



CITY OF VANCOUVER

POLICY REPORT OTHER

Report Date: September 25, 2006
Author: Christina Medland
Phone No.: 604.871.6844
RTS No.: 5428
VanRIMS No.: 01-0500-11
Meeting Date: November 2, 2006

TO: Standing Committee on City Services and Budgets

FROM: Ad Hoc Interdepartmental Steering Committee comprised of the Director of Financial Planning, Director of Civic Theatres, Director of Social Planning, Director of Communications, Director of Corporate Services, Park Board and Managing Director, Cultural Services in consultation with Director of Legal Services

SUBJECT: Naming Rights and Commemorative Naming Policies, Civic Community Facilities

RECOMMENDATION

- A. THAT Council approve the draft *Naming Rights Policy, Civic Community Facilities* governing City-owned/controlled and operated community facilities as well as City-owned/controlled facilities occupied by non-profit community tenants (collectively referred to as “Civic Community Facilities”) as outlined in Appendix A;
- B. THAT Council approve the draft *Commemorative Naming Policy, Civic Community Facilities* governing Civic Community Facilities as outlined in Appendix B;
- C. THAT Council refer the draft *Naming Rights Policy, Civic Community Facilities* and the draft *Commemorative Naming Policy, Civic Community Facilities* (collectively the “Naming Policies”) to the Park Board for consideration;
- D. THAT Council authorize the City Manager to review and approve Naming Rights proposals for the naming of interior and exterior components of Civic Community Facilities in accordance with the Naming Policies;
- E. THAT Council direct staff to withhold enforcement at this time with respect to the existing signage at two Civic Community Facilities which do not meet the terms and conditions set out in the Naming Policies:

- (1) Westcoast Energy Hall at the Orpheum Theatre; and
- (2) Vancity Theatre at the Vancouver International Film Centre

noting that such withholding of enforcement in these two cases does not restrict the City in any way from enforcing the Naming Policies in connection with any other naming requests;

- F. THAT Council authorize the Director of Legal Services to execute on the City's behalf agreements with non-profit tenants for future naming proposals approved by Council and/or the City Manager as provided in the Naming Policies and on such other terms and conditions as are satisfactory to the Director of Legal Services in consultation with the Assistant Director of the Office of Cultural Affairs;
- G. THAT Council thank the members of the Naming Rights Community Advisory Committee for their input and advice in the development of the Naming Rights Policy for Civic Community Facilities; and
- H. THAT Council revoke and rescind any naming rights policies adopted by the City prior to the date of this report relating to the naming of Civic Community Facilities and their interiors.

GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMENTS

The General Managers recommend approval of A through H.

CITY MANAGER'S COMMENTS

The City Manager notes that the granting of naming rights presents both opportunities and challenges in balancing the need to support capital investment in Civic Community Facilities with the public's expressed concern about preserving the public realm.

Many of the City's Civic Community Facilities are operated by non-profit tenants. The proposed Naming Policies set out clear guidelines to aid both the City and its non-profit tenants in their planning processes and to provide Council with a framework for decision-making intended to balance both public and private interests. The City Manager therefore recommends approval.

COUNCIL POLICY

In 1995, the Vancouver Board of Parks and Recreation adopted Sponsorship Guidelines governing corporate participation in programs, events and activities. There were also guidelines put in place for the naming of parks.

In 1996, City Council deferred entering into a major City sponsorship program, pending a review of sponsorship experience through Park Board and Library Board sponsorship initiatives.

In 1997, City Council approved the guiding principles and implementation of a City sponsorship program for revenue generation opportunities and the acquisition of goods and services.

In 1998, Council approved corporate sponsorship for limited components of the street banner program.

In 2003, the Library Board adopted a sponsorship policy including the naming of rooms within library buildings and in 2004, approved related donor recognition guidelines.

In July 2005, Council approved the development of a comprehensive naming rights policy for City-owned buildings, including those operated by the City and those leased to non-profit tenants. Council indicated at that time that it would not consider any proposals for naming of City-owned buildings until a new comprehensive policy was developed. Council also approved naming of rooms within City-owned facilities subject to terms and conditions outlined in the July 4, 2005 Council report.

The Sign-Bylaw restricts the use of third-party advertising, which means sign content that directs attention to products sold or services provided that are not the principal products sold or services provided on the premises at which the sign is located.

The City grants occupation of certain Civic Community Facilities to non-profit tenants at a nominal rent.

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to recommend approval of the Naming Policies which will provide a clear set of guidelines and a decision-making framework for Council and City staff to consider naming requests for Civic Community Facilities. It addresses naming rights where an exchange of monies take place (Naming Rights Policy, Civic Community Facilities) and for naming rights where there is no financial consideration (Commemorative Naming Rights, Civic Community Facilities).

The purpose of the Naming Policies is to balance public and private interests – encouraging philanthropic giving while acknowledging public investments and safeguarding against the commercialization of the public realm – and providing a clear and consistent evaluation framework and approval process for City Council in considering naming requests for City-owned facilities. As such, any revenue from Naming Rights Opportunities would go towards the Tenant or Applicant as outlined in the Policy.

These draft policies were created under the guidance of an interdepartmental Steering Committee comprised of the Director of Financial Planning, Director of Civic Theatres, Director of Social Planning, Director of Communications, Director of Corporate Services, Park Board and chaired by the Managing Director, Cultural Services.

A Community Advisory Committee provided input on the development plan and content of the draft Naming Rights Policy. Additional community consultation was sought through a public opinion survey, public meeting, and an online survey. Inputs have also been sought from key community stakeholders including the corporate community.

The information gathered over the course of the policy development was extensive. When considered together with the 2005 study that preceded this initiative, overall community input was received through personal interviews with 30 stakeholders, an independent public opinion telephone survey of 529 households, meetings with a 26-member Advisory Committee, feedback from an Open House of 150 participants, 370 responses to the Open House/online survey, and feedback from members of the corporate community.

Opinions received have been diverse, strongly held, and often contradictory. While the most recent (online) survey indicated that 59% of respondents *opposed* naming of City-owned facilities, the 2005 public opinion survey indicated 59% *supported* naming.

For those opposed to naming, there was a very strong sentiment to protect public space and keep it free of private interests. The act of naming a public facility by a private entity, in particular a corporate entity, was viewed as a threshold that should not be crossed, symbolizing a loss of control and influence by the public over the public realm.

Those in favour of naming viewed it as a valuable means of encouraging philanthropy and felt that the financial challenges facing most non-profits was such that unless public dollars could cover the full costs of the community facilities' capital requirements, this fund raising tool was essential to their future.

While there was a wide array of strongly held opinions, through the consultation process a convergence of opinion on key areas of concern was revealed. In general, there was agreement that Individual Naming was generally regarded more favourably than Corporate Naming. There was considerable resistance to renaming existing facilities, and there was general discomfort with corporate logos associated with public buildings.

As a result of this process, individual naming of existing and new facilities is recommended while corporate naming is recommended for limited facilities, with no logo presence and limited mostly to interior spaces. The process encourages the applicant to seek stakeholder support and demonstrate a rigorous internal process. The commemorative naming policy is intended to reflect the honour of a significant community contribution and in doing so outlines a process of demonstrated community support.

The draft Naming Policies seek to set out a clear set of guidelines and a framework for decision making which is intended to balance both public and private interests, create opportunities for philanthropy and celebrate community contributions. The proposed policies would not apply to privately owned facilities.

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The City of Vancouver owns an extensive array of community facilities which provide much needed services to its citizens. Some are operated directly by the City; others are made available at nominal rates to non-profit tenants for the provision of public services and programs. Whether operated by the City or the non-profit tenant, these community facilities include community centres, sport facilities, theatres, museums, galleries, gardens, and childcares.

The real estate relationships are complex. They include cases where the City owns and/or leases the land, the building, or a portion of the building. While complex, all these relationships have one thing in common – the City provides its capital resources to the non-profit sector through a nominal lease/licence grant for the purpose of public services and programs.

Many of these facilities were built in the 1950s and 1960s and are now aging and in need of re-investment. Both the City and its non-profit tenants are seeking ways to upgrade these facilities.

As in all cities, finding the financial resources to fund capital reinvestment and expansion to meet growing demands is a challenge. Vancouver has some additional challenges with high real estate prices and relatively little support from senior governments in recent years. This lack of investment has meant that our Civic Community Facilities have not kept up with the tremendous growth and diversity of the community, or the growing demands from residents and visitors.

In Canada, capital costs of community facilities are generally funded through a combination of public and private support. With little senior government investment in recent years, and increasing competition for civic capital, some non-profit organizations have begun to explore Naming Rights as a way to encourage more private sector funding.

Naming Rights in Canada have most commonly been associated with large “lead gifts” from individuals or families towards a major capital campaign. Corporations have also become involved in naming, although to date in Canada, corporate naming represents a relatively small percentage of naming commitments.

Naming is common in the higher education, health and cultural sectors. It is less common in social service, childcare, parks and recreation sectors where commemorative naming, or naming which is not tied to a financial contribution, is more the norm.

While naming can be an attractive tool in garnering private support for community capital projects, there are significant challenges. In Vancouver, the public has a strong sense of ownership of the existing civic facilities, which have been largely financed by taxpayers. There is also a very high level of concern about commercialization of the public realm.

In the context of the 1995 sponsorship policy, Council directed that any naming request be reported to Council on a case-by-case basis. While to date no requests have been received, several non-profit tenants have indicated an interest in obtaining naming rights relating to certain City-owned facilities.

In March 2005, in response to these initiatives, a study was undertaken to research, evaluate and consult with the community to weigh issues and opportunities related to naming. During the course of the study, research was gathered from other cities, stakeholders were consulted through interviews, and public opinion was measured through an independent telephone survey.

In general, in 2005 Vancouver residents tended to support the concept of naming City-owned buildings as a way of raising funds, but their support was contingent on the type of buildings

(e.g. childcare, theatre, etc.), type of sponsor (e.g. corporate, individual) and whether or not the building already had a distinctive name and/or was considered a Vancouver landmark.

In July 2005, Council approved the development of a comprehensive naming rights policy for City-owned buildings, including those operated by the City and those leased to non-profit tenants. Council directed staff to report back within six months after having consulted broadly with the community, sought input from a Community Advisory Committee, and drafted a policy guided by an inter-departmental Steering Committee. Council indicated at that time that it would not consider any proposals for naming of City-owned buildings until a new comprehensive policy was developed. Council also approved naming of rooms within City-owned facilities subject to terms and conditions outlined in the July 4, 2005 Council report.

DISCUSSION

A policy development plan was created to seek input from the public as well as a Community Advisory Committee through a series of meetings. In summary, the policy development process included the following phases:

- Scope
- Research
- Community Advisory Committee
- Public Consultation
- Synthesis and Deliberation
- Draft Policy Writing

Scope

The scope of the policy development plan was framed to include all Civic Community Facilities whether operated by the City or by non-profit tenants.

The Naming Policies are intended to govern facilities which are used for the purposes of the following activities: Cultural, Childcare, Theatres, Galleries, Sport, Recreation, and Gardens.

The Naming Policies are not intended to govern:

- City-owned facilities leased to commercial tenants;
- City core services facilities (eg. City Hall, fire halls, police stations);
- Non-City facilities (eg. BC Place, Scotiabank Dance Centre);
- Non-City facilities which occupy City lands, but where the City does not wholly and currently own the building (eg. YWCA Crabtree Corner, Chinese Cultural Centre);
- Vancouver Public Library facilities;
- Streets;
- Parks; and
- Programs, events, or other kinds of sponsorships.

Further, these policies are intended to be complementary to existing civic policies including:

- Vancouver Public Library: Sponsorship Policy and Donor Recognition Guidelines;
- City of Vancouver: Street Naming Guidelines; and
- Vancouver Park Board: Guidelines for Naming Parks.

Research

While considerable research was commissioned as part of the 2005 planning phase, further information was gathered regarding other cities' and other jurisdictions' naming rights policies. Policies varied widely in their degree of comprehensiveness, but did yield many important considerations for best practices.

Community Advisory Committee

The Naming Rights Community Advisory Committee was formed in March 2006. The mandate of the Advisory Committee was to advise on the naming rights policy development process, review the public inputs, and provide input from members' individual or organizational perspectives. The Community Advisory Committee was not intended to take the place of or fetter broader public opinion or inputs.

The Committee included representation from key areas of interest representing civic community facilities: Park Board non-profit tenants and associations; Social Planning non-profit tenants; Cultural Services non-profit tenants; and people with City-wide corporate and community interests representing a broader public perspective. The list of Advisory Committee members is attached to this report as Appendix C and their Terms of Reference as Appendix D.

Public Consultation

An Open House was held at the Vancouver Public Library, where approximately 150 participants viewed presentation boards that explained about naming rights, and provided feedback on naming options. Questionnaires were also provided onsite, as well as online.

A demographic analysis of the surveys revealed that most Open House/online survey respondents reported an affiliation with a non-profit organization. Staff note that this affiliation may account for some variance from the general public opinion survey of 2005, although key findings are consistent. In summary, the Open House/online survey indicated:

- Opposition to corporate naming with the majority of those opposed indicating strongly opposed;
- More support for individual naming;
- Opposition to renaming of existing facilities;
- Opposition to corporate logos on signage.

In terms of the types of facilities that could potentially be named, there was more acceptance of naming for sports and cultural facilities, and less support for naming of social service, community recreation and childcare facilities.

Many people took the time to submit extensive comments with their survey, which revealed the following strong themes:

For those who favoured naming, there was very strong support for naming as an *honour* for exceptional service, leadership, community involvement, not just for a financial contribution. Many felt that in an ideal world, naming would not be required with governments fully funding non-profits. However, since it is not an ideal world, government should support and not impede non-profits' ability to raise funds.

For those opposed, there was a very strong sentiment to protect public space and keep it free of private interests. It was felt that corporate naming was too much like advertising with the

public realm already inundated with corporate signage and messages. Also, there was a sentiment that corporate naming gives corporations too much control, and that it erodes or degrades public and civic identity.

An executive summary of all the input received through the course of this policy development is attached to his report as Appendix E.

Draft Naming Rights Policy (Policy 1 of 2):

The attached policy (Appendix A) endeavours to balance the concerns that have emerged regarding the naming of public facilities, with the desire to encourage philanthropic giving which can contribute to our community civic infrastructure. The inputs received during the course of the policy development have been diverse, and strongly held. Nevertheless, the major themes identified above have been incorporated into the policy.

The policy provides guidance and a framework specifically for:

- both City-owned and operated as well as City-owned and non-profit operated;
- various types of naming (Individual, Corporate and Community);
- various types of properties (buildings as well as portions of properties including interior and exterior components); and
- various types of use (childcare, sport, recreation and culture).

Generally, the draft policy seeks to enable and encourage individual naming, in keeping with the public’s greater level of acceptance for this type of naming, and the historically higher levels of giving demonstrated by individual naming donors. Corporate naming of buildings is much more restricted, depending on the type of facility; however, the naming of interior rooms within facilities is recommended. In no case would the use of corporate logos be permitted.

The public’s concern with renaming facilities, and potentially losing names of community significance, has been addressed by ensuring that any renaming requests, which are limited to individual naming requests, reflect the historical name of the facility.

In summary, staff recommend that Council consider requests for naming as follows and subject to the terms and conditions outlined in the draft policy. Requests would be subject to a review process and eligibility does not ensure approval. The categories of facilities for 1, 2 and 4 would exclude all facilities in the care and custody of the Park Board.

1. Community Sport Facilities

	Corporate	Individual (incl. Community Orgs.)
New Facilities	Yes	Yes
Renaming	No	Yes
Interior Facility Components	Yes	Yes
Exterior Facility Components	Yes	Yes

2. Cultural Facilities

	Corporate	Individual (incl. Community Orgs.)
New Facilities	Yes	Yes
Renaming	No	Yes
Interior Facility Components	Yes	Yes
Exterior Facility Components	Yes	Yes

3. Park Board Facilities

(including but not limited to community centres, pools, rinks, gardens, conservatories, and tenanted properties. For naming of parks refer to Park Board Policy, “*Naming of Parks*”)

	Corporate	Individual (incl. Community Orgs.)
New Facilities	No	Yes
Renaming	No	Yes
Interior Facility Components	Yes	Yes
Exterior Facility Components	No	Yes

4. Community, Social Services and Childcare Facilities

(including Neighbourhood Houses)

	Corporate	Individual (incl. Community Orgs.)
New Facilities	No	Yes
Renaming	No	Yes
Interior Facility Components	Yes	Yes
Exterior Facility Components	No	Yes

The policy seeks to encourage a process which would commence with an applicant developing an internal naming policy as well as an inventory of naming opportunities in advance of seeking or responding to individual requests. This will vest responsibility with the Applicants for ensuring a good fit between a potential naming opportunity and the organization’s mission, vision and values, and for ensuring stakeholder acceptance. It will also ensure an integrated approach to fund raising for capital infrastructure and endowment campaigns as naming rights is only one of the tools in a successful capital campaign. As a result of research on other policies and application of a policy to maximize opportunities while providing benefits to both the applicant and naming entity, all proceeds from the naming opportunity would go to the Applicant and not the City of Vancouver.

In the case of a request for corporate naming of a facility, the policy calls for the City to commission an independent public opinion survey. This would ensure independent community-based feedback on the acceptability of a potential corporate naming opportunity to a broader City-wide audience.

Finally, the policy recognizes the City’s authority to grant approval for naming of a civic facility and requires Council approval for the naming of any Civic Community Facility. Staff recommend that Council delegate its authority to the City Manager for any request relating to components (interior or exterior) of Civic Community Facilities. In the case of non-profit tenants, the City and non-profit will enter into an agreement to safeguard the City’s interests.

Draft Commemorative Naming Policy (Policy2 of 2):

The purpose of the attached Commemorative Naming Policy (Appendix B) is to provide a consistent framework for consideration and approval of names which honour an individual or community organization. Unlike Individual Naming, commemorative naming is not a transaction in exchange for financial consideration, although in certain cases an individual may be recognised for past philanthropic acts.

Generally, the public was supportive of Commemorative Naming although concerns were raised about renaming existing institutions, in particular where there was a strong community, geographic or historical reference. Proposals to commemoratively rename existing Civic Community Facilities will only be considered under exceptional circumstances.

Generally, the policy sets out a process which requires an applicant to ensure broad community support. Applicants would submit a proposal to recognize significant community contribution which must be well documented and broadly acknowledged and written permission must be obtained from the naming entity (individual or organization). Civic Facilities will be considered by an ad hoc committee appointed by the City Manager and this committee will consider public input through a public meeting with respect to the naming. Interior or Exterior Facility Components will be reported to the City Manager for consideration and decision.

Signage:

Throughout the consultation the public very clearly indicated discomfort and concern with respect to corporate signage in association with public buildings. The Naming Rights Policy seeks to balance the need to recognize corporate donors through the granting of the naming rights, with the public's right to a public realm, including interior public space, free of corporate signage. The draft Naming Rights Policy therefore does not permit the use of corporate logos, trademarks, or wordmarks on any interior or exterior signs. Where the policy does permit corporate naming, the corporate name only could appear on the sign.

Staff note that as proposed in the draft Naming Rights Policy, corporate naming of Civic Community Facilities would be limited to new cultural and sport facilities – a relatively rare occurrence and likely to occur in conjunction with a rezoning where Council could consider appropriate signage proposals and approvals. Each naming proposal will also require amendment of the Sign By-law (including a Public Hearing) on a site specific basis.

Finally, staff note that there are two current Civic Community Facilities which have corporate names relating to the naming of rooms within buildings and which have existing exterior signage. The naming of these rooms would be permitted under the new Policy but the related signage would not. They are:

- Westcoast Energy Hall at the Orpheum Theatre; and
- Vancity Theatre at the Vancouver International Film Centre

Westcoast Energy contributed to the 1982 renovation of the Orpheum Theatre. In exchange, the City granted the right to name the lobby the Westcoast Energy Hall and a sign was erected on Smithe Street.

In 2004, the Vancouver International Film Festival Society entered into an agreement with Vancity Credit Union to name the cinema in the new Vancouver International Film Centre, a City amenity bonus facility. While the City's policy at that time was to report requests for naming to Council on a case-by-case basis, the Society concluded a contract directly and have erected signage on the new civic amenity facility which honours the commitments they made to their donor but which are contrary to the draft policy outlined in this report.

Staff are proposing to withhold enforcement against these two signs, but only on the basis that such withholding of enforcement in these two cases does not restrict the City in any way from enforcing the Naming Policies in connection with any other naming requests.

Olympic and other Major Event Signage Implications

The organizers of more and more large-scale events are wishing to base those events in Vancouver. Access by the organizers to City venues can be critical in the hosting of such events. As part of these arrangements, the City may be required to comply with certain event hosting obligations some of which may involve signage. It is therefore important that any policy with respect to naming not preclude the City's ability to host such events.

In particular, the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games may provide both opportunities and constraints relative to naming and signage. While there may be opportunities to secure a naming sponsor seeking a high profile presence during the Olympic period, the City has certain obligations as a "Host City" to ensure a "clean site" on City-owned or controlled sites which may be potential sites for Olympic related activities (for example rented as part of the Olympic Arts Festival) or which may be located adjacent to an Olympic venue.

Therefore, City staff recommend that as a condition of any City approval of the naming a Civic Community Facility, that all parties be required to agree that for a specific limited time any interior or exterior signage containing a corporate name may be covered up or removed and any named building may be referred to by a generic or pre-naming name only.

FINANCIAL AND PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

Capital:

Adopting these policies may enable and encourage private sector investment in Civic Community Facilities. Approval of these policies does not however guarantee support and continued civic capital investment will be necessary to ensure ongoing services and programs which meet the growing and evolving needs of Vancouverites. Important to note is that while encouraging private investment in these facilities is invaluable and necessary, it may also encourage increased requests for capital and expanded operating support which Council would need to consider in light of all other priorities and demands on the Capital Plan.

Operating:

While it is not possible to estimate the number of requests which may arise as a result of this proposal, staff propose to monitor and report back any incremental administrative costs and resources required to process applications, noting that staff in Park Board, Social Planning and Cultural Services are already fully engaged with our non-profit community tenants involved in capital projects and the incremental time associated with reviewing and reporting naming requests should be manageable within existing resources.

CONCLUSION

The draft Naming Policies seek to set out a clear set of guidelines and a framework for decision making which is intended to balance both public and private interests, create opportunities for philanthropy and celebrate community contributions.

The proposed Naming Rights Policy, Civic Community Facilities is intended to balance public and private interests by encouraging philanthropic giving while acknowledging public investment and safeguarding against commercialization of the public realm; and to encourage both public and private investment in Civic Community Facilities for the citizens of Vancouver for generations to come.

The proposed Commemorative Naming Policy, Civic Community Facilities is intended to provide guidance in initiating and assessing proposals to honour individuals, groups of individuals and community organizations which have made a significant contribution to the community.

* * * * *

City of Vancouver Naming Rights Policy, Civic Community Facilities

1. Preamble

Naming Rights refers to the granting by the owner the right to name a piece of property or portions of a property usually granted in exchange for financial consideration.

Commemorative Naming refers to the naming of a property in honour of outstanding achievement, distinctive service, or significant community contribution.

This policy is intended to cover Naming Rights for Civic Community Facilities. A companion policy, Commemorative Naming Policy, Civic Community Facilities covers requests to name Civic Community Facilities as an honour and generally without financial consideration.

Section 1.01

2. Purpose

- 2.1. The purpose of this Policy is to provide clear guidance regarding Naming Rights for Civic Community Facilities. The goal is to provide a consistent evaluation framework and approval process when considering Naming Proposals for Civic Community Facilities.
- 2.2. This Policy is intended to balance public and private interests by encouraging philanthropic giving while acknowledging public investment in, and ownership of Civic Community Facilities as well as the public realm; and to encourage continued investment in these facilities for the benefit of the citizens of Vancouver for generations to come.

3. Scope

For other policies related to Naming, see Section 4.

3.1. This Policy applies to all Civic Community Facilities (see Definitions in Section 5), including Interior and Exterior Building Components, including those facilities operated directly by the City, and those operated by Non-profit Tenants.

3.2. This Policy does not apply to:

- a) City-owned facilities leased to commercial tenants;
- b) City core services facilities (eg. City Hall, firehalls, police stations);
- c) Non-City facilities (eg. BC Place, Scotiabank Dance Centre);
- d) Non-City facilities which occupy City lands, and where the building is wholly and currently owned by the non-profit tenant (eg. YWCA Crabtree Corner, Chinese Cultural Centre);
- e) Naming of Vancouver Public Library facilities (See Section 4);
- f) Naming of streets (See Section 4);
- g) Naming of parks (See Section 4); and
- i) Naming of programs, events, or other kinds of sponsorships.

4. Other Related Naming Policies

Related Civic Naming policies include:

- a) City of Vancouver: Commemorative Naming Policy;
- b) Vancouver Public Library: Sponsorship Policy and Donor Recognition Guidelines;
- c) City of Vancouver: Street Naming Guidelines; and
- d) Vancouver Park Board: Guidelines for Naming Parks.

5. Definitions

5.1. **Applicant:** either a civic department, in the case of City-operated facilities, or a Non-profit Tenant, which makes a formal Proposal to the City to name all or portions of a Civic Community Facility.

5.2. **Approval Agreement:** an agreement between the City and a Non-profit Tenant outlining the terms and conditions of approval in granting Naming Rights.

- 5.3. **Civic Community Facility:** any property, complex, structure, building or portion thereof owned or controlled (e.g. through longterm lease) by the City of Vancouver but excluding properties identified in Section 3.2.
- 5.4. **Commemorative Naming:** Naming Rights granted to honour outstanding achievement, distinctive service, or significant community contribution. Commemorative Naming will not be tied to a financial contribution.
- 5.5. **Community Sport Facilities:** any Civic Community Facility used primarily for sporting activities, programs or services, but excluding those in the care and custody of the Park Board.
- 5.6. **Corporate Naming:** Naming Rights granted to a corporation or a corporate foundation, negotiated for a specific fee.
- 5.7. **Cultural Facility:** any Civic Community Facility used primarily for the purpose of arts and cultural activities, programs or services but excluding those in the care and custody of the Park Board and/or operated by the Vancouver Public Library.
- 5.8. **Designated City Staff:** for the purpose of administering this Policy, the City Manager will designate a staff person in the relevant City department.
- 5.9. **Exterior Facility Components:** all ancillary structures, and all exterior components of a Civic Community Facility which are visually accessible from the public realm, including, but not limited to, plazas, courtyards, squares, gardens, lawns, playing fields, playgrounds.
- 5.10. **Individual and Community Organization Naming:** Naming Rights granted to an individual, group of individuals, family foundation, or a non-profit community organization in recognition of significant philanthropy.
- 5.11. **Interior Facility Components:** all substantial interior components of a Civic Community Facility, including, but not limited to, wings, halls, auditoriums, galleries, lounges, lobbies, and program rooms, etc.

- 5.12. **Logo:** a combination of characters and/or graphics used to identify a company or organization, including a symbol, wordmark, or trademark.
- 5.13. **Market Valuation:** a current assessment of the potential value within the marketplace of the Naming Rights for a specific property.
- 5.14. **Naming Rights Agreement:** a legal contract outlining the terms of the agreement between the Applicant and Naming Entity.
- 5.15. **Naming Entity:** The entity (eg. corporation, community organization or individual) to whom Naming Rights are granted pursuant to a Naming Rights Agreement.
- 5.16. **Naming Rights:** the right to name or rename a piece of property, or parts of a property granted in exchange for financial considerations.
- 5.17. **Non-profit Tenant:** a Non-profit organization occupying a Civic Community Facility through an Occupation Agreement.
- 5.18. **Occupation Agreement:** the lease, sublease, licence, sublicense, management and/or operating agreement which grants a Non-profit Tenant the right to use and occupy a Civic Community Facility or a portion thereof.
- 5.19. **Park Board Facility:** Any Civic Community Facility under the care and custody of the Park Board, including but not limited to community centres, pools, rinks, gardens, conservatories, and tenanted properties.
- 5.20. **Proposal:** the proposal by an Applicant to the City with respect to Naming Rights.
- 5.21. **Public Realm:** Publicly owned streets, sidewalks, rights-of-ways, parks and other publicly accessible or visually accessible open spaces.
- 5.22. **Renaming:** a change of name of a piece of property which already has a name whether geographic, commemorative or historic.

5.23. Social Services and Childcare Facility: any Civic Community Facility used primarily for the purpose of social, community, and childcare programs or services but excluding those in the care and custody of the Park Board.

6. General Principles

- 6.1. The granting of Naming Rights is intended to support and promote investment in Civic Community Facilities that provide important services to citizens.
- 6.2. Naming Rights may be granted under the terms and conditions outlined in this Policy as recognition for financial contributions from Naming Entities, where these contributions result in significant and direct benefits to the community.
- 6.3. A Naming Rights Agreement may not compromise the City's or a Non-profit Tenant's ability to carry out its functions fully and impartially.
- 6.4. Neither the City nor its Non-profit Tenant may relinquish any aspect of its right to manage and control a Civic Community Facility through a Naming Rights Agreement.
- 6.5. The granting of Naming Rights will not entitle a Naming Entity to preferential treatment by the City outside of the Naming Rights Agreement.
- 6.6. The approval of Naming Rights is not intended to replace other grant or support programs to Non-profit Tenants.
- 6.7. A Naming Rights Agreement must not conflict with the terms and conditions of any existing Occupation Agreement between the City and a Non-profit Tenant, and/or between the City and a head-landlord.
- 6.8. Established names of facilities contribute significantly to historic continuity, community identity and pride.

- 6.9. Naming Rights recognition will be compatible with the physical attributes of a location.
- 6.10. Naming Rights opportunities are intended to benefit the Applicant in the provision of significant and direct benefits to the community.
- 6.11. The approval of Naming Rights will not result in additional costs for the City, excluding the City's approval process.
- 6.12. The authority to grant Naming Rights rests with Council or its designate.
- 6.13. The City will not pursue Naming Rights with respect to a Civic Community Facility fully occupied by a Non-profit Tenant.
- 6.14. In multi-tenanted buildings, Proposals for Naming Civic Community Facilities, Exterior Facility Components or common areas will only be considered if all the Tenants support the Proposal and their support is documented to the City's satisfaction.

7. Guidelines

- 7.1. The granting of Naming Rights will be considered for the following categories of Civic Community Facilities, noting approval will be subject to the application process outlined in section 7:

a) Community Sport Facilities	Corporate	Individual
i. New	Yes	Yes
ii. Renaming	No	Yes
iii. Interior Facility Components	Yes	Yes
iv. Exterior Facility Components	Yes	Yes

b) Cultural Facilities		Corporate	Individual
i.	New	Yes	Yes
ii.	Renaming	No	Yes
iii.	Interior Facility Components	Yes	Yes
iv.	Exterior Facility Components	Yes	Yes
c) Park Board Facilities		Corporate	Individual
i.	New	No	Yes
ii.	Renaming	No	Yes
iii.	Interior Facility Components	Yes	Yes
iv.	Exterior Facility Components	No	Yes
d) Social Services, Childcare		Corporate	Individual
i.	New	No	Yes
ii.	Renaming	No	Yes
iii.	Interior Facility Components	Yes	Yes
iv.	Exterior Facility Components	No	Yes

7.2. Any Applicant seeking approval of the granting of Naming Rights must first establish an internal Policy related to the sale of Naming Rights which has been approved by its Board of Directors, or in the case of civic departments and Boards, by the City Manager or General Managers of Boards.

7.3. Any Non-profit Tenant seeking approval for Naming Rights must have a current signed Occupation Agreement in place with the City, and must be in full compliance with that Agreement, to the satisfaction of the City.

- 7.4. City Council or its designate shall have the authority to either grant or refuse any Proposal to name Civic Community Facilities or any portion thereof.
- 7.5. The City will only consider Proposals directly from an Applicant.
- 7.6. The City shall evaluate Corporate Naming Proposals according to the following criteria:
 - a. An assessment of the Proposal against the Applicant's mission, vision and values.
 - b. A Naming Entity's products, services and business practices shall not contradict, to the extent reasonably ascertainable, the mandate, policies or objectives of the City, including the City's Ethical Purchasing Policy.
 - c. The Naming Entity's products, services and business practices shall conform to all applicable federal, provincial or municipal statutes, to the extent reasonably ascertainable.
- 7.7. The City shall evaluate Individual and Community Organization Naming Proposals according to the following criteria:
 - a. An assessment of the Proposal against the Applicant's mission, vision and values
 - b. The Naming Entity should have a direct relationship with the Applicant
 - c. If the Naming Entity is a non-profit community society, the Naming Entity must be a registered charitable society in good standing under the BC Societies Act.
 - d. If the Naming Entity is a non-profit community society, an assessment of the compatibility of the Naming Entity's and Applicant's mission, vision and values.
- 7.8. Logos will not be permitted on any signage relating to Naming Rights save and except for the Applicant's logo.
- 7.9. Signage and acknowledgement associated with Naming Rights must comply with all applicable laws and by-laws, and must be approved in advance by the City.
- 7.10. Naming of a Civic Community Facility should include the purpose of the facility (eg. The ABC Performing Arts Centre as opposed to The ABC Centre).

- 7.11. Renaming of Civic Community Facilities must reflect the historic name.
- 7.12. All Naming Rights Agreements will be for a fixed term, not to extend beyond the term of the Occupation Agreement.
- 7.13. If a Naming Rights Proposal is approved by Council or its designate, an Approval Agreement will be executed between the City and the Non-profit Tenant authorizing the Non-Profit Tenant to grant Naming Rights to the Naming Entity under terms and conditions to the satisfaction of the City's Legal Department.
- 7.14. The City will endeavour, to the extent reasonably practicable, to balance its responsibility to maintain transparent processes and provide full disclosure to the public, with its responsibility to maintain confidentiality regarding third party interests.

8. Application Process

- 8.1. For all Naming requests (Civic Community Facilities, Interior and Exterior Facility Components), the Applicant will provide the Designated City/Board Staff with advance written notice of its intention to pursue Naming Rights, along with a copy of the Applicant's Naming Rights Policy which has been approved by the Applicant's Board of Directors, or in the case of a City operated facility, by the City Manager.
- 8.2. Designated City/Board Staff will review the Applicant's Naming Rights Policy to determine if it meets the intent of this Policy.
- 8.3. Applicants will make a Proposal and will provide to the Designated City Staff all relevant materials including:
- a) Capital campaign plan including case for support, and comprehensive list of naming opportunities;
 - b) Current market valuation of the proposed Naming opportunity completed by an independent fundraising professional;
 - c) Proposed Naming Rights fee;

- d) Proposed term of Naming Agreement;
- e) Proposed rights and benefits;
- f) Demonstrated support from key stakeholders (eg. members, users, donors, funders);
- g) Intended use of funds (eg. capital, endowment, capital reserve plans);
- h) Draft signage and acknowledgement plan;
- i) In the case of a multi-Tenanted Civic Community Facility, letters of support and approval from all other Tenants or occupants of the Civic Community Facility; and
- j) Draft Naming Rights Agreement.

8.4. Designated City staff will review the Proposal and prepare a report.

8.5. For Corporate Naming Proposals for an entire Civic Community Facility, the City will commission and pay for an independent public opinion survey. Survey wording will be developed in non-binding consultation with the Applicant. A minimum approval rate of 50% of those surveyed will be required for the Proposal to be submitted to Council for consideration.

8.6. If the Naming request is associated with a heritage building, the Designated City Staff will seek the advice of the City's Heritage Commission.

8.7. Naming Proposals for Civic Community Facilities which comply with this Policy will be reported to City Council or its designate for consideration and decision.

8.8. Naming Proposals for Interior and/or Exterior Facility Components of a Civic Community Facility which comply with this Policy will be reported to the City Manager for consideration and decision.

9. Roles & Responsibilities

9.1. The City Manager will:

- i. Designate a City staff person in the appropriate City departments who will:
 - a) Act as the primary liaison for Naming Rights requests;
 - b) Provide information to the Applicant on the interpretation of this Policy;
 - c) Evaluate the extent to which this Policy's guidelines have been met in the Proposal;
 - d) Facilitate timely communication;
 - e) Protect the confidentiality of Naming Rights Agreements to the extent practicably possible;
 - f) Facilitate and pay for an independent public opinion survey where required;
 - g) Review all Naming Rights Agreements to ensure that the City's interests are adequately protected;
 - h) Seek advice from the City's Advisory Committees, if appropriate;
 - i) Seek advice from the City's Legal Services Department regarding the proposed Naming Rights Agreement; and
 - j) Report to the City Manager, City Council or its designate as appropriate.
 - ii. Maintain a registry of all Occupation Agreements, Naming Rights Agreements, Commemorative Naming Agreements and Approval Agreements.
 - iii. Consider and respond to all requests for Naming of Interior Facility Components and Exterior Facility Components based on this Policy.
- 9.2. City Council will consider Naming Proposals for Civic Community Facilities based on this Policy.
- 9.3. An Applicant will:
- a) Develop a Naming Rights Policy to be approved by its Board of Directors, or in the case of City-operated Civic Community Facilities, by the City Manager;
 - b) Undertake due diligence to ensure all Proposals meet the spirit, intent, guidelines and procedures outlined in this Policy;
 - c) Provide the Designated City Staff with the necessary documentation and information as outlined in this Policy;
 - d) Execute a Naming Rights Agreement as outlined in this Policy;

- e) Execute an Approval Agreement as outlined in this Policy;
- f) Maintain regular communication with Designated City Staff throughout the process; and
- g) Assume any costs associated with the Naming of a Civic Community Facility or any portion thereof, with the exception of a public opinion survey where required.

10. Naming Rights Agreement

10.1. Naming Rights Agreements will be in the form of a legal contract between the Applicant and Naming Entity and should contain:

- a) A description of the contractual relationship, specifying the exact nature of the agreement;
- b) The term of agreement;
- c) Renewal options, if any;
- d) Value assessment, including cash, in-kind goods and services (and method of evaluating in-kind contributions);
- e) Payment schedule;
- f) Any commissions to be paid, accompanied by a payment schedule;
- g) Rights and benefits;
- h) Agreement to remove or cover signage for a limited period and only during an event where the City has a legal obligation to ensure sites are free of corporate signage, (eg. any Olympic-related event);
- i) Release, indemnification and early termination clauses;
- j) Insurance clauses; and
- k) Confidentiality terms.

10.2. All Naming Rights Agreements shall be reviewed to the satisfaction of the City's Director of Legal Services.

11. Approval Agreement

11.1. Approval Agreements shall be in the form of a legal contract between the City and a Non-profit Tenant and contain any terms and conditions of Council's or its

designate's approval in granting Naming Rights, and shall be to the satisfaction of the City's Director of Legal Services.

City of Vancouver Commemorative Naming Policy Civic Community Facilities

1. Preamble

Commemorative Naming refers to the naming of a property in honour of outstanding achievement, distinctive service, or significant community contribution, generally without financial consideration. Naming Rights refers to the granting by the owner the right to name a piece of property or portions of a property usually granted in exchange for financial consideration.

This policy is intended to cover Commemorative Naming for Civic Community Facilities. A companion policy, Naming Rights, Civic Community Facilities covers requests to name Civic Community Facilities in exchange for financial consideration.

2. Purpose

- 2.1. The purpose of this policy is to provide clear guidance regarding Commemorative Naming of Civic Community Facilities. The goal is to provide a consistent evaluation framework and approval process when considering Commemorative Naming proposals for Civic Community Facilities.

3. Scope

For other policies related to Naming, see Section 4.

- 3.1. This policy applies to all Civic Community Facilities (see Definitions in Section 5), including Interior and Exterior Building Components, including those facilities operated directly by the City, and those operated by Non-profit Tenants.
- 3.2. This policy does not apply to:
 - a) City-owned facilities leased to commercial tenants;

- b) City core services facilities (eg. City Hall, firehalls, police stations);
- c) Non-City facilities (eg. BC Place, Scotiabank Dance Centre);
- d) Non-City facilities which occupy City lands, and where the building is wholly and currently owned by the non-profit tenant (eg. YWCA Crabtree Corner, Chinese Cultural Centre);
- e) Naming of Vancouver Public Library facilities (See Section 4);
- f) Naming of streets (See Section 4);
- g) Naming of parks (See Section 4); and
- h) Naming of programs or events.

4. Other Related Naming Policies

- 4.1. Related Civic Naming policies include:
 - a) City of Vancouver: Naming Rights Policy for Civic Community Facilities;
 - b) Vancouver Public Library: Sponsorship Policy and Donor Recognition Guidelines;
 - c) City of Vancouver: Street Naming Guidelines; and
 - d) Vancouver Park Board: Guidelines for Naming Parks.

5. Definitions

- 5.1. **Applicant:** either a civic department, in the case of City-operated facilities, or a Non-profit Tenant, which makes a formal Proposal to the City for the Commemorative Naming of all or portions of a Civic Community Facility.
- 5.2. **Approval Agreement:** an agreement between the City and a Non-profit Tenant outlining the terms and conditions of approval in granting Commemorative Naming Rights to a Naming Entity.
- 5.3. **Civic Community Facility:** any property, complex, structure, building or portion thereof owned or controlled by the City of Vancouver but excluding properties identified in Section 3.2.

- 5.4. **Commemorative Naming Rights:** Naming Rights granted to honour outstanding achievement, distinctive service, or significant community contribution. Commemorative Naming will not be tied to a financial contribution.
- 5.5. **Commemorative Naming Rights Agreement:** a legal contract outlining the terms of the agreement between the Applicant and Naming Entity.
- 5.6. **Commemorative Naming Committee:** an ad hoc committee comprised of community representatives from Civic advisory groups, community foundations, and/or community organizations.
- 5.7. **Designated City Staff:** for the purpose of administering this policy, the City Manager will designate a staff person in the relevant City department.
- 5.8. **Exterior Facility Components:** all ancillary structures, and all exterior components of a Civic Community Facility which are visually accessible from the public realm, including, but not limited to, plazas, courtyards, squares, gardens, lawns, playing fields, playgrounds.
- 5.9. **Interior Facility Components:** all substantial interior components of a Civic Community Facility, including, but not limited to, wings, halls, auditoriums, galleries, lounges, lobbies, and program rooms, etc.
- 5.10. **Logo:** a combination of characters and/or graphics used to identify a company or organization, including a symbol, wordmark, or trademark.
- 5.11. **Naming Entity:** The entity (eg. community organization or individual) to whom Naming Rights are granted pursuant to a Commemorative Naming Agreement.
- 5.12. **Non-profit Tenant:** a non-profit organization occupying a Civic Community Facility through an Occupation Agreement.

5.13. Occupation Agreement: the lease, sublease, licence, sublicense, management and/or operating agreement which grants a Non-profit Tenant the right to use and occupy a Civic Community Facility or a portion thereof.

5.14. Proposal: the proposal by an Applicant to the City with respect to Commemorative Naming Rights.

5.15. Renaming: a change of name to a piece of property which already has a name whether geographic, commemorative or historic.

6. General Principles

6.1. Commemorative Naming Rights may be granted under the terms and conditions outlined in this Policy in recognition of individuals, groups of individuals and/or community organizations which have made a significant contribution.

6.2. A Commemorative Naming Rights Agreement may not compromise the City's or a Non-profit Tenant's ability to carry out its functions fully and impartially.

6.3. Neither the City nor its Non-profit Tenant may relinquish any aspect of its right to manage and control a Civic Community Facility through a Commemorative Naming Rights Agreement.

6.4. The granting of Commemorative Naming Rights will not entitle a Naming Entity to preferential treatment by the City outside of the Commemorative Naming Rights Agreement.

6.5. A Commemorative Naming Rights Agreement must not conflict with the terms and conditions of any existing Occupation Agreement between the City and a Non-profit Tenant, and/or between the City and a head-landlord.

6.6. Established names of facilities contribute significantly to historic continuity, community identity and pride.

- 6.7. Commemorative Naming recognition will be compatible with the physical attributes of a location.
- 6.8. The approval of Commemorative Naming Rights will not result in additional costs for the City.
- 6.9. Any cost associated with Commemorative naming will be the responsibility of the Applicant.
- 6.10. The City will not pursue Commemorative Naming Rights with respect to a Civic Community Facility fully occupied by a Non-profit Tenant.
- 6.11. The authority to grant Commemorative Naming Rights rests with Council or its designate.
- 6.12. In multi-tenanted buildings, Proposals for Naming Civic Community Facilities, Exterior Facility Components or common areas will only be considered if all the Tenants support the Proposal and their support is documented to the City's satisfaction.

7. Guidelines

- 7.1. Any citizen, group of citizens, entity or organization may submit a proposal to an Applicant to name a Civic Community Facility and Exterior/Interior Facility Components after an individual, group of individuals, or community organization to honour and recognize significant contributions to the community through public service, community volunteerism or outstanding achievement.
- 7.2. The contributions of the individuals or group must be well documented and broadly acknowledged within the community.

- 7.3. To the extent possible, a direct relationship should exist between the Naming Entity and the Applicant.
- 7.4. If the name proposed to be bestowed is that of an elected official or civil servant, they must be retired from public service to be eligible.
- 7.5. Written permission and agreement must be obtained from the individual, group or organization who or which is being commemorated, or their legal representative, prior to consideration.
- 7.6. Commemorative Names which reflect or imply a reference to any of the following will not be eligible:
 - a) Elected officials currently in office;
 - b) Commemorative Names which do not meet criteria outlined in this Policy;
 - c) Commemorative Names which are inconsistent with the mission, vision or values of the City of Vancouver.
- 7.7. Proposals to commemoratively rename existing Civic Community Facilities will only be considered in exceptional circumstances. Existing names will not be changed without consideration of:
 - a) The historical significance of the existing name;
 - b) The impact on the individual or organization associated with the existing name;
and
 - c) The cost and impact of changing existing signage, rebuilding community recognition and updating records.
- 7.8. Commemorative naming requests for Civic Facilities will be considered by an ad hoc Commemorative Naming Committee appointed by the City Manager.
Commemorative naming requests for Interior or Exterior Facility Components will be reported to the City Manager for consideration and decision.
- 7.9. If a Proposal is approved by Council or its designate, an Approval Agreement will be executed between the City and the Non-profit Tenant authorizing the Non-Profit

Tenant to grant Commemorative Naming Rights to the Naming Entity under terms and conditions to the satisfaction of the City's Director of Legal Services.

- 7.10. The City will endeavour, to the extent reasonably practicable, to balance its responsibility to maintain transparent processes and provide full disclosure to the public, with its responsibility to maintain confidentiality regarding third party interests.

8. Application Process

- 8.1. The Applicant will provide the Designated City Staff with written notice of any inquiry from the community related to Commemorative Naming whether approved or not by the Applicant's Board of Directors, or in the case of a City operated facility, by the City Manager.
- 8.2. For all Commemorative Naming requests, the Applicant shall submit a written Proposal including at a minimum:
- a) Documentation verifying that the person/organization being honoured is in agreement with the Proposal (if they are living), or by their legal representative should they be deceased;
 - b) Background information and/or biographical information demonstrating that the proposed name is of significance to the community;
 - c) Documentation including letters of support for the Naming.
 - d) In the case of a multi-tenanted civic community facility, letters of support and approval from all other tenants or occupants of the civic community facility.
- 8.3. Designated City Staff will review the Proposal to determine if it meets the intent of this Policy.

- 8.4. If a Proposal for a Civic Community Facility is associated with a heritage building, the Designated City Staff person will seek the advice of the City's Heritage Commission.
- 8.5. If the Proposal for a Civic Community Facility is found to be in compliance with this Policy, staff will submit the Proposal, as well as a report and recommendation to the Commemorative Naming Committee.
- 8.6. When considering the naming of Civic Community Facility, the Commemorative Naming Committee shall hold at least one advertised public meeting in the vicinity of the relevant Civic Community Facility to hear public input with respect to the Proposal.
- 8.7. A notice of intent to consider Commemorative Naming of a Civic Community Facility shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation. The notice shall indicate the location of the facility, any historical significance of the property or facility, and inform the public of the time, date and place of the public meeting.
- 8.8. Prior to making a final recommendation, the Commemorative Naming Committee shall fully investigate the Proposal, and shall consider compliance with this policy and any other factor the Committee deems relevant. A recommendation for approval shall require an affirmative vote of a majority plus one of the total Commemorative Naming Committee membership.
- 8.9. The Commemorative Naming Committee shall complete its review process within 90 days of its establishment and report its recommendation to City Council, and disband when Council action is taken to accept or reject the recommendation of the Committee.
- 8.10. City Council or its designate will consider a report to name a Civic Community Facility by the Designated City Staff as well as the Committee recommendation prior to making its decision.

9. Roles & Responsibilities

9.1. The City Manager will:

- i. Designate a City staff person in the appropriate City departments who will:
 - a) Act as the primary liaison for Commemorative Naming requests;
 - b) Provide information to the Applicant on the interpretation of this Policy;
 - c) Evaluate the extent to which this Policy's guidelines have been met in the Proposal;
 - d) Facilitate timely communication;
 - e) Protect the confidentiality of Commemorative Naming Agreements to the extent practicably possible;
 - f) Review all Commemorative Naming Agreements to ensure that the City's interests are adequately protected;
 - g) Seek advice from the City's Advisory Committees, if appropriate;
 - h) Seek advice from the City's Legal Services Department regarding the proposed Commemorative Naming Agreement;
 - i) Report to the City Manager, City Council or its designate as appropriate;
 - j) Convene and provide support to the Commemorative Naming Committee for a Civic Community Facility.
- ii. Maintain a registry of all Occupation Agreements, Naming Rights Agreements, Commemorative Naming Agreements and Approval Agreements.
- iii. Consider all Proposals for Commemorative Naming of Interior Facility Components and Exterior Facility Components based on this Policy.

9.2. City Council will consider Commemorative Naming Proposals for Civic Community Facilities based on this Policy.

9.3. An Applicant will:

- a) Consider and report any request from the community for Commemorative Naming to its Board of Directors, or in the case of City-operated Civic Community Facilities, the City Manager for approval or rejection;
- b) Undertake due diligence to ensure all Proposals meet the spirit, intent, guidelines and procedures outlined in this Policy;
- c) Provide the Designated City Staff with the necessary documentation and information as outlined in this Policy;
- d) Execute a Commemorative Naming Rights Agreement as outlined in this Policy;
- e) Execute an Approval Agreement as outlined in this Policy;
- f) Maintain regular communication with Designated City Staff throughout the process; and
- g) Assume any costs associated with the Commemorative Naming of a Civic Community Facility or any portion thereof including the cost of any public meetings.

10. Commemorative Naming Rights Agreement

10.1. Commemorative Naming Rights Agreements will be in the form of a legal contract between the Applicant and Naming Entity and should contain:

- a) A description of the contractual relationship, specifying the exact nature of the agreement;
- b) Rights and benefits;
- c) Agreement to remove or cover signage for a limited period and only during an event where the City has a legal obligation to ensure sites are free of corporate signage, (eg. any Olympic-related event);
- d) Release, indemnification and early termination clauses;
- e) Insurance clauses; and
- f) Confidentiality terms.

10.2. All Commemorative Naming Rights Agreements for Civic Community Facilities shall be reviewed to the satisfaction of the City's Director of Legal Services.

11. Approval Agreement

11.1. Approval Agreements shall be in the form of a legal contract between the City and a Non-profit Tenant and contain any terms and conditions of Council's approval in granting Commemorative Naming Rights and shall be to the satisfaction of the City's Director of Legal Services.

Naming Rights Advisory Committee

Anthony Abrahams
Jerry Adams
Lance Berelowitz
Kathleen Bigsby
Joel Bronstein
Hank Bull
Mary Butterfield
Dr. Stephen Drance
Dr. Godwin Eni
Alan Franey
Shelley Frost
Kate Gibson
Robert Haines
Linda Harmon
Nancy Knight
Paul Larocque
Robert Lemon
Duncan Low
Susan Low
Heather Redfern
Donald Shumka
Ken Thompson
Patricia Thomson
Faye Wightman
Arthur Willms

Naming Rights Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

1. The Advisory Committee (AC) will provide advice to the Steering Committee on the public consultation process, as well as the content related to the development of a comprehensive policy for Naming Rights for City-owned facilities, for City Council's consideration.
2. The Advisory Committee will represent as broad a range of interests as possible. Therefore the purpose of the AC is to bring together a spectrum of interests and perspectives on the issue in order to provide the fullest input into the development of new policy.
3. This Committee is not intended to replace or fetter broader community input into the content of the policy. There will be an opportunity for other members of the community to provide input through an Open House forum and other mechanisms.
4. The Committee will meet approximately four times - generally about once every two weeks.
5. It will provide input and advice during each meeting. It will also receive input from the general community through an Open House forum and other mechanisms.
6. Every attempt will be made to provide advance material for timely consideration before each meeting.
7. Meetings will be chaired by Sue Harvey and/or Christina Medland of the City's Cultural Services department. Meetings will be coordinated by Barb Martineau, Project Coordinator, and minutes will be distributed as soon as possible after each meeting.
8. Meetings will be held late in the afternoons or evenings - the time to be determined by the majority of the Committee at the first meeting, and will include refreshments.
9. The AC does not have to come to consensus on any issue. Different advice from different members will be valuable to the process. However, if there is broad-based agreement on content issues, that agreement will be noted and will be even more helpful to the process.
10. Opportunities within the process for individual input by stakeholder groups will be sought and will be welcome. The AC is not meant to replace, limit or fetter in any way input to the content of the project provided individually by any one stakeholder group or individual. Any input received from a member of the AC between AC meetings will be treated as input from an individual or stakeholder group instead of input discussed and submitted at AC meetings.
11. Individual contributions by Committee members and all information received through participation on the Committee will be considered confidential.

Executive Summary of Inputs

1. Interviews with Key Stakeholders (2005)

Confidential interviews were conducted with 30 key stakeholders from non-profit organizations, community and corporate leaders, and City representatives. This group was knowledgeable on the topic of naming rights, and provided insight on the issues. Of the 30 interviewed, 19 were either actively pursuing naming opportunities or wanted to leave the door open to the possibility.

Key interview findings were:

- 67% supported the position to sell naming rights while 23% opposed;
- 90% of interviewees indicated support for naming new buildings while the majority were opposed to renaming existing facilities;
- Almost all interviewees felt more favourably towards commemorative naming vs. corporate naming

Interviewees recommended the development of guidelines and standards to ensure clarity, simplicity, equity, consistency, creativity and flexibility to protect the integrity of the public space.

2. Public Opinion Survey (2005)

A random telephone survey of 529 Vancouver residents was conducted by the Mustel Group. Generally, the public opinion survey indicated that:

- 59% supported the position to sell naming rights while 35% opposed;
- Those who supported cited the sale of naming rights as an effective means to raise funds and reduce pressure on non-profit organizations and the City;
- Those opposed viewed the practice as too commercial, too much like advertising and cited concern about corporate influence or involvement;
- The public was most resistant to renaming of buildings;
- The public tended to disagree with allowing corporate logos on buildings;

In summary, Vancouver residents tended to support the concept of naming City-owned buildings as a way to raise funds, but their support was contingent on the types of buildings and sponsors being considered, and whether or not the building already had a distinctive name or was considered a Vancouver landmark.

The public tended to support naming sport venues, recreational facilities/community centres, and community or social service centres. They were also more receptive to commemorative names than to corporate names.

3. Open House (2006)

An Open House was held on the concourse of the Vancouver Public Library in April 2006, where approximately 150 participants viewed presentation boards that explained about naming rights, and sought feedback on hypothetical examples of named facilities. Questionnaires were also provided onsite, closely modeled on the 2005 public opinion survey,

modified somewhat to probe further on corporate versus individual naming. 70 people filled out questionnaires onsite.

4. Online Survey (2006)

The same survey duplicating the Open House questionnaire was made available for three days, to capture comments from people who were not able to attend the Open House; an additional 300 people responded to the online survey.

Survey Findings

A demographic analysis revealed that 53% of survey respondents (or 85% of those that responded to the question), reported an affiliation with a non-profit organization. This was likely due to the fact that the survey was promoted through the non-profit community, and many organizations encouraged their membership to respond. As well, many responses were likely prompted by the extensive media coverage surrounding the Open House.

Major findings of the Open House/online survey included:

- opposition to corporate naming (64% opposed versus 33% in favour); the majority of those opposed were strongly opposed;
- less discomfort with individual naming (51% opposed versus 48% in favour). The opposition to individual naming was not as extreme as for corporate naming;
- opposition to renaming of existing facilities (71% opposed versus 26% in favour);
- opposition to corporate logos on exterior signage (72% opposed vs. 25% in favour);
- overall, 59% of respondents were opposed to naming of City-owned facilities, while 35% supported.

In terms of the types of facilities that could potentially be named, there was more acceptance of naming for sports/recreational and cultural facilities, and less support for naming of social service/childcare facilities.

Many people took the time to submit extensive comments with their survey, which revealed the following strong themes:

For those who favoured naming, there was very strong support for naming as an *honour* for exceptional service, leadership, or community involvement, not just for a financial contribution. A common sentiment was that in an ideal world, naming would not be required, but in reality, non-profits did not really have any choice. If governments are not willing to adequately fund non-profits, they must not hamper their ability to raise money.

For those opposed, there was a very strong sentiment to protect public space and keep it free of private interests; public spaces need to be non-partisan. Corporate naming is too much like advertising, we are inundated enough already. Also, there was a sentiment that corporate naming gives corporations too much control, and that it erodes or degrades our civic identity.

If corporate naming were to be allowed, ethical guidelines should exist to screen companies. Signage must also be tasteful and discreet, in keeping with the style of architecture and the surrounding area.

5. Advisory Committee: Online Survey

Members of the Advisory Committee also filled out the Open House/online survey.
Key findings were:

The majority supported naming (70% in support of corporate naming; 90% in support of individual naming);

There was general support for naming of all types of facilities, except corporate naming for social service/childcare and parks/gardens;

The majority did not support renaming a facility, though naming of new facilities was strongly supported;

The committee was more in favour of corporate names only on buildings, as opposed to logos;
Most opinion were influenced by the type of sponsoring corporation.