

REGION OF OTTAWA-CARLETON
RÉGION D'OTTAWA-CARLETON

REPORT
RAPPORT

Our File/N/Réf. 50 21-00-1200
Your File/V/Réf.

DATE 25 September 2000

TO/DEST. Co-ordinator
 Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee

FROM/EXP. Deputy Commissioner
 Environment and Transportation Department

SUBJECT/OBJET **TOURISM AND PUBLIC SERVICE SIGNS STUDY**
 CONSULTANT APPOINTMENT

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council approve the appointment of Delcan Corporation, Ottawa, for professional engineering services to undertake the Tourism and Public Service Signs Study, as defined by the study Terms of Reference, for a total contract provision of \$75,000.

BACKGROUND

Council, at its meeting of 08 December 1999 approved a staff report entitled "Tourism and Public Services Sign Policy - Draft Policy Status and Amendment to Accommodate MTO Logo Sign System". One of the recommendations was as follows:

- "2. Acceptance in principle of a consultant study to undertake a comprehensive Regional sign policy and by-law review and update to be initiated prior to year's end, in which the Tourism and Public Service signage policy, amongst other sign policy, will be finalized."

Additionally, the Transportation Committee, at its meeting of 30 November 1999, while considering the report, requested that staff include a number of outstanding signage issues in the consultant study. This has been done.

DESCRIPTION OF ASSIGNMENT

The funding available restricts the extent of the sign study. Based on this limitation the project has been divided into three parts: detailed study, preliminary review and other sign issues.

Sign issues requiring a detailed study are: (a) sign hierarchy/humanistic considerations, (b) TODS/LOGO signs, (c) developers' signs, (d) by-pass signs and (e) industrial park signs. The consultant will do a best practices review, determine what other similar municipalities are doing, recommend a signage system for each sign category along with a written policy for future applications.

Sign issues requiring a preliminary study are: (a) community facility signs, (b) areas of cultural significance, (c) community name signs, (d) scenic routes, (e) boundary signs and (f) community awareness signs. The consultant will do a best practices review, determine what other similar municipalities are doing, tabulate the results and comment on the strengths and weaknesses of each, recommend a common design theme and integrated design approach and formulate recommendations for further study to finalize each issue.

Four other signage issues have to be addressed but are different in scope from the issues identified above and will therefore be treated separately. First, it is necessary to establish an overall sign policy within which staff can consider future requests for the placement of signs on the road allowance, and secondly, it is recommended that a sign review committee be established to consider and decide on anomalous signage issues as they arise instead of sending them to Council. The consultant will do a best practices review and recommend how to proceed on these issues.

The remaining issues to be reviewed are rural/urban signage issues and the potential for sign revenue generation. The consultant will review the issue of rural signage and the appropriateness of permitting signs in a rural environment that would not be considered in an urban environment. The potential for sign revenue generation on a road allowance will be investigated and recommendations made.

A Sign Advisory Committee composed of staff from the Region, area municipalities, National Capital Commission, Ottawa Board of Trade, Ottawa-Carleton Homebuilders Association, etc., has been established to oversee the study. The consultant and project manager will be meeting with the Committee on a regular basis to ensure that its concerns are being addressed.

CONSULTANT SELECTION PROCESS

The consultant selection process was carried out in accordance with the Guidelines for Procurement of Consulting Engineering Services. A Request for Proposal (RFP) was sent to the following consulting firms who have all demonstrated past capabilities for this type of assignment:

- Ainley Graham and Associates Limited, Gloucester

- Delcan Corporation, Gloucester
- Entro Communications, Toronto
- MacKenzie Krusberg, Ottawa
- McCormick Rankin Corporation, Ottawa

- Pixo Graphics, Gloucester
- Stantec Consulting Limited, Ottawa
- Totten Sims Hubicki Associates, Kanata

Study proposals were received from four firms: Ainley Graham and Associates Limited, Delcan Corporation, Pixo Graphics and Totten Sims Hubicki Associates. Four members of the Environment and Transportation Department independently rated the proposals using the following criteria:

- Resources and experience of firm
- Experience, qualifications and availability of team members
- Understanding of objectives
- Quality of approach and methodology
- Proposed work plan, schedule and level of effort
- Financial

The financial aspect of the proposals was not considered a determining factor in the evaluations as none exceeded the project's upset limit and in any case all were within about \$900 of each other. This permitted staff to concentrate on the technical proposals based on their respective merits. Based on the above criteria it is recommended the award of contract be made to Delcan Corporation with a contract provision of \$66,138, contingency of \$3,955 and GST of \$4,907, for a total contract of \$75,000.

CONSULTATION

Public consultation is not required for consultant appointments.

However, prior to the RFP being sent to the consulting firms the Sign Advisory Committee approved the study's terms of reference (on file with the Regional Clerk's Department, CSEDC Coordinator). As described previously, the Committee will oversee the study and is composed of municipal staff, outside agencies, councillors, business associations and the general public. This diversity of participation in the study should ensure that all concerns are addressed during the study.

The Ottawa Transition Board's Visual Identity Project Team was consulted to ensure that this study would not conflict with the development of corporate identifiers, and established that it would not. In any case, it is staff's intention that a member of the Visual Identity Project Team will participate in the Sign Advisory Committee to ensure that the two studies complement each other.

Public consultation will take place as part of the study prior to it being finalized.

EXPENDITURE JUSTIFICATION

Traditionally, municipalities have permitted only guide, information and regulatory signs on a public road allowance, but recently other types of signs are starting to appear on public property that are new in concept or historically restricted to private property. Examples of new signs are TODS and LOGO signs recently developed by the Province and installed by its contractors. The LOGO signs are a modified version of the former single panel sign indicating food, fuel and lodging, but considerably more substantive. Municipalities are starting to enter into partnerships with the private sector to provide public services at no or reduced cost to taxpayers, and in return the sponsoring company can advertise on the new infrastructure (i.e. bicycle parking racks, bus shelters).

Businesses are clamouring for advertising space on public road allowances because of an increasingly competitive business environment, and many are starting to place signs on roads without permission. Additionally, other situations have emerged that may require special signing considerations, and these have to compete for space with municipally installed signs and the other signs in an increasingly cluttered landscape. The demand for advertising/information conveying space on Regional roads may be contributing to an unsafe driving environment as an escalating number of signs compete for motorist attention against an increasingly cluttered background. The increased clutter of signs is also having an impact on the image and character of the public right-of-way as well as adjacent neighbourhoods.

In contrast, the Region markets itself as a tourist destination that, in addition to the federal public buildings and institutions, is a clean and green location. And, if calls from the general public are any indication, they are opposed to more signs being added to the existing inventory. All of these issues have to be considered and rationalized.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND APPROVAL

	<u>900003</u>	<u>900286</u>	<u>132611</u>
Approved Budget to Date	3,500,000	1,020,000	1,638,863
Total Paid and Committed	<u>(2,973,532)</u>	<u>(270,891)</u>	<u>(1,223,611)</u>
Balance Available	526,468	749,109	415,252
THIS REQUEST	<u>(10,000)</u>	<u>(15,000)</u>	<u>(50,000)</u>
Balance Remaining	<u>516,468</u>	<u>734,109</u>	<u>365,252</u>

Funds have been provided for in the 2000 Capital and Operating Budgets, Order No. 900003, Economic Affairs (reference page 57), Order No. 900286, Transportation Facility Plan (reference page 514), Cost Center 132611, Safety and Traffic Studies (reference page 219). Purchase Requisition Nos. 10075092, 10075094, 10075095.

Approved by
Doug Brousseau

SEM