

December 21, 2006

VIA EMAIL or fax (82 pages)

**ADDENDUM NO. 7****REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. 9103-06-7316  
CLOSING: 12 NOON (LOCAL TIME), January 31, 2007****For Co-ordinated Street Furniture Program**

Please refer to the above Request for Proposal (RFP) document in your possession and be advised of the following:

**A. Revisions:**

1) **Refer to Section 5.3, Sub-Section 3(b) “Website Renderings”, Page 42 and replace with the following:**

b) Website Renderings

One (1) set of letter sized artistic drawings depicting the various street furniture elements **with a separate set of letter sized text descriptions of the renderings** must be provided and will be posted on the City’s website for public viewing. **The artistic renderings should be submitted as high resolution jpegs (300 ppi).**

2) **Refer to Section 5.2 (e) “Proposal Documentation and Delivery”, page 39 of the RFP and replace with the following:**

e) Must consist of **one (1) bound original** (clearly marked as such on its first page) and **ten (10) unbound** full photocopies of:

3) **Refer to Section 3.16, 4th bullet point from the bottom (page 29) and replace with the following:**

- post a readily visible notice on each street furniture element or cluster of elements indicating that the Successful Vendor is responsible for the maintenance and cleaning of the element and provide a current and operative 24-hour telephone number that is TTY capable **and e-mail address** to be used by the public to report an element which requires cleaning or maintenance, and the Successful Vendor will respond to such complaints within twenty four (24) hours;

4) **Refer to Section 3.9.6 (page 22), under the heading “Design” and add the following bullet:**

- contain an automated safety feature to prevent automated cleaning from activating while a user is still inside the facility;

5) **Refer to Section 3.4 “Functionality and Design Quality”, second paragraph, top of page 11 and replace with the following:**

The specifications outlined in this RFP are based on universal design principles. This approach seeks to create designs that are usable by all people to the greatest extent possible without the need for adaptation or specialized design. Accessibility of street furniture elements for persons with disabilities, the very young and the elderly are of utmost priority. **All street furniture must comply with the City’s Accessibility Design Guidelines.**

**B. Questions and Answers:**

Q1 Does the City of Toronto have any official colors that are used for public works, letterhead, etc?

A1 **The City Logo can be used in three official colours which are City Blue (pantone 647), Black or White.**

Q2 Due to the various business disruptions and family distractions during the holiday season from mid-December to early January, will the City please reconsider the response given to Question 1 in Addendum 4 and grant a short extension to the RFP closing date by 3 weeks (to January 31, 2006)?

A2 **As per Addendum No. 5, issued on December 5, 2006 extending the closing date to January 24, 2007 and further extended as per Addendum #6, issued on December 7, 2006, the closing date for this RFP has been extended to January 31, 2007.**

Q3 Please confirm that any future street furniture element(s), that may be considered from any third party outside of the scope of the RFP during the term of the agreement on the City's right-of-way, parks, parking facilities, or any other City property will NOT be permitted to contain any advertising?

A3 **The City is prepared to restrict any other advertising on public highways as set out in the RFP. Staff have no authority in the context of this RFP process to make such a commitment in respect of parks, parking facilities or any other City property, nor has the City been required to make such a commitment in respect of any of the existing contracts respecting these installations.**

Q4 This RFP calls for a total of 25,640 individual elements. At the same time, the advertising is limited to 198,200 sq ft and the maximum size of the advertising is 4ft X 6ft (1.22m by 1.83m). This means a maximum of 8,258 elements can have advertising on it, assuming that 100% of the advertising is of the 4X6 variety (and since the vendor will seek to maximize revenue, the larger advertising format will be utilized most often).

The result of this is that approximately 17,382 elements will be required but will have no revenue attached to them. They will be pure cost centres requiring great capital investment and on-going maintenance throughout the life of the asset.

The standard the city sets out in this RFP for quality and standards of maintenance are commendable and comparable with the best in the world. But the number of elements and the capital and operating costs associated with them is extremely high - too high, in fact, to make a sustainable business model.

In light of this, would the city accept a bid as compliant that offers fewer elements than requested and/or a lower MAG than expected, but maintains standards for design and maintenance?

A4 **The submission must be compliant with the mandatory requirements set out in the RFP. We assume that MAG refers to the “Minimum Annual Guarantee Payable to the City”. The RFP does not establish a minimum level for this figure.**

Q5 Would the City consider amending the RFP to reduce the number of elements it seeks? If the City does amend, would the City consider offering an extension beyond January 10th for the bidders to prepare a renewed bid with fewer elements?

In order for our firm to make the January 10th, 2007 RFP deadline we must sign-off on written materials intended for formal publication and binding by December 6 (this is due to seasonal holidays and vendor shut-downs during the holiday season). As such, we would not be able to make use of responses to the December 4th question deadline, including quite possibly addendums with significant impact. As such, and in benefit of the City's requirements, we would ask for a minimum RFP extension of Two (2) weeks. Further, in order for the requested extension to be useful we would ask that the City reply by December 5, 2006, in electronic format.

- A5 **There was clear consensus through the industry consultation prior to issuance of the RFP that a comprehensive scope was the appropriate way for the City to achieve its stated objectives for this program. The request to reduce the number of elements seems inconsistent with the previous industry advice. As per Addendum No. 6, issued on December 7, 2006 the closing date for this RFP has been extended to January 31, 2007.**
- Q6 Does the City require the financial offering to be included under separate cover or envelope?
- A6 **No, this does not have to be included under separate cover. Please refer to Section A2 of this Addendum for minor revisions respecting proposal submissions.**
- Q7 Can the City provide an example of a “narrow” shelter?
- A7 **A current example of a narrow shelter installed within the public right of way may be found at the north east corner of University Avenue and Queen Street West**
- Q8 How will the City evaluate additional items, values or services not specifically requested within the RFP?
- A8 **Additional items, values or services may be considered and, subject to the approval of City Council, included in the scope of any final agreement but will not, under the terms of the RFP, be included in the evaluation or form the basis for a recommendation to award the contract.**
- Q9 Fairness has been an integral part of this RFP process. Can the City explain the rationale of removing the Lobbyist Disclosure Statement as part of the submission requirements?
- A9 **The Lobbyist Disclosure Policy was rescinded by City Council at its meeting of September 25, 26 and 27, 2006 when it approved staff Report No. 6, Clause 6 of the Administration Committee, titled “Amend and Repeal Various Purchasing Policies”.**
- Q10 What was the total value of Taxes levied upon the existing Transit Shelter concession for a recent year (preferably, within the last 1-3 years)?

In section 5.3.8, page 46, the RFP says that the successful vendor will pay all business/realty taxes. What are the business/realty taxes applicable to each type of street furniture? How are these taxes calculated?

Taxes on advertising: Addendum 4, A4, states that taxes are not collected on various items of street furniture. The City of Toronto Act empowers the city to levy new taxes, including a tax on billboards. What mechanisms do city staff have in mind to insulate the successful vendor from paying taxes on billboards on its coordinated street furniture?

- A10 **Under the municipal property tax system applicable in the City of Toronto and Province of Ontario, a provincial government corporation, Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), assesses property that is liable for taxation pursuant to the provincial Assessment Act. Property taxes (which encompass business/realty tax as used in the RFP) would only be payable on street furniture where it has been determined that such furniture is subject to assessment.**

**To date MPAC has not identified assessment attributable to street furniture as these items are located in the City's street allowance; with one exception. Transit shelters located only within the boundaries of the pre-amalgamation City of Toronto have been assessed by MPAC. There is currently one assessment parcel for the aggregate value of these shelters. Property taxes payable are calculated based on the Current Value Assessment (CVA) and the tax classification established by MPAC for the street furniture, and the applicable tax rate for the property class. MPAC is responsible for determining the method by which street furniture is assessed.**

**According to City records, the Current Value Assessment (CVA) of this parcel (on which property taxes are based) for the 2006 taxation year was 5,932,000 (Commercial tax class) and the commercial class tax rate for 2006 is 4.0634348%. The CVA for the 2005 taxation year was also 5,932,000 (Commercial tax class) and the commercial class tax rate for 2005 was 4.5089525%.**

**As indicated, property taxes may only be levied where property has deemed to be liable for taxation by MPAC under the provincial Assessment Act. While the new City of Toronto Act confers broader authority on the City to impose new taxes, Council has not at this time indicated an intention to levy new taxes on billboards. In any event, the City does not consider the advertising elements that may be advanced under the co-ordinated street furniture program to be billboards and would be willing to consider provisions in the agreement with the Successful Vendor in this regard.**

- Q11 As there have been so many "replacement" clauses and terms as provided by the City, can the City provide a "clean" RFP draft with all required changes to avoid potential confusion or inadvertent error?

- A11 **No, this is not a standard practice in the City's procurement process.**

Q12 Are there more specific details, other than what it contained in the RFP, pertaining to handling or shipping that the City would like addressed in advance of delivery of Materials including modeling (example, shipping bays, etc) to purchasing?

A12 **For Vendors wishing to use the loading dock at Toronto City Hall, the entrance is located at the corner of Armoury Street and Chestnut Street and is available for deliveries between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. local time, Monday to Friday. Alternatively, Vendors may enter Toronto City Hall via one of the other public entrances to the facility.**

**Elevator access is available from the loading dock to the 18th floor, West Tower, Monday to Friday, between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. local time.**

**Vendors will be responsible for delivering their submission from the loading dock to the 18th floor, West Tower by the closing date and time of Wednesday, January 31, 2007 at 12 Noon (local time).**

**Please note that the maximum doorway clearance on the 18th floor, West Tower is 32" wide x 82" high.**

Q13 The City does not specify certain furniture elements that directly impact upon costing. Specifically, how many Multipublication "A" units are required in 4, 8 or 12 sizings? How many Multipublication "B" units will be required to accommodate 2, 4, 8 or larger sizings? How many shelters in narrow or canopy style will be required?

A13 **The RFP makes no reference to accommodating two (2) or four (4) publications. The parameters for these elements are set out in Section 3.9.4 of the RFP. Vendors can complete their assessments based on the numbers set out in this section. The City has provided the current transit shelter inventory but cannot provide the detail requested at this time.**

Q14 Our architects have been reviewing the 4 sites provided by the City for modeling purposes. The placement of the furniture at these sites is in error of measurement ranging from 10' to 40'. This being the case, is the measurement of sidewalk widths and building faces represented accurately? Can the City provide accurate drawings of the 4 proposed sites?

A14 **Representation of existing furniture (shown dotted on the drawings) is intended to indicate approximate locations/quantities of current furniture groupings and**

**elements only. However the base drawings have been derived from the City's GIS mapping system, thus sidewalk widths, street widths and building faces should be considered accurately represented.**

Q15 The original RFP document contains some very onerous business implications, that were challenging over the proposed 20 year contract.

The subsequent Addendums Nos. 1 and 2 have answered and clarified a number of questions.

However questions raised and answered in Addendum No. 4, shed a different perspective on this RFP. In particular with reference to Section A, Item 4 and 5, and Question 28 on pages 8 and 9.

These are major rule changes to the financial implications of the RFP document, and comes late in the process.

We recognize that the City's desire to have a new contract in place by September 1, 2007. We also feel that an extension to this RFP closing, will not jeopardize or delay the process of a new contract date of September 1, 2007.

Therefore, in light of the answers now provided in Addendum No. 4, we therefore respectfully request that the City grant an extension of 30-45 days to the original closing of January 10, 2007.

Please note we acknowledge receiving Addendum No. 5

A15 **The City does not agree that the information provided in Addendum No. 4 resulted in major changes to the financial aspects of the RFP. The amendments elaborated on and clarified certain items but did not fundamentally alter the evaluation categories or weighting. As per Addendum No. 6, issued on December 7, 2006 the closing date for this RFP has been extended to January 31, 2007.**

Q16 Please explain how the City will ensure fairness and transparency to vendors in the report/negotiations stage of the selection process, with specific regard to the following: "City Council ... may authorize staff to initiate negotiations with up to three of the top-scoring Vendors on such matter(s) as it chooses without the obligation to communicate, negotiate, or review similar modifications with other Vendors." (section 4.6, p. 37)

A16 **The need for fairness and transparency will be an important consideration for staff in making any recommendations to City Council respecting negotiations. As already**

**indicated in Section 4.6 of the RFP, the intent of this is to allow an opportunity for some interim direction from City Council with respect to finalizing the terms of existing proposals and contract terms and/or refine design elements. There is no intent to seek new bids or share information respecting other bidders.**

- Q17 We understand that the Selection Committee (comprising representatives assigned by the City, relevant City staff and other persons as may be selected by the City) will evaluate the bids, and that the design submissions will also be reviewed by an independent jury. What percentage of the design element score will be awarded by the independent jury? What percentage of the design element score will be awarded by the Selection Committee?
- A17 **Please refer to Appendix E of the RFP. The Design Jury will be responsible for the entire Design Element, Table B, score encompassing a total of 40 points.**
- Q18 Should the design submissions be included in the overall proposal submitted by the bidders, or should they be in a separate package?
- A18 **Please refer to Addendum No. 1, Section A(12), dated October 2, 2006. The eight (8) full colour copies of the Design Submission set out in Section 5.2 (d) of the RFP as amended should be submitted separately and in addition to also being included in the one (1) original and ten (10) copies of the consolidated Main Proposal Document in Section 5.2(e) as amended.**
- Q19 To simplify the production of our submission, it will be helpful if we can use a single size of paper for various elements of it, such as the executive summary, company profile, architectural drawings, etc. Is there a maximum permitted size of paper that is to be used for the submission?
- A19 **Architectural drawings should be single sided and can be submitted on 11" x 17". All other written documentation should be submitted on 8 1/2" x 11".**
- Q20 Are we permitted to put our corporate logo on the street furniture models, presentation boards and any other part of our submission?
- A20 **Yes. Please also see Addendum No. 1, Section B(A6), dated October 2, 2006.**
- Q21 Please confirm whether the Successful Vendor is required at all times to provide both primary and secondary (local) advertising formats. If this is the case, what quantity or proportion of advertising space has to be available in each format?



- A21 **Please refer to section 3.13 of the RFP. The RFP does not stipulate a proportion of these formats, however, opportunities for local advertisers should be available.**
- Q22 In addition to the various items required in section 3 “Design Submission” of 5.3 “Proposal Content,” we want to insert text describing the concept of the furniture and the individual products. Where should this go in the overall submission document?
- A22 **It could be submitted with the Design Submission package.**
- Q23 In view of the considerable age of the concrete pads and electrical connections of existing CBS (Daytech design) transit shelters, are we correct to assume that all pads and electrical connections will have to be changed? Please provide an estimate of the number of concrete pads and electrical connections that will have to be replaced over the life of the Agreement, in order that we can accurately calculate capital costs.
- A23 **Where existing concrete pads or electrical connections are in a safe serviceable condition and the Successful Vendor’s design is compatible with such existing structures, this existing infrastructure would not automatically have to be replaced. We are not in a position at this time to provide the requested estimate.**
- Q24 Please provide the number of transit shelters, according to the following categories:
- a) # Existing old (Daytech) lit with ad face
  - b) # Existing old (Daytech) lit with no ad face
  - c) # Existing old (Daytech) not lit with ad face
  - d) # Existing old (Daytech) not lit with no ad face
  - e) # Existing new design lit with ad face
  - f) # Existing new design lit with no ad face
  - g) # Existing new design not lit with ad face
  - h) # Existing new design not lit with no ad face
- A24 **Refer to Addendum No. 2, Section D “Transit Shelter List”. The vast majority of shelters identified on the list as Daytech that have advertising would be illuminated and the vast majority of Daytech shelters identified as not having advertising would not be illuminated. The vast majority of shelters identified as Enseicom (new design) on the transit shelter list, that have advertising would be illuminated and the vast majority of those Enseicom shelters identified as not having advertising would contain roof lighting.**

Q25 Under the existing transit shelter contract, is CBS obliged to illuminate all its transit shelters? If so, and there is a new supplier after September 1, 2007, are we correct to assume that CBS will be responsible?

A25 **The existing Vendor was obligated to illuminate the “new design” or Enseicom transit shelters (approximately 1,000) and only those other shelters with advertising caissons. The existing Vendor’s obligations in this regard expire at the end of its current agreement.**

Q26 Answer 16 (Addendum 2, p. 19) says “The street lighting system cannot be used as a power supply ...” Please clarify whether there are instances where street lights have been used as a power supply and, if this is the case, will such installations have to be redone, and who is responsible for the work and who will pay for it.

A26 **We believe the reference should be to Addendum No. 2, Section B, (A66). We are advised by Toronto Hydro that new safety regulations are emerging, and Hydro staff are assessing the implications of these. We are unable to provide a definitive answer to this question. Should installations have to be redone, the owner would be responsible for the work and costs.**

Q27 What is the value of the existing street furniture that we will have to include in our insurance coverage if we are awarded the contract?

A27 **In the case of street furniture, the City suggests that the total value of all elements is not required to determine an acceptable insurance level. It is assumed that insurance providers will have a reasonable approach to this requirement in the context of the agreement. The maximum loss would be limited to the value of each individual unit damaged or destroyed. That amount would almost certainly fall under the Vendor's existing property insurance policy. A catastrophic loss that would involve all or most of the elements is highly improbable.**

Q28 Page 34, section 3.28 (ii): The RFP says “... the Agreement would contain a mechanism to allow the City to buy out the Successful Vendor’s complete inventory ...” If we are successful, we will enter into long-term agreements with suppliers and fabricators that will create ongoing obligations to them. If the City terminates, please confirm that it will buy out not only the inventory of currently build items, but that it will also compensate us for such ongoing obligations to our suppliers for items not yet supplied to us.

A28 **Please refer to Section B, A(24) of Addendum No. 4.**

Q29 Page 30, section 3.20. The RFP says "... it is essential that the City have the ability, at its sole discretion, to direct the Successful Vendor to temporarily remove, replace or relocate Street Furniture ..." Does this apply to all City street furniture, or only items that we have supplied?

A29 **The Successful Vendor will be responsible only for the existing inventory assumed by the Successful Vendor pursuant to Section 3.18 of the RFP and all new street furniture elements provided by the Successful Vendor.**

Q30 In section 5.3.8.i, page 46, the RFP says "Cost/Revenues submitted in a proposal are to be firm for the duration of the RFP process and the term of any resulting Agreement." We are concerned about how broadly this requirement will be applied. For example, in section 5.3.8.a (page 44), we are required to "provide documentation substantiating revenue projections." Similarly, in section 5.3.8.b (page 44), we are required to provide "full description of all costs associated with every task of the proposal."

With regard to revenues, please confirm that payment to the City will be based on percentage of revenues realized, and not projected revenues.

A30 **Appendix D of the RFP (as revised) stipulates the requirements of Vendors with respect to City revenue. The "Percentage of Gross Annual Advertising Revenue Payable to the City" (Column 3) is based on actual revenues realized, not projected revenues.**

Q31 Is Eucan, or its parent company Cemusa, responsible for the costs of maintenance of existing litter/recycling bins until the expiry of the existing contract?

A31 **The current Vendor is responsible for these items in accordance with its existing agreement with the City.**

Q32 In Appendix B, section 8.1 says "The Company shall replace maps and up-date map information every two (2) years or earlier as required by the City." Please confirm what the intended interval is.

A32 **The regular interval is anticipated to be two (2) years, however, earlier updates may be required on an as needed basis.**

Q33 Regarding maps in Information/way-finding structures (section 3.8, page 13), who is responsible for the production of the maps of the neighbourhood?

A33 **Refer to Page 20, Section 3.9.3 “Maps/Directional Information” of the RFP, which states:**

**“It is a requirement of the Agreement that the Successful Vendor provides, install and maintain all translucent maps and/or directional information signs and pocket maps for dispensing units. These items must be provided by the Successful Vendor at its sole expense and the City will approve and retain ownership of all content and design”.**

Q34 With regard to the advertising spaces that are available within the City’s 7% (section 3.13, page 25), please confirm that the City will be responsible for the production and associated costs of that advertising?

A34 **Yes, this is the case.**

Q35 Locked PDFs: The RFP and city publications flowing from it are public documents. The coordinated street-furniture program could not possibly be more public in its scope, since, as a solution in search of a problem, it proposes selling nearly every piece of street furniture, likely to a foreign national, for 20 years. Accessibility for people with disabilities is a nominal requirement of any successful design, though city staff are having trouble with the specifics.

As such, why was the RFP and why were all addenda issued in untagged PDFs with security features enabled?

A35 **It is important for the fairness of the process, that all potential vendors be provided with the same document. In order to prevent any confusion as to the form and requirements of the official document, we have provided the document in a soft format which cannot be easily tampered with. The alternative would have been to provide only hard copies of the document. The process for distributing this RFP and subsequent addenda is the same standard as the City uses in all of its procurement processes.**

Q36 Does the city understand that PDF password security can be broken in a matter of seconds?

A36 **The City has attempted to take reasonable precautions to achieve the objective stated in response to the previous question, while providing vendors with the convenience of a soft copy of the document.**

Q37 What outcome is the city guarding against by using password security? If it is piracy, can the city explain how public documents could be pirated, even conceptually?

- A37 **The City believes that it does, as a matter of law, have intellectual property rights in the information provided. However, there is no intent to prohibit reasonable use of the document by persons wishing to prepare a proposal in response to the RFP.**
- Q38 While content extraction for assistive technologies is enabled in the PDFs (perhaps accidentally), does the city understand the accessibility ramifications of producing documents filled with tables in untagged PDF format? Is the city aware that a free Microsoft Word for Windows plug-in can create tagged PDFs automatically?
- A38 **Please refer to the answers provided to the previous questions for the rationale behind the current PDF format.**
- Q39 Does the city appreciate the inconvenience it has created for accredited vendors, who cannot even legitimately copy and paste sections of the document for later usage? How, for example, do city staff expect vendors to manipulate 300 pages of addresses of transit shelters when provided solely in locked PDFs?
- A39 **The City is willing to provide the subject attachments in an unlocked PDF format upon request. Any Vendors who are interested in receiving this documentation should contact the City Contact for this RFP.**
- Q40 Does the city accept that there are no justifiable and incontrovertible reasons to publish documents in locked-PDF form?
- A40 **The City does not accept this. Please see A35 above.**
- Q41 The city is hereby requested to redistribute the RFP and all addenda, including any produced after 2006.12.04, in tagged PDF format with no security features or locks enabled.
- A41 **No, this is not a standard practice in the City's procurement process. The City will not redistribute the RFP and all Addenda in tagged PDF format for the reasons set out in A35 above.**
- Q42 Information/wayfinding structures: RFP p. 13 states that: The information structures are intended to address an identified need for pedestrian-oriented visitor information and map signage.

What evidence does the city have backing up this identified need? When and where was it identified? (Please provide the original written documentation.)

A42 **The Tourism Action Plan of May 2003 (Attachment #1) lists poor signage and a need for a higher standard of urban design as key elements missing in the city for visitors. Within the Action Plan reference to the August 1992 report *Competitive Tourism Development Strategy for Metropolitan Toronto*, stating that there is a need for “strategically located information booths, multi-lingual material and signage” in Toronto.**

**On February 14, 2006, Toronto City Council passed the motion to: “reaffirm the validity of the Five Year Tourism Action Plan as a guide for strengthening Toronto’s tourism industry, and endorse the continuation of the Visitor Information Services directions for 2005 to 2007”.**

Q43 Was it identified by the city parks department in its desire to sell off tiny squares of land to Astral for Info-to-Go pillars, two of whose three faces show advertising and whose placement exempts them from street-furniture guidelines? (The Info-to-Go pillars were grandfathered under an agreement with Parks, sidestepping any real public discussion of the claimed need or actual built form or utility of these structures. They are located on parkland that, surely by coincidence, abuts the streetscape and is indistinguishable from the streetscape to the average person. The contract for these pilot pillars expires in 2010.)

Addendum 2, at A42, states that Info-to-Go pillars are not part of this RFP and that only one of the 25 [Info-to-Go pillars]... is located on city streets. Why has the city chosen to downplay the fact that one arm of city government has unilaterally used a loophole to sell parcels of city property for advertising? (The ostensible purpose info to go is no more real than was the Eucan megabins ostensible function as garbage cans.)

What is the exact location of the single pillar located on city streets?

A43 **The existing Info-to-Go pilot program was authorized by City Council at its meeting of June 22, 23 and 24, 2004, Clause No. 24 of Report No. 5 of the Policy and Finance Committee entitled “Pilot Project for 25 Information Pillars, Request for Proposal No. 3012-03-7369” (Attachment #2). The City does not agree with the premise set out in the question with regard to exemption from street furniture guidelines or that one arm of city government has unilaterally used a loophole to sell parcels of city property for advertising. No land was sold and the pillars in question are time limited in their locations.**

**The location of the single pillar that is permitted to be located on City streets was approved by City Council at its meeting of June 27, 28 and 29, 2006 in its consideration of Clause No. 1b of Report No. 3 of the Works Committee entitled “Co-ordinated Street Furniture Program – Design and Policy Guidelines and Direction**

**Report (All Wards) and Supplementary Information on the Eucan Recycling/Litter Bin Test”, specifically Recommendation No. 8 of the Works Committee contained in the Clause. The original request to place this single pillar at the Dundas St W location came from the Ontario Minister of Tourism to provide after hours access to tourist information when the adjacent Ontario Travel Information Centre is closed.**

Q44 If the entire purpose of this exercise is to create a coordinated street-furniture program, why does p. 13 of the RFP specifically require that new information/wayfinding structures not conflict with Astrals existing Info-to-Go pillars? Explain how grandfathering a competing advertiser constitutes coordinated street furniture.

A44 **The RFP indicates that any new information/wayfinding structure installed will provide adequate distancing from the existing pilot pillars. This would be a consideration only until expiry of the pilot project in order that the function provided is not duplicated in close proximity. The RFP recognizes that not all existing street furniture agreements and pilot program agreements expire at the same time, and there will be a period of transition. The City has clearly indicated it will continue to honour all terms and conditions of existing agreements until their expiry (refer to Addendum No. 4, Section B (A12)).**

Q45 Map dispensers: On p. 13 of the RFP, we are told that information/wayfinding structures should have a coin-operated map dispenser and incorporate audio technology and scrolling LED screens.

Who keeps the money collected in the form of those coins? Will the price be set or regulated by the city? (A cost of \$20 per map can be paid solely by coins.)

A45 **Presently Astral Media outdoor collects the money from maps sold and maintains the supply of pocket maps contained in the INFOTOGO pillars.**

**Under agreement, the City owns the artwork created for maps; however Astral Media collects the \$2 per map to cover the cost of design and printing of these maps. The price will be approved by the City.**

Q46 Addendum 4, Section B, A(21), states that, apart from washrooms, no form of street furniture may impose a fee or charge any person for... use. Yet the city recommends charging for maps. Which of these instructions are we to heed?

A46 **Addendum No. 4, Section B, A(21) is in error. It should in fact also have referred to the fee for pocket map dispensing.**

Q47 What requirements will be imposed to keep the map supply stocked?

A47 **Stocking of maps will be addressed in the agreement with the Successful Vendor under maintenance provisions.**

Q48 What are the requirements for map coverage? Will the maps show the whole city, or the former City of Toronto, or just the relevant neighbourhood? How much advertising will be permitted?

A48 **Page 13 of the RFP under “Information/Wayfinding Structures states that there be “maps of the neighbourhood”. The content for the maps will be determined by the City’s Economic Development and Tourism Division. There will be no commercial advertising permitted on the map face; only the promotion of City features and attractions.**

Q49 What audio technology does the city have in mind? Auto-spamming recorded commercials, of the sort found at gas stations? Is the city trying to articulate a requirement for full accessibility for blind and visually-impaired users, and if so, why wasn’t the city clearer on that topic?

A49 **We assume this question is in relation to Section 3.9.3 of the RFP. The City does not have a specific technology in mind at this time. Auto-spamming of commercials is not the intent and the RFP does not accommodate this form of commercial advertising. Such technology may assist blind and visually impaired users as well as other users of the system.**

**The City is open to exploring new and emerging technology and will consider suggestions put forward by the Successful Vendor that go towards enhancing the visitor’s experience.**

Q50 What requirements are there to duplicate information presented on scrolling LED screens in speech, Braille, tactile lettering, or other blind-accessible forms?

Does the city really understand what scrolling LED screens are (versus crawling LED screens, for example)? What are the size limits of these screens, what are the brightness limits, what direction must they face or not face, and may they display advertising? (Text-only advertising is still advertising.)

Accessibility of signage: Why does the RFP fail to include a requirement for talking signs (not necessarily Talking Signs, a proprietary technology)?



Where is the requirement for tactile signage and maps?

**A50 The RFP does not contain specific requirements in this regard. The RFP does indicate that proposals should comply with the City of Toronto's Accessibility Design Guidelines. For clarity refer to Section A(5) of this Addendum. The RFP also indicates under Section 3.8 that the information/wayfinding structures should be adaptable to emerging technologies. At this time, the City's programs are evolving and have not been fully developed. The City would work with the Successful Vendor throughout the term to rollout such features (examples of programmable LED message screens can be found at the INFOTOGO pillars at Nathan Phillips Square and Yonge & Dundas Square. Potential proponents are invited to propose their own concepts).**

**A number of the specific details noted in these questions will be dependent on the designs developed by the Vendors and evaluated in accordance with the criteria set out in the RFP. Commercial advertising would not be permitted on the LED screens.**

**Q51 Who pays for the electricity incurred by audio technology, scrolling LED screens, and the proposed touch-screen Internet, GPS, and Wi-Fi.**

**A51 The Successful Vendor is responsible for any energy costs.**

**Q52 If scrolling LED screens should be provided, then why does Addendum 2, at A46, state that advertising on electronic or video signage boards is not contemplated? (Does that mean it is forbidden or allowed?) Aren't scrolling LED screen electronic signage?**

**A52 The response in Addendum No. 2, Section B(A46) referred to mechanical scrolling signage. The intent of LED screens is to inform visitors and residents of information promoting city-related events / activities (i.e. Farmers Market, Special Events, concerts, etc). A possible addition to these screens would be the ability to display information of public interest (i.e. Amber Alerts, etc). Commercial advertising would be prohibited on this signage.**

**Q53 What is the dividing line between video signage advertising and scrolling advertising? Video can be made up of nothing but type. It can also be made up of still pictures that display for long durations (e.g., minutes at a time) and are replaced by other still pictures in effect, a slow-motion slideshow. Is a combination of such long-duration stills and scrolling type to be permitted?**

**A53 The use of video signage under the scenario of the non-animated display of commercial pictures/text as posed by this question would not necessarily be**

**prohibited, provided the design of the street furniture element and advertising panel is consistent with the design, functionality, technical and advertising criteria set out in the RFP. This, in effect, would be similar to mechanical scrolling.**

Q54 De facto video screens: RFP p. 20 tells us that vendors are encouraged to propose innovative lighting solutions which do not produce excessive glare, and innovative communications solutions (e.g., audio, video, scrolling text) to promote interactivity and enhance the user experience.

What evidence does the city have that citizens want their garbage cans to be interactive?

A54 **Innovative lighting solutions are not equated with video screens in the RFP. The RFP does not specify interactive garbage cans.**

Q55 What evidence is available demonstrating that street furniture provides a user experience?

A55 **The phrase “user experience” is used in the RFP in the context of Information/Wayfinding Structures and refers to the functionality of this element in providing information to users.**

Q56 As with map stands, exactly what kind of audio does the city want?

A56 **Refer to A49 above.**

Q57 In Addendum 2, the city flatly rejects the use of video screens. Yet video is explicitly encouraged in the above section. Which of these are we to trust?

A57 **Addendum No. 2 clarified that the use of video screens for commercial advertising would not be permitted. The assumption in that response was that the question referred to animated or moving content being shown on the video screen. This is further clarified in A53 above.**

Q58 Eye-tracking studies conducted for the outdoor advertising industry conclude that using light as beacon attracts people to advertising. Pattison Outdoor has recently rolled out new pedestal signs on downtown parking lots using a light beacon on the edges of the signs. Would such light beacons be prohibited on the street furniture?

A58 **Yes, such lighting solely for the purpose stated would be prohibited. Lighting should focus on function and safety issues. Decorative lighting may be considered. Unnecessary light pollution is discouraged.**

Q59 Typography: The RFP and addenda do not address issues of city-wide functional typography. Minutes from the public information sessions on street furniture show a clear public demand for coordinated typography... on all street furniture and streetsigns; develop custom font for Toronto with local expertise. Addendum A9, calls for unique designs that reflect Toronto's distinctiveness.... It is therefore essential that the Toronto designs not be used elsewhere.

Why has the city not required a fully scoped plan for typography, backed up by prototypes and test results? (Such tests might inclement weather, night time, with visually-impaired persons, and with combinations of those features.) How will the requirement for distinctiveness be achieved without such a plan?

P. 16 of the RFP states that transit-stop names shall be affixed on two sides in letters no less than 80 mm high. Current transit-stop labelling wasn't even in place until activists forced the city to require the current vendor to live up to the terms of its contract, and it is presently typeset in white Helvetica on a transparent ground. Why does the RFP not set out requirements for typefaces, contrast, and tested legibility under conditions such as those mentioned above?

P. 19 states that the City of Toronto will provide detailed labelling directions such as size, color [U.S. spelling sic], graphics, and content. Why is there no mention of typeface, nor any mention of testing of typeface, size, colour, graphics, and content?

A59 **The RFP provides flexibility for Vendors in the design of street furniture elements. The typography will be addressed in the detailed design phase of the development of the street furniture prototypes. Section 3.29 "Prototype" of the RFP stipulates that the Successful Vendor is required to provide fully functional prototypes and will be required to make appropriate refinements to the street furniture elements, as directed by the City. This would include finalizing detailed typography aspects noted in the question.**

Q60 P. 20 tells us that multi-publication structures A should allow for the street or intersection name to be incorporated into the multi-publication boxes. Does the city really mean incorporated into rather than displayed on, and what are the typographic standards for such usage? What if other street furniture with similar labels, like a transit shelter, is close by?

A60 **The typographic considerations are referred to in A59 above. The RFP indicates that the design should allow for a street or intersection name to be incorporated and the City considers the phrase "incorporated into" to include the display of the name. If other street furniture elements have similar labels then this would not be a requirement depending on the given location.**

Q61 The scoring sheet, under the heading Building and Supporting Toronto's Identity, lists two criteria:

The design represents a unique solution and approach specific to Toronto

The design is timeless [quotes in original] and will be appropriate in all areas of the City

What identity must the winning design build and support? What typographic standards and testing underlie that identity?

A61 **The RFP provides flexibility for Vendors to offer creative solutions to address these requirements.**

Q62 Streetsigns: The city is undertaking a separate process to develop new streetsigns, a project that has been reported in the press as part of the plans for coordinated street furniture. Addendum 1 denied that press report, but questions remain.

Street signage appears not to be covered by the RFP. Why not?

What evidence can the city propose to establish that the streetsign program is indeed coordinated with the current RFP?

What typographic standards, including testing, will the city impose to ensure that RFP-covered street furniture and streetsigns match or are compatible?

A62 **For clarification, Addendum No. 1, Section B (A23) did not deny the press report for new street signs but did address certain inaccuracies in that article. Street signs are City owned, City manufactured and City installed. The scope of the street sign design contract included consultation and design - not implementation. Coordination with the street signs project will occur in the detailed design phase as referred to in A59 above.**

Q63 Lack of coordination: Addendum 1, exempts the City's existing banner program. (At the vendor meeting, city staff were visibly surprised to hear about street-pole banners, even though they hang right outside city buildings.) Addendum 4, A32, states that 1,000 new glass transit shelters will be grandfathered.

In the cases of banners, streetsigns, Info-to-Go pillars, new glass bus shelters, and city parking-lot signage (Addendum 2, Q81), why does the RFP pretend that all those features will fail to be just as visible and apparent as RFP-covered street furniture?

If this process is one of street-furniture coordination, why are hundreds of banners, two dozen advertising posts with hidden factual information, 30,000 streetsigns, a thousand bus shelters, and dozens of parking-lot signs excluded?

- A63 **The City has never pretended nor purported that this Coordinated Street Furniture program will encompass every manner of street amenity on public and private property. Staff were not surprised to hear about the banner program, as this was referred to in the Vibrant Streets document. The issue of the 1,000 existing new design transit shelters was addressed in the report approved by City Council (refer to [www.toronto.ca/streetfurniture](http://www.toronto.ca/streetfurniture), Consolidated Clause 1b in Works Committee Report 3, considered by City Council on June 27, 28 and 29, 2006) that set out the context of the Coordinated Street Furniture RFP within the cumulative efforts of the Clean and Beautiful City initiative to improve Toronto's public spaces; specifically refer to Sections 2.0 and 4.2 of the staff report. Also refer to Section 5 of the Vibrant Streets document. It was noted that this program is an important step, but cannot on its own completely change the current landscape. What it will do is set the bar at a high level and establish a tone and direction for future decisions related to other elements. Generally, the elements called for within the scope of this RFP are items that are currently supplied to the City by an outside Vendor or new items that the City does not currently provide.**
- Q64 Why is the city unable to reconcile different departments and agencies into one coordinated street-furniture program?
- A64 **This issue was discussed in the staff report approved by City Council at its meeting of June 27, 28 and 29, 2006 (refer to [www.toronto.ca/streetfurniture](http://www.toronto.ca/streetfurniture), Consolidated Clause 1b in Works Committee Report 3). In parallel with this RFP, steps are being taken by the City to review and address its organizational response to this program.**
- Q65 Ashtrays: RFP P. 18 states that the contents of the ashtray compartment must be stored separately. Does the city intend to limit designs to one ashtray per unit (the ashtray compartment)?
- A65 **No, designs do not need to be limited to one ashtray.**
- Q66 Collection of organics: RFP P. 18 states that designs must be modular to accommodate ashtray [singular], battery compartment, or the option of organics. Wet-waste collection is a different task from dry-waste and recyclable collection, particularly during a heat alert. Any requirement to handle green-bin-like waste collection will significantly change the

model form. Is the city requiring any kind of up-front accommodation of wet waste, and, if such is not provided in submitted designs, will there be a penalty?

**A66 The City does not have any plans to collect organics from street receptacles at this time. However, the bin design should clearly demonstrate versatility of adapting to organic collection should the City decide to include organics in the future. Bin designs that are not adaptable to organic collection will receive lower scores.**

**Q67** Drain holes for vermin: P. 19 of the RFP requires the container to have drain holes and prevent vermin from entering. Toronto has all the usual bugs, like roaches, plus a recurring problem of yellow-jacket wasps. Can the city point to an existing design anywhere in Canada that meets both of these requirements at once, keeping in mind that insects are vermin?

**A67 The litter/recycling receptacles shall be designed in a manner that allows rainwater that enters the receptacle and water from power spraying the inside of the container to drain. For example the draining mechanism could have screen size/pin holes that allow water to drain and prevent vermin from entering.**

**Q68** Advertising by another name: The RFP proposes a putatively strict limit on advertising on street furniture. However, a close reading, not apparently done by the city, reveals further examples of permitted advertising.

P. 21 states that third-party advertising is not permitted on multi-publication structures B. Does that mean the successful vendor, which by definition is not a third party, may advertise itself?

**A68 No.**

**Q69** Also on those structures, publication names may be shown on the outside. What are the size, colour, and typographic restrictions? What is to stop a publisher from using half the available surface area, multiplied by 2,000 boxes city-wide, in which to show its name?

Addendum 1 answered a question about branding showing the successful vendor's name: Such badges are not considered advertising. However, the city is hereby requested to clarify that it really understands the implications of the topic, which caught city staff by evident surprise at the vendor's meeting.

For this question, two items of existing street furniture were surveyed: old-style steel and new glass transit shelters.

Badges were modelled as rectangles, though they are actually lozenges with rounded ends.

Old shelters bore badges showing the vendor's name with dimensions of  $0.180 \times 0.023$  m ( $0.00414$  m<sup>2</sup>). Dimensions of badges on new shelters are  $0.32 \times 0.059$  m ( $0.01888$  m<sup>2</sup>).

Assume that small street furniture will use the old-shelter badge size (smaller) and large street furniture the new-shelter badge size (larger).

Small street furniture includes litter/recycling receptacles (12,500), postering kiosks (500 and 2,000), multi-publication structures (500 and 2,000), and bike-parking facilities (1,000). Total units: 18,500. Total space used by vendor badges:  $18,500 \times 0.00414$  m<sup>2</sup> = 76.49 m<sup>2</sup>.

Large street furniture includes transit shelters (5,000), information/wayfinding structures (120), benches (2,000), and public washrooms (20). Total units: 7,140. Total space used by vendor badges:  $7,140 \times 0.01888$  m<sup>2</sup> = 134.8 m<sup>2</sup>.

Is the city aware that, when all forms of covered street furniture are included, it is authorizing the display of up to 23,640 badges all carrying the name of the successful vendor? When visitors arrive here, what city would they think they were visiting Toronto or the vendor's name? (Which would be more widespread on street furniture?)

Does the city really intend to give the successful vendor, without fee or oversight, the quantity of 211.3 m<sup>2</sup> of additional space to advertise its own name? The amount is equivalent to an additional 1.15% of ad space, or a 14 m  $\times$  14 m billboard distributed city-wide in 23,640 pieces, or 94 ad caissons at 24 sq.ft. (2.23 m<sup>2</sup>) each.

- A69 **The City presumes that the designs of the multi-publication boxes advanced by Vendors will be done in a manner that does not allow the opportunity for each publisher to use half the surface area for advertising. With regard to the Successful Vendor showing its branding, it is common practice and not unreasonable to have such identification on a product. The question does, however, raise an important design issue, namely that such branding should not be a prominent design feature and overwhelm the other quality and functional objectives the City seeks through this RFP. The response in Addendum #1, Section B, (A6) intended to place such company branding in the context of the overall street furniture design. Proposals that have company branding incorporated in an inappropriate or prominent manner will receive lower scores. The City will also work with the Successful Vendor at the prototype stage on this aspect as necessary.**

- Q70 Addendum 4, A48, states that permanent directional information or maps would not be included in calculation of advertising surface area. Does the city really mean that such faces might include advertising that could not be counted against the maximum, or does it mean that such faces could not contain advertising at all?
- A70 **This response did not suggest that such faces would include advertising. Advertising would not be permitted in the scenario set out.**
- Q71 Public Washrooms: Washrooms must provide external indicators informing potential users of whether the unit is available or in use. How does the city propose to make such indicators accessible to blind or low-vision persons?
- A71 **If the washroom is in use, the door will be locked. The RFP has not specified detailed solutions on this specific aspect and provides Vendors flexibility to propose solutions.**
- Q72 Why do the specifications for toilets not explicitly state the requirements for accessibility, including wheelchair access (up to and including large power wheelchairs); tactile and/or Braille labelling; adequate space for a wheelchair user and an attendant; and audible and visible instructions?
- What are the exact requirements for accessibility to blind/visually-impaired, deaf/hard-of-hearing, and mobility-impaired persons for such panic alarms? (This is not a request to refer vendors to the accessibility document. It is a request for the exact requirements for panic alarms that work for blind, deaf, and quadriplegic citizens and others.)
- A72 **Sections 1.4.7, 2.3.11 and 2.3.14 of the City of Toronto Accessibility Design Guidelines provide detailed information on the accessibility requirements of public washrooms. The City is aware that there are such products in use in European and US cities that successfully encompass the types of design and safety features noted in this question. The RFP sets out the City's intent to seek state of the art products and the City expects Vendors will respond accordingly.**
- Q73 Communication and/or panic alarms: The scoring sheet, at p. 67 (pages numbers overwritten by shaded table cell), lists: There are provisions for communication and/or panic alarms, where appropriate twice.
- A73 **This was corrected as per Addendum No. 4, Section A5.**
- Q74 Accessibility of repair-notification systems: After misrepresenting a question posed at the vendor meeting, the city eventually decided to half-respond to the issue of accessibility of systems to notify the vendor of street furniture that needs repair or attention. Addendum 2,



Q14, refers the reader to A6, which states that every piece or cluster of street furniture must include a notice of a current and operative 24-hour telephone number that is TTY-capable to report problems.

Does the city really intend to authorize up to 25,640 such notices? May they contain branding or badges of the successful vendor, and if so, at what size?

How are such notices to be made accessible to low-vision or blind citizens?

A74 **The City makes every effort to accurately interpret the questions as posed by Vendors. If the City has misunderstood any question, it has certainly not done so purposely and has no intent to misrepresent or mislead Vendors. The RFP requires that a notice be posted on individual elements or on a least one element within a cluster. Such notices would not contain branding or badges of the Successful Vendor. Detailed specifications for such notices, including how notices would be made accessible to low vision or blind citizens have not been established at this time and the City expects Vendors to address these issues in their proposals.**

Q75 Is the city aware that, with advances in wireless and Internet technologies, deaf and hard-of-hearing people use TTY less and E-mail and instant messaging more? Why does the requirement suit the late 1980s, when there was no practical alternative but to place a phone or TTY call, while ignoring the use of Web sites, E-mail, instant messaging, or other methods?

Will the city require the use of such technologies, specifically a Web site, and if so, what will be the requirements for standards compliance; Web accessibility; and browser-compatibility and user testing?

A75 **Refer to Section A(3) of this Addendum. The City will work with the Successful Vendor to develop appropriate e-mail or web based technology and use World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) guidelines for development (“Essential Components of Web Accessibility” - [www.w3.org](http://www.w3.org)).**

Q76 Claimed coordination of street furniture and BIAs: Addendum 2, A6, informs us that BIAs may not opt out of the RFP.

Are any BIAs bidding on this RFP? Are they even included in the process in the first place, or is it logically impossible for BIAs to opt out of something they were never included in?

- A76 **Clearly, the City will not know until the closing date who will bid on this RFP. BIAs are included in the process as set out in the staff report approved by City Council at its meeting of June 27, 28 and 29, 2006 (refer to [www.toronto.ca/streetfurniture](http://www.toronto.ca/streetfurniture), Consolidated Clause 1b in Works Committee Report 3). Individual BIA's submitted correspondence and made deputations on the program at the May 3, 2006 Works Committee meeting. The Toronto Association of Business Improvement Areas (TABIA) in a May 2, 2006 letter to the Committee concluded, "we support the recommendations outlined in the report from the General Manager of Transportation Services and City Planning and look forward to continued TABIA/BIA involvement as this important project moves forward".**
- Q77 BIA's would be allowed to maintain their own street furniture, albeit without advertising. Is the city imagining a scenario in which the street-furniture program is greeted with such hostility by BIA's plural that they reject it altogether, choosing instead to maintain their own neighbourhood look and feel? Irrespective of reasons, wouldn't a coordinated street-furniture program be vitiated if BIA's maintain their own street furniture?
- A77 **Given the consultation undertaken with BIA's on this project and their feedback, the City does not anticipate such a level of hostility from BIA's. The coordinated street furniture project recognizes that a number of BIA's have made substantial investments in their areas in the form of enhanced decorative sidewalks, planters, lighting and in some cases street furniture. It is not the intent of this project to negate these investments. While there will not be total uniformity of all street furniture across the entire city by allowing these elements to remain, the City does not feel that this will appreciably undermine the goals and objectives of the project.**
- Q78 Payment for, and acquisition of, street furniture: Addendum 1, A, 8, states that the successful vendor will assume ownership of existing street furniture.
- What evidence can staff provide that elected city councillors authorized the outright gift of all existing covered street furniture to an outside vendor?
- A78 **The City does not accept the premise of this question. The Successful Vendor assuming ownership of these structures during the term of the agreement will be assuming the cost of all maintenance, repair, replacement and taxation obligations. This model has been applied for many years under existing and previous transit shelter agreements.**
- Q79 ??11 states (sic) that the successful vendor must pay the city for any street furniture not actually rolled out. That gives the winning vendor 20 years less a day in which to decide exactly how many items of street furniture to roll out. What assurances does the city have

that the successful vendor will not simply refuse to stock as many items of street furniture as are required? (The penalty doesn't kick in for two decades.)

- A79 **The penalty clause referred to will take effect at the mid-point of the Agreement, not at the end. The City has no reason to assume that the scenario as suggested above would occur. One reason for this is that the Successful Vendor will be relying upon the roll-out of new Street Furniture for its own advertising inventory. In any event, the Successful Vendor will be legally obligated under the Agreement to fulfill its responsibilities. In the case of default at any time during the term, the Agreement will contain termination clauses and other remedies for non-performance and the City will hold a substantial non-refundable irrevocable letter of credit as financial security for performance of the vendor's obligations.**
- Q80 The cash value of the existing street furniture may offset the vendor's planned expenditures on new furniture. In effect, the vendor could use existing furniture as units of currency in calculating how much new furniture to roll out. Can city staff demonstrate that it has insulated the citizenry from the successful vendor's leaving the existing street furniture in place and merely paying a fine 20 years later for an equivalent number of uninstalled new items?
- A80 **The City does not believe that the value of the remaining existing street furniture to be assumed by the Successful Vendor is significant enough to justify this concern.**
- Q81 3D and enhanced advertising: Addendum 4, A46 and A47, state that 3D transit-shelter wraps are not contemplated but planting a giant fibreglass moose on top of a bus shelter might be. The latter would be exempted from square-footage calculations, meaning that fibreglass moose could be installed on top of tens of thousands of street-furniture items if agreed by the city. Hence, A46 and A47 contradict each other and A47 undermines the stated advertising limits imposed by the present program. Which requirements shall prevail?
- A81 **The City does not believe that these responses are contradictory or undermine the stated advertising limits. Addendum No. 4, Section B(A47) refers to initiatives by the City of Toronto to promote Toronto, not commercial advertising.**
- Q82 Reduction of advertising space: City Council appears to have approved a staff report that called for a 14% reduction in advertising square footage from 198,200 sq. ft. to about 170,400. This RFP, however, states: The total amount of current advertising is 18,395 square metres (198,200 square feet) and under this agreement the city will require the successful vendor to maintain total advertising levels as less than this amount, which suggests that a square footage of 198,199 would be permitted. (See p. 30 of a [staff report](#))

[PDF]: Another measure is total cumulative area of ad space in the public streets. Today, the amount is about 198,200 square feet, compared to about 170,400 square feet projected with the controls. This is a net reduction of about 27,800 square feet or 14%.)

Has this RFP not substantially deviated from City Council's direction?

Didn't City Council expect an RFP that mandated a 14% reduction in square footage? Will further City Council approval of the RFP be required to correct this?

- A82 **City Council at its meeting of June 27, 28 and 29, 2006 adopted, as amended the Recommendations of Works Committee with respect to direction for the Co-ordinated Street Furniture Program. The recommendations in Consolidated Clause 1b in Works Committee Report 3 comprise Council's direction to staff in the formulation of the RFP. Council did not direct staff as suggested in this question. The RFP has been prepared based on the direction of Council and does not deviate from this direction.**
- Q83 The vibrant-streets document suggests that the spacing between transit stops will generally regulate the proximity of two advertising faces. If an advertisement is placed on a streetcar shelter, which is located in the middle of the roadway, will another advertisement be allowed on the same block as that streetcar shelter, but on the sidewalk? In other words, will another advertisement be allowed in close proximity to a mid-street streetcar shelter advertisement?
- A83 **No.**
- Q84 Will there be any restrictions on so-called metro-domination campaigns? For example, is it permitted for the successful vendor to sell every advertising face, or a huge proportion of them, in the entire downtown core to a single advertiser?
- A84 **There are no restrictions contemplated in the RFP in respect of how advertising is sold or allocated, provided that the agreement requirements are met (i.e. portion of available space reserved for public service advertising, no offensive advertising, etc.).**
- Q85 Web renderings: Addendum 1, A, 14(b), states that the vendor must provide one set of letter-sized artistic drawings that will be posted on the City's Web site for public viewing.

Why did the city not specify a delivery format? What if the delivered resolution is not enough to adequately understand the rendering?

Is the city aware that Web sites are not print and certainly are not letter-sized?

- A85 **Refer to Section A(1) of this Addendum. The City will ensure that all web site postings are scaled appropriately for viewing.**
- Q86 If the city is contemplating posting these artistic drawings on PDF, what accessibility provisions will there be?
- A86 **The above-noted Section A(1) of this Addendum also calls for text descriptions of the renderings.**
- Q87 Public viewing of models: Addendum 1, A, between 16 and 17, states that models shall be fully enclosed to prevent viewing and/or protection against damage.
- Does the city understand that the sentence actually requires enclosed models to prevent protection against damage (i.e., to permit damage) and/or to prevent viewing?
- The same section states that models may later be made available for viewing. Can the city reconcile these two requirements?
- A87 **This statement applies during the delivery of the models to the City by Vendors. The model is enclosed to prevent damage and viewing during transport for confidentiality purposes. The enclosure is removable for viewing.**
- Q88 Multilingualism: In what languages other than English will the successful vendor be required to provide services of any and all kinds?
- A88 **The City responded to a question in Addendum #2, Section B, (Q12) concerning linking the Successful Vendor's maintenance management system to the City's 311 system. Services provided under the coordinated street furniture program should be compatible as the City's system evolves. The RFP is not specific in terms of multilingual services, however, the City will work with the Successful Vendor to determine where, in what languages and under what circumstances such services would be provided. This will be guided by the City's "Multilingual Service Policy" set out in Clause No. 4 of Report No. 2 of the Administration Committee, adopted by Council at its meeting of February 13, 14 and 15, 2002 (Attachment #3).**
- Q89 Vendor longevity: What requirements will the city impose, if any, if a successful vendor fails; goes bankrupt; cancels the contract; winds up business; or is sold, particularly to another of the vendors vying for this contract?

- A89 **These issues are addressed in the draft agreement included in the RFP as Appendix B.**
- Q90 Losers lawsuits: Recent history in the City of Toronto shows that bidders never actually lose a contract; they merely sue the city if they don't win it. What provisions has the city made to address lawsuits or claims made by losing vendors?
- A90 **It is hoped that the City's process will not result in any claims. However, the City has no control over whether a third party decides to take legal action or not. In the event that a claim does arise, it will be dealt with on its merits based on the facts and applicable law and the City will vigorously defend its position.**
- Q91 Zero-advertising budget: An article in the December 2006 Toronto Life (Ryan Bigge, Space Man, p. 48) states that the city... recently presented a budget that... included the cost of street furniture with and without advertising sponsorship. Where is that budget, why hasn't it been provided to vendors, and will you provide it now?
- A91 **No such budget has been submitted. The staff report contained in Consolidated Clause 1b in Works Committee Report 3, approved by City Council at its meeting of June 27, 28 and 29, 2006 ([www.toronto.ca/streetfurniture](http://www.toronto.ca/streetfurniture)) provided order of magnitude capital and operating cost estimates to secure and sustain a street furniture program of the quality and scale proposed.**
- Q92 Inclusion of community comments: What evidence can the city provide that the wishes expressed by average citizens in street-furniture consultations, specifically the oft-mentioned desire for street furniture with no advertising whatsoever, were actually heeded in this process?
- A92 **The staff report contained in Consolidated Clause 1b in Works Committee Report 3, approved by City Council at its meeting of June 27, 28 and 29, 2006 ([www.toronto.ca/streetfurniture](http://www.toronto.ca/streetfurniture)) fully documents the consultation process and the comments received from the general public. Interested parties had the opportunity to make deputations to the Works Committee. Ultimately, the decision as to the form and content of the RFP was debated and determined by City Council in full awareness of the various viewpoints surrounding this issue.**
- Q93 Necessity of wrapping things up by September: Addendum 4, A1, mentions a necessity to have a new contract in place by September 1, 2007. What is the source of this necessity? Please answer in light of the fact that an election has been held and a new city council sworn in.

A93 **The current agreement for the provision and maintenance of transit shelters will expire on August 31, 2007. It is therefore necessary to have a new provider in place prior to that time. The municipal election and swearing in of a new City Council had no bearing on this date.**

Q94 Stated disregard for public opinion: This entire exercise is ostensibly meant to improve the public realm, though that would be achieved through the mechanism of selling tens of thousands of items of street furniture to a single vendor, likely a foreign national. Yet, during the eventual design-review stage, Addendum 1, A, 14(b), baldly states:

Public feedback to renderings will not be used in the evaluation of proposals. The sole intent is to provide the public with the opportunity to view street-furniture elements that the city is considering so as to provide context for the eventual recommendations of the selection committee.

Is the city really saying that it truly intends to disregard public opinion, and that such opinion will be canvassed only so that common citizens will understand the irreversible declarations of their superiors in the selection committee?

A94 **As note in A92 above, the form of the street furniture program and RFP were debated and decided by City Council. The City does not agree that public input has been disregarded. The City is not saying it intends to disregard public opinion. As with any City procurement process, the proposals submitted in response to this RFP will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria as set out in the RFP, in a fair, professional manner. As per Council's approval, a Design Jury composed of members with expertise in a design discipline will evaluate the design elements of the proposals. City staff will evaluate technical elements. There is no suggestion that those evaluating the proposals are superior to other citizens.**

Q95 In which document adopted by elected City Council was city staff empowered to embark upon this RFP yet also to explicitly disregard public opinion?

A95 **The initiation of this RFP process was approved by City Council at its meeting of July 19, 20, 21 & 26, 2005 in adopting Consolidated Clause 6 of Works Committee Report No. 7. The City does not accept the premise of this question nor does it agree that public opinion has been explicitly (or otherwise) disregarded.**

Q96 Insulation against criticism: Nearly all, if not actually all, the press and online coverage of the street-furniture program is critical, sometimes excoriating. Published results from a public-opinion survey show great ambivalence and hostility and little in the way of outright support. This is a program that people willing to venture an opinion do not want.

As such, what exact plans does the city have to insulate itself, its staff, and the successful vendor from 20 years of activism, and possible vandalism, from citizens who never wanted coordinated street furniture in the first place?

A96 **The City does not agree with these comments or the suggestion that Toronto's citizens would express their opinion on this issue by damaging public property. Should street furniture be subject to vandalism or other unlawful activities, the City will take appropriate action to address these issues.**

Q97 In § 3.8 of the RFP on pg. 14, the City states in part (boldface italics added for emphasis): "The current generation of public washrooms is a superior product incorporating many **technological advances**. Models available employ **hygienic advances**, including **self-cleaning after every use**. The City has recognized the need for **self-cleaning, state of the art** public washrooms. In the order of 20 facilities will be **required** over 20 years."

In § 3.9.6 of the RFP on pg. 22, the City states in part (boldface italics added for emphasis):

"The public washroom **should**:

- be designed with the ability to automatically self-clean and disinfect the seat and bowl **after every use**;
- fully clean and disinfect the floor **after a designated number of uses**; ..."

As the meaning of the word "should" above might be interpreted by some to convey something less than a mandatory requirement, please clarify that by "should" in the above excerpt from § 3.9.6 of the RFP on pg. 22, the City means "must" (i.e., the automated self-cleaning public toilet ("APT") features listed on pg. 22-23 are required features of the public washrooms that the City is requesting in this RFP and that a failure to provide these APT features will cause a proposer to be disqualified).

A97 **The City does not wish to disqualify an entire proposal on this basis alone. The City would be working with the Successful Vendor to ensure that these preferred features are provided.**

Q98 The above excerpt from § 3.9.6 of the RFP on pg. 22 states that the toilet seat and bowl must be automatically self-cleaned and disinfected "after every use." However, in the very next bullet, the City appears NOT to be requiring that the APT's floor, TOO, must be automatically fully self-cleaned and disinfected "after every use" but, instead, only "after a designated number of uses." This represents a lesser standard than is found in any true APT product.



Requiring that the APT's floor, too, be automatically and fully self-cleaned "after every use" would be consistent with the City's requirement that the APT's toilet seat and bowl be automatically self-cleaned and disinfected "after every use." Otherwise, contrary to the City's expressed intent in the excerpt above from § 3.8 of the RFP on pg. 14 ("The City has recognized the need for self-cleaning, state of the art public washrooms."), it can be successfully argued that the City, instead, is requesting a proposal for only a lesser, substandard product, and a less sanitary facility that is not a true APT.

Therefore, since any true APT always incorporates the technology to automatically and fully self-clean and disinfect the floor "after every use," will the City revise the wording in § 3.9.6 of the RFP to require this essential feature?

Neither RFP § 3.9.6 nor any other part of the RFP or the related Addenda issued to date require the provision of APT technology with automated safety features to prevent the automated cleaning process from activating while a user is still inside the APT facility. Will the City revise RFP § 3.9.6 to also require this essential safety feature, which is an integral component of any true APT product?

**A98 The City will work with the Successful Vendor to ensure that the appropriate standards and safety features are achieved in this regard. Refer to Section A(4) of this Addendum.**

**Q99** Kindly clarify the City's description of its NPV calculation methodology in the revised Table D and its accompanying Note on pg. 19 of Addendum #4:

Is the Year 1 "Existing Revenue" of \$6,000,000 being inflated by the 2% annual inflation rate commencing with Year 1 (i.e., for each of the 20 years)? OR is Year 1 left at \$6,000,000 and the 2% annual inflation rate is only first applied commencing with Year 2 and forward (i.e., only for the last 19 years of the 20 year term)?

In other words, is the \$6,000,000 base amount being multiplied by a Year 1 inflation factor = 1.00000, Year 2 inflation factor = 1.02000, Year 3 inflation factor = 1.040400, and so on through Year 20? OR is the \$6,000,000 base amount being multiplied by a Year 1 inflation factor = 1.02000, Year 2 inflation factor = 1.040400, Year 3 inflation factor = 1.061208, and so on through Year 20?

**A99 The City's minimum annual guaranteed revenue would be pre-paid at the beginning of each year as set out in the draft Agreement, Appendix B of the RFP. Therefore, the first such payment would be made upon execution of the agreement. Accordingly, for the purposes of the "Existing Revenue" NPV calculation, the first payment would not be inflated by the 2% factor. The 2% inflation rate,**

**compounded, will be applied for each of the 19 subsequent annual payments (the first inflation factor on the first \$6 million payment is 1.00, second payment 1.02, third payment 1.0404 and so on).**

Q100 In the City's NPV calculation, is each annual "Existing Revenue AFTER inflation" figure being discounted at 5% annually beginning with Year 1 (i.e., each year of the 20 year term is discounted to present value at 5% annually)? OR is each annual "Existing Revenue AFTER inflation" cash flow being discounted to present value commencing with Year 2 (i.e., Year 1 is left at \$6,000,000 and only the last 19 years of the 20 year term are discounted to present value)?

In other words, is your PV multiplier for Year 1 = 0.952381, for Year 2 = 0.907029, for Year 3 = 0.863838, and so on through Year 20? OR is your PV multiplier for Year 1 = 1.00000, for Year 2 = 0.952381, for Year 3 = 0.907029, and so on through Year 20?

A100 **Consistent with A99 above, the discount factor would be applied beginning with the second annual payment.**

Q101 Depending on the City's answers to Questions #2a and #2b above, which of the following 4 possible NPV values correctly reflects the outcome of your "Existing Revenue NPV" calculation methodology:

(a) **\$94,239,872.04** (i.e., the scenario where 2% annual inflation is applied beginning in Year 1; but PV discounting at 5% annually is applied beginning in Year 2)?

(b) **OR \$89,752,259.09** (i.e., the scenario where both 2% annual inflation and PV discounting at 5% annually are applied beginning in Year 1)?

(c) **OR \$87,992,410.87** (i.e., the scenario where 2% annual inflation is applied beginning in Year 2; but PV discounting at 5% annually is applied beginning in Year 1)?

(d) **OR \$92,392,031.41** (i.e., the scenario where both 2% annual inflation and PV discounting at 5% annually are applied beginning in Year 2)?

A101 **(d) \$92,392,031.41**

Q102 While it seems obvious to assume that the City will perform the "minimum guaranteed revenue NPV" calculation this way because the "upfront payment" cash flow occurs at the beginning of Year 1 and is already at "present value" as a result, please still confirm that the "upfront payment on signing agreement" component of a proposer's "minimum guaranteed revenue" cash flows does NOT require discounting and that the City will NOT

apply a 5% PV discounting multiplier to any "upfront payment" component occurring at the beginning of Year 1 when the City calculates a proposer's "minimum guaranteed revenue NPV." Instead, the "upfront payment" component will simply be added to the NPV of any remaining "minimum guaranteed revenue" cash flows occurring at the end of Year 1, Year 2 and so forth through Year 20.

A102 **Yes this interpretation is correct. The “upfront payment” would not be subject to inflation or discounting as this would take place on signing the agreement (i.e. the beginning of Year 1).**

### **C. Attachments:**

- |                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <b>Attachment #1</b> | <b>Tourism Development Action Plan - A Five-Year<br/>Tourism Development Action Plan for the City of Toronto<br/>(All Wards)</b> |
| <b>Attachment #2</b> | <b>Pilot Project for 25 Information Pillars,<br/>Request for Proposal No. 3012-03-7369</b>                                       |
| <b>Attachment #3</b> | <b>City of Toronto<br/>Multilingual Services Policy</b>  |

Should you have any questions regarding this addendum, contact Vicki Strugnell at 416-397-5190 or [vstrugn@toronto.ca](mailto:vstrugn@toronto.ca).

Please attach this addendum to your Request for Proposal document and be governed accordingly. Vendors must acknowledge receipt of all addenda in their proposal in the space provided on the Proposal Submission Form as per Appendix A, Section 4 – Addenda of the RFP document. All other aspects of the RFP remain the same.

Victor Tryl, Manager  
Professional Services

Clause embodied in Report No. 5 of the Economic Development and Parks Committee, as adopted by the Council of the City of Toronto at its meeting held on June 24, 25 and 26, 2003.

**3****Tourism Development Action Plan - A Five-Year  
Tourism Development Action Plan for the City of Toronto  
(All Wards)**

*(City Council on June 24, 25 and 26, 2003, adopted this Clause, without amendment.)*

The Economic Development and Parks Committee recommends the adoption of the report (June 3, 2003) from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, subject to adding the following Recommendation:

**“Priority Six be added to protect the City’s assets, including, but not limited to, the Toronto Zoo, Canadian National Exhibition, Casa Loma and Black Creek Pioneer Village.”**

so that the Recommendations embodied in the “Five-Year Tourism Action Plan” now read as follows:

**(1) To Address Priority One: Leadership and Governance:**

- (a) a medium to long term strategic tourism plan be developed;**
- (b) private sector participation in Tourism Toronto be increased; and**
- (c) a Tourism Advisory Committee be formed to provide sector leadership during the next two year period.**

**(2) To Address Priority Two: Raising Industry Profile:**

**A communications plan be undertaken to increase awareness about the value of tourism.**

**(3) To Address Priority Three: Enhancing Tourism Product:**

- (a) a Tourism Events Strategy be developed;**
- (b) the tourism impact of City produced events be enhanced;**
- (c) a business plan for attracting “mega events” be developed;**

- (d) product development and packaging initiatives for smaller scale attractions be undertaken, including investigating the feasibility of a “City Card”;**
  - (e) the capital improvement plans for City and provincially owned attractions be assembled so that synergies, gaps and opportunities can be better identified and input provided to marketing and investment strategies; and**
  - (f) a pilot Integrated Quality Management program (IQM) be developed to focus on urban environmental issues, specifically on security, cleanliness and maintenance, and visitor services.**
- (4) To Address Priority Four: Creating an Investment Friendly City:**
  - (a) flexible financing and incentive models be developed;**
  - (b) investment capitalizing on Toronto’s unique attributes be proactively sought; and**
  - (c) culture and tourism opportunities be prominently featured in waterfront development, and that the timing, scope and direction of waterfront development be clarified.**
- (5) To Address Priority Five: Increasing Marketing Reach and Impact:**
  - (a) market research and knowledge of Toronto customers be leveraged to a greater extent and linked to marketing and product development activities;**
  - (b) overall awareness be increased by developing and marketing a relevant Toronto brand;**
  - (c) the focus on developing and marketing existing and potential niche markets be increased;**
  - (d) concerted marketing focused on the expected cultural renaissance that will begin in 2006 be undertaken;**
  - (e) tourist access to “sell-out” leisure activities such as sporting events, concerts, theatre events, etc. be increased;**
  - (f) stronger relationships be developed between Toronto-based tourism development and marketing activities and those undertaken by the provincial and federal governments;**
  - (g) stronger relationships be developed with adjacent destinations (e.g. Niagara Falls, Muskoka);**
  - (h) the focus on leisure markets be increased; and**

- (i) **destination marketing resources be increased, in the short term by supporting the Greater Toronto Hotel Association's initiative to introduce a voluntary 3 percent levy on room charges and by the City increasing its financial support for destination marketing, and in the longer term by continuing to work with the provincial government to enable a stable user-pay funding mechanism.**

**(6) To Address Priority Six: Protecting the City's Assets:**

**The City's assets be protected, including, but not limited to, the Toronto Zoo, Canadian National Exhibition, Casa Loma and Black Creek Pioneer Village.**

The Economic Development and Parks Committee reports, for the information of Council, having requested the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism to:

- (a) report to the September 8, 2003 meeting of the Economic Development and Parks Committee on:
  - (i) a proposed budget for the Tourism Development Action Plan; and
  - (ii) the implementation of the Tourism Development Action Plan;
- (b) include a request for funding within the Economic Development, Culture and Tourism Department's 2004 budget submission;
- (c) include the creation of a reserve account in the five-year budget plan so that funding will be available in the event of a slowdown in the tourism sector; and
- (d) meet with Toronto Zoo officials to discuss the report and how it relates to the Toronto Zoo and that further discussions take place on major Zoo initiatives and the findings be reported at the implementation stage.

**The Economic Development and Parks Committee submits the report (June 3, 2003) from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism:**

Purpose:

To recommend actions that will strengthen and revitalize Toronto's tourism industry and reverse the loss in market share and employment that has occurred in this important economic sector over the last five years.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no financial impacts or implications in the current year.

The implementation of the report's recommendations may lead to the identification that an expanded role for the City of Toronto in tourism development is needed to effectively support the industry. Any such implications will be reported on and quantified in future year budget submissions.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) City Council adopt the Five-Year Tourism Action Plan as a basis for coalescing action across the industry to strengthen Toronto's success as a visitor and convention destination;
- (2) the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism be requested to:
  - (a) report back to the Economic Development and Parks Committee on the terms of reference for a Tourism Advisory Committee, to provide industry leadership during the next two-year period;
  - (b) lead the implementation of a communications strategy which informs the tourism community about the Plan and enlists their participation in its implementation; such strategy to include an annual industry forum for reviewing progress and providing input to next steps; and
  - (c) report annually to the Economic Development and Parks Committee on the implementation of the Action Plan;
- (3) City Council endorse exploring an "Integrated Quality Management (IQM)" approach to addressing environmental issues in tourist destinations, and request the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism to lead an IQM team which will develop a proposal for a pilot project; such Team to report to the Tourism Advisory Committee and include representation from Works and Emergency Services, Community and Neighbourhood Services, Corporate Services, Urban Development Services, the Toronto Transit Commission, the Toronto Parking Authority, and the Toronto Police Services Board; and
- (4) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

Background:

At its meeting of October 29, 30 and 31, 2002, Council adopted Clause No. 1 of Report No. 9 of The Economic Development and Parks Committee that established the Tourism Sector Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee was requested to formulate a Five-Year Tourism Development Action Plan directed at strengthening the industry, and to report back to the Economic Development and Parks Committee in 2003. The terms of reference for the Advisory Committee are listed in Attachment No. 1 and the members are set out in Attachment No. 2.

Tourism is a key economic activity in Toronto. According to data released by Tourism Toronto, Toronto's visitors number 16.3 million, creating an economic impact of \$7.2 billion and supporting 95,000 jobs. Toronto's tourism industry generates about \$1.7 billion in annual tax revenue, \$290 million of which flows to the City of Toronto and other municipalities.

However since the mid-1990s, tourism in Toronto has experienced a gradual decline relative to other regions in North America. The report (September 30, 2002) recommending the establishment of a Tourism Sector Advisory Committee commented on two issues contributing to Toronto's loss of market share. First, other cities have more financial resources for tourism destination marketing. Second, the Toronto industry needed to update the strategic framework guiding its future. The Action Plan is a first step to addressing this second issue while discussions with the Province of Ontario to enable new revenue sources for tourism destination marketing continue.

A consultant team was retained to assist in the development of the action plan. The City issued an open Request for Proposals to solicit bids from consultants with strong backgrounds in tourism development and strategic planning. The successful proponent was a consortium led by Cameron Hawkins & Associates and also including KPMG and the Tourism Company. Each of these firms has over 20 years experience working with the tourism sector around the world. The Ministry of Tourism and Recreation provided half of the funds required to retain the consultant team. The remaining half was contributed from the Tourism Division's Operating Budget.

The following pages summarize the work that was undertaken by the Consultant team and the recommendations for a five-year Tourism Action Plan that have emerged. The next steps required from the City of Toronto in order to move forward are then outlined.

The Consultants' work was completed prior to the outbreak of SARS in Toronto. The need to rebuild Toronto's devastated tourism sector as quickly as possible has increased the urgency of many of the directions recommended in the Action Plan. The City, Province and industry responses to the outbreak have greatly accelerated action and focused attention on the immediate situation. Actions impacted by the responses to the SARS outbreak are noted throughout the following report.

#### Comments:

#### 1. Work Undertaken to Formulate Action Plan

##### 1.1 Consultation

As is set out in more detail in the Consultant's report (available from Tourism Division staff and after June 2003, from the website [www.toronto.ca/depts/tourism](http://www.toronto.ca/depts/tourism)), a series of interviews were undertaken with over three dozen stakeholders both within Toronto's tourism sector and outside Toronto with recent experience bringing tours or conventions to the City. These interviews sought opinions about the issues facing the Toronto industry, Toronto's strengths and weaknesses, best practices elsewhere, and what could be done differently.

The consultation process was broadened at a half day workshop involving about 130 sector representatives, City staff and officials and representatives from the senior levels of government. Participants were asked to consider the issues facing the industry, and to prioritize which were the most important to address in the short-term and long-term. They then offered potential solutions. A long list of ideas for future action was generated. In-house Tourism Division staff provided their input to the Consultant at a similar workshop.



The Tourism Sector Advisory Committee provided input and guidance at five meetings, held at the project's strategic decision points.

## Research Audit and Document Review

A significant number of recent studies relevant to Toronto's tourism sector and the challenges and opportunities for effecting change have been undertaken by a variety of bodies. The Consultant was asked to review, summarize and evaluate this information. In addition, best practices research was undertaken to discover and summarize what other cities are doing to increase tourism. The findings from this research audit are summarized in the Consultant's report.

### 2. Priorities for Action

The Consultants' review of information and discussions with industry leaders led them to the conclusion that the Action Plan should focus on addressing five priorities over the next five years:

- (1) Leadership and Governance;
- (2) Raising Industry Profile;
- (3) Enhancing Tourism Product;
- (4) Creating an Investment Friendly City; and
- (5) Increasing Marketing Reach and Impact.

The actions and general timelines recommended to address the five priorities are summarized in Attachment No. 3. More information about the various initiatives is set out in the Consultants' report.

#### 2.1 Priority One: Leadership and Governance

Toronto's tourism sector currently is fragmented and lacks a shared vision to guide tourism development, marketing and investment. There is a lack of understanding within government as to how public sector actions impact tourism, and until the SARS outbreak, the industry had low profile within the business community and the general public. Other jurisdictions have taken bold steps to bring stakeholders from the public and private sectors together in a formal leadership structure. Examples include Montreal, Vancouver, Chicago, New York State and City, and Singapore.

The Consultants indicate that four priority leadership actions are crucial to building a stronger foundation of Toronto's tourism industry:

- (i) The development of a medium to long-term strategic plan. The strategic plan would build on the Action Plan to undertake an analysis of the global tourism market outlook and Toronto's competitive position in attracting visitations, and then assess the actions needed to increase Toronto's competitiveness in attracting both current and emerging market segments.

- (ii) Increasing awareness of the value of tourism. Although tourism is a significant employer, generator of government revenue, and contributor to the quality of life in Toronto, awareness of its value has been low, even within the industry itself. Ironically, it took the virtual collapse of the industry in April and May of this year in the aftermath of the SARS outbreak to highlight its significance and importance. The development of a communications plan is recommended which would leverage the new awareness gained about the sector in the last two months into long-term knowledge and support.
- (iii) Increasing private-sector participation in Tourism Toronto. Tourism Toronto's membership has become increasingly skewed towards larger scale industry participants and to a convention/group focus in recent years. The myriad of small scale operators that comprise much of the tourism sector have not felt their interests well represented. The Consultants recommend that Tourism Toronto make it a priority to broaden its membership base so that it truly is able to represent the entire industry.
- (iv) Creating a permanent leadership vehicle. After reviewing leadership and governance models in a number of municipal, provincial/state and national jurisdictions, the Consultants reached the conclusion that the strongest model was a single Destination Marketing Organization (DMO) providing both destination marketing activities and industry leadership. Tourism Toronto has not been able to fill this role in the past for a number of reasons. However, it could have the potential to do so in the future if the Board were to agree to assume an increased leadership responsibility, if a large and stable independent revenue source were developed, if a broadened membership base were built, and if a balanced marketing program with an increased emphasis on leisure were undertaken.

The Consultants recommend that leadership for these initiatives come from a Tourism Advisory Committee. The Committee should balance public and private sector interests as well as represent "large" and "small" business, education and labour. It would be established for an approximate two-year period, and would then be replaced by a permanent leadership vehicle for the industry.

## 2.2 Priority Two: Raising Industry Profile

The tourism sector has launched few, if any, initiatives to demonstrate to the community at large the importance of tourism, not just as an economic lever, but also for its contribution to the quality of life. Furthermore, tourism leaders seldom talk to the leaders of other business sectors about the importance of tourism to their industry. For Toronto's tourism sector to succeed, a new understanding is required.

The Consultants recommend that a multi-phased communications and education strategy be undertaken, aimed at three key target audiences:

- (a) business and political leaders;
- (b) the community at large; and
- (c) all Torontonians having contact with visitors.

The initial goal would be to generate a broad level of awareness of the role tourism plays in supporting recreation and culture, quality of life and economic growth. The second and perhaps more important role would be to motivate involvement and activity at a variety of levels aimed at supporting tourism development initiatives in Toronto. The ultimate goal should be to integrate tourism-friendly attitudes into the fabric of Toronto's urban life.

The first stage of the strategy would be to develop a research-based Backgrounder documenting the economic and qualitative impact that tourism has on the local community, and that Toronto-based tourism has on the rest of the province and Canada. This would flow into a public awareness campaign, with many industry-specific thrusts (e.g., documenting the significance of the car rental industry to the automotive sector), partnership opportunities, and an overall vibrant, creative and fresh approach. Local residents would be encouraged to be "tourists in their own town". The goal would be to build participation and pride in the City's cultural, recreational and entertainment amenities. Front line workers would be motivated to provide exceptional service and to be "visitor-friendly".

The communications strategy would be undertaken under the leadership of the Tourism Advisory Committee.

### 2.3 Priority Three: Enhancing Tourism Product

At the outset of the project, the Consultants heard a number of people express the opinion that Toronto's tourism product was old and tired. This conclusion was not borne out by the research undertaken, or by the tour and convention representatives interviewed outside Toronto. Visitors are generally satisfied with the quality of the attractions they come to see.

This will become even more the case three and four years in the future when the announced investments in the Royal Ontario Museum, Art Gallery of Ontario, Ontario Science Centre, the Ricoh Coliseum at Exhibition Place, the Four Seasons Centre (ballet/opera) and Festival Hall (announced new home for the Toronto International Film Festival) come on stream. To quote from the Consultants' report, "Not since the 1970's have we seen such an array of publicly supported attractions of interest to the leisure visitor".

During the intervening 2003-2005 period, the Consultants recommend focusing on:

- (i) the development of a Tourism Events strategy;
- (ii) enhancing the tourism impact of City-produced events;
- (iii) business plan for attracting international mega events;
- (iv) product development and packaging initiatives for smaller scale attractions; and
- (v) the quality of the urban environment.

They also recommend that the capital improvement plans for City and provincially owned attractions be assembled so that synergies, gaps and opportunities can be better identified and input provided to marketing and investment strategies.

## 2.4 Priority Four: Creating an Investment Friendly City

A critical success factor for any urban destination is ongoing investment in new, enhanced or expanded attractions and visitor services. Toronto is no exception, and needs to continue to pay attention to its ability to attract new investment.

Our competitive strength is our extremely large local, business and tourist market. In each of these market segments, Toronto is number one in Canada and amongst the largest in North America.

We compare less favourably with other North American jurisdictions competing for the global investment dollar in having high property tax levels, and in being limited in our ability to offer financial incentives for development. Difficulty in accessing capital for tourism development is another issue, not only in Toronto but also throughout Canada. However, these two limitations are not within the sphere of influence of the tourism industry or the City of Toronto.

The Consultants note that it is nonetheless critical that Toronto work to increase its attractiveness to investors by maintaining a high quality urban environment (also important for Priority Three) and by increasing tourist visitations through effective destination marketing (Priority Five). They also recommend that the tourism sector work together with the City to proactively seek investment on an ongoing basis, and focus investment on tourism development that builds on Toronto's unique attributes.

## 2.5 Priority Five: Increasing Marketing Reach and Impact

Toronto currently lacks sufficient resources for destination marketing to compete effectively with other North American jurisdictions. As a result, Toronto's position in the North American and international tourism marketplace has been diminished.

The Consultants recommend two streams of activity to address this issue:

- (i) Make more efficient and effective use of current resources by leveraging research, using a branding strategy, focusing on niche markets, capitalizing on the forthcoming renaissance (2006/7) among Toronto's premiere cultural attractions, positioning existing leisure products (e.g., sports, theatre) to tourist markets, developing stronger relationships with adjacent destinations and other levels of government, and focusing more on leisure markets and relationships.
- (ii) Work to increase the resources available for destination marketing, in the short-term by supporting the Greater Toronto Hotel Association's efforts to put in place a voluntary levy, and over the longer term by continuing to work with the provincial government to seek new revenue sources.

Since the Consultants' completed their work, the provincial government has earmarked considerable increases in destination marketing resources for 2003 and 2004 to accelerate recovery from the damage done to Toronto's international profile by the SARS outbreak. While welcome, these resources are time limited and intended for specific purposes. They do not replace the need for a stable revenue source to support a competitive level of destination marketing activity.

### 3. Next Steps

The actions recommended by the Consultants to address the five priorities require activity and support not only from the City of Toronto, but also from Tourism Toronto, industry associations and individuals, and the senior levels of government. Success will come from widespread support and commitment across these bodies, and agreement to work together towards a common goal. Three integrated streams of activity to build the necessary coalitions and commitment are set out below:

- (i) undertaking a communications strategy for the Action Plan;
- (ii) forming the Tourism Advisory Committee; and
- (iii) forming an IQM Team.

While these building blocks are being put in place, City staff are progressing with a number of specific projects and initiatives that support the Action Plan. These are set out in Attachment No. 4. Staff also will be commencing work to support the new initiatives recommended in the Action Plan for 2003 and 2004 (see Attachment No. 3) in the coming months.

The timing of these initiatives has been impacted by the immediate need to focus on developing and implementing a recovery strategy addressing the impact the SARS outbreak has had on Toronto's tourism sector. A Toronto Tourism Industry Community Coalition was formed in mid-April to develop a recovery plan and to ensure that all activities undertaken by partners are consistent and avoid duplication of effort. The Coalition includes representatives from the City of Toronto, Tourism Toronto, the Greater Toronto Hotel Association, Ontario Restaurant, Hotel and Motel Association, Board of Trade, Retail Council of Canada, Air Canada, Metro Convention Centre, Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, Ontario Tourism Marketing Partnership, and Canadian Tourism Commission.

As is further detailed in the Chief Administrative Officer and Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism's May 21, 2003 report to Council entitled "Mayor's SARS Recovery Task Force – Status Report", the recovery plan will cover an 18 to 24 month period and will undertake a wide range of initiatives. The Province's financial commitments are closely tied to the Coalition's recovery plan. To date, these total \$128 million.

At a Special Meeting on April 24, 2003, City Council formed the Mayor's SARS Recovery Task Force, adopted a number of motions on specific actions to be considered by the Task Force, and approved a \$5.5 million budget. The mandate of the Task Force is to:

- (a) address the public health needs of the City;
- (b) combat the public's fears about SARS;
- (c) promote Toronto to Torontonians, the international business community, and leisure travellers; and
- (d) ensure economic relief for individuals and businesses whose livelihoods have been impacted by SARS.

The work program has been divided into five streams, each one with Councillor champions and a staff resource team. The Task Force's role is to provide overall leadership on the strategy, manage the related intergovernmental relations, and oversee planning, priority setting and resource allocation decisions.

Significant activity and results have been achieved in a very short space of time, including a Mothers Day restaurant promotion and four days of celebration and promotional activities extending over the Victoria Day Weekend to welcome the thousands of people who took advantage of Air Canada's "Canada Loves Toronto" promotion. More information is included in the May 21, 2003 status report referenced above.

A key element in ensuring the success of the recovery is strategic alignment and forming effective working partnerships with the provincial and federal governments. It is the goal of the Task Force to ensure that the City's funding is used most effectively within the overall tri-level of government strategy and achieves optimum benefit.

It is anticipated that strategic planning for the recovery strategy will continue to command the industry's almost single minded focus until at least the end of June. This notwithstanding, staff already are working laying the groundwork for the next steps, and will continue to do so throughout the summer months.

### 3.1 Communications Strategy for Action Plan.

Many of the key stakeholders who will be involved in implementing the Action Plan directly participated in its development by being included on the Advisory Committee. Others were interviewed by the Consultants. Dialogue with a broader cross section of the industry was initiated at the January 22, 2003. Tourism Summit workshop. It is recommended that this dialogue be continued.

It is recommended that the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism be authorized to develop and lead a communications strategy for informing the industry about the Five-Year Action Plan and discussing how the various groups and industry sub-sectors can participate in its implementation. Presentations will be made to individual association and sectoral meetings at which more focused discussions can be held about interfaces with the Action Plan. Members of the Advisory Committee could be invited to deliver some of the presentations, whereas others would be delivered by the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism or the Executive Director of the Tourism Division.

The Action Plan should be revisited annually. Progress should be monitored, and new events, trends and experiences should be incorporated in planning the next steps to be undertaken in the coming year. It is proposed that the broader industry be invited to participate in this review at an annual Tourism Industry Summit, following up on the session held in January 2003. Following the Summit, the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism would report on the action plan annually to the Economic Development and Parks Committee.

### 3.2 Tourism Advisory Committee

The Consultants recommend that a high level “Advisory Committee” be formed for an approximate two-year period to lead:

- (i) a Strategic Plan for Toronto’s Tourism Industry; and
- (ii) a communication and education program to raise awareness of tourism’s significance among business and public sector leaders, the general public, and people in direct contact with visitors (both the general public and front line staff), and engage them in positive programs supportive of tourism and tourists.

The Consultants suggest that the Committee initially be comprised of a senior representative of the City, the President of Tourism Toronto, and one other individual chosen for his/her impartiality and prominence in the Toronto community (not necessarily with a tourism background). The three-person team would strike the balance of the Committee, seeking a total of no more than fifteen representatives balancing public and private sector interests as well as being inclusive of “large” and “small” businesses, education and labour.

Broader discussion and assessment of alternative committee models and terms of reference is required before the Advisory Committee can be formed. It is recommended that this work be undertaken by the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, followed by a report back on the formation of the Advisory Committee.

### 3.3 Integrated Quality Management

Integrated Quality Management (IQM) is an integrative approach to managing the urban environment that has been successfully used in several European cities, including Dublin. It recognizes that the visitor experience is affected by many organizations in both the public and private sector, and brings these organizations together to develop and implement a common plan for enhancing and maintaining a high quality environment.

It is important that this be done to address two of the Action Plan priorities – “Enhancing Tourism Product” and “Creating an Investment Friendly City”. Toronto has long had the international reputation for being a clean and safe city. This reputation has come under assault in recent years as the need for public sector cutbacks has reduced the level of service in a number of key areas, and as Toronto continues to grapple with the social and logistical challenges of being home to a diverse population of 2.5 million people.

A new approach to managing Toronto’s urban environment in the face of these challenges is needed. It is recommended that the IQM approach be further explored, with the view of implementing a pilot project. This would be initiated by forming an interdepartmental and inter-agency team led by the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism to learn more about best practices in IQM and develop terms of reference for a pilot project in Toronto.

### 3.4 Actions Already in Progress

Initiatives already are underway that address the Action Plan's five priorities. Attachment No. 4 lists some of the major projects under development in the Tourism Division's 2003 work program. Some of these – for example, a business plan to attract mega events to the City, and a new Service Agreement to guide the City's relationship with Tourism Toronto over the next three years – will be forwarded to the Economic Development and Parks Committee in the coming months. As is recommended in the Action Plan, Toronto Special Events already is implementing a strategy for its three signature events to target higher yield tourist markets and to build partnerships with other attractions and businesses in the community. This will increase tourist visitations and average expenditure levels, and will increase the level of economic spin-offs to other Toronto tourist businesses and attractions. Over the next couple of years, Winterfest, Celebrate Toronto Street Festival, and Cavalcade could well evolve in what the Consultant has labelled "hallmark" events. These are defined as "recurring events that possess such significance that they provide the host community with a competitive advantage".

In addition, there are significant synergies between the Tourism Action Plan and the Culture Plan that has been under development in the Department. The area of cultural tourism is a significant opportunity for the City, both to increase tourism and to enhance cultural development. The Tourism and Culture Divisions will be co-operating closely in moving forward to realize cultural tourism opportunities.

#### Conclusions:

The Five-Year Tourism Development Action Plan is a significant first step in coalescing energies across the tourism sector to strengthen Toronto's success as a visitor and convention destination. Five priorities have been identified to focus attention and resources, and more than twenty action areas suggested to address the priorities.

In 2003 and 2004, the focus needs to be on building the coalitions across the industry and within City Hall that are needed for success, and then on determining strategic direction. While these building blocks are being put in place, work will proceed on many individual initiatives that further the Action Plan.

It is recommended that City Council adopt the Five-Year Action Plan as a basis for coalescing action across the industry to strengthen Toronto's success as a visitor and convention destination, and put in place the vehicles needed to lead and co-ordinate the Plan's implementation.

#### Contact Name:

Mr. Duncan H. Ross, Executive Director – Tourism, Tel: (416) 397-5395, Fax: (416) 392-2271, dhross@toronto.ca.

(A copy of the Five-Year Tourism Action Plan referred to in the foregoing report was forwarded to all Members of Council under separate cover and a copy thereof is on file in the office of the City Clerk)



Attachment No. 1  
Tourism Sector Advisory Committee  
Terms of Reference

Purpose:

The Tourism Sector Advisory Committee is a special advisory committee of the Economic Development and Parks Committee. The Task Force acts on the Committee's direction to examine how Toronto's tourism industry can be re-vitalized and strengthened in order to reverse the loss of tourism market share and the loss of employment in this important sector of the economy that has occurred from 1997 to the present.

Term of Office:

The Tourism Sector Advisory Committee will be in existence until the activities specified are completed.

Activities:

- (a) Review key tourism development documents including "Tourism Investment Study", Cameron Hawkins & Associates, December 2001 and "Competitive Tourism Development Strategy for Metropolitan Toronto", KPMG, 1992 and identify any gaps or changes in context that suggest different conclusions, directions or priorities for action.
- (b) Identify current reality and perceptions of issues that need actions and new initiatives under development through consultation with senior staff in the Tourism Division, senior officials at Tourism Toronto, the Canadian Tourism Commission, the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, and selected sector representatives.
- (c) Consult with travel and tourism industry representatives based in jurisdictions outside of Toronto to determine their perspectives of Toronto tourism development challenges and opportunities.
- (d) Identify other jurisdictions that are successful and showing leadership in developing their tourism industries, and summarize best practices relevant to the Toronto context.
- (e) Participate and facilitate a one-day Toronto Tourism Industry Summit to research seek ideas for action with key tourism industry representatives.
- (f) Draft a five-year tourism development Action Plan for the period from the beginning of 2003 to the end of 2008 for and present it to the Economic Development and Parks Committee in early 2003.

These activities will be undertaken with staff from the Tourism Division and Tourism Specialist who will be responsible for external research, organizing stakeholder meetings and preparing reports.

Composition:

- (a) Five Councillors who are interested in the tourism industry with preference being given to achieving a geographical balance;
- (b) one representative or member from each of the following:
  - Tourism Toronto;
  - Toronto Board of Trade;
  - Greater Toronto Hotel Association;
  - Ontario Restaurant Association;
  - Attractions Ontario;
  - A member of a Faculty of Business, Economics, Hospitality/Tourism or Urban Studies of a University located in Toronto;
  - Exhibition Place;
  - Toronto Transit Commission;
  - Toronto Zoo;
  - A representative of the Cultural Sector.
- (c) a total maximum voting membership of 16;
- (d) if a member has not attended the Task Force for three consecutive meetings without leave of the committee, they will be deemed to have resigned and another member will be sought; and
- (e) the following City Departments, Divisions, Agencies, Boards and Commissions or other City Organizations and Corporations be requested to appoint a representative to attend meetings and act as a non-voting advisory member with otherwise full participation privileges:
  - Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, Culture/Parks and Recreation/Economic Development;
  - Works and Emergency Services, Transportation Services/Solid Waste; and
  - Corporate Services, Facilities and Real Estate

Meetings:

- (a) That meetings be regularly scheduled and there will be not more than four full Task Force Meetings including the Toronto Tourism Industry Summit;
- (b) that proceedings of the meetings be recorded;
- (c) that co-chairs be elected from among the membership; one to be a Council member, one a citizen member;
- (d) that the Committee be supported by staff of the Tourism Division;
- (e) that the Economic Development and Parks Committee be authorized to appoint their own citizen membership in accordance with the composition recommended by this report; and

- (f) that the presence of five members, including at least one co-chair, constitutes a quorum.

---

Attachment No. 2

Tourism Advisory Committee Members

1. Mr. Ralph Strachan (Co-Chair)  
Chair and Acting President, Tourism Toronto
2. Mr. Terry Mundell  
President, Ontario Restaurant Hotel and Motel Association
3. Mr. Bill Duron  
Chair, The Toronto Board of Trade Tourism Committee  
Designate: Michele Carroll, The Toronto Board of Trade
4. Mr. Rod Seiling  
President, Greater Toronto Hotel Association
5. Mr. Joel Peters  
Vice President, Marketing and Commercial Development, Royal Ontario Museum -  
representing Attractions Ontario
6. Ms. Dianne Young  
General Manager, Exhibition Place  
Designate: Kathryn Reed-Garrett, Director, Business Development, Exhibition Place
7. Mr. Rick Ducharme  
Chief General Manager, Toronto Transit Commission  
Designate: Bob Hughes, Chief Marketing Officer, Toronto Transit Commission
8. Mr. Cal White  
General Manager, Toronto Zoo
9. Dr. Marion Joppe (educational sector)  
Ryerson University, Hospitality and Tourism Management
10. Ms. Kathleen Sharpe (cultural sector)  
Director, Ontario Cultural Attractions Fund
11. Mr. Clive Baxter (retail sector)  
Vice President – General Manager, Toronto Eaton Centre  
Toronto City Councillors
12. Councillor Denzil Minnan-Wong (Co-Chair)

Ward 34 - Don Valley East

13. Councillor Brian Ashton  
Ward 36 – Scarborough Southwest
14. Councillor David Miller  
Ward 13 – Parkdale-High Park
15. Councillor Joe Pantalone  
Ward 19 – Trinity-Spadina
16. Councillor Kyle Rae  
Ward 27 Toronto Centre-Rosedale

City of Toronto Staff (non-voting members)

Mr. Duncan Ross - Executive Director, Tourism Division  
Mr. Rita Davies – Executive Director, Culture Division  
Ms. Brenda Librecz - Executive Director, Economic Development Division  
Designate: Bruce Graham, Director, Business Development & Retention  
Ms. Claire Tucker Reid - General Manager, Parks and Recreation Division  
Designate: Don Boyle, Director, South District  
Mr. Geoff Rathbone - Director, Solid Waste and Corporate Services  
Designate: Guy Perry, Senior Engineer  
Mr. Bruce Bowes - Executive Director, Facilities and Real Estate  
Designate: Doug Stewart, Director, Real Estate  
Mr. David Kaufman - General Manager, Transportation Services  
Designate: Andy Koropeski, Director, District 1

Provincial Staff (non-voting member)

Mr. Douglass Legg - Senior Advisor, Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation

---

## Attachment No. 4

### Short Term Actions in Progress

Tourism Division staff already are working on a number of initiatives that will implement the action plan. These include the following:

#### Addressing Priority One: Leadership

Action Plan Development

New Service Agreement between the City and Tourism Toronto

#### Addressing Priority Three: Enhancing Product Development

The repositioning of Signature Events produced by Toronto Special Events to increase partnership opportunities and become more tourist oriented.

The establishment of cross-departmental Event Support team to streamline logistics associated with holding events (e.g. traffic considerations, security, etc.)

Business plan for Toronto International establishing strategy for attracting mega events

Liaison with Licensing Commission on regulations to better ensure that pedicabs (rickshaws) provide acceptable customer service

Liaison with the tour guide industry and George Brown College to increase standards within the industry and to introduce a course training tour guides.

Further development of a "Museum Passport" including City museums and the Royal Ontario and Gardiner Museums.

Advice and support to the Toronto Aerospace Museum to enable it to expand its program and attain a sustainable level of operations

Continued work with Cruise Ontario to strengthen and expand the Great Lakes Cruising Program

Continued work with OTMP to develop and expand Toronto based product clubs ("Nutcracker Neighbourhood", "Toronto Jazz Live", "A Great Night Out").

#### Addressing Priority Four: Creating an Investment-Friendly City

Development of a new Tourism Investment Attraction Brochure and information package

Continued liaison to facilitate initiation of Fast Ferry service to Rochester Summer 2004

#### Addressing Priority Five: Increasing Marketing Reach and Impact

Toronto Branding Strategy

Development of a strategy and work plan for making City website ([www.Toronto.ca](http://www.Toronto.ca)) more friendly and useful to prospective visitors

---

The following persons appeared before the Economic Development and Parks Committee in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Mr. Bill Duron, Chair, Board of Trade, Tourism Division;
- Councillor Kyle Rae, Ward 27 Toronto Centre-Rosedale; and
- Councillor David Shiner, Ward 24 Willowdale.

**Consolidated Clause in Policy and Finance Committee Report 5, which was considered by City Council on June 22, 23 and 24, 2004.**

**24**

**Pilot Project for 25 Information Pillars,  
Request for Proposal No. 3012-03-7369**

*City Council on June 22, 23 and 24, 2004, amended this Clause by deleting staff Recommendation (4) contained in the Recommendations section of the report dated May 13, 2004, from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, and inserting instead the following:*

*“(4) provided that there is a favourable review in accordance with Recommendation (3) and Council decides not to pursue a revised comprehensive street furniture program in 2009, and Council authorizes the continuation or expansion of the project, then Council consider at that time whether to provide Astral Media Outdoor L.P. with the option of first right of refusal to extend the agreement for a further five years, excluding portions of land on the public rights-of-way, in accordance with the terms and conditions set out in the RFP;”.*

---

**The Policy and Finance Committee recommends adoption of the recommendation of the Economic Development and Parks Committee contained in the communication (June 8, 2004) from the Economic Development and Parks Committee, subject to adding the following:**

- (1) that no information pillars be placed within BIAs;**
- (2) that local Councillors be consulted by staff on the placement of information pillars within their Ward; and**
- (3) that historical districts be respected.**

Recommendation:

The Economic Development and Parks Committee recommended to the Policy and Finance Committee that City Council adopt the report (May 13, 2004) from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, subject to amending Recommendation (3) by deleting “2007” and replacing it with “2006”, so that the Recommendation now reads:

- “(3) staff conduct an evaluation in 2006, and submit a report to Council with recommendations on whether the project should be continued, expanded or terminated at the end of the contract period;”.

Action taken by the Committee:

The Economic Development and Parks Committee requested the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism to develop a measurable criteria for the locations of the Information Pillars and report to the Economic Development and Parks Committee.

Background:

The Economic Development and Parks Committee, on June 7, 2004, considered the following:

- (i) report (May 13, 2004) from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, advising on the results of Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 3012-03-7369 for the design, provision, installation, and maintenance of 25 Information Pillars for the Parks and Recreation Division, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism Department, and to obtain authorization to negotiate and enter into an agreement with the recommended proponent, Astral Media Outdoor L.P. for a term of up to five years as a pilot project initiative; and recommending that:
  - (1) Astral Media Outdoor L.P., the highest overall scoring proponent meeting the requirements, and their “Streetsmart 100 series” as the preferred design, be selected to provide for the design, provision, installation, and maintenance of twenty-five Information Pillars for the pilot project initiative;
  - (2) authority be given to the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, and the City Solicitor to negotiate and enter into an agreement with Astral Media Outdoor L.P. to provide for the design, provision, siting, installation, and maintenance of twenty-five Information Pillars for a term of up to five years as a pilot project initiative in accordance with the terms and conditions set out in the RFP, and in a form and content acceptable to the City Solicitor;
  - (3) staff conduct an evaluation in 2007, and submit a report to Council with recommendations on whether the project should be continued, expanded or terminated at the end of the contract period;
  - (4) provided that there is a favourable review in accordance with Recommendation 3, and Council decides not to pursue a revised comprehensive street furniture program in 2009, and Council authorizes the continuation or expansion of the project, Astral Media Outdoor L.P. be granted the option of first right of refusal to extend the agreement for a further five years, excluding portions of land on the public rights-of-way, in accordance with the terms and conditions set out in the RFP;

- (5) the appropriate City officials be authorized to issue a permit for erecting information pillar(s) in Nathan Phillips Square, and in accordance with the Toronto Municipal Code, Chapter 237, Article II;
  - (6) this report be forwarded to the Policy and Finance Committee for consideration;
  - (7) any revenue increase arising from implementation of this proposal be reported to the Budget Advisory Committee for consideration with the Parks and Recreation and Facilities and Real Estate 2005 Operating budgets; and
  - (8) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take all actions necessary and execute all documents to give effect thereto; and
- (ii) communication (June 7, 2004) from James L. Robinson, Downtown Yonge Business Improvement Area, requesting that the Business Improvement Areas be consulted prior to the placement of the proposed Information Pillars.

The following persons appeared before the Economic Development and Parks Committee:

- Rene Desmarais, President, Astral Media Outdoor LP; and
- Jeremy Kramer, President, Kramer Design Associates.

Councillor Giorgio Mammoliti, Ward 7 York West, appeared before the Economic Development and Parks Committee.

---

(Report dated May 13, 2004, addressed to the Economic Development and Parks Committee from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer)

Purpose:

The purpose of this report is to advise on the results of Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 3012-03-7369 for the design, provision, installation, and maintenance of twenty-five Information Pillars for Parks and Recreation Division, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism Department and, to obtain authorization to negotiate and enter into an agreement with the recommended proponent, Astral Media Outdoor L.P. for a term of up to five years as a pilot project initiative.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

The pilot project proposed in this report presents the potential for new revenue generation for both the Parks and Recreation Division and the Facilities and Real Estate, Corporate Services Department over the five-year contract period. The preferred proponent's initiative is projected to generate \$800,000.00 in payments to the City for the placement of 25 information pillars on City property over the five-year period. Annual payments are projected at \$150,000.00 in the



first year, increasing over the years with the final year payment estimated at \$170,000.00. Revenue would be split according to the location of the pillars and is projected to be approximately 85 percent for Parks and Recreation and 15 percent for Facilities and Real Estate.

In addition to direct payments, approximately \$1 million of in-kind advertising allocations are included in the proposal which would provide the City with placements on the vendors national media network, advertising on the pillar faces, tourist information services on the pillars and way finding devices in the pole structures. These in-kind opportunities would contribute tourism destination marketing and local tourism support, which would not otherwise be available.

### Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) Astral Media Outdoor L.P., the highest overall scoring proponent meeting the requirements, and their "Streetsmart 100 series" as the preferred design, be selected to provide for the design, provision, installation, and maintenance of 25 Information Pillars for the pilot project initiative;
- (2) authority be given to the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, and the City Solicitor to negotiate and enter into an agreement with Astral Media Outdoor L.P. to provide for the design, provision, siting, installation, and maintenance of 25 Information Pillars for a term of up to five years as a pilot project initiative in accordance with the terms and conditions set out in the RFP, and in a form and content acceptable to the City Solicitor;
- (3) staff conduct an evaluation in 2007, and submit a report to Council with recommendations on whether the project should be continued, expanded or terminated at the end of the contract period;
- (4) provided that there is a favourable review in accordance with Recommendation 3, and Council decides not to pursue a revised comprehensive street furniture program in 2009, and Council authorizes the continuation or expansion of the project, Astral Media Outdoor L.P. be granted the option of first right of refusal to extend the agreement for a further five years, excluding portions of land on the public rights-of-way, in accordance with the terms and conditions set out in the RFP;
- (5) the appropriate City officials be authorized to issue a permit for erecting information pillar(s) in Nathan Phillips Square, and in accordance with the Toronto Municipal Code, Chapter 237, Article II;
- (6) this report be forwarded to the Policy and Finance Committee for consideration;
- (7) any revenue increase arising from implementation of this proposal be reported to the Budget Advisory Committee for consideration with the Parks and Recreation and Facilities and Real Estate 2005 Operating budgets; and

- (8) that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take all actions necessary and execute all documents to give effect thereto.

Background:

City Council, on May 30, 31, and June 1, 2001, adopted a report of the Economic Development and Parks Committee, recommending that a Request for Proposals be issued for a third party outdoor advertising pilot project for 25 information pillar locations to be distributed City-wide. Responsibility for the execution of this project was given to the Inter-departmental 3rd Party Outdoor Advertising Committee and after extensive consultation with key City staff, including Legal, Insurance and Risk Management, Finance, and Corporate Services, Request for Proposals No. 3012-03-7369 was prepared.

On October 17, 2003, The City of Toronto through the Purchasing and Materials Management Division, officially invited interested firms to submit proposals for entering into an agreement for a term of up to five years as a pilot project initiative for the design, provision, installation, maintenance of 25 “information pillars,” defined as multi-sided ground signs that have panels for third party advertising. The information pillars must demonstrate design excellence, enhance the “public realm” and be located at approved sites in such a manner as to improve pedestrian flow and the visual character of the Streetscape. This initiative, increasingly common in other major urban centres world-wide, also addresses gaps that exist in the provision of tourist oriented way-finding signage as well as information dissemination in Toronto.

The successful proponent will be permitted to sell advertising space on the information pillars. The revenue from the advertising will be shared between the City and the successful proponent and monies derived from the City’s portion of signage revenue will be used for improvements to the immediate facility and surrounding community. In 2007, staff will conduct an evaluation of this pilot project and submit a report to Council with recommendations on whether the project should be continued, expanded or terminated at the end of the contract period.

This proposed pilot project represents a modest initiative to allow limited third party outdoor advertising on City-owned property. It will help to determine the potential of such advertising structures to provide effective venues for City-related public service messages and information, to obtain an accurate indication of the future revenue-generating potential of third party outdoor advertising and to allow Council to better address public concerns on maintaining the integrity and aesthetics of streetscapes, facilities and parks.

As directed by Council, potential locations for siting information pillars include City-owned lands such as civic squares, areas adjacent to community centres and street-level entrances to parks and ravines. The current criteria for locations, which emphasize public safety considerations, include maintaining the pedestrian and visual amenity of residential and business communities, maintaining the aesthetic quality, usability and accessibility of sidewalks, parks and public spaces as well as protecting important views and vistas. All signs and sign locations proposed under this program will be subject to all necessary municipal approvals. An interdepartmental staff team will assist the successful proponent in the co-ordination and securing of the necessary approvals, such as by-law amendments or variances, as required.

Comments:

Thirty-nine firms from the City's bidders list were notified and invited to submit proposals. The RFP was also advertised on the City's internet website. The RFP was issued by the Purchasing and Materials Management Division on October 17, 2003, and closed on November 28, 2003. The City received three submissions from the following firms:

- (1) Astral Media Outdoor L.P.;
- (2) Eucan Urban Equipment of Canada, Inc.; and
- (3) Pattison Outdoor Advertising.

The three proposals received were evaluated by members of the Inter-departmental 3rd Party Outdoor Advertising Committee consisting of representatives from the Policy and Development, Parks and Recreation and Tourism Divisions of EDCT; the Transportation Division of WES; the Corporate Communications, and Facilities and Real Estate Divisions of Corporate Services; and the Urban Design Group of UDS.

The team evaluated the proposals, first individually and then as a group, in accordance with a set of pre-established criteria to determine which proponent(s) were the most responsible and responsive to the City's requirements.

The first stage of the evaluation examined the proponent's experience and competency to successfully carry out and manage what they are proposing, the design and technical merits of the proposed Information Pillars and a financial assessment of both the proposal and proponent.

Originally, proponents were required to score a minimum of 75 percent in the first stage to qualify for further evaluation, although due to the small number of responses to the RFP, this requirement was waived and all three proponents were evaluated in both the first and second stages.

The second stage of the evaluation involved an interview process examining the proponent's presentation of their proposal, their performance during the interview and their ability to answer questions specific to their proposal. Upon completion of the second stage, the final scores ranged from 68 to 94 out of a possible 100.

The decision to interview the three proponents did not change the outcome of the evaluation process. Astral Media Outdoor L.P. was the highest scoring proponent in both the first and second stages of the evaluation process.

In addition to the guaranteed cash revenue of \$800,000.00 paid to the City over five years, which will be allocated to the budgets of Parks and Recreation and Facilities and Real Estate when the list of pillar locations is finalized, the Astral proposal offers a total of \$1,014,867.00 in associated in-kind value.

- (1) This in-kind contribution includes \$500,000.00 in advertising allocation value for advertising City messages on the preferred proponent's entire national media network. For example, this could enable the City to promote Toronto as a tourism destination

across Canada including major markets such as Vancouver, and Montreal. This is the kind of promotion the City has desired to implement but has previously been limited due to budget constraints.

- (2) Additionally, \$220,000.00 in advertising value over five years is included for City messaging on the information pillar faces, which could be used to promote City-wide events or programs.
- (3) \$248,367.00 in additional monetary value is included for co-ordinating a tourist information dissemination service for the pillar system utilizing a map dispenser, LED enhancements to two pillars and provision of an interactive telephone/on-line/digital information service.
- (4) A further \$46,500.00 in added value is included for the provision of three wayfinding finger pole structures.

The evaluation team concluded that the proposal submitted by Astral Media Outdoor L.P. demonstrates a good understanding of the objectives and the requirements for the design, provision, siting, installation, and maintenance of 25 Information Pillars as a pilot project, and further concludes that the Astral's "Streetsmart 100 series" is the preferred design.

The Fair Wage Office has reported that the recommended firm has indicated that they have reviewed and understand the Fair Wage Policy and labour trades requirements and have agreed to comply fully.

#### Conclusions:

This report requests authority to negotiate and enter into an agreement with Astral Media Outdoor L.P, the highest overall scoring proponent, to provide for the design, provision, installation, and maintenance of twenty-five Information Pillars for Parks and Recreation Division, EDCT for a contract of up to five years as a pilot project initiative, including the option of first right of refusal, excluding portions of land on the public rights-of-way, in the event that the project is continued or expanded.

This timing will allow the City to develop and finalize an overall strategy for the implementation of a co-ordinated street furnishings program. With the pilot nature of this initiative and the expiry of the contracts for transit shelters and recycling containers on road allowances occurring in 2007 and 2009 respectively, the City has a unique opportunity to harmonize and implement a co-ordinated street furnishings program and report thereon to Council next year.

#### Contacts:

Brenda Librecz, Acting General Manager, Parks and Recreation Division, Tel.: 416-397-4451, Fax: 416-392-8565; e-mail: blibrec@toronto.ca

Lou Pagano, P.Eng., Director, Purchasing and Materials Management, Finance Department, Tel: 461-392-7312, Fax: 416-392-0801; e-mail: lpagano@toronto.can

(A copy of the communication dated June 7, 2004, from James L. Robinson, Downtown Yonge Business Improvement Area, referred to in the communication dated June 8, 2004, from the City Clerk, was forwarded to all Members of Council with the June 14, 2004, agenda of the Policy and Finance Committee and a copy is also on file in the office of the City Clerk, City Hall.)

Clause embodied in Report No. 2 of the Administration Committee, as adopted by the Council of the City of Toronto at its meeting held on February 13, 14 and 15, 2002.

4

**City of Toronto  
Multilingual Services Policy**

*(City Council on February 13, 14 and 15, 2002, adopted this Clause, without amendment.)*

**The Administration Committee recommends:**

- (1) the adoption of the report (December 17, 2001) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, subject to the cost of providing the French language translation services, referred to therein, not exceeding \$10,000 per year; and**
- (2) that the Commissioner of Corporate Services be requested to:**
  - (a) monitor the policy and report back to the Administration Committee prior to the end of the year on any additional strategies that need to be considered to ensure that the policy is effective; and**
  - (b) continue to work with the French community, multicultural committees, ethnic media (including local media) in the City to address the concerns raised with respect to lack of advertising in the ethnic and French media, and report thereon to the Ethnic and Race Relations Committee.**

**The Administration Committee submits the following report (December 17, 2001) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services:**

Purpose:

This report describes the results of the consultations with the Race and Ethnic Relations Committee and the French Committee regarding a City of Toronto Multilingual Services Policy. Staff were directed to consult with these committees following a report entitled "City of Toronto Multilingual Services Policy" that was submitted to the Administration Committee at its meeting of October 16, 2001. (Appendix 1)

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There is a small financial impact as result of the recommendations of this report. Increasing the volume of French translations to ensure that French is included on all documents where another language is provided (in full or in summary form) will cost the City an additional estimated \$8,000.00 per year. This cost will be spread across all departments; thus the impact will be fairly insignificant on each individual department or service area.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the City of Toronto approve the Multilingual Services Policy as submitted in the report (October 2, 2001) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, with the following additions to it:

- (a) Under Section (3) “French Language Services”:

The third paragraph will now read: “This policy recommends that French translation of documents be provided (in full or in summary form) whenever public information materials are translated into another language. Excepted from this is the purchase of advertising which is addressed separately in this policy.”

- (b) Under Section (2) “Guidelines for Determining Priorities for Multilingual Services”:

Add the following two paragraphs:

“The City of Toronto Advertising Policy, adopted by Council at its meeting of July 24, 2001, addresses the purchase of advertising in newspapers that publish in languages other than English. The Advertising Policy states that ‘much of the City’s social marketing/public information advertising is directed at those most in need. There are instances where mainstream outlets do not reach the target audiences for these messages. Therefore, advertisements may be placed in newspapers that publish in languages other than English.’

The Advertising Policy also states ‘that advertising be based on a communications plan which includes identification and assessment of the target audience and how best to reach the target audience within budget’.”

- (c) Under Section (4) “General Operating Procedures”:

Add the following sentence: (g) That the City of Toronto work with the City of Toronto French Committee to ensure the delivery of cost effective multilingual services to the French community using the existing French networks.

Background:

A report entitled “City of Toronto Multilingual Services Policy” was submitted to the Administration Committee at its meeting of October 16, 2001 (Appendix 1). The Administration Committee directed staff to consult with the French Committee and the Race and Ethnic Relations Committee. These consultations were done with the committees at their regularly scheduled meetings of October 22 and November 6, 2001 respectively.

Comments:

The Race and Ethnic Relations Committee endorsed the policy contained in the October 16, 2001 report to Administration Committee.

The French Committee submitted for consideration a series of proposed additions to the policy. A copy of the full text, as submitted by the French Committee, is attached in Appendix 2. The committee's main points are summarized as follows:

Under Background:

- (a) The former City of Toronto established a French Committee in 1981 and in 1999, the new City of Toronto approved the continuation of this committee.

Under Principles:

- (a) The ethnic diversity of our community is a source of social, cultural and economic enrichment and strength, and of national/international prestige.
- (b) English and French are common links to many ethnic communities.
- (c) English and French are important factors in attracting newcomers from other countries and other regions of Canada.

Under Demographics:

- (a) There are many immigrants who come from countries where English or French is an official language.
- (b) Francophones moving to Toronto from other regions of Canada also contribute to the growth of this City.
- (c) The French community in Toronto is not concentrated in any particular neighbourhood.
- (d) Because the French community (a) speaks one of the official languages of Canada, (b) has certain rights guaranteed under federal and Ontario legislation, (c) is an established as well as an intake community, and (d) is an important factor in attracting both French speaking Canadians from other parts of Canada and newcomers from French speaking countries, the French community, therefore, has more influence for Toronto than the comparative number of its members.

Under French Language Services:

- (a) The translation of documents (or summaries thereof) into French must be included whenever public information materials are translated into another language.

Under General Operating Procedures:

- (a) The City of Toronto should work with the City of Toronto French Committee to ensure the delivery of cost-effective French language services.



In consideration of the French Committee's request to include French whenever a document (or portion thereof) is translated into another language, it should be noted that the former City of Toronto Council, at its meeting on October 19, 1989, adopted Clause No. 43 of Report No. 36 of The Executive Committee, entitled "French Translation of City of Toronto Printed Materials." This report's recommendation stated:

"That when materials relating to issues of general public interest are sent to Toronto residents and ratepayers, and are to be produced in any language in addition to English, such materials be automatically produced in both official languages, French and English, as well as in any other language(s) specified."

The French Committee, therefore, is seeking to ensure this practice of the former City of Toronto is part of the new City of Toronto Multilingual Services policy.

Conclusions:

As a result of consultations with the Race and Ethnic Relations Committee and the French Committee, staff are recommending three amendments to the Multilingual Services Policy for the City of Toronto regarding: (a) the provision of French translations, (b) advertising and (c) staff working with the French Committee to ensure the cost-effective delivery of French-language services.

Contact:

Patricia MacDonell, Manager, Public Information, Corporate Communications Division  
416-392-8591

Valerie Chavossy, Director, Corporate Communications Division 416-397-4149

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Original policy submitted to Administration Committee on October 16, 2001.

Appendix 2: Policy with proposed changes (in bold) submitted by French Committee.

**The Administration Committee also submits the following report (October 2, 2001) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services:**

Purpose:

This report outlines a multilingual services policy for the City of Toronto. The goal of the policy is to affirm the City's commitment to ensuring that City information is made available to all its residents. It formalizes practices already in place, and provides guidelines for staff in determining how residents can best be served through the use of multilingual services.

A separate policy addressing barrier-free communications for seniors and people with disabilities will be developed.

### Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no new financial implications associated with this policy. Recommendations contained in the report are mindful of the need for accountability. Costs for providing multilingual services are to continue to be borne by the individual departments or programs.

### Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) the City of Toronto Multilingual Services Policy be comprised of the following four components, as described further in this report:
  - (a) fundamental principles on which multilingual services are based;
  - (b) guidelines in determining priorities for multilingual services;
  - (c) description of French Language Services delivery; and
  - (d) general procedures and operational guidelines; and
- (2) the City of Toronto adopt the multilingual services policy as outlined in this report and that appropriate officials be given authority to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

### Background:

Previous policies:

Of the seven amalgamating municipalities, the former Metro and the former City of Toronto had policies referring to multilingual access. These municipalities had designated multilingual staff who provided translation and interpretation services. The other municipalities provided multilingual services on an informal basis. (Appendix 1).

Current Approach:

Since amalgamation, City departments have had uniform access to translation and interpretation services.

In 2000, the City of Toronto provided residents with oral interpretations in 52 languages and written translations in 37 languages. These services are provided by the Multilingual Services Unit of the Corporate Communications Division. The unit serves all City departments, as well as many agencies. High volume clients include Public Health, the Works and Emergency Services Department, Parks and Recreation and the City's various housing organizations. Staff in the Multilingual Services provide a full range of services ranging from consultation on demographics of a neighbourhood and identification of prominent languages, to translation, interpretation, through to project completion.

## Toronto's Diversity:

Toronto's diverse population makes it one of the most multilingual cities in the world. More than half of Toronto's residents (52 percent) have come from outside of Canada. Toronto is recognized world-wide as a city that embraces its different communities. The City's vision reflects the values and traditions of a diverse, democratic society.

## Process for developing this policy:

Staff consulted with a variety of stakeholders including Members of Council, representatives from the Access and Equity Unit of the CAO's Office and staff from departments and agencies.

## Comments:

### (1) Principles:

It is recommended that the following fundamental principles form the basis of the City of Toronto's multilingual services policy:

- (a) The City of Toronto recognizes that the ethnic diversity of our community is a source of social, cultural and economic enrichment and strength.
- (b) The City of Toronto recognizes that providing multilingual services is an effective way to reach individuals, groups and organizations of diverse communities to allow them to access City services and programs.
- (c) Adoption of this policy is another step in the implementation of the Council-approved report of the Task Force on Community Access and Equity (December, 1999) which states:  
  
"All residents shall be entitled to municipal services and programs which are racially sensitive, culturally and linguistically appropriate, gender appropriate, accommodate disability, and are adequately resourced to ensure equitable access and outcomes."
- (d) The need to provide multilingual services must be addressed in communications plans that support City of Toronto programs.
- (e) The City of Toronto will provide high quality, accurate translations that meet professional standards.
- (f) To ensure efficiency and accountability in the provision of multilingual services, the City shall deliver multilingual services, that meet the diverse needs of its many audiences, in the most timely and cost effective manner through the Multilingual Services Unit, Corporate Communications Division.

(2) Guidelines for Determining Priorities for Multilingual Services:

The delivery of multilingual services requires sound judgement and decision-making in ascertaining how interpretation and translation needs can be met in the most effective manner. It is important to first identify the target audience(s). Departmental and agency staff responsible for specific public services or programs are the most familiar with their audiences' needs. The decision to translate a document or provide interpretation services into one or more languages requires that a number of factors be considered:

- (a) Demographics: The City of Toronto's population, as identified by home language in the most recent census data is outlined in appendix 2. Demographic information is useful when a particular message is targeted to all City residents. Languages accessed through the City's Language Line Services (over-the-phone interpretation service) is also a useful guide.
- (b) Language needs of a particular community: When narrowing the target audience to specific communities, the language needs of ethno-racial groups in those communities must be determined. This is often the case for certain public health or public education programs where staff are able to identify specific ethnic communities, or specific population groups, as the intended recipients of a message.
- (c) Language needs of a particular geographic area or neighbourhood: When the message is intended for easily identifiable geographic areas, the prominent languages spoken in that particular area must be determined. This is an approach often used by Works and Emergency Services, for example, when it communicates information about road or watermain work in a particular neighbourhood.
- (d) Type of City information: Priorities may also be established based upon the nature and type of information. For example, a document which addresses life-threatening issues such as carbon monoxide poisoning or immunization is identified as a priority for translation. The length of a document should also be taken into consideration; for many documents a summary is appropriate.

The Multilingual Services Unit is in regular contact with the Access and Equity Office, the Public Health Division, Social Services, Housing Services and the Urban Development Services Department to keep up-to-date on population trends and immigration patterns, as well as language needs for new arrivals to the city. This is supplemented, as appropriate, by information obtained from school boards.

(3) French Language Services:

The provision of French language services is outlined in the Government of Ontario's French Language Services Act and the Federal Government's Official Languages Act. The federal government translates all documents into the two official languages and ensures that federal government services are available in either English or French.

The Province of Ontario's French Language Services Act guarantees each individual the right to receive provincial government services in 23 designated areas of the province; the City of Toronto is one such area. Under the Act, municipalities are not required to provide French language services, even in designated areas. Municipalities are responsible for deciding whether or not to provide their services in French.

This policy recommends that the translation of documents into French be provided whenever public information on citywide issues is also translated into another language.

(4) General Operating Procedures:

In order for multilingual services to be delivered consistently across the City, it is useful to include a number of operational guidelines as part of this policy.

- (a) Departments must determine budgets and include translation and interpretation services in their annual workplans.
- (b) Departments should provide as much notice as possible to Multilingual Services regarding upcoming translation projects to ensure print and production deadlines are met.
- (c) In conjunction with the Multilingual Services Unit, departments should evaluate the effectiveness of translation and interpretation in reaching their audiences and achieving their objectives.
- (d) The Multilingual Services Unit in Corporate Communications will continue to broker multilingual services for city departments and agencies at competitive rates.
- (e) Departments/programs providing written materials in third languages should include the phrase "oral interpretation available in additional languages." The provision of interpretation services can be through Language Line Services (over the phone) or by City staff, where appropriate.
- (f) Where appropriate, individual units in departments should establish lists of employees who speak other languages and who are willing to provide an informal interpretation service to help overcome language barriers in the delivery of customer service.

Conclusions:

This report recommends a multilingual services policy for the City of Toronto that provides principles, guidelines and operating procedures for the effective delivery of multilingual and French language services to its communities. A separate policy addressing barrier-free communications for seniors and people with disabilities will be developed.

Contacts:

Valerie Chavossy, Director, Corporate Communications Division 416 397-4149

Patricia MacDonell, Manager, Public Information 416 392-8591

Elizabeth Pong, Supervisor, Multilingual Services 416 397-5003

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Copies of applicable policies of former Metro and former City of Toronto

Appendix 2: Recent census data

Appendix 1: Applicable policies of former Municipalities

Metro Toronto:

The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto passed its Ethnoracial Access to Metropolitan Services Policy on August 15, 1990 (Report No. 23 of the Management Committee). The policy stated that:

- “The Council of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto reaffirms its commitment to the principle that the ethnoracial diversity of our community is a source of social, cultural and economic strength;
- The Council of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto recognizes that individuals, groups and organizations of diverse ethnoracial minority communities encounter barriers in their efforts to gain access to services and derive equal benefit from the services directly provided, purchased and contracted by the Municipality;
- The Council of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto undertake to develop specific measures to ensure that individuals, groups and organizations representative of diverse ethnoracial minority communities have access to racially sensitive, culturally appropriate services, and are able to participate in the planning, design, development and delivery of services directly provided, purchased and contracted by the Municipality.

Former City of Toronto:

The City of Toronto adopted a Multi-lingual Access Program on May 6 and 13, 1991 (Executive Committee Report No. 9) and June 1993 (Executive Committee Report No. 26). The Multi-lingual Access Program stated that:

“...the City recognizes its obligation to make its services available to racial and ethnic groups. This responsibility includes facilitating access to services by removing barriers that may be caused by average complexity, language differences or discrimination.”

and

“The City of Toronto is responsible for removing barriers that may be presented by organizational complexity, language differences, cultural insensitivity, racial intolerance and discriminatory attitudes and practices.”

Immigration Statistics 1991 - 2000  
Immigrant Landings - Canada, Ontario and Toronto, 1991, 1999

| Year | Canada  | Ontario | GTA     | Toronto | Percent of GTA | Percent of Canada |
|------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------------|-------------------|
| 1991 | 232,751 | 119,771 | 89,455  | 70,064  | 78.3%          | 30.1%             |
| 1992 | 254,820 | 139,074 | 109,740 | 86,981  | 79.3%          | 34.1%             |
| 1993 | 256,736 | 134,853 | 107,673 | 84,633  | 78.6%          | 33.0%             |
| 1994 | 224,373 | 117,502 | 95,429  | 75,228  | 78.8%          | 33.5%             |
| 1995 | 212,860 | 115,900 | 96,016  | 76,310  | 79.5%          | 35.8%             |
| 1996 | 226,043 | 119,690 | 97,900  | 79,439  | 81.1%          | 35.1%             |
| 1997 | 216,021 | 117,660 | 99,447  | 82,101  | 82.6%          | 38.0%             |
| 1998 | 174,162 | 92,296  | 76,920  | 64,877  | 84.3%          | 37.3%             |
| 1999 | 189,885 | 104,080 | 84,314  | 70,273  | 83.3%          | 37.0%             |
| 2000 | 226,379 | 133,101 | 107,781 | 90,695  | 84.1%          | 40.1%             |

Source: Citizenship and Immigration Canada  
Immigration and Settlement Unit, Ontario Ministry of Citizenship  
Prepared by: Health Planning, Toronto Public Health/June 6, 2001

Immigrant Landings to  
Ontario and Toronto

| Country of Birth                | Toronto 1999 | Ontario 1999 | To % of Ontario | Toronto 1998 | Ontario 1998 | To % of Ontario |
|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
| China, People's Republic of     | 13306        | 17436        | 76.3%           | 9278         | 11882        | 78.1%           |
| India                           | 6653         | 11493        | 57.9%           | 5810         | 9583         | 60.6%           |
| Pakistan                        | 5239         | 7427         | 70.5%           | 5143         | 6709         | 76.7%           |
| Philippines                     | 2579         | 4037         | 63.9%           | 2417         | 3708         | 65.2%           |
| Sri Lanka                       | 3132         | 3861         | 81.1%           | 2429         | 2895         | 83.9%           |
| Iran                            | 2936         | 3764         | 78.0%           | 3545         | 4294         | 82.6%           |
| Korea, Republic of              | 2590         | 3392         | 76.4%           | 1567         | 1877         | 83.5%           |
| Russia                          | 2235         | 2815         | 79.4%           | 2624         | 3213         | 81.7%           |
| United States of America        | 1096         | 2638         | 41.5%           | 976          | 2120         | 46.0%           |
| Jamaica                         | 1482         | 2171         | 68.3%           | 1413         | 2055         | 68.8%           |
| Ukraine                         | 1582         | 2000         | 79.1%           | 1239         | 1794         | 69.1%           |
| Romania                         | 1229         | 1906         | 64.5%           | 1169         | 1797         | 65.1%           |
| Yugoslavia                      | 835          | 1742         | 47.9%           | 742          | 1706         | 43.5%           |
| England                         | 543          | 1468         | 37.0%           | 536          | 1295         | 41.4%           |
| Afghanistan                     | 924          | 1369         | 67.5%           | 957          | 1297         | 73.8%           |
| Somalia, Democratic Republic of | 777          | 1359         | 57.2%           | 805          | 1211         | 66.5%           |
| Bangladesh                      | 1044         | 1301         | 80.2%           | 1037         | 1262         | 82.2%           |
| Iraq                            | 685          | 1298         | 52.8%           | 643          | 1169         | 55.0%           |

Immigrant Landings to  
Ontario and Toronto

| Country of Birth                    | Toronto | Ontario | To % of | Toronto | Ontario | To % of |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                                     | 1999    | 1999    | Ontario | 1998    | 1998    | Ontario |
| Guyana                              | 857     | 1277    | 67.1%   | 809     | 1183    | 68.4%   |
| Trinidad and Tobago, Republic of    | 681     | 1081    | 63.0%   | 690     | 1078    | 64.0%   |
| Albania                             | 785     | 1070    | 73.4%   | 317     | 450     | 70.4%   |
| Taiwan                              | 814     | 1036    | 78.6%   | 1110    | 1357    | 81.8%   |
| Poland                              | 437     | 1028    | 42.5%   | 494     | 1117    | 44.2%   |
| Union of Soviet Socialist Republics | 811     | 968     | 83.8%   | 952     | 1372    | 69.4%   |
| Hong Kong                           | 587     | 933     | 62.9%   | 1867    | 2479    | 75.3%   |
| Bosnia-Herzegovina                  | 357     | 881     | 40.5%   | 444     | 943     | 47.1%   |
| Egypt                               | 542     | 868     | 62.4%   | 582     | 861     | 67.6%   |
| Vietnam, Socialist Republic of      | 430     | 767     | 56.1%   | 486     | 935     | 52.0%   |
| Mexico                              | 368     | 669     | 55.0%   | 347     | 557     | 62.3%   |
| Nigeria                             | 495     | 669     | 74.0%   | 437     | 562     | 77.8%   |
| Germany, Federal Republic of        | 266     | 662     | 40.2%   | 272     | 602     | 45.2%   |
| Colombia                            | 476     | 657     | 72.5%   | 331     | 458     | 72.3%   |
| Ghana                               | 436     | 630     | 69.2%   | 579     | 798     | 72.6%   |
| Saudi Arabia                        | 418     | 630     | 66.3%   | 609     | 783     | 77.8%   |
| Lebanon                             | 225     | 619     | 36.3%   | 307     | 654     | 46.9%   |
| South Africa, Republic of           | 326     | 551     | 59.2%   | 356     | 538     | 66.2%   |
| Jordan                              | 328     | 528     | 62.1%   | 246     | 376     | 65.4%   |
| Turkey                              | 360     | 508     | 70.9%   | 400     | 522     | 76.6%   |
| Kuwait                              | 268     | 499     | 53.7%   | 290     | 555     | 52.3%   |
| Syria                               | 257     | 488     | 52.7%   | 311     | 492     | 63.2%   |
| United Arab Emirates                | 342     | 486     | 70.4%   | 427     | 504     | 84.7%   |
| Bulgaria                            | 371     | 483     | 76.8%   | 376     | 474     | 79.3%   |
| Sudan, Democratic Republic of       | 226     | 460     | 49.1%   | 234     | 550     | 42.5%   |
| Ethiopia                            | 300     | 450     | 66.7%   | 281     | 426     | 66.0%   |
| Hong Kong Sar                       | 300     | 413     | 72.6%   | 251     | 344     | 73.0%   |
| Cuba                                | 187     | 385     | 48.6%   | 177     | 299     | 59.2%   |
| Netherlands, The                    | 62      | 382     | 16.2%   | 40      | 246     | 16.3%   |
| Brazil                              | 245     | 380     | 64.5%   | 217     | 318     | 68.2%   |
| Japan                               | 226     | 375     | 60.3%   | 187     | 296     | 63.2%   |
| Croatia                             | 139     | 372     | 37.4%   | 94      | 238     | 39.5%   |
| Israel                              | 274     | 371     | 73.9%   | 242     | 356     | 68.0%   |
| Belarus                             | 289     | 339     | 85.3%   | 336     | 387     | 86.8%   |
| Czech Republic                      | 172     | 337     | 51.0%   | 10      | 117     | 8.5%    |
| Kazakhstan                          | 260     | 337     | 77.2%   | 470     | 593     | 79.3%   |
| Hungary                             | 173     | 288     | 60.1%   | 129     | 212     | 60.8%   |
| Slovak Republic                     | 169     | 282     | 59.9%   | 68      | 117     | 58.1%   |
| Indonesia, Republic of              | 158     | 272     | 58.1%   | 38      | 60      | 63.3%   |
| Algeria                             | 145     | 270     | 53.7%   | 146     | 241     | 60.6%   |
| Zaire, Republic of                  | 141     | 265     | 53.2%   | 137     | 228     | 60.1%   |



Immigrant Landings to  
Ontario and Toronto

| Country of Birth                       | Toronto<br>1999 | Ontario<br>1999 | To % of<br>Ontario | Toronto<br>1998 | Ontario<br>1998 | To % of<br>Ontario |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Morocco                                | 114             | 259             | 44.0%              | 110             | 226             | 48.7%              |
| Kenya                                  | 160             | 258             | 62.0%              | 99              | 160             | 61.9%              |
| Portugal                               | 142             | 253             | 56.1%              | 193             | 314             | 61.5%              |
| Ecuador                                | 196             | 249             | 78.7%              | 202             | 253             | 79.8%              |
| France                                 | 140             | 244             | 57.4%              | 114             | 240             | 47.5%              |
| Grenada                                | 202             | 240             | 84.2%              | 229             | 272             | 84.2%              |
| Scotland                               | 83              | 235             | 35.3%              | 42              | 161             | 26.1%              |
| Italy                                  | 111             | 233             | 47.6%              | 99              | 201             | 49.3%              |
| El Salvador                            | 129             | 232             | 55.6%              | 116             | 224             | 51.8%              |
| Argentina                              | 135             | 192             | 70.3%              | 149             | 192             | 77.6%              |
| Venezuela                              | 124             | 191             | 64.9%              | 102             | 174             | 58.6%              |
| Peru                                   | 95              | 190             | 50.0%              | 100             | 159             | 62.9%              |
| Malaysia                               | 102             | 173             | 59.0%              | 89              | 131             | 67.9%              |
| Switzerland                            | 51              | 167             | 30.5%              | 53              | 180             | 29.4%              |
| Moldova                                | 108             | 163             | 66.3%              | 116             | 167             | 69.5%              |
| Singapore                              | 95              | 149             | 63.8%              | 59              | 83              | 71.1%              |
| Palestinian Authority (Gaza/West Bank) | 79              | 147             | 53.7%              | 77              | 132             | 58.3%              |
| Australia                              | 57              | 145             | 39.3%              | 82              | 152             | 53.9%              |
| Guatemala                              | 53              | 143             | 37.1%              | 57              | 138             | 41.3%              |
| Haiti                                  | 17              | 136             | 12.5%              | 18              | 124             | 14.5%              |
| St. Vincent and the Grenadines         | 107             | 136             | 78.7%              | 120             | 137             | 87.6%              |
| Libya                                  | 38              | 125             | 30.4%              | 38              | 99              | 38.4%              |
| Latvia                                 | 100             | 123             | 81.3%              | 113             | 125             | 90.4%              |
| Tanzania, United Republic of           | 73              | 114             | 64.0%              | 53              | 104             | 51.0%              |
| Uzbekistan                             | 80              | 113             | 70.8%              | 80              | 101             | 79.2%              |
| Rwanda                                 | 44              | 111             | 39.6%              |                 |                 |                    |
| Chile                                  | 64              | 103             | 62.1%              | 83              | 118             | 70.3%              |
| Dominican Republic                     | 75              | 102             | 73.5%              | 59              | 95              | 62.1%              |
| Qatar                                  | 65              | 101             | 64.4%              | 56              | 72              | 77.8%              |
| Yemen, Republic of                     | 34              | 101             | 33.7%              | 34              | 82              | 41.5%              |
| Barbados                               | 65              | 100             | 65.0%              | 62              | 111             | 55.9%              |
| Greece                                 | 58              | 95              | 61.1%              | 56              | 90              | 62.2%              |
| Nepal                                  | 61              | 90              | 67.8%              | 43              | 66              | 65.2%              |
| Thailand                               | 57              | 90              | 63.3%              |                 |                 |                    |
| Fyr Macedonia                          | 56              | 88              | 63.6%              |                 |                 |                    |
| Armenia                                | 69              | 86              | 80.2%              | 65              | 72              | 90.3%              |
| Djibouti, Republic of                  | 4               | 78              | 5.1%               |                 |                 |                    |
| Ireland, Republic of                   | 30              | 76              | 39.5%              | 31              | 71              | 43.7%              |
| Chad, Republic of                      | 26              | 71              | 36.6%              |                 |                 |                    |
| Kyrgyzstan                             | 63              | 71              | 88.7%              |                 |                 |                    |

Immigrant Landings to  
Ontario and Toronto

| Country of Birth             | Toronto<br>1999 | Ontario<br>1999 | To % of<br>Ontario | Toronto<br>1998 | Ontario<br>1998 | To % of<br>Ontario |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Uruguay                      | 50              | 71              | 70.4%              | 59              | 72              | 81.9%              |
| Mauritius                    | 37              | 69              | 53.6%              | 31              | 67              | 46.3%              |
| Nicaragua                    | 24              | 69              | 34.8%              | 37              | 60              | 61.7%              |
| Azerbaijan                   | 54              | 66              | 81.8%              | 85              | 91              | 93.4%              |
| Belgium                      | 24              | 66              | 36.4%              |                 |                 |                    |
| Cambodia                     | 29              | 64              | 45.3%              | 41              | 101             | 40.6%              |
| Bahrain                      | 34              | 62              | 54.8%              | 51              | 74              | 68.9%              |
| Burundi                      | 29              | 62              | 46.8%              |                 |                 |                    |
| Lithuania                    | 37              | 61              | 60.7%              | 51              | 65              | 78.5%              |
| Uganda                       | 36              | 61              | 59.0%              | 27              | 58              | 46.6%              |
| St. Lucia                    | 41              | 57              | 71.9%              |                 |                 |                    |
| Honduras                     | 23              | 54              | 42.6%              |                 |                 |                    |
| Sweden                       | 21              | 54              | 38.9%              |                 |                 |                    |
| Eritrea                      | 32              | 50              | 64.0%              |                 |                 |                    |
| Not Coded                    |                 |                 |                    | 336             | 554             | 60.6%              |
| Georgia                      |                 |                 |                    | 72              | 77              | 93.5%              |
| Tunisia                      |                 |                 |                    | 40              | 70              | 57.1%              |
| Estonia                      |                 |                 |                    | 45              | 61              | 73.8%              |
| Macao                        |                 |                 |                    | 46              | 58              | 79.3%              |
| All Other Countries of Birth | 804             | 1435            | 56.0%              | 983             | 1650            | 59.6%              |
| Column Total                 | 68207           | 103717          | 65.8%              | 63329           | 92629           | 68.4%              |
| Official Total               | 68207           | 103717          | 65.8%              | 63265           | 92629           | 68.3%              |

Source: Citizenship and Immigration Canada Data: Immigration and Settlement Unit, Ontario  
Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation  
Prepared by: Health Planning, Toronto Public Health/Aug 2000

**The Administration Committee also submits the following report (October 27, 2001) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, entitled “City of Toronto Multilingual Services Policy: With Input from French Committee” (Appendix 2):**

Purpose:

This report outlines a multilingual services policy for the City of Toronto. The goal of the policy is to affirm the City’s commitment to ensuring that City information is made available to all its residents. It formalizes practices already in place, and provides guidelines for staff in determining how residents can best be served through the use of multilingual services.

A separate policy addressing barrier-free communications for seniors and people with disabilities will be developed.

### Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no new financial implications associated with this policy. Recommendations contained in the report are mindful of the need for accountability. Costs for providing multilingual services are to continue to be borne by the individual departments or programs.

### Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) the City of Toronto multilingual services policy be comprised of the following four components, as described further in this report:
  - (a) fundamental principles on which multilingual services are based;
  - (b) guidelines in determining priorities for multilingual services;
  - (c) ~~description of~~ French Language Services delivery; and
  - (d) general procedures and operational guidelines.
- (2) the City of Toronto adopt the multilingual services policy as outlined in this report and that appropriate officials be given authority to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

### Background:

Previous policies:

Of the seven amalgamating municipalities, the former Metro and the former City of Toronto had policies referring to multilingual access. These municipalities had designated multilingual staff who provided translation and interpretation services. The other municipalities provided multilingual services on an informal basis. (appendix 1).

Les anciennes villes de Métro et de Toronto fournissaient aussi des services en français (annexe 3-français). L'ancienne ville de Toronto avait établi en 1981 le Comité français de l'hôtel de ville de Toronto/ the French Committee of Toronto City Hall lequel, durant l'amalgamation, fut transformé au Comité français de la Ville de Toronto/ City of Toronto French Committee actuel en 1998.

The former Metro and the Former City of Toronto also provided French services (appendix 3-anglais). The Former City of Toronto had established in 1981 the French Committee of Toronto City Hall / Comité français de l'hôtel de ville de Toronto which, during the amalgamation, was transformed into the present City of Toronto French Committee / Comité français de la Ville de Toronto in 1998.

### Current Approach:

Since amalgamation, City departments have had uniform access to translation and interpretation services.

In 2000, the City of Toronto provided residents with oral interpretations in 52 languages and written translations in 37 languages. These services are provided by the Multilingual Services Unit of the Corporate Communications Division. The unit serves all City departments, as well as many agencies. High volume clients include Public Health, the Works and Emergency Services Department, Parks and Recreation and the City's various housing organizations. Staff in the Multilingual Services provide a full range of services ranging from consultation on demographics of a neighbourhood and identification of prominent languages, to translation, interpretation, through to project completion.

### Toronto's Diversity:

Toronto's diverse population makes it one of the most multilingual cities in the world. More than half of Toronto's residents (52 percent) have come from outside of Canada. Toronto is recognized world-wide as a city that embraces its different communities. The City's vision reflects the values and traditions of a diverse, democratic society.

### Process for developing this policy:

Staff consulted with a variety of stakeholders including Members of Council, representatives from the Access and Equity Unit of the CAO's Office and staff from departments and agencies.

### Comments:

#### (2) Principles:

It is recommended that the following fundamental principles form the basis of the City of Toronto's multilingual services policy:

- (a) La ville de Toronto reconnaît que la diversité ethnique de notre communauté est une source d'enrichissement et de force aux niveaux social, culturel et économique et de prestige/influence au niveaux national et international.
- (b) The City of Toronto recognizes that the ethnic diversity of our community is a source of social, cultural and economic enrichment and strength and of national and international prestige/influence.

La ville de Toronto reconnaît que divers groupes ethniques ont choisi de s'identifier au français ou à l'anglais, les deux langues officielles du Canada; que le français et l'anglais sont des facteurs importants pour attirer de nouveaux arrivants de souches ethniques des autres pays et des autres régions du Canada.

The City of Toronto recognizes that various ethnic groups have chosen to identify with French or English, the two official languages of Canada; that both French and English are important factors in attracting newcomers of ethnic backgrounds from other countries and from other regions of Canada.

\*\*\*La ville de Toronto reconnaît que les communautés francophone et anglophone sont non seulement des communautés établies; mais également des communautés d'accueil et d'intégration, composée de milliers d'individus dont les langues maternelles sont le français ou l'anglais et de milliers d'autres pour lesquels le français ou l'anglais sont des langues de choix ou apprises pour la communication.

\*\*\*The City of Toronto recognizes that the Francophone and Anglophone communities are not only established communities, but also intake and integration communities made up of thousands of individuals whose mother tongue is either French or English and thousands more for whom French or English are the preferred or learned languages of communication.

\*\*\*La ville de Toronto reconnaît que les communautés francophone et anglophone sont les liens communs entre plusieurs groupes ethniques.

\*\*\*The City of Toronto recognizes that the French and English communities are the common links between many ethnic groups.

- (b) The City of Toronto recognizes that providing multilingual services is an effective way to reach individuals, groups and organizations of diverse communities to allow them to access City services and programs.

\*\*\*La ville de Toronto reconnaît que ses communautés de langues officielles, avec leur diversité et infrastructure ethniques respectives, lui permettent de représenter la dualité linguistique du Canada lors d'événements politiques, sociaux, culturels, sportifs d'envergure nationale et internationale.

\*\*\*The City of Toronto recognizes that its official languages communities, with their respective ethnic diversity and infrastructure, allow it to represent the linguistic duality of Canada at political, social, cultural, sporting events of national and international level.

- (c) Adoption of this policy is another step in the implementation of the Council-approved report of the Task Force on Community Access and Equity (December, 1999) which states:

“All residents shall be entitled to municipal services and programs which are racially sensitive, culturally and linguistically appropriate, gender appropriate, accommodate disability, and are adequately resourced to ensure equitable access and outcomes.”

- (d) The need to provide multilingual services must be addressed in communications plans that support City of Toronto programs.

- (e) The City of Toronto will provide high quality, accurate translations that meet professional standards.
- (f) To ensure efficiency and accountability in the provision of multilingual services, the City shall deliver multilingual services, that meet the diverse needs of its many audiences, in the most timely and cost effective manner through the Multilingual Services Unit, Corporate Communications Division.

(2) Guidelines for Determining Priorities for Multilingual Services:

The delivery of multilingual services requires sound judgement and decision-making in ascertaining how interpretation and translation needs can be met in the most effective manner. It is important to first identify the target audience(s). Departmental and agency staff responsible for specific public services or programs are the most familiar with their audiences' needs. The decision to translate a document or provide interpretation services into one or more languages requires that a number of factors be considered:

- (a) Demographics: The City of Toronto's population, as identified by home language in the most recent census data is outlined in appendix 2. Demographic information is useful when a particular message is targeted to all City residents. Languages accessed through the City's Language Line Services (over-the-phone interpretation service) is also a useful guide.

\*\*\*Démographie: Nombreux sont les immigrants provenant de pays où le français ou l'anglais sont des langues officielles ou des langues parlées (souvent apprises) qui s'intègrent à la communauté torontoise.

\*\*\*Demographics: Many immigrants, from countries where French or English are official languages or spoken (often learned) languages, integrate Toronto's community.

\*\*\*Démographie: La migration francophone et anglophone (intra-provinciale et inter-provinciale) est un autre élément de la croissance de la ville de Toronto, impliquant aussi la composition de leurs groupes ethniques respectifs.

\*\*\*Demographics: Francophone and Anglophone migration (intra-provincial and inter-provincial) is another element in the growth of the city of Toronto, including the composition of their respective ethnic groups.

- (b) Language needs of a particular community: When narrowing the target audience to specific communities, the language needs of ethno-racial groups in those communities must be determined. This is often the case for certain public health or public education programs where staff are able to identify specific ethnic communities, or specific population groups, as the intended recipients of a message.

- (c) Language needs of a particular geographic area or neighbourhood: When the message is intended for easily identifiable geographic areas, the prominent languages spoken in that particular area must be determined. This is an approach often used by Works and Emergency Services, for example, when it communicates information about road or watermain work in a particular neighbourhood.

\*\*\*La communauté francophone n'est pas concentrée dans un seul quartier ou secteur de la ville. La communauté francophone, étant une communauté établie et d'accueil, ayant aussi accès à des services garantis par des lois fédérale et ontarienne, fournit, grâce à ses réseaux francophones établis, plusieurs services à ses membres, incluant ceux dont la langue maternelle est le français et ceux pour lesquels le français est la langue de choix ou apprise pour la communication.

\*\*\*The French community is not concentrated in a single neighbourhood or area of the city. The Francophone community, being an established and an intake community and having access to services guaranteed by federal and Ontario laws, provides through established Francophone network, many services to its members, including those whose mother tongue is French and those for whom French is their preferred or learned language of communication.

La ville de Toronto reconnaît que la communauté francophone parle une des langues officielles du Canada; qu'elle jouit de certains droits garantis sous la législation fédérale et ontarienne; qu'elle est une communauté établie et d'accueil; qu'elle est un facteur important pour attirer les Canadiens d'expression française des autres régions de l'Ontario et du Canada et pour attirer de nouveaux arrivants de souches ethniques des autres pays francophones ou des autres régions du Canada et que, pour toutes ces raisons, la communauté francophone a plus d'influence pour Toronto que le nombre comparatif de ses membres.

The City of Toronto recognizes that the French community speaks one of the official languages of Canada; that it has certain rights guaranteed under federal and Ontarian legislations; that it is an established as well as an intake community; that it is an important factor in attracting French-speaking Canadians from other regions of Ontario and Canada and in attracting newcomers of ethnic backgrounds from other Francophone countries and from other regions of Canada and that, for all these reasons, the French community has more influence for Toronto than the comparative number of its members.

- (d) Type of City information: Priorities may also be established based upon the nature and type of information. For example, a document which addresses life-threatening issues such as carbon monoxide poisoning or immunization is identified as a priority for translation. The length of a document should also be taken into consideration; for many documents a summary is appropriate.

The Multilingual Services Unit is in regular contact with the Access and Equity Office, the Public Health Division, Social Services, Housing Services and the Urban Development Services Department to keep up-to-date on population trends and immigration patterns, as well as language needs for new arrivals to the city. This is supplemented, as appropriate, by information obtained from school boards.

(3) French Language Services:

The provision of French language services is outlined in the Government of Ontario's French Language Services Act and the Federal Government's Official Languages Act. The federal government translates all documents into the two official languages and ensures that federal government services are available in either English or French.

The Province of Ontario's French Language Services Act guarantees each individual the right to receive provincial government services in 23 designated areas of the province; the City of Toronto is one such area. Under the Act, municipalities are not required to provide French language services, even in designated areas. Municipalities are responsible for deciding whether or not to provide their services in French.

~~This policy recommends that the translation of documents into French be provided whenever public information on citywide issues is also translated into another language.~~

\*\*\*Toronto reconnaît l'importance de la dualité linguistique aux niveaux provincial et national; reconnaît la communauté francophone comme étant une des deux communautés de langue officielle du Canada et reconnaît les avantages de promouvoir le bien-être et la croissance de sa communauté francophone dans sa poursuite de prestige/influence nationale et internationale et reconnaît donc l'égalité du français et de l'anglais lorsqu'elle fournit des services multilingues à ses citoyens.

\*\*\*Toronto recognizes the importance of linguistic duality at the provincial and national levels; recognizes the importance of its French community as being one of the two official language communities of Canada and recognizes, the advantages of promoting the well-being and growth of its French community in its pursuit of national and international prestige/influence and therefore recognizes the equality of French and English when it provides multilingual service to its citizens.

Toronto reconnaît l'importance de la continuité et la complémentarité des services en français offerts aux niveaux fédéral, provincial et municipal pour ses citoyens de langue française et surtout pour l'accueil envers et l'intégration de ses nouveaux arrivants francophones, en provenance des autres provinces ou pays.

Toronto recognizes the importance of the continuity and complementarity of French language services offered at federal, provincial and municipal levels for its French-speaking citizens and especially for the intake and integration of its Francophone newcomers, from other provinces or countries.

(4) General Operating Procedures:

In order for multilingual services to be delivered consistently across the City, it is useful to include a number of operational guidelines as part of this policy.



Que la ville et les organismes francophones établissent un partenariat via le Comité français de la ville de Toronto afin d'assurer la livraison de services multilingues à coûts abordables à la communauté francophones en utilisant les réseaux francophones existants.

That the City and Francophone organizations establish a partnership via the City of Toronto French Committee to ensure the delivery of cost effective multilingual services to the French community using the existing French networks.

- (a) Departments must determine budgets and include translation and interpretation services in their annual workplans.
- (b) Departments should provide as much notice as possible to Multilingual Services regarding upcoming translation projects to ensure print and production deadlines are met.
- (c) In conjunction with the Multilingual Services Unit, departments should evaluate the effectiveness of translation and interpretation in reaching their audiences and achieving their objectives.
- (d) The Multilingual Services Unit in Corporate Communications will continue to broker multilingual services for city departments and agencies at competitive rates.
- (e) Departments/programs providing written materials in third languages should include the phrase "oral interpretation available in additional languages." The provision of interpretation services can be through Language Line Services (over the phone) or by City staff, where appropriate.
- (f) Where appropriate, individual units in departments should establish lists of employees who speak other languages and who are willing to provide an informal interpretation service to help overcome language barriers in the delivery of customer service.

Conclusions:

This report recommends a multilingual services policy for the City of Toronto that provides principles, guidelines and operating procedures for the effective delivery of multilingual and French language services to its communities. A separate policy addressing barrier-free communications for seniors and people with disabilities will be developed.

Contacts:

Valerie Chavossy, Director, Corporate Communications Division, 416 397-4149

Patricia MacDonell, Manager, Public Information, 416 392-8591

Elizabeth Pong, Supervisor, Multilingual Services, 416 397-5003

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Copies of applicable policies of former Metro and former City of Toronto

Appendix 2: Recent census data

---

The Administration Committee reports, for the information of Council, having also had before it a communication (January 16, 2002) from the Councillor Peter LiPreti, Ward 8 - York West, writing in support of the City of Toronto Multilingual Services Policy.

---

The following persons appeared before the Administration Committee in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Ms. Manon Le Paven, President, City of Toronto French Committee;
- Mr. Jean Bédard, Q.C., incoming President, The Toronto French Committee; and
- Mr. Francois Bergeron, Associate Publisher, L'Express; and filed a written submission in regard thereto.

Councillor Pam McConnell, Toronto Centre-Rosedale, also appeared before the Administration Committee in connection with the foregoing matter.