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In May 2015, the Housing and Community Development Department of the city of Oakland, California, submitted a request through the National Resource Network’s 311 for Cities asking for information on the main barriers facing the preserving and development of affordable artist housing and workplaces in cities. The city also requested that the network research ways to fund the development of artist housing. The request resulted in a “heavy” 311 response from the Network. The following report was researched, developed and shared with the city by the Network to highlight the challenges and recommendations for the development of artist live/work housing and workspaces.

PURPOSE

Rising housing costs and rising commercial rents, coupled with the influx of people who have been priced out of other parts of the Bay Area, are making it hard for the Oakland artist community to live and work in their own communities. The reality and threat of high cost housing has triggered the gradual relocation of Oakland artist communities to more affordable cities, jeopardizing an essential part of Oakland’s culture and identity. In this paper, the Network will summarize some of the challenges, best practices and solutions in developing affordable artist spaces for Oakland’s new Artists Housing and Workspace Task Force, which was recently established to address this issue. The work thus far is based on online research and interviews completed in June and July 2015.

This report is intended as a preliminary framing of issues only. While the task force continues to convene, this paper will evolve to include more information and recommendations.
BACKGROUND

Artists and makers are contributors to community well-being, and their presence has spurred community economic development and social improvements. As a creative class, they help to preserve and carry on the culture of a city and the fabric of its neighborhoods. Sometimes they are catalysts to jump start revitalization of a neighborhood. In doing so, in certain markets where real estate values increase quickly, some perceive artists to be drivers of displacement – eventually the rising values may even displace the artists themselves. Landlords who are not invested in the mission of the artist community may raise rents as overall housing prices rise in a neighborhood, or sell their buildings, causing displacement of artists who can no longer afford to stay in their units or afford other spaces.

Making deliberate efforts to keep artists in their neighborhoods will preserve some of the heart of those communities when local real estate values increase at a fast pace and outstrip what makers can afford. Therefore, it is important for there to be practical tools and mechanisms that help to preserve the creative culture and help artists and entrepreneurs thrive and contribute to local communities. One of the most effective tools to preserve creative culture is the development of permanently affordable “artist spaces” – live/work artist housing and workspaces.

Rent increases by for-profit building owners is the biggest challenge facing artists in Oakland today. With increasing rents, many artists and makers can no longer afford to live and/or work in their current spaces – sometimes spaces they’ve lived and worked in for decades. Unlike certain residential units, commercial spaces are not protected by rent control laws, and thus artists occupying these spaces have little or no protection against commercial rent increases. It takes a lot of time and effort to seek out and establish a new affordable place to live and work. If these artists leave Oakland in search of more affordable places, it is unlikely they will return. The future development of additional affordable artist spaces will not help this group or prevent them from relocating because they are facing an affordability crisis at this very moment. Interim solutions should be considered and prioritized to triage this displacement issue.
CHALLENGES OF DEVELOPING OF AFFORDABLE ARTIST SPACES

Zoning and Building Codes
Many artist space projects take advantage of adaptive re-use of older, out-of-commission industrial or commercial buildings. Since the early 1990’s, the Oakland Building Code has allowed the conversion of commercial and industrial buildings into artist space while maintaining their commercial use. There are also several zoning definitions of other types of work/live facilities that are residential or mixed-use occupancy that can be allowed in residential districts. However, these rules are often not well understood, and better education is necessary for those applying the codes within the city.

Currently in Oakland, there are thousands of units of artist spaces in buildings and industrial locations that are not in compliance with building and planning codes. These artist spaces provide affordable live/work spaces to the artist community. At the same time, landlords benefit from having rent-paying tenants in buildings that would otherwise be undesirable for residential use. However, these spaces also create challenges and potential disincentives for building owners to voluntarily upgrade these buildings. Even if such buildings are upgraded, landlords may be inclined to pass additional costs to residents through increased rents or to seek market rate tenants, displacing current artist communities. Rent control currently only applies to residential units of a certain date, not to commercial properties.

Perception of Artists as Drivers of Gentrification
There is a perception of artists as a “voluntary poor” community, serving as engines of gentrification and displacement of a neighborhood’s original residents. The so-called “SoHo effect” characterizes such artist-led gentrification as follows:

- First, artists move into buildings and spaces in neighborhoods that are undesirable and thus affordable.

- Then artists generate an influx of cultural and social improvements that help to turn the area into a more vibrant, safer and “cool or hip” neighborhood desirable to more affluent people.

However, as a corollary to this effect, rising popularity and demand also result in rising rent and home prices, making this previously undesirable and affordable area unaffordable for the neighborhood’s “original” residents as well as the artists who moved to the area. Artists once again become displaced and will need to look for other affordable places to live and work. On the policy side, it may also be a challenge to advocate for support of affordable artist spaces. Stakeholders may interpret a unit of affordable housing set aside specifically for artists as one less unit for the homeless people, low-income families and individuals people suffering from mental health illness, etc.
**Political Support**
Without support from political and civic leaders in the community and city, it is very difficult for nonprofits, artist groups, and other mission-oriented stakeholders to gain the momentum needed to undertake the development of affordable artist spaces. Once the development process has started, taking an artist housing project through the regulatory process will be very rigorous. The same barriers that traditional real estate developers face are also present in artist housing developments, sometimes even more so, since artist spaces will likely require special design elements.

**Financial Feasibility**
Well-designed artist spaces can cost more to develop per square foot than typical residential projects due to larger units and accommodations made to suit artists’ work needs. However, rehabilitation of industrial spaces can often be cheaper if they are to remain an industrial or commercial space for art making. Former commercial and industrial spaces could face a combination of high acquisition costs (if the zoning allows other uses such as residential), historical preservation and/or remediation of site and building contamination that will drive up development costs. For rehabilitation and reuse, installation or upgrades to major building systems should also be expected, requiring specialized subcontracts with firms hiring certified carpenters, electricians and members of other building trades. These high costs for acquisition, rehabilitation, and development coupled with the goal of affordability often cause gaps in project development financing. Projects also typically will have low operational cash flow due to lower rents making difficult to obtain and support a permanent loan.

**Who is an Artist?**
Many nonprofits and developers are wary of taking on the development of artist space projects or focusing attention on potential opportunities because there is ambiguity surrounding how an artist is defined and qualified. There are no clear criteria because there are many medium and modes of art forms (fine artists, industrial artists, writers, actors, musicians, makers, etc.) that cannot be easily encompassed by a single set of standards. Further, when an artist space project is developed, this diversity of artists can result in difficulties for creating, managing and clearly communicating tenant criteria and selection (see also “Fair Housing” below).

**Fair Housing**
During the tenant selection process for an artist space development, project owners can specify preferences, including an artist preference that prioritizes available space. However, the selection process has to be extremely transparent, well documented, and may not discriminate against any protected class under the Fair Housing law (race, color religion, national origin, sex disability, and familial status).
**Needs and Demands of the Artists**

The demographics, needs and demands of the artist community are not always clearly understood by the city or the general community, making it difficult to set clear development goals and action steps to maintain affordability. The diversity of artists may create a variety of resident space requirements. Artists may be single people or have partners or children. They may be creators of traditional fine arts or manufactures/makers of local crafts or products. There will also be income disparities within the artist community itself with some members earning very sporadically. In addition to creating difficulties in artist space development programming, these different demands may create unique underwriting challenges.

**TYPES OF HOUSING AND USE**

**Workspace only** – studios or spaces where artists work and make their craft, with no residential component. These are usually commercial or industrial occupancy per building codes.

**Live/Work** – buildings that are used both as residences and as workspaces for occupants.

**Live/Work Structures**

- Single family or duplexes used as live and work spaces. These structures typically provide space for one or two families. In buildings that include a ground floor commercial space, workspaces, commercial or gallery uses could be located, with upper floors used for residential units.

- Multifamily artist spaces can be designed as (1) buildings with self-contained live/work units each fully equipped with bathrooms and kitchens, or (2) buildings with common workspaces and separate living units that share bath and kitchen facilities. These can be considered transitional or group housing occupancies, which can raise additional complications in an approval process.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ARTIST SPACE PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

POLICY AND PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- Create appropriate incentives in order for developers and properties owner to want to undertake an artist space development, or for commercial building owners to be willing to put their property into a land trust for the arts. See Appendix A, “Artspace Development Incentives” for a list of possible incentives.

- Prioritize not only the development of additional affordable artist spaces, but also the retention of its existing creative community by developing policies and interim solutions that will stem the prevailing displacement of artists. If the city focuses only on the development of additional units of artist housing in the future, it could face a gradual loss of its creative class in the interim.

- Make it a policy and priority to preserve and develop affordable artist spaces and incorporate supportive elements for the development of such spaces and the arts into the city’s formal plans to assist in funding availability. This would also help to align the development of artist spaces with the city’s longer term community development and revitalization strategies. Artist studios can be a good interim use of ground floor spaces that are not ready for retail businesses because the market is not strong enough.

- Designate affordable artist spaces as part of a larger housing plan (e.g., Oakland will build 5000 units of affordable housing and 500 will have artist preference) to avoid competing for resources with traditional affordable housing. The city could also use new sources of affordable housing money to fund artist housing (i.e. money that’s come back to the city from redevelopment) to avoid dipping into the existing pool of affordable housing funds.

- Encourage the creation of “Creative Enterprise Zones” or “Arts Districts.” These areas can be incorporated into the city’s plans to support preservation of artist culture and businesses to lessen the SoHo or gentrification effect. These zoning overlays in certain areas can have specific land uses allowances that protect and encourage artist spaces.

- Look beyond a revitalization strategy that includes the development of artist spaces only in low-income or distressed neighborhoods. Some stakeholders may view the development of artist housing in a distressed or low-income neighborhood as leading to displacement of existing residents and changing the demographics of the neighborhood.
• **Ensure that city resources for supporting artists facing displacement** – such as specialists to assist with potential evictions and illegal rent increases, free legal help to assist with landlord/tenant issues (residential and commercial), and staff available to assist with relocation and connections to funding sources – are well known and understood. Create a comprehensive website or other communication tools.

• **Conduct market research and community engagement to inform the project.** To develop a solid plan for artist spaces, the developer and its partners should conduct a market study, similar to those completed in traditional multifamily transactions, to determine feasibility of the project. The market study should focus on the following elements – artist community (size of market, income, demographics, needs, and design requirements), site location (suitability and alignment with community goals), leadership (local and political support), and funding (available financial resources). Through the entire process of planning and market analysis, the project developer should engage representatives from the artist community, civic and community leaders, local residents, nonprofits, and community lending institutions. A list of sample questions to assist in this process can be found in Appendix B.

### Development and Design

**Seek Public/Private Financing**

Artist spaces that are work-only are relatively inexpensive to develop due to the wide range of suitable properties that can be adapted into workspaces. Compared to full artist live/work spaces, pure workspaces generally have a lower level of build-out and required finish, making them less expensive to develop. On the other hand, a full artist space project will typically require a large amount of subsidy when coupled with the goal of affordability. It is essential for such projects to seek out both public subsidy sources and private funding in the form of foundation grants and donations. See “Funding Sources” below and Appendix A for more information.

**Keep Acquisition/Construction Costs Low**

The two biggest drivers of development costs are the costs of acquisition and construction. Below are some suggestions to help keep these costs down in order to maintain affordability.

**Acquisition**

- Select sites that are owned by the city or mission-oriented groups to increase likelihood of a below-market purchase.

- Select sites whose primary uses are declining or no longer relevant, but currently have no alternative re-use options (older manufacturing sites, warehouses); sites that have limited markets because of their unique design (old schools, hotels, government buildings); or sites with exaggerated contamination claims.
Codes
• Educate the city’s building and fire department staff about codes relevant to artist’s work and occupancy. Projects need to find a balance between safety, affordability and practicality. Relaxing the following code standards could help to keep construction costs low: seismic standards, Title 24 (energy code), ADA (accessibility may not be necessary for artist space buildings that will not have walk-in customers or employees).
• Relaxation in change of occupancy requirements could allow for more development of artist spaces in buildings whose primary purpose is not residential

Design
• Plumbing and electrical expenses are huge cost drivers of construction. Developers could design larger, multi-bedroom units with large shared kitchens in the center of the unit that could also serve as communal/gathering places.
• Smaller individual efficiency units that open out onto shared courtyards and gardens, which have easy access to central common workspaces, allow for social interaction, community building and space for work and creativity.

Community Building
For artists, and others who conduct their work from home, a live/work space can be an isolating experience. It is beneficial for artists, the wider community and for the creative process for artist spaces to be designed to be open, accessible, welcoming and conducive for interaction and collaboration. Instead of treating the artist space development as merely a number of units in a building, these development should be viewed through the lens of building a holistic and creative community.

Mixed-Income
It could be beneficial to build and include artist spaces in existing affordable housing developments or to place them in mixed-income developments. Sprinkling artist units and community programming among existing affordable units could help to build community cohesion and encourage interest in the arts. Using a mixed-income model could help bring more opportunities to a community, close project financing gaps and avoid further concentration of low-income households in already poor neighborhoods.
Mixed-Use
The mixed-use model should be considered for the development of affordable artist spaces. Many mixed-use developments are located in industrial-residential zones or older underutilized commercial zones where building codes are more likely to allow for such uses. A mixed-use artist space development could include ground floor artist workspaces, gallery spaces, community rooms and other commercial spaces with upper floors devoted to affordable residential units for artists and other low-income residents. Placing artist workspaces and showcasing their work on the ground floor could serve to activate and revitalize the street and support various community and youth programs. Having commercial space in a mixed-use project could also help with project financing if a reliable tenant could be found to occupy the space.

Community Land Trusts in Supporting Artist Housing or Workspaces
A community land trust (CLT) is a private, nonprofit entity that is created to acquire and hold land for the benefit of a community, securing affordable access to land and housing for its residents or users. CLTs prohibits speculation and helps to preserve long-term affordability.

Interim Artist Spaces
Underutilized and empty ground floor commercial space could be potential options for artist workspaces. Artists could use these spaces for a limited time for below market or no rent, or the city could provide subsidies to cover a portion of the rent as part of a wider “district” or neighborhood revitalization strategy. A change of occupancy issue may arise if the artist wants to use the ground floor commercial space for both living and work uses. However, if the artist residential space is less than 10 percent of the total building square footage, residential code standards may not apply.

OPERATION
Partnerships
To maintain community investment and buy-in, project owners should partner with a well-established and respected, high capacity local arts organization to support and streamline the artist selection process as well as to support the development of programming for the building.
Selection Process
Adopt a broad definition of artist as someone who has a body of work, or is developing a body of work, or someone who can give a demonstration of their work. It is crucial that the selection process does not judge the quality or content of an artist’s work, but rather focuses on the artist’s commitment to their craft and excitement about participating in and contributing positively to the artist community and the surrounding neighborhood. Artist space selection processes should include a standard application, background checks and income qualification processes. A formal selection committee should be established to review and approve applications and to make sure processes adhere to Fair Housing rules. In addition, formal guidelines should be developed for long-term operations of the buildings.

On-site Management
The on-site property manager will need to have experience working with the artist community and understand their needs. Unlike traditional multifamily residents, artists may want to make changes to their units to create more productive workspaces. They may also want to display art in building corridors, decorate common spaces or leave supplies and materials outside of their units. They may use hallways, lobbies and other common areas as work and gathering spaces or work and generate noise at odd hours. Therefore, the building and community rules for an artist space development may differ from that of a traditional multifamily building.

Resident Engagement
Property management should work to engage building residents in programming of the building’s common spaces and galleries to build community and reach out to the surrounding neighborhood. Programming could include art shows, art classes for youth and the general public, open houses, musical performances and tours of artist’s workshops.
KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN AFFORDABLE ARTIST SPACES AND TRADITIONAL AFFORDABLE HOUSING

• Affordable artist spaces could be used to more strategically leverage economic development and business and art district improvements, aligning multiple neighborhood revitalization goals.

• Development of affordable artist spaces may have the ability to bring in additional partners (nonprofit and for-profit partners, investors and private funders) that may not otherwise be involved in traditional affordable housing developments but are invested in the arts.

• Artist space unit design is significantly different from traditional affordable housing units. The layout and design of these live/work units must functionally suit the needs of the artists (bigger units, higher ceilings, freight elevators, concrete floors, etc.). If the affordable artist building is mixed use, other elements such as ground floor workspaces, galleries and performance spaces may also be present.

• Additional sources of philanthropic funding that supports the arts may be available for artist space development.

• Operation and maintenance of artist spaces requires on-site management with experience and an understanding of artist needs and lifestyles.

• Artist spaces will have more official programming in the shared spaces. Common spaces and lobbies in buildings may be used for gallery shows, tours, classes or programs for the general public.

• Underwriting may be more difficult for artist spaces because artist incomes can be more sporadic and unstable.
FUNDING SOURCES

Much like traditional affordable multifamily buildings, funding sources for affordable artist spaces can be broken down as follows:

• **Market rate debt** – Private bank financing

• **Below-market debt** – Community lenders, foundation program-related investments, government loans

• **Equity** – Developer cash, federal/state tax credit, government grants, and individual, foundation and corporate contributions

In addition, many other incentives and funding opportunities may exist to support the creation of artist workspaces. Please see Appendix A for some examples.

PUBLIC SUBSIDIES

Having public subsidies in the deal is essential to fill financing gaps. It is not unusual for more than 50 percent of artist space project financing to come from Low-Income Housing Tax credits. Since many of these developments are adapted from older historic buildings, Historic Preservation Tax Credits are also widely used. Although these two tax credit sources may be available for the same development, their use together can become complicated. Therefore, it is important to select a development partner that has experience blending these two financial resources.

(See page 16 for a table of common public subsidy programs used to fund affordable artist space development.)

PHILANTHROPIC RESOURCES

In places where foundations and supporters of the arts are active, projects should seek grants and contributions from these private sources as an alternative or supplement to below-market debt or public subsidies.
## Common Public Subsidy Programs Used to Fund Affordable Artist Space Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Projects Where Used</th>
<th>Program Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Housing Tax Credit</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Treasury/State Housing Finance Agencies</td>
<td>Spinning Plate Lofts, Tashiro Kaplan, Westfield Lofts, Coral Arts, Cooper School</td>
<td>Affordable housing for households earning less than 60 percent of median income or below (about twice poverty level).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Tax Credit</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Interior</td>
<td>Monahassett Mills, Dreyfus Hotel, Cooper School, Spinning Plate Lofts, Ice House Studios, Coral Arts</td>
<td>Renovation of historic properties; allocated by U.S. Department of Interior; no income requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Preservation Tax Credits</td>
<td>State Departments of Commerce/Economic Development/Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Monahassett Mills, Dreyfus Hotel, Coral Arts</td>
<td>Renovation of historic properties; allocated by State historic preservation offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Program</td>
<td>Federal Home Loan Banks</td>
<td>AS220, Dreyfus Hotel</td>
<td>Affordable housing for households earning less than 80 percent of median income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant Program</td>
<td>Local affordable housing agencies; Pittsburgh URA</td>
<td>Spinning Plate Lofts, PAAI</td>
<td>Affordable housing development for people earning less than 80 percent of median income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant Program</td>
<td>Local economic development agencies; Pittsburgh URA</td>
<td>Ice House Studios</td>
<td>Economic development to create employment for people earning less than 80 percent of median income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME Program</td>
<td>Providence Preservation Society</td>
<td>Monahassett Mills</td>
<td>Rental or homeownership housing development; benefits to various income levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX A:
CREATIVE SPACE DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES/FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

FOR DEVELOPERS/PROPERTY OWNERS

1. Low-interest development loan program or partnership with a private foundation providing PRI funding in the form of low-interest capital loans to developers/property owners who offer long-term affordable spaces for creative businesses and artists.

2. Public Art Percent for art programs that emphasize public use space (galleries, working studios with public hours, theater space, etc.) rather than public art on the project site. Some percent for art programs incentivize through a tiered payment structure (e.g., 2 percent for on-site art or 1 percent into an urban art fund that can be used for public art and public art space in a designated area).

3. Density bonus for inclusion of permanently affordable, live/work space for artists. Developers would include a leasing preference for artists and provide appropriate design. This makes the most sense in a designated arts district or zone.

4. Reduced zoning/building fees or streamlined approval for the inclusion of permanently affordable space for the arts (working, retail, creative office, production space, etc.).

5. A policy that encourages the creation of an artist preference for the affordable units in any 80/20 deals (where at least 20 percent of the units are set aside for lower-income residents) within a designated creative district.

6. One percent sales and use tax for cultural facilities. Such a fund could provide revolving loans, capital improvement grants for tenant build-out, for subsidizing long-term master-leases for creative industries or for providing direct rental subsidy to qualified creative businesses and artist studios leasing in a commercial building. Building owners could be required to provide a rental rate reduction in return for the benefit of a long-term master-lease.

7. Creation of business improvement districts (BIDs) that allocate funding to the creation and preservation of affordable space for creative uses within the district boundaries. Both the RiNo neighborhood of Denver and Lakewood, Colorado, are pursuing this course to address issues of gentrification in their arts neighborhoods.

Incentives may be city-wide or restricted to designated creative or cultural corridors, BIDs, tax increment financing (TIF) districts, etc. There may be broader support for affordable artist housing incentives if they are targeted to designated arts districts, rather than city wide.

Source: Artspace, www.artspace.org
APPENDIX B: FRAMING QUESTIONS FOR THE TASK FORCE TO CONSIDER

Some of the questions below are adapted from The Art of Creative Placemaking: An Artspace Report and Artist Space Financing: Making the Case.

CURRENT ISSUES SCAN

• Who exactly is an artist/maker in Oakland?
• What are the biggest factors driving the displacement of artists in Oakland?
• How does the artist community contribute to the culture and identity of Oakland?
• How does the artist community impact the community and local economy?
• Why should the city and the community care about keeping the creative class in Oakland?
• Why and how should the city prioritize the preservation and development of artist spaces?
• What type of spaces do artists currently need in Oakland (Workspaces? Galleries space? Places to live)?
• What type of spaces can artists actually afford?
• Can there be multiple uses for new artist spaces, such as an ability to rent certain areas or common spaces to generate additional income or to finance the project?
• What type of arts programs and initiatives does Oakland currently support?
• What type of affordable housing programs and initiatives does Oakland currently support?
• What are Oakland’s short- and long-term community redevelopment or revitalization plans and strategies?
• Is there commitment to other issues that can be consistent with or enhanced by artist spaces, such as economic development, building a creative economy, historic preservation?
COMMUNITY
• What are the predominant artist genres of this community?
• What is the size of the artist community that needs affordable space to live and work?
• What are the demographics of that community?
• What percentage of the artists have partners or children?
• What is the income range of these artists?
• What are artists currently paying in rent for live and/or work spaces?
• Are there cultural practitioners and art forms that might stretch the traditional definition of artist?

SITE SELECTION AND PROJECT SOLICITATION
• Does the city have a roster of financially feasible sites that are available or can become available for development?
• Where are the existing buildings and sites in Oakland that are under-utilized with potential for adaptive reuse?
• Are such properties in industrial, mixed-use or residential zones? Are these areas designated for economic development or undergoing planning?
• What is the physical state of potential target sites? Does the property have historic value or historic designation? What level of improvements, modification or rehabilitation will be necessary? Does the property require environmental remediation?
• What are the primary building criteria for obtaining public subsidy for development?
• Are there foundations in Oakland that could be potential investors? Who do they serve? What are their funding priorities and timelines?
• Which partners and investors would be willing to make some sacrifices in return for mission-oriented work?
• Does the city need assistance in crafting clear RFP language with specific criteria to solicit proposals for the development of artist spaces (criteria have to be very clear about the community process)?
LEADERSHIP AND EXPERIENCE

- Is there sufficient political leadership – at the neighborhood, city, county, state and congressional levels – to sustain a project through its inevitable challenges?
- Is there buy-in from community members and partners organizations?
- Are there advocates (artists, politicians, funders, lenders) that see the development of artist housing as a priority?
- Do artists, nonprofits, and for-profit developers, lenders, funders, and city regulatory agencies have experience with artist spaces?
- Is there an experienced organization or individual who can manage this process and bring different stakeholders together?

FUNDING

- Are there financial resources – public, philanthropic, private – to properly capitalize a development?
- What kinds of competition exist for these existing resources?
- Will an investment in artist spaces have sufficient impact to justify the expenses?
- Will it help attract and foster other creative enterprises and entrepreneurs and create secondary impacts to the local economy?
- Will it create opportunities for the surrounding neighborhood and community?
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEWEES AND ONLINE RESOURCES

INTERVIEWEES
Interviews with the following individual helped to identify the challenges and shape the recommendations presented in this report thus far:

Josh Simon, EBALDC
Tom Dolan, Thomas Dolan Architecture
Teri Deaver, Artspace
Hiroko Kurihara, Oakland Makers
Aron Weisner, Enterprise Community Investment
Heather Hood, Enterprise Community Partners
Maryann Leshin, Enterprise Community Partners
Kelley Kahn, City of Oakland

ONLINE RESOURCES
Artist Space Development: Financing
www.urban.org/research/publication/artist-space-development-financing

Artist Space Financing: Making the Case
www.urban.org/research/publication/artist-space-development-making-case

The Art of Creative Placemaking: An Artspace Report