiveness, efficiency, equity, and administrative, political, and financial feasibility. A ranking system is used to evaluate each proposed policy alternative in terms of these criteria.
Policy Alternatives

The following section summarizes proposed policy alternatives for Easthampton to consider.

Policy #1: Conduct a Formal Analysis of Artist Needs (city)

A formal analysis of artists needs would help determine what artists needs are and would help the planning department develop the best policies to address those needs.

Model: Boston, Massachusetts

As described in Chapter 2, the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) has recently undertaken a survey process. They hired ArtSpace Projects, Inc., a developer of affordable artist spaces, as a consultant to conduct a formal survey of artists needs. The survey asked questions relating to artists’ current living and working information, preferences for live and work spaces, demographics, and respondent’s personal interest in proposed projects. From this survey, city departments are working together to retain existing spaces for artists and to create new ones. Their preference is for spaces that are permanently dedicated to artists through deed restrictions; are located in buffer areas between industrial and residential areas which do not support traditional family housing; and those that offer both live-work and work-only spaces with a local preference. In addition, the BRA has created design guidelines for live-work units, and staffs and supports a certification process to ensure that artists are certified by a panel of peers before they qualify for these units.

Proposed Policy:

Easthampton should conduct more formal analyses of artists needs and to design a program around the results of this survey. Easthampton should hire a consultant to survey artists in the city

34 Boston Redevelopment Authority website: http://www.ci.boston.ma.us/bra/econdev/econdev.asp#13
in order to have accurate data on artists and also to find out what their needs are. From this, more
detailed suggestions could be made as to how the city can help meet the needs of artists.

Many artists in Easthampton feel that within the past several years there has been an
increase in the number of artists in the city. Many of the artists also feel that as Easthampton
markets its arts presence, through the website, that more artists would be drawn to the area. It
would be helpful for all the stakeholders involved if the city were to initiate and maintain a
formal database of artists in the city. It would also be helpful if data was collected on location of
artist studios.

| Policy #2: Adopt an inclusionary zoning ordinance inclusive of artist live-work space (city) |
| Inclusionary zoning requires that developers set aside a certain percentage of new units as affordable. |

Model: Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Chapel Hill has passed an ordinance requiring that 15% of all new units be affordable. An index
of Chapel Hill’s strategies to increase affordable housing is available online through the Town of
Chapel Hill’s Planning Department (CHDOC 2000). There are two basic strategies highlighted on
the webpage: the 15% goal, and alternatives to the 15% goal. Chapel Hill’s comprehensive plan
includes language that supports affordable housing, and indicates that the town government is well-
aware of its affordability problem:

As a general policy, the town should encourage developers of residential
developments of five or more units to 1) provide 15 percent of their units at prices
affordable to low and moderate income households, 2) contribute in-lieu fees, or 3)
propose alternative methods so that the equivalent of 15 percent of the units will be
available and affordable to low and moderate income households (CHDOC, 2000).

The 15% goal passed in March of 2000. The resolution reads,

“…whereas, development proposals regularly come before the Town Council
seeking approval, but without an affordable housing component; now, therefore,
be it resolved by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that it is the expectation
of the Council that applicants seeking approval of rezoning applications containing a residential component will incorporate a “15 percent  affordable” feature into their plans, and that mechanisms will be proposed to assure ongoing affordability of these so-designated dwelling units…(CHDOC, 2000b).”

While the goal of 15% is vague, the language in the resolution indicates that there is an expectation that any rezoning application must include the 15% affordable housing component or else it will not be approved.

However, projects are also approved using alternatives to the 15% goal. These alternatives include contributions of in-lieu fees donated to land trusts or other housing agencies, donations of land, restrictions on dwelling unit size, and sponsorship of a Habitat for Humanity house within Chapel Hill boundaries (CHDOC, 2003).

The problem with Chapel Hill’s inclusionary zoning statute is that it does not include live-work units. If Chapel Hill included live-work units in its resolution, the development community would probably respond by building them.

**Proposed Policy:**

Easthampton is considering passing inclusionary zoning. If passed, the city amendment would require that all new construction include 15% of their units as affordable. The amendment was considered by the city council in 2004, and was rejected. It is going to be up for council review again in 2006. The city should include live-work units under inclusionary zoning requirements.
Policy #3: Create an Arts District (artists/city)

Arts districts can be either informal or formal. An informal arts district is a designation that artists themselves come up with and maintain. The purpose of this district is for artists to market themselves and provide an opportunity for direct sales. A formal arts district is included in a city’s zoning ordinance. It has similar goals as the informal district. One advantage to the formal district is that it must be supported by the city and therefore is representative of an arts community that has support from its jurisdiction.

Models: River District Artists (Asheville, NC) and Worcester Arts District Overlay (Worcester, MA)

Asheville, North Carolina River District Artists (artist-initiated district)

Asheville, North Carolina was mentioned previously as the location of Handmade in America, a regional support structure for the crafts industry. There is a concentration of artists, including craftspeople, in an area known as the River District in downtown Asheville. According to their website, the mission of the River District Artists is to create art, support artists, produce a successful arts event known as the Studio Stroll two times a year, and create a protected environment for artists in the river district area. There are approximately forty artist studios in the district. The River District does not appear to be an official district; however, artists themselves have organized to market their work. Besides having a central location off of which individual artists can link to their personal website, the website features a map of the River District that shows location of artists’ studios and a way to request an individual tour of the district that is fee-based. There is a feedback form, a section for current events, information on available studio space, and guidelines for how to become a district member.35

35 http://www.riverdistrictartists.com/index.asp
**Worcester, Massachusetts Arts District Overlay (zoning district)**

Downtown Worcester, Massachusetts, has an official arts district overlay. It is about .6 miles long. There are eight buildings in the district that are on the National Register of Historic Places, with several others eligible for listing. According to the city website, the district is

…a public/private partnership project intended to revitalize a disinvested area of the City by promoting the reuse of several underutilized and vacant properties that would be suitable for artist live/work space, performance venues, college centers, cafes and eateries, art supply shops, galleries and other creative commercial and retail enterprises. The successful development of the Arts District and the creation of a major destination point for the region is one of the City's seven highest development priorities and is also one of the four major goals of Worcester's cultural community.  

The city’s zoning ordinance says that the purpose of the district is “to promote the health, safety and general welfare of the community, to promote the expansion of commercial art and craft activities as a compatible land use within the [arts overlay district], and to enhance the environment and improve site opportunities for commercial art and craft activities within the… district.” The district permits all allowable uses in the underlying zone. It also allows artists to sell their artwork directly from their studio, regardless of the underlying zone. The code allows flexibility for changes to the interior of buildings in the district. The parking requirements are one space per 1,000 square feet of floor area.

**Proposed Policy:**

An arts district could be created in Easthampton. The purpose of an arts district in Easthampton would be to show support for artists’ endeavors; to draw tourism to the area; and to highlight infrastructure improvements to the streetscape. This arts district could be an informal designation through artists’ own collaborations. The arts district could also be incorporated into the city’s zoning ordinance as an overlay district, designed in a similar fashion as an historic district. In an
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36 [http://www.worcestermass.org/development/artsdistrict.html](http://www.worcestermass.org/development/artsdistrict.html)
37 [http://www.ci.worcester.ma.us/cco/ordinances/ProposedArticleI-VI.pdf](http://www.ci.worcester.ma.us/cco/ordinances/ProposedArticleI-VI.pdf)
38 [http://www.ci.worcester.ma.us/cco/ordinances/ProposedArticleI-VI.pdf](http://www.ci.worcester.ma.us/cco/ordinances/ProposedArticleI-VI.pdf)
overlay district, the base zoning is permitted, but there is incentive for arts uses. These uses could include gallery space, studio space, live-work space, or some combination of the three. In order to provide the carrot for developers to build this space, the planning department could offer additional density allowances. Heights could be controlled by floor area ratios.

Additional requirements could be made of the arts district. Easthampton could allocate a certain percentage of permitting fees to an arts trust fund. This fund could go towards arts-related activities in the district, such as providing public art, maintenance of galleries, or funding arts nights out. Developers, artists who work in the district, business owners and residents (if applicable), could all be part of a volunteer board to determine what public art is displayed.

**Policy #4: Set Aside 1% for Public Art (city)**

The way this program typically is administered is that 1% of chosen city-sponsored capital project budgets are allocated towards art.

**Model: Chapel Hill, North Carolina**

The Chapel Hill Town Council established the town’s percent for art ordinance in March 2002. For selected capital projects, the ordinance budgets 1% for “the creation, fabrication/construction, installation, and maintenance of permanent works of public art.” The funding for projects comes from each project’s construction budget, which may include subsidies from federal, state, county, town, or private sources.

39 Chapel Hill Public Arts Commission Website: [http://www.chapelhillarts.org/programs_percent_ov.php](http://www.chapelhillarts.org/programs_percent_ov.php)
Proposed Policy:

Some artists were proposing a citywide 1% tax for public art. Through investing in public art, Easthampton is showing support for its artists, enhancing the character of its neighborhoods, and investing in its future residents. The policy could have a local preference so that artists living or working in Easthampton would have first priority.

Besides the 1% for capital projects, another possibility for funding public art is through a property tax override, known in Massachusetts as 2.5% override. The override is established to allow municipalities to fund local operations and requires voter approval in order to exceed the annual levy limit. If the override passed, Easthampton could temporarily or permanently increase its local tax revenue and dedicate a particular amount specifically to public art.

Policy #5: Provide incentives to landlords who rent to artists (city)

Cities provide incentives to landlords who rent live-work or studio space to artists.

Model: Peekskill, New York

In conjunction with creation of an arts district in order to develop second floor live-work/studio spaces in its downtown, Peekskill has offered incentives to landlords who renovate their buildings so that they can be used as studio spaces. Landlords are offered tax incentives, grants, façade improvements, and loans to renovate buildings for second floor artist use.

Proposed Policy:

One artist suggested that landlords who rent to artists could be given certain incentives by the city. Easthampton could offer property tax relief to landlords who rent to artists. However, One Cottage Street is owned and managed by Riverside Industries, Inc., a non-profit agency. In this

---

40 http://www.ci.peekskill.ny.us/subpageM.cfm?subPageID=14&mainPageID=2
case, the city could offer other incentives, such as sidewalk improvements, relaxations on parking requirements, or low interest loans to renovate buildings.

**Policy #6: Provide artist for-sale live-work space (condominium or limited equity cooperative) (developers/artists)**

This suggestion is for the private sector. It could be initiated by artists or developers. Though there are many ways to conceptualize co-ownership, I will focus on two of the most common and feasible methods: condominium or limited equity cooperative.

In a condominium ownership structure, a condo owner owns the interior walls of his unit and has a common interest in the exterior of the building as well as any common areas, such as stairs. Each owner has a separate mortgage and there may or may not be a deed restriction on the unit.

In a limited equity cooperative, there are deed restrictions on units. Owners who occupy units do not own the unit but rather own a share of the cooperative’s equity. The “limited equity” is a restriction on the amount that the owner can sell her interest in the cooperative. There is a calculation that allows an owner to receive her original down payment amount plus a calculated appreciation on equity plus any improvements. In this way, the subsidy that one receives upfront is passed on to future owners.

In either case, a building or buildings could be purchased fee simple by one legal entity, which could be an arts group, a developer, or some combination of professionals who all want to engage in this activity. The building could then be converted to a condominium or a cooperative.

**Model: Monohasset Mill Project, Providence, RI**

The Monohassett Mill Project is an adaptive reuse of a 19th century mill located on the outskirts of Providence, Rhode Island. The project was conceived by four individual artists. The mill has been subdivided into 37 condominium units ranging from 1,000-2,500 square feet and ranging in price from $100,000 to $200,000. The mill contains a mix of market rate (75%) and affordable units (25%) and the units also range from housing only, to live-work, to office/studio only. A majority of the units require that the condominium association approve that the owner is an artist.

Eleven of the units are subsidized with $50,000 per unit through the HOME program which carries long-term deed restrictions, ensuring that the units will remain affordable. There is a market rate housing option that is not restricted to artists, though preference is given to art patrons.
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41 Note, deed restrictions that have similar calculations restricting sale prices could be used in conjunction with a condominium structure as well.

42 http://www.live-work.com/revised/lwi/codes/affordable.shtml
and/or community activists. The market rate housing option was necessary in order to make the project financially feasible. State Historic Tax Credits were also used in the development of this mill. The Providence Preservation Society Revolving Fund administers the HOME funds and ensures compliance of State Historic Tax Credit stipulations.\textsuperscript{43} Table 4 lists the sources of funding for the project.

Table 4. Monohasset Mill Project Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loan from Providence Economic Development Partnership</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge loans from Providence Preservation Society Revolving Fund</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence Neighborhood Housing Corporation</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans from Bank of Rhode Island</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private loans from family and friends</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner loans ($75,000 from each of 4 partners)</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Tax Credits</td>
<td>$1.8 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Erik Bright, Personal Communication.

Proposed Policy:

Many artists I spoke with indicated interest in cooperative ownership of studio and/or live-work space. This suggestion is especially relevant for the mill buildings in Easthampton. There is a real opportunity for an institutional organization such as a community development corporation to take the lead in organizing this initiative. There are artists who would be very interested in this kind of space.

\textsuperscript{43} http://www.millproject.org/mission.php
**Policy #7: Adopt a mill tax credit program (state)**

The state could sponsor a state tax credit program that would be specifically intended to support redevelopment of mills. The program would have a similar function as the low income housing tax credit, historic tax credit, or new markets tax credit programs. However, developers could apply for the state mill tax credit in lieu of the state historic tax credit, with additional credits available for the mills.

**Model: State of North Carolina**

In North Carolina, the General Assembly is considering a mill tax credit program. This program would allow owners to receive 30% tax credits in the first year of operation. Other restrictions on the program include:

- The mill must show a minimum of 80% vacancy in the past five years
- Proposed rehabilitation costs must exceed $2 million
- The program piggybacks off the federal tax credit program. No separate approval process is required for the state mill tax credit, besides the actual application itself.
- The state mill tax credit cannot be combined with the state historic tax credit
- The mill must prove a history of industrial use
- The amount of tax credit differs based on a tier system which ranks mills in poorer counties higher than mills in wealthier counties.

The reason for the last requirement of the program is to ensure that a greater incentive exists for redevelopment of mills in lower-income areas. The assumption is that the development community may already be interested in mill redevelopment in downtown areas. This assumption is based on the recent successful redevelopment of downtown mills, such as the American Tobacco Complex in the city of Durham, as well as Carr Mill Mall in Carrboro. Greater subsidy is needed for areas that have weak markets because they are less likely to experience rising rents which would help cover the costs of rehab. The State estimates that there are over 200 mills that would qualify for this credit. Lobbyists of the program are estimating that at least 30 mills will be
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44 Rhode Island is the only known state to have implemented a mill tax credit program.
developed and $260 million of rehabilitation will occur in the two years following implementation of the program.\(^{45}\)

**Proposed Policy:**

If this program were in place in the state of Massachusetts, developers would be more interested in redevelopment of Easthampton mills and would have more financial leverage to pay for rehabilitation costs, which can be very costly.

Since a majority of the artists who work in Easthampton work out of one of three major mills downtown, and since mills or factories nationwide have proven to be excellent working spaces for artists, an incentive program to encourage redevelopment of mills is likely to help artists find spaces to work downtown. This program does not directly address affordability of such spaces. Besides the obvious correlation that if there is more available studio space for artists, then prices are likely to be lower, it is also possible that a developer could pursue both the state mill tax credit as well as other low income housing funding sources.

**Policy #8: Issue an RFP for affordable live-work rental units (city/developers)**

This initiative has the city taking the role in fostering development of affordable live-work units. In this model, units would be developed for-rent with long-term rental restrictions on the units. The city would issue a Request for Proposals for developers to build these units. The city could be a co-partner in development of these units.

**Model: Midway Studios, Boston, Massachusetts**

Though not a city-issued RFP, the Midway Studios development in Boston is a good example of how affordable housing rental subsidies can be used in conjunction with live work spaces. There are a total of 89 studios available for rent, with thirty-six studios deed restricted to incomes less than

\(^{45}\) Source for North Carolina mill tax credit program requirements is Myrick Howard, President of Preservation North Carolina.
than 120% AMI\textsuperscript{46}. Eighteen of the 36% are restricted to incomes less than 50% AMI, 12 units are restricted to incomes less than 80% AMI, and 6 units are restricted to incomes less than 120% of AMI.\textsuperscript{47}

**Proposed Policy:**

A city-issued RFP for affordable live-work or studio space for artists would indicate Easthampton’s support of affordable spaces for artists. The city could also act as a joint partner in developing the building as a way of building confidence in the project as well as offering incentives to developers (less risky if city is partner).

**Policy #9: Hire an arts development officer**

An arts development officer acts as an advocate for the arts as well as an agent of the city whose task it is to market the presence of the arts.

**Model: Civic Arts Coordinator, City of Berkeley, California**

While many cities have city arts commissions or cultural affairs offices, they lack the jurisdiction and visibility of a Civic Arts Coordinator who is employed directly by the city. The following is taken from the job description of the coordinator in Berkeley:

\begin{quote}
... is responsible for the coordination of planning, organizing, and implementation of City-wide art programs and activities and promoting related cultural programs; acting as a liaison with community groups, organizations, other governmental agencies, and businesses to coordinate art programs, on-street programs and activities; coordinating City art programs with other local and regional activities. The Civic Arts Coordinator... has responsibility for program planning, fundraising, budgeting, implementing city-sponsored art programs and supervising staff and volunteers (Zenk, 2005).\textsuperscript{48}
\end{quote}
**Proposed Policy:**

Easthampton could hire an arts development officer. This person would be responsible for promoting the arts in the city and outside of the city through marketing. The arts coordinator would be the point person for the city regarding all arts activities that take place within the city. S/he could also act as an advocate for the arts in city activities, though s/he would not necessarily be charged with coordinating all the various arts organizations or acting as a representative of them all. The diversity of existing and new arts organizations is a healthy process and one that leads to better outcomes. Rather, the point of this position would be to show how much the city values its artists. The staff member could be put in charge of a monthly or bi-weekly arts night out. A regular arts night out is a common feature in many arts communities, including Northampton.

**Evaluating Policy Alternatives**

In order to evaluate these nine policies based on the chosen criteria of effectiveness, efficiency, equity, and administrative, political, and financial feasibility, a ranking system was used. The following table summarizes the policy alternatives proposed and evaluates them based on a chosen scale of 1 to 5, with 5 indicating a high degree of meeting the criteria, and 1 indicating a low degree. Because the ultimate purpose of this research is to evaluate policies that keep artists in Easthampton, I created a separate column for this, which is weighted on a scale of 1-10, allowing for more sensitivity. These ratings reflect my opinions alone. None of my respondents were asked to provide ratings.

As the total score column to the right indicates, it is believed that artist cooperatives or condominiums, the state mill tax credit, and a more formal analysis of artists needs are the best strategies for dealing with the space needs of artists.
Table 5. Evaluation of Proposed Policy Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Policy Alternative</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
<th>Political Feasibility</th>
<th>Financial Feasibility</th>
<th>Keeps Artists in Easthampton</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Analysis of Artist Needs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusionary Zoning, inclusive of artist live-work space</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts District</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% for Public Art</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives to landlords who rent to artists</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist Cooperatives/Condominiums</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State mill tax credit program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP for subsidized rental units</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire Arts Development Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation scores for the proposed policy alternatives ranges from the lowest score of 22 to the highest score of 34. The least effective alternative is to hire an arts development officer, primarily because it seems the least feasible in terms of city resources. While subsidizing units places a burden on city resources, it is a one-time commitment, whereas hiring an arts officer is more long-term. The policies that ranked the highest are those that would be organized mostly by artists and developers (in the case of arts cooperatives), and the state (state mill tax credit program). However, the majority of these suggestions are policies that the city could consider implementing, such as the formal analysis of artist needs, inclusionary zoning, an arts district, 1% for public art program, helping to provide incentives/issuing an RFP for affordable artist space, and hiring an arts development officer. Many of these suggestions received the middle-range score, indicating that while the city may need to put some resources into implementation, there would be moderate to high returns in terms of benefiting artists and keeping them in the city.

The formal analysis of artists needs seems to be appropriate for the city to undertake. In addition to helping the city determine artists’ needs, it would also be valuable to developers who are interested in building spaces for artists’ downtown. Perhaps the city could ask for funding from developers who may stand to benefit from this important document, and thus reduce the financial burden on the city.
Regarding inclusionary zoning, based on conversations with public officials and developers, it is my understanding that the reason why it was rejected is because many leaders in the community feel that Easthampton already is an affordable town. That is, although units are not technically subsidized, the rents are affordable to low- or moderate-income families. Since the majority of Easthampton is already developed or protected, there are not a lot of large developments being proposed. Therefore, for the council to require a small developer to have two of her eight units set aside as affordable is not feasible unless the city agrees to density bonuses or other kinds of trade-offs. The city should also consider that the inclusionary zoning requirement could apply only to developments that have ten or more units.

For the arts district, it is important to acknowledge that the city already has flexible zoning regulations in place for the mills which allow artists to work and live out of them. The purpose of an arts district would have more to do with marketing for artists rather than allowing them to live and work. Since an official arts overlay district would probably not add to the flexibility already allowed in the Mixed-Use/Mill Industrial District, perhaps it is better for artists, developers, and other private market actors to come together themselves to name an “arts district,” similar to the one in Asheville, North Carolina.

The 1% for public art program seems relatively straightforward to implement. One major benefit of this policy is that it is a strong marketing tool. Many people are familiar with the program, which originated in New York City in 1982.49 Since then, many communities have adopted similar programs.

Artist cooperative/condominium spaces ranked high in the matrix. One of the main reasons why is because ownership is the most powerful, direct way to combat gentrification. It places control in the hands of artists themselves. As indicated by artists I interviewed, however, one major drawback is that it can be very time-consuming. In addition, artists are not trained as developers, nor do they necessarily have the kind of capital it takes to invest. This situation

creates a gap that can be filled by an intermediary such as a non-profit or a community
development corporation, which could help to organize artists and to act as developer.

The mill tax credit program is very new to development and there may be some initial
barriers as policymaking is often very time-consuming, especially at the state level. Short of
communicating with state representatives, there is realistically very little that Easthampton
stakeholders could do to initiate the program. Research and analysis needs to be done to see if the
costs to implement the statewide program are offset by the benefits. This research would address,
among other things, how many mills there are in the State of Massachusetts that may qualify for
this program. Given the hurdles of research analysis and consensus building at the state level, this
policy seems unlikely to be implemented, at least in the near-term.

Two of the suggestions are direct subsidies that the city could more easily undertake:
incentives to landlords who rent to artists and the RFP for subsidized rental units. Density
bonuses are already included in Easthampton’s mill district zoning ordinance. The city has
applied for and received grants for sidewalk improvements surrounding the mill buildings. While
other incentives could be considered, such as property tax relief, low interest loans, or relaxations
on parking, it seems that the city already has programs in place to provide incentives to landlords
who rent to artists. The other subsidy suggestion, issuance of an RFP for subsidized rental units,
would be beneficial to the city because it allows the city to control a rental project and to ensure
that it complies with the vision that arts stakeholders have of such a building. A public
announcement of an RFP also draws regional developers who may not otherwise be interested in
developing in Easthampton.

Hiring an arts development officer would be beneficial to the city and to artists because
this person could act as an advocate for all the various arts organizations downtown. However,
the planning department in the city is very small. It seems unlikely that one full-time (or even
part-time) position would be dedicated to the arts over other more pressing needs. It is important
to note that such positions exist in communities that have a significant arts presence. Berkeley,
California was used as an example, and it has a population over 100,000 people. It is doubtful that any community more comparable in size to Easthampton could dedicate a staff person to the arts.

Lastly, there are some equity issues regarding supporting artists. Specifically, why support artists and not nurses, teachers, firefighters? The responses are that artists are an existing asset to this particular city, and the city is in danger of losing this asset. Also, arts provide a clear connection to downtown reinvestment in a way that is unique among many occupations. If one views artists as a particular kind of downtown business as opposed to people in an occupational group, then the link seems clear. Cities provide incentives to specific business-related ventures very often. Stadiums or large retailers are the most obvious examples, but there are others. Lastly, there is a lot of opportunity for artists to give back to cities for this “subsidy.” For example, if artists who work in the arts district are the ones who provide the public art, they may choose to do so at a negotiated cost to the city. The reason why they would negotiate the fee, or perhaps even bid for the project, is that it promotes their own business. In this way, the city benefits by saving money, as does the artist by getting publicity.
Chapter 7

Conclusion

It is my hope that this report will encourage all stakeholders, in particular artists and city officials in the city of Easthampton, to pursue strategies to ensure that artists are able to remain living and/or working in the city. Overall, the city seems to have a positive relationship with the artists who work there. While not unheard of, it is my impression that this is not typical, and it seems to me that the small size of the city, the willingness of city leaders to work with artists, artists who are active in city decision-making, and the geographic proximity between working artists and city hall are all reasons for the positive relationship between the two groups. I believe that these unique characteristics combined mean that the city is in a good position to be able to begin long-range planning for affordable artist space. While this topic has been broached in charrettes and has been expressed as a concern by all parties, to my knowledge no concentrated effort has been put forth to discuss how the problem could be mitigated. This report provides some suggestions that could be considered, as well as a background and framework to help contextualize and evaluate those suggestions.

I have included examples of communities that have considered affordable artist space, such as Asheville, San Francisco, and Providence. However, it was difficult to find more appropriate comparisons of smaller cities that have dealt with the specific topic of affordable space for artists. It is my impression that not many areas with populations less than 20,000 have the same concentration of artists working in the city, especially not in main downtown corridors.
The city is privileged to have this existing base; indeed, many communities are trying to attract artists but have neither a real existing arts community nor thriving mill conversions which show how artists can be accommodated with successful redevelopment.

Both the existence of artists working downtown as well as the mills are incredibly unique and valuable assets. While it is important to consider how the city may best capitalize on these assets in the short-term through marketing, promotion, and overall support, it is equally if not more important to figure out how to preserve these assets. As many artists indicated, they do not want Easthampton to become another Northampton. According to artists, Northampton in the 1980s and 1990s experienced gentrification that forced many artists away from downtown. Artists’ displacement as a result of gentrification is not an unusual story.

Easthampton also has a gritty, down-to-earth quality about it that a lot of its artists value, perhaps partly because it is indicative of a city that is experiencing change, which in turn inspires them in their own artwork. This synergy between residents or businesspeople and the city is the makeup of successful communities. Long-range planning, policy, and advocacy should be given to protecting and preserving that relationship, because as the examples have shown, it will not persevere on its own.
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Table 4. Artistic Concentration Index for the Top 29 U.S. Metro Areas by Employment, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Performing Artists</th>
<th>Visual Artists</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Musicians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY-NJ</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco-Oakland, CA</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA-NH</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County, CA</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, OR-WA</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US AVERAGE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA-NJ</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau-Suffolk, NY</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO-KS</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa-St. Petersburg, FL</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside-San Bernardino, CA</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO-IL</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ann Markusen, Greg Schrock and Martina Cameron. 2006. The Artistic Dividend Revisited: Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, Humphrey Institute, University of Minnesota. Data from Census 2000 5% PUMS dataset, Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample, Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota. The figures index each metro's artists as a share of all employment over the national share.

Source: Markusen, Ann and Amanda Johnson. 2006. p. 21
Appendix B: Interview Questions

1. What do you do for a living?
2. How long have you lived or worked in Easthampton?
3. What is good about Easthampton that makes you stay?
4. What could Easthampton improve on?
5. Do you find it affordable to live here?
6. Have you seen prices (in particular housing prices) change at all since you’ve been here?
7. If so, how have you had to change your trade to accommodate this? Was it easy/hard?
8. What do you think the role of the arts is in a community?
9. Have you ever heard any talk of “promoting the arts for economic development”? If so, what does that mean to you?
10. Do you see people in economic development involved in arts-related activities (and vice versa)
11. What issues do you think are important to planning (economic development, housing) that you don’t see addressed in Easthampton?
12. Is there anything else relevant that you’d like to mention that we haven’t covered?
13. Can you put me in contact with someone else to talk to?

Questions for Public Officials

1. In your opinion, what is the role of public officials in promoting the arts? How effectively are the public officials in Easthampton doing this?
2. How do you feel about having artists in Easthampton? Is it a viable long term economic development strategy?
3. What specific strategies would you support to keep or attract artists to Easthampton?

Questions for Artists

1. What are your biggest challenges as an artist?*
2. What people or organizations do you work with the most in your arts related activities?*
3. When is business “good”?*
4. What if anything do you do besides art to make a living?*
5. Have you lived or worked as an artist anywhere else? (if so, where? Why did you move?) If not, why haven’t you moved?*
Appendix C: Maps

This map, developed for the Manhan Rail Trail, also shows the location of Pleasant Street, Cottage Street, and the bodies of water around which the mills developed, including Lower Mill and Nashawannuck Ponds. Source: http://www.manhanrailtrail.org/img/alan-james-robinson-map.gif
Easthampton, Massachusetts Zoning Map

Map Legend
Zoning Classifications
- Downtown Business
- Highway Business
- Industrial
- Mixed Use/Mill Industrial
- Neighborhood Business
- Residential - Rural B
- Residential - Rural C
- Residential - Suburban A
- Residential - Suburban B
- Residential - Urban
- Residential Rural A

Created by Rachana Purohit, 4/9/2006
Data Source: Easthampton City Planning Department, 2002

Easthampton's Downtown Mixed Use/Mill Industrial District
Includes Pleasant Street and One Cottage Street
Appendix D: Pictures

Sources: Dwyer, Edward. 2000. Easthampton. Arcadia: Charleston, SC (black and white); Rachana Purohit, 2006. (color)

Left, Former West Boylston Mills, currently Eastworks

Right, The Easthampton Rubber Thread Company on Payson Avenue (building now demolished)

Left, The Williston Mills Mill #2 (torn down in 1931)
Left, The Eastworks Building

Below, Eastworks Interior
1st Floor Retail

Below, view of Pleasant Street, looking North
Left, One Cottage Street; Right, One Ferry Street

Left, One Ferry Street; Right, view from One Ferry Street of Lower Mill Pond