Lessons from American City Flag Redesign Efforts

By Ted Kaye

Introduction

Vexillologists generally study flags after their design and adoption. Seldom do we have clear insights into the processes by which flags are designed and adopted. Even less often do we have the opportunity to participate in or influence those processes. However, in recent years a number of municipalities in the United States have redesigned their flags, or adopted flags for the first time. Members of NAVA and other vexillologists have followed closely, and in some cases been part of, the activities surrounding flag design and redesign in the twenty-first century. We have learned much about the considerations—both aesthetic and political—that surround the debate over municipal flag adoption efforts. This article focuses on the lessons that may be drawn from examining recent city flag redesign efforts in the United States.

In 2003, NAVA published American City Flags,1 and followed that by conducting an internet-based survey in which participants rated the design qualities of the 150 flags in the book.2 While subsequent news coverage in nearly every city spurred discussion among the general public, only a handful of governing bodies re-examined their flags, and even fewer actually changed them. In 2006, NAVA published Good Flag, Bad Flag (GFBF)—a summary of commonly accepted principles of flag design—in a redesigned web-friendly and hard-copy format.3 The new edition of GFBF brought the basic “rules” of flag design to a mass audience for the first time.

But in 2015 a TED Talk by radio and podcast host Roman Mars, later posted as a video on the internet, triggered a wave of city flag design and redesign in the United States (and beyond). Titled “Why City Flags May Be the Worst-Designed Thing You’ve Never Noticed”, the talk has been viewed 5 million times.4 In it, Mars describes the basic principles of flag design as presented in Good Flag, Bad Flag; shows examples of successful and unsuccessful city flags; and concludes with a call for cities to improve their flags.

Mars asserts:

There is a scourge of bad flags—and they must be stopped. That is the truth and that is the dare. The first step is to recognize that we have a problem… I’ve seen first-hand what a good city flag can do in the case of Chicago. The marriage of good design and civic pride is something that we need in all places. The best part about municipal flags is that we own them. They are an open-source, publicly owned design language of the community. When they are done well, they are remixable, adaptable, and they are powerful. We could control the branding and graphical imagery of our cities with a good flag, but instead, by having bad flags we don’t use, we cede that territory to sports teams and chambers of commerce and tourism boards… But a great city flag is something that represents a city to its people—and its people to the world at large. And when that flag is a beautiful thing, that connection is a beautiful thing.

As we move more and more into cities, the city flag will become not just a symbol of that city as a place, but also, it could become a symbol of how that city considers design itself, especially today, as the populace is becoming more design-aware. And I think design awareness is at an all-time high. A well-designed flag could be seen as an indicator of how a city considers all of its design systems: its public transit, its parks, its signage. It might seem frivolous, but it’s not.

“In my crusade to make flags of the world more beautiful, many listeners have taken it upon themselves to redesign their flags and look into the feasibility of getting them officially adopted. If you see your city flag and like it, fly it—even if it violates a design rule or two. I don’t care. But if you don’t see your city flag, maybe it doesn’t exist, but maybe it does, and it just sucks, and I dare you to join the effort to try to change that.5

A large number of U.S. cities so far have answered the call issued by Mars.6 Watching, advising, and interacting with those efforts can provide vexillologists a laboratory of flag design and adoption.

After NAVA published the results of its 2001 survey of U.S. and Canadian state, provincial, and territorial flags, I asserted a formula for adoption of state flags which can be adapted to city flags as well. The steps to actually getting a city flag changed to a successful design are:

1. Create public discontent with the flag or enthusiasm for change.
2. Get city government agreement that a change is necessary.
3. Create a process to receive designs.
4. Name a proper committee to judge them.
5. Have the city council vote yes or no.7

Recent experience in U.S. cities bears out the suggestion that this technique is a course of action most likely to result in the enactment of new flag legislation.

Figure 1. The opening frame of the 2015 TED talk by Roman Mars.
Status of Redesign Efforts

As of mid-2017, I had examined about 100 city flag redesign efforts begun in the previous two years. At that time, about half of the cities had flag-design efforts in the idea stage. In a sense, those didn’t count, as they had not found traction for progress. But they show the kind of person who might initiate the process—sometimes a media figure, often a designer or an activist, and sometimes an elected official. These instigators often proposed multiple designs. Of the rest, about a quarter of the cities had active efforts under way, some with the endorsement of the city government and some without. The sponsors were sometimes individuals, new groups, or existing organizations (such as arts commissions, community promotion agencies, or schools), or even departments within the city government. Another quarter had nearly reached the end of a process—selecting a flag design—but had stalled at the finish line. These failed efforts mostly reflected a lack of political groundwork, with minor exceptions. But about half of the cities had new flags adopted.

Lessons Learned

What can vexillologists learn from these efforts, and share with those who are interested in city flags and their redesign?

The most important lesson is that the work is less about flag design than it is about the political process.8 In fact, as NAVA president Peter Ansoff has pithily observed: “Designing the flag is the easy part…”9 While we vexillologists have articulated and publicized basic design principles as they apply to flags, we continue to learn about the pitfalls and best practices in the flag-adoption process. Those have more to do with group decision-making, public relations, political considerations, and democracy.

In fact, Roman Mars observed that some cases of poor city flags are “discouraging enough to make you think that good design and democracy just simply do not go together.”10 It seems that in many cases, a city’s leaders confuse representing the city government with a flag and representing the city as a whole with a flag. The question is, does the flag represent just the city’s government—mayor, council, bureaus, employees—or does it represent the entire city—all of its residents, its institutions, its history? This confusion may explain the predominance of city seals—the ultimate symbol of the city government—on flags.11

When we examine the efforts that have not advanced beyond the idea stage, it appears that it is counterproductive to argue to retire the current flag and to propose a new design at the same time. That is, the decision to change a flag can be undermined by the distraction of considering a new design. So it seems imperative to seek and obtain city agreement to change a flag before advancing any new design.

In fact, nearly all of the stalled efforts omitted the important initial step of lining up political support for flag change. Some campaigners exhibit a naive belief that a good redesign will be self-evident and that once elected officials see it, they will embrace it. Others believe that the weight of public opinion after a design is selected will sway elected officials. But while flag design is an artistic process, flag adoption is clearly a political process.

Common objections to flag change include: the city faces more important issues (why is a city flag important?); we lack resources for new flags (this will cost money); the current flag is part of our history (the designer was a good person); there’s no compelling reason for change (nobody’s complained about this); and, a new flag might be unpopular or non-representative of the city (let’s not stir up a hornet’s nest). Counterarguments to these objections center on: the costs are minimal, especially since most current flags are rarely flown widely; the to-be-retired flag will be honored as part of the city’s history; the new flag can be part of the city’s “brand”—a tool of economic development; and, the flag can inspire civic pride and community cohesion.

Here are twelve lessons to be learned from examining over 100 flag redesign efforts begun between 2015 and 2017, with overlapping vignettes from cities demonstrating the lessons:

1. Advance approval of the concept and process from elected officials greatly increases the likelihood of the successful adoption of a new flag design. Without it, the likelihood of success is significantly lower.

   A widely remarked-upon example of terrible design, the flag of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, certainly deserves an update. Graphic designer Steve Kodis led a long effort, bringing together the city’s design and activist communities. Under the umbrella of “Greater Together”, he connected the organizations AIGA-Wisconsin, Ink to the People, and 89.9 Radio Milwaukee.12

   Greater Together held several community workshops on flag design and drew interest from aldermen and the mayor. After a competition that received 1,006 submissions, five judges narrowed them down to 50 semifinalists and five finalists.13 The judges—three design professionals, a historian, and a vexillologist—made changes in each finalist design. The public rated the finalists on a 0–10 scale; there were over 7,000 responses and some campaigning by the designers. “Sunrise over the Lake” won and was unveiled in a large public event on June 14, 2016. While some Common Council members and the mayor had been supportive, and many people simply call it “the new flag”, it has not yet adopted (recently it came before city council only to be referred to the arts commission). Meanwhile, Kodis has promoted it as the “People’s Flag of Milwaukee”, calling on the citizenry to “contact your alderperson” and posting vector artwork and full specifications (including Pantone numbers) online.

Figure 3. Milwaukee, Wisconsin flag (adopted 1954).

Figure 4. The five finalists in the 2016 competition for Milwaukee, WI, including the winning flag, on right.
2. Although this may be obvious, attempts to create a flag for a city without a flag fare better than efforts to replace an existing flag. (There is one fewer obstacle to overcome.) Because Aberdeen, Washington, had no flag, local resident John Barclay approached the city council in June 2015 to propose the concept. With its encouragement, and the support of the Aberdeen Revitalization Movement (which wrote, “sometimes we chance to happen upon an idea whose time has come”), he created a design and brought it for approval a year later.14 His presentation included a discussion of the basic principles of flag design. The council voted on June 29, 2016, to adopt the flag as the city’s official flag, with one dissenting vote from councilwoman Tawni Andrews, who said the design reminded her of Alvin and the Chipmunks.15

3. It is counterproductive to propose a new design before obtaining agreement to change the current flag. Most efforts that began with asking a city to adopt a single proposed design have not proceeded past the idea stage.

Gabe Re, an art director and graphic designer in Albuquerque, New Mexico, published a pitch for a new flag on his website in 2015.16 He identified the challenges with the current flag (giving it an “F” grade, citing GFBF principles), saying “we can do better”, and proposed an alternative “inspired by the folk art of the American Southwest, the state’s natural landscape, and the red clay of the city’s Rio Grande river”. However, after his initial excitement, he put the effort on hold when he found no enthusiasm from city officials.

4. Providing guidance on flag design principles leads to better designs and stronger winners—nearly all efforts cite the basic principles presented in GFBF.

Columbia, South Carolina, the state capital, had suffered negative flag publicity around the Confederate Battle Flag, which had been removed from the capitol grounds in 2015, so it was eager for positive news. In the spring of 2017, the Columbia Design League (CDL), in partnership with One Columbia for Arts and History, secured city council approval to collect ideas and designs from the public for a new city flag, offering a $2,500 prize.17 Its attractive website asked “Need a Flag Design Crash Course?” and offered the GFBF principles. 547 designs were submitted and a team of nine NAVA members served as judges to narrow them down to ten finalists plus nine alternates.18 Under the leadership of Lee Snelgrove (executive director of One Columbia), the CDL committee removed one of the finalists as too closely resembling the Confederate Battle Flag and substituted another design. It then found that one student submission had been plagiarized from a Kentucky state flag design proposal, so it was removed. The public rated 18 designs on a 0–10 scale during the summer of 2017, and a team of local experts then sent a final proposal to the city council, which has not yet acted. One Columbia functions as the city’s arts commission, making the process semi-official.
5. Organizations can be more successful than individuals acting alone—creating a group to promote flag change, or recruiting existing organizations to sponsor the effort, significantly increases the chances of success. (This is a natural reflection of the political process; it demonstrates to city decision-makers that there is broader support for flag change.) Bellingham, Washington, had no flag, so in early 2016 the Downtown Bellingham Partnership organized an unofficial contest to design one. Brad Lockhart, a popular local graphic designer, created the winning design. Over the apparent opposition of the mayor, he secured the endorsement of the Port of Bellingham and the Nooksack and Lummi Tribal Councils, had the flag flown by dozens of local businesses and hundreds of citizens, and secured 1,200 supporters on Facebook. After a year in limbo, the flag was officially adopted by the city council on April 24, 2017.

6. Involving students advances the cause—whether they drive the effort or are simply assured inclusion in it, their involvement can induce political support.

High school students in Albany, Oregon, learned that their city had no flag. Forming GUAVA (the Greater Unified Albany Vexillological Association) under the guidance of teacher Cole Pouliot, they created a design and took it to the city council, which recommended they conduct a community competition. Albany’s public information officer Marilyn Smith created a page on the city website, which drew media attention and 40 submissions. A review committee of seven community leaders narrowed the field to five finalists, which were then offered on the city’s website, and on ballots at the local library and city hall, for the public to rate. The city council considered all five finalists, and on August 10, 2016, ultimately adopted the design rated most highly by the public—the design originally proposed by GUAVA.

7. Public voting is not always necessary—half of the flags were adopted by city councils without a public consultation or vote, relying instead on committees or the council itself to decide. Dan Dunne, a member of the city council of Liberty Lake, Washington, launched an effort via Facebook in May 2017, coordinated by the Spokane Valley Arts Council, to design a flag for the city and its surrounding community, with a prize of $300. He received 46 entries. The council narrowed them down to 14 semifinalists and asked several designers to make minor changes. It selected three finalists for consideration by a small group of representatives of the essential organizations of the community: the Spokane Valley Fire Department, the Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District, the Central Valley School District, the city government, the Kiwanis Club, the Rotary Club, and the local newspaper the Liberty Lake Splash. On December 18, 2017, the group chose a winner, designed by Rebekah Wilding.

8. Smaller cities seem to have more success. Nearly all of the cities adopting new flags have populations of fewer than 150,000. Perhaps the complexity of politics in larger cities makes flag change more difficult, or maybe there are just more small cities in the universe considered.

Sunnyvale, Texas (population 6,000), had used an unofficial flag for many years until resident Ross Miracle proposed a new design in March 2015. Over the next year he persisted in lobbying city officials to adopt his design. Town government staffers posted it online and polled residents. The town council directed staff to conduct a two-month competition between Miracle’s design and two others that were submitted. With the advice of NAVA member Federico Drews, the town distributed with residents’ utility bills a poll asking citizens’ opinions about the three proposals and the current flag. While 67% voted for the current flag and only 30% favored Miracle’s, after much debate the town council adopted Miracle’s design on July 25, 2016.

9. It helps to consider the process from a public-relations perspective, and to plan a campaign to build public support—first for flag change and then for the design adopted.

South Bend, Indiana, adopted a seal-on-a-bedsheet flag for its centennial in 1965. As part of its sesquicentennial festivities, in late 2015 the organizing group South Bend 150 conducted a contest to redesign the flag. It used coordinated
media outreach, a website, and public events to advance the contest. More than 200 submissions came in, and a flag design committee—consisting of professional designers, marketing professionals, city officials, and SB150 representatives—put forward three finalists for public input. After community input, collected in person and online and totaling over 1,000 comments, the committee produced a composite design integrating elements from all three finalists. The city’s common council adopted the flag on March 14, 2016.29

10. Most contemporary flag-change efforts employ social media to reach, influence, and hear from the public, actively using websites, blogs, Facebook, Twitter, Reddit, scribd, change.org, Straw Poll, and SurveyMonkey.

In Tulsa, Oklahoma, Joey Wignarajah and Jacob Johnson launched a redesign effort, with a timeline that started in November 2016 and planned to finish in June 2017. Local press covered the project’s start extensively as the organizers received city council approval of the process. The concept even drew a humorous editorial cartoon showing “rejected designs”.

With a professional website, snappy videos, and a Facebook campaign funded by local foundations and their own resources, Wignarajah and Johnson received 378 submissions, had an independent panel narrow them down, and then offered three finalists to the public, who voted for two weeks via text message. 51% of the 8,200 votes favored design “B”. One city councilor explored returning to a version of the 1924 flag, until it was pointed out that “TULSA” read on the reverse as “ASLUT”.

Meanwhile, a rival activist based in the United Kingdom seized on the large number of negative Facebook comments about the finalists and conducted his own competition, receiving over 200 entries. He conducted a series of runoffs, and narrowed them down to 20. While the city council so far has balked at changing to the new flag, more than 200 have been distributed and it flies prominently in downtown Tulsa. [Editor’s note: see p. 10 for news of the flag’s adoption in October 2018.]

11. City officials must be prepared for negative reactions (to flag change and to proposed designs). They are often surprised by the volume and magnitude of criticism.

Mayor Matt Powell of Cedar Park, Texas, asked the community in April 2016 to submit designs to replace the city’s flag. Over 250 submissions arrived and were discussed at three public hearings; then a subcommittee of three city council members chose two finalists, from which the full city council selected a winner in September. After the flag was unveiled in a large public event in December 2016, a Facebook-driven public backlash ensued, protesting the lack of a vote by the public and resistance to the barbed-wire imagery. Still, the flag was soon flying at ten city locations, including Veterans Memorial Park, City Hall, the Police Department, the city’s four fire stations, and the city library; the city spent $6,985 for the flags at the city facilities as well as some desktop flags. But the city council quickly took those flags down and sent all 250 original submissions to the city’s Parks, Arts, and Community Enrichment Board, asking it to narrow down the designs in anticipation of a public vote. It selected 16, not including the initial winner. A vote has not yet taken place.

12. The process can take much longer than people expect. (While some efforts have taken as little as two months from start to finish, most take much longer and some have gone on for more than two years.)

Pocatello, Idaho’s civic pride logo was never intended to serve as its flag, which apparently for many years flew only at the municipal sewer plant. Stung by its flag’s rating as the worst in the country in NAVA’s 2004 survey and by the negative publicity spurred by the Roman Mars TED Talk, several community members organized in August 2015 and approached Mayor Brian Blad to ask for change. The flag had also received negative national attention from outlets including CBS Sunday Morning with correspondent Mo Rocca. Logan McDougall, the city’s public information officer, led an effort launched publicly in January 2017 which brought in 709 entries, categorized as Professional, Ages 18+, Ages 13–17, Ages 7–12, and Ages 1–6. The City of Pocatello...
Flag Design Ad Hoc Committee narrowed the submissions to 330, then to 19, making changes to some of them. It presented the final six designs to the public, asking the people to rate them on a scale of 1–10 (actually, a scale of 0.5 to 5.0 stars in increments of one-half). On July 20, 2017, after a public comment period lasting four weeks, the city council adopted the committee’s recommended winning design. The new flag rose officially on September 19, 2017.

**Conclusion**

By examining recent U.S. municipal flag-change efforts, we vexilologists can identify major factors contributing to their success or failure. By documenting these efforts and systematizing our learning, we can contribute to future flag design and adoption efforts in the U.S. and beyond. Just as vexillology helped improve the quality of flag design in recent years by articulating the basic principles of flag design, it can now help improve the success of flag adoption in the coming years by articulating the basic lessons of flag change.
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