
MEMORANDUM

November 15, 2006

TO: Mayor and Council

CC: City Manager
City Clerk
General Manager, Community Services
General Manager, Parks and Recreation
Naming Rights Steering Committee
Assistant Director, Office of Cultural Affairs

FROM: Managing Director, Cultural Services

SUBJECT: Naming Rights and Commemorative Naming Policies, Civic Community Facilities RTS #05428

This memo addresses issues raised by community and Council members at the City Services and Budgets Committee meeting November 2, 2006, and provides clarification and options for Council's consideration. This memo should be read in conjunction with Council report entitled Naming Rights and Commemorative Naming Policies, Civic Community Facilities, dated September 25, 2006, RTS # 05428.

Corporate Renaming of Existing Civic Facilities:

Issue:

- The proposed policy:
 - Permits individual and commemorative renaming of existing facilities but not corporate renaming;
 - Permits the corporate naming of new cultural and sport facilities, but not the corporate renaming of existing cultural and sport facilities;
 - Does not permit corporate naming or renaming of community social service, childcare or Park Board facilities.
- Two speakers felt that the policy would cause inequity between new and existing facilities.
- One speaker noted that her Board was divided on renaming their neighbourhood house, but spoke personally about wanting to keep all options open to meet future funding needs.

Background:

- Naming rights policies of other Canadian municipalities frequently recognize the community and historical significance of existing names.
- Where renaming is permitted, the benefits are weighed against the cost and impact of changing existing signage, rebuilding community recognition and updating records (i.e. letterhead, databases, promotional materials).

- In very few cases has the corporate renaming of civic social service and/or childcare facilities occurred; municipalities across Canada have seen public resistance to corporate branding of neighbourhood and community-centred resources. Moreover, few corporations have found a satisfactory strategic alignment with these civic facilities, and have not come forth as potential naming entities. As a result of this tentative climate, there have been very few cases of corporate renaming of civic social service and/or childcare facilities.
- Corporate renaming of existing whole buildings is historically rare in Canada. In a recent survey of cultural investments in Canada since 1995, only three of the 55 projects involved corporate renaming.
- The only civic community sport facilities that are not in the care and custody of the Park Board are the Pacific Coliseum, Agrodome and Forum.
- Public opinion was strongly against renaming existing facilities (83% opposed in public opinion survey and 71% opposed in online survey).

Recommendations/Alternative Options:

- In light of their upcoming use as Olympic venues, and the planning process for Hastings Park, staff recommend deferring any consideration of renaming of community sport facilities until after 2010, and then, only in the context of the Hastings Park Master Plan.
- Should Council wish to consider corporate renaming of cultural facilities, the following would need to be added to amend Recommendation A:
 - To permit corporate renaming of existing cultural facilities subject to retaining the existing/historic name and such other terms and conditions as outlined for corporate naming of cultural facilities.

Exterior Signage for Corporate Naming of Interior Components:

Issue:

- Speakers supported permitting exterior signage in recognition of named rooms within buildings.

Background:

- The Sign By-law currently permits an eye-level directory sign to assist in way-finding and room identification but does not permit third-party advertising.
- A corporate name is permitted inside the building, on recognition walls, on posters, tickets, programs and media advertising.

Recommendations/Alternative Options:

- Staff note that most facilities have multiple rooms and an exterior sign for each named room could result in a proliferation of corporate signage on the publicly owned facility.
- Too many exterior corporate signs on a building are considered contrary to the public's desire to avoid the over commercialization of the public realm - particularly on those structures or facilities which were originally paid for by public dollars.
- Staff recommend no change to the policy.
- However, should Council wish to consider additional signage, staff strongly recommend that it be limited to one ancillary sign only to be limited in size. In the event Council wishes to permit signage associated with

corporate naming of interior or exterior components within the building, the following amendment would be required to Recommendation A:

- To consider, as part of a comprehensive sign package, one ancillary exterior sign for the naming or renaming of rooms within or components of facilities but excluding logos or wordmarks.
- Furthermore, should Council wish to consider additional signage, staff note that there may be an increase in staff time to process signage applications.

Corporate Logos:

Issue:

- Several speakers spoke in support of allowing corporate logos in association with corporate naming and renaming of facilities, and supported their placement on interior and exterior components of facilities.

Background:

- Corporate logos in association with interior naming agreements are not the norm in Vancouver and not part of naming packages at the Vancouver Public Library, the YWCA, or the BC Children's Hospital, although the University of British Columbia and Simon Fraser University do consider corporate logos in interior facilities on a case-by-case basis.
- Public opinion was against the use of corporate logos (52% against in public opinion survey and 65% opposed in online survey). The most frequently given explanation (24% of respondents to the 2006 random telephone survey of 529 individuals) was that "logos are advertising/names would be less commercial".

Recommendations/Alternative Options:

- Staff recommend no change noting that if the City permits the use of logos associated with corporate naming of civic facilities or components of facilities, other entities in the fund raising marketplace will also follow suit to ensure equity in offerings - with a resultant increase in the number and location of corporate logos.

Public Opinion Survey required for Corporate Naming:

Issue:

- The proposed policy calls for the City to conduct and pay for a public opinion survey in advance of reporting to Council for the corporate naming of a new cultural or sport facility. The purpose of the poll is to seek public input in advance of Council's consideration to avoid placing Council and the corporation in the position of hearing speakers express non-support in the event there is little or no community support. Speakers felt that a public opinion survey would discourage corporate naming but that negative speakers at a public Council meeting would not.

Background:

- Public opinion inputs noted that "good corporate match" was critical to supporting corporate naming, and that the public should have a say in that decision.
- Public opinion surveys and/or demonstrations of public support are recognized as a best practice for similar naming policies in other municipalities across Canada (i.e. Edmonton, Calgary, Kingston).

- Corporate naming is a relatively rare occurrence. Of the 55 examples of cultural capital investments between 1995 - 2005 for projects over \$3 million in Canada, only 4 involved the corporate naming of an entire facility. Based on that survey staff have estimated 4 to 5 requests - with 4 to 5 associated public opinion surveys - over the coming years.

Recommendations/Alternative Options:

- Should Council wish to remove the requirement for a public opinion poll from the policy, the following would need to be added to amend Recommendation A:
 - To consider a public opinion poll regarding potential corporate naming at the discretion of the City Manager; or
 - To remove the requirement for a public opinion poll regarding potential corporate naming.

Policy vs. Case by Case Consideration:

Issue:

- One speaker expressed a preference to continue the past policy of Council considering requests for naming on a case-by-case basis.
- One speaker spoke in favour of having a policy as it provided guidance to their Board in this complex matter.

Background:

- While Council did have a case-by-case policy from 1997 through 2005, no requests were made, although at least two tenants entered into agreements for naming civic facilities without seeking Council approval.
- Corporate leaders interviewed during the policy development phase urged the City to adopt a Naming Rights policy noting that it provided transparency and clarity to the corporate and philanthropic community as well as to civic tenants. All but one of the 32 stakeholders that were interviewed in 2005 supported the development of a policy.

Recommendations/Alternative Options:

- Staff recommend approval of the policy as outlined in the staff report of September 25, 2006.

Lease Agreements:

Issue:

- A condition of naming a civic community facility is the need to have a signed lease agreement.
- One speaker noted that they had not yet signed their lease and felt that this could impede their ability to enter into a naming agreement.
- Another speaker worried that tenants in amenity bonusing facilities or new construction would not have an agreement until after they had moved in, and therefore would not be able to seek naming partners.

Background:

- The City's community tenants all have either a signed lease, or for those over-holding on an expired lease, have Council-approved lease terms.
- The approval of amenity bonus arrangements and the approval of new lease terms for those facilities occur at the same time. As a result, tenants entering

into new amenity bonus facilities have Council-approved lease terms well in advance of construction.

- Council-approved lease terms do need to be developed into full lease agreements. While executing new leases is a departmental priority, the major impediment is the ability of the parties to reach agreement - not an ability to draft agreements.

Recommendations/Alternative Options:

- Staff recommend no change to the draft policies.

Policy for Non Civic Buildings:

Issue:

- Two speakers felt that the policy should apply to non-civic community buildings.

Background:

- Most community facilities in Vancouver are owned by the City, the Province, or the Federal Government (through CMHC). A few are owned by non-profit societies.

Recommendations/Alternative Options:

- Staff recommend no change, noting that it is outside of City Council's purview to set a naming rights policy for other levels of government, or for private or non-profit land owners.

Park Board Input:

Issue:

- Council wishes to seek advice from the Park Board.


Background:

- Park Board staff have been actively involved in the development of the policy and in the public consultation process. Park Board staff sit on the interdepartmental Steering Committee and Park Board tenants were interviewed and sat as members of the Advisory Committee.

Recommendations/Alternative Options:

- Recommendation C refers the Policy to the Park Board for advice. Staff note that this item has been scheduled for the December 12th Board meeting.

If you have any further questions please feel free to call me at 871-6001, or Christina Medland at 871-6844.



Sue Harvey
Managing Director

Phone: 604.871.6001
Fax: 604.871.6005

SH/jf