

Consolidated Clause in Works Committee Report 3, which was considered by City Council on June 27, 28 and 29, 2006.

**1b****Co-ordinated Street Furniture Program -  
Design and Policy Guidelines and  
Directions Report (All Wards) and  
Supplementary Information on the  
Eucan Recycling/Litter Bin Test**

*City Council on June 27, 28 and 29, 2006, amended this Clause:*

- (1) *by deleting Recommendation (A)(2)(i) of the Works Committee, and inserting instead the following:*

*“(2)(i) bicycle stands;”;*

- (2) *by adding to Recommendation (A)(6) of the Works Committee, the words “provided that staff shall include language in the RFP and agreement with a successful proponent which will permit the City to require a successful proponent to undertake programs allowing for the exploration of new street furniture opportunities at fair market value to the City and, where the proponent cannot so provide, the City shall be permitted to undertake such programs with a third party”, so that Recommendation (A)(6) now reads as follows:*

*“(A)(6)as a condition of the contract(s) for co-ordinated street furniture, no other advertising program be authorized on any other street element, and no future pilot program involving advertising within the public road allowance be approved by the City over the duration of the contract(s), provided that staff shall include language in the RFP and agreement with a successful proponent which will permit the City to require a successful proponent to undertake programs allowing for the exploration of new street furniture opportunities at fair market value to the City and, where the proponent cannot so provide, the City shall be permitted to undertake such programs with a third party;”;*

- (3) *by inserting in Recommendation (B)(3) of the Works Committee, after the words “remain in place”, the words “unless requested by the local Councillor”, so that Recommendation (B)(3) now reads as follows:*

*“(B)(3)the Eucan bins installed for the test remain in place, unless requested by the local Councillor, under the existing terms and conditions, until a final decision is reached by Council on the award of the Co-ordinated Street Furniture program, subject to concurrence by Eucan.”; and*

- (4) *by adding the following new Recommendation (B)(4):*
- “(B)(4)any pilot Eucan bin removed as per Recommendation (3) above from a pre existing silver box location, be replaced by a silverbox, at the expense of Eucan.”;*
- (5) *in accordance with the staff recommendations contained in the Recommendations Section of the confidential report (May 18, 2006) from the City Solicitor, such report to remain confidential in its entirety, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, 2001, as it contains information related to the security of the property of the municipality;*
- (6) *to provide that the report requested of the General Manager, Transportation Services and the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning [by the Works Committee, in Part (III) of the Action Taken by the Works Committee] also include the following additional principle:*
- “(7) ensuring that the City has the right to determine the location and relocation of any street furniture at its discretion.”;*
- (7) *to provide that that the General Manager, Transportation Services be requested to ensure that street furniture include receptacles for disposing of cigarette butts; and*
- (8) *by adding the following:*
- “That:*
- (a) *once the RFP has been issued, the project be placed under a blackout with a prohibition against discussing the RFP with individual Members of Council, and all communication with any bidder or potential bidder be through an official point of contact in accordance with the call document;*
- (b) *the RFP require the winning bidder to remove all posters and graffiti, and to repair any damage within a designated time frame to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Solid Waste Management, and consideration be given to extending this requirement to other street elements, including hydro poles, parking pay and display machines and traffic control boxes within the vicinity of street furniture;*
- (c) *the Toronto Parking Authority be requested to establish a program for the ongoing removal of posters and graffiti from pay and display parking machines on other properties under their management;*
- (d) *the City Manager be requested to review all City expenditures on street maintenance to determine how to co-ordinate those expenditures with the obligations for maintenance imposed through the street furniture RFP;*
- (e) *the General Manager, Solid Waste Management, and the General Manager, Transportation Services, be requested to report to the Works Committee, in July 2006, with a further review of existing contract(s) for benches, such report to*

*summarize the terms and conditions of the contracts related to maintenance or type of bench used, and the numbers of benches currently on the street;*

- (f) the General Manager, Solid Waste Management be requested to report to the Works Committee on how to deal with the existing bus shelters when their ownership reverts to the City; and*
- (g) a final report on the RFP go to a joint meeting of the Works Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee.”*

*This Clause, as amended, was adopted by City Council.*

*Council also considered additional material, which is noted at the end of this Clause.*

---

*City Council on June 14, 2006, postponed consideration of this Clause to its next regular meeting on June 27, 2006.*

*Council also considered additional material, which is noted at the end of this Clause.*

---

*City Council on May 23, 24 and 25, 2006, postponed consideration of this Clause to its special meeting on June 14, 2006.*

*Council also considered additional material, which is noted at the end of this Clause.*

---

**The Works Committee recommends that City Council:**

- (A) adopt the following staff recommendations in the Recommendations Section of the report (April 18, 2006) from the General Manager, Transportation Services and the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning, headed “Co-ordinated Street Furniture Program – Design and Policy Guidelines and Directions Report”, as amended by the Works Committee:**

**“It is recommended that:**

- (1) the general design principles for a co-ordinated street furniture program for Toronto, as summarized in this report and set out in “Vibrant Streets: Toronto’s Co-ordinated Street Furniture Program Design and Policy Guidelines” draft document, May, 2006, be endorsed and form the basis of terms and conditions to be contained in the upcoming Request for Proposals (RFP), namely:**
  - (a) a cohesive design style appropriate for Toronto that incorporates flexibility for customization, neighbourhood expression, size, scale and arrangement of elements;**

- (b) the primacy of high quality design, proven durable materials, functionality, accessibility, safety, universal design principles, modularity and environmental elements; and
        - (c) placement and pedestrian circulation;
- (2) the scope of the program to be described in the RFP shall be for the design, manufacture, installation and maintenance of:
  - (a) transit shelters;
  - (b) litter/recycling receptacles;
  - (c) benches;
  - (d) multi-publication structures;
  - (e) information/wayfinding (info pillar) facilities;
  - (f) postering/neighbourhood information facilities; and
  - (g) public washrooms;
  - (h) such other products or services which might contribute to an improved streetscape, environment, or access to services; and
  - (i) innovative technological transportation elements, such as rentals of bicycles and other non-motorized transportation vehicles;
- (3) staff be directed to include a provision in the RFP requiring the successful proponent to fund (through a specified payment payable upon execution of the required contract(s)) a design study, to be administered by the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning, and other City officials as appropriate, linking bollards, pedestrian railings, tree grates, maintenance covers, sidewalk subway entrance portals and other street amenities deemed necessary, in the context of the chosen street furniture design;
- (4) the Toronto street furniture program be advanced on the advertising-funded model, as described in detail in the body of this report and subject to the controls set out in Recommendation (5) below, seeking proposals which shall be at no cost to the City and generate sufficient revenues to cover the costs of design, manufacture, supply, installation and maintenance of the specified street furniture, as well as provide a revenue stream to the City;
- (5) in respect of the advertising permissions granted, controls as outlined in this report, including but not limited to the following, be applied:
  - (a) provisions be made for a primary advertising format (illuminated, transit shelter-style advertising) and a secondary advertising format (smaller, non-illuminated poster style) aimed primarily at local business clients;
  - (b) no more than one advertising element be deployed at a given location or “cluster” of street furniture;
  - (c) minimum separation guidelines between advertising elements, based generally on distance between transit stops;
  - (d) public service advertising and accommodation of BIA advertising as described in this report be provided as a condition of contract(s);

- (e) **the size, form and placement of every street furniture element should be determined by functionality and beauty considerations rather than advertising considerations;**
  - (f) **total square footage of advertising on Toronto street furniture be reduced from current levels; and**
  - (g) **advertising on benches not be considered;**
- (6) **as a condition of the contract(s) for co-ordinated street furniture, no other advertising program be authorized on any other street element, and no future pilot program involving advertising within the public road allowance be approved by the City over the duration of the contract(s);**
- (7) **the City honour its legal obligations under all existing street furniture contracts and pilots currently underway, but all contracts and pilots be concluded at the specified end of their term with no expansion of scope;**
- (8) **the installation of one pilot infoTOgo pillar be approved, which would be the final one permitted under the previous RFP for the pilot program, on the north sidewalk of Dundas Street West, west of Yonge Street, as requested by the Minister of Tourism, Ontario, and described in a separate report of the General Manager, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism;**
- (9) **the RFP be based on the premise that one contract for the range of street furniture specified be awarded for the entire City of Toronto to a single corporate vendor or a consortium of companies on acceptable terms, and the term of such contract be 20 years;**
- (10) **the RFP set out specific terms and conditions required by the City to meet its objectives; the RFP contain detailed evaluation criteria and make it clear that proposals received will be evaluated pursuant to a detailed evaluation process and criteria; and the proposal(s) selected as best meeting the City's requirements in accordance with the evaluation criteria will be subject to negotiation of the detailed terms and conditions of the proposal and contract(s) for consideration by Council;**
- (11) **the RFP be formulated in such a way as to allow a matrix that gives design, beauty and functionality primary consideration;**
- (12) **the RFP contain the requirement that the proposal include evidence of financial wherewithal and a commitment to provide performance security under the contract sufficient to secure the performance of the contract;**
- (13) **authority be granted to select an independent jury, composed of City staff, City consultants or private citizens, with competencies and qualifications in a design discipline to evaluate the design aspects of the bids received; and staff will report to the Works Committee for confirmation of the individuals;**

- (14) staff be directed to prepare and issue all the necessary RFP documentation and evaluate submissions received pursuant to the principles established by Council; in doing so staff are authorized to make any necessary refinements and amendments as their research and assessment continues, including amendments to the Design and Policy Guidelines document, however, in the event that a fundamental departure from the Council-endorsed principles arises, staff shall report such changes to the Works Committee prior to issuing an RFP;**
  - (15) a minimum period of four months from the date of issuance of the RFP be provided for interested respondents to prepare their bid submissions, in response to the RFP;**
  - (16) at such time as staff submit their recommendation report to the Works Committee on the award of contract(s) pursuant to the RFP, the Deputy City Manager Fareed Amin report on any organizational adjustments made or pending related to the management and administration of the street furniture program;**
  - (17) within the RFP process, submissions be reviewed by an independent jury of local urban designers, planners/urban designers, architects, artists, landscape architects and industrial designers, selected by their professional organizations, and that the Design Exchange be requested to assist with the creation of such a jury; and**
  - (18) proponents be encouraged to incorporate on their team multi-disciplinary design talent (for example, urban designers, architects, artists, planners, landscape architects, and industrial designers) who have demonstrated local familiarity and experience with Toronto, and that the evaluation be weighted to acknowledge this input; and**
  - (19) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.”;**
- (B) adopt the following staff recommendations in the Recommendations Section of the report (April 19, 2006) from the General Manager, Solid Waste Management Services, headed “Supplementary Information on the Eucan Recycling/Litter Bin Test”:**
- “It is recommended that:**
- (1) the Eucan proposal for the new recycling/litter bins not be accepted;**
  - (2) recycling/litter bins be included in the Co-ordinated Street Furniture Request for Proposals (RFP); and**

- (3) **the Eucan bins installed for the test remain in place, under the existing terms and conditions, until a final decision is reached by Council on the award of the Co-ordinated Street Furniture program, subject to concurrence by Eucan.”; and**
- (C) **adopt the staff recommendations in the Recommendations Section of the confidential report (April 26, 2006), headed “Review of Existing Street Furniture Agreements”, from the City Solicitor, which was forwarded under separate cover; and further that, in accordance with the Municipal Act, discussions pertaining to this report be held in camera as the subject matter relates to the security of the property of the municipality.**

Action taken by the Committee:

The Works Committee:

- (I) requested Deputy City Manager Fareed Amin to report to the Works Committee before the RFP is issued on how to incorporate appropriate review mechanisms on a periodic basis to ensure that the original objectives of the contract are realized, and that this report be in conjunction with the Deputy City Manager’s report already requested on the implementation of a project team;
- (II) requested that, prior to release of the RFP, the General Manager, Transportation Services and the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning report to the Works Committee on the draft guidelines for placement of street furniture;
- (III) requested the General Manager, Transportation Services and the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning to report to the Works Committee on:
- (1) possible annual revenues if advertising space was:
    - (a) held constant at the current 198,200 square feet; or
    - (b) increased by 10 percent; or
    - (c) increased by 20 percent;
  - (2) how to maximize diversion rates, including measures such as organic collection and battery collection;
  - (3) how to maximize the use of solar panels and/or wind power to power lighting/advertising;
  - (4) how to include locational indicators and City of Toronto identification;
  - (5) including a binding dispute resolution mechanism within the RFP; and
  - (6) ensuring the City has the right to review any advertising proposed and withdraw any advertising at its sole discretion with no financial penalties;

- (IV) received the report (April 19, 2006) from the General Manager, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, headed “Request from the Ontario Ministry of Tourism to Place an InfoTOgo Information Pillar on Dundas Street West, in Front of the Ontario Travel Information Centre (Ward 27)”; and
- (V) received all communications and written submissions.

**The Works Committee submits the report (April 18, 2006) from the General Manager, Transportation Services and Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning:**

Purpose:

To seek City Council endorsement of a strategy for the development of a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a co-ordinated street furniture program for Toronto that comprises a design framework and fundamental terms of reference and contract elements.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

At this stage in the process leading toward a co-ordinated street furniture program for Toronto, the adoption of recommendations contained in this report will not involve a quantified financial impact. However, the directions set by Council will establish the framework for a subsequent RFP and eventual contract(s) award, with resulting detailed cost and revenue implications. These will be reported at such time as bids are evaluated.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) the general design principles for a co-ordinated street furniture program for Toronto, as summarized in this report and set out in “Vibrant Streets: Toronto’s Co-ordinated Street Furniture Program Design and Policy Guidelines” draft document, May, 2006, be endorsed and form the basis of terms and conditions to be contained in the upcoming Request for Proposals (RFP), namely:
  - (a) a cohesive design style appropriate for Toronto that incorporates flexibility for customization, neighbourhood expression, size, scale and arrangement of elements;
  - (b) the primacy of high quality design, proven durable materials, functionality, accessibility, safety, universal design principles, modularity and environmental elements; and
  - (c) placement and pedestrian circulation;

- (2) the scope of the program to be described in the RFP shall be for the design, manufacture, installation and maintenance of:
  - (a) transit shelters;
  - (b) litter/recycling receptacles;
  - (c) benches;
  - (d) multi-publication structures;
  - (e) information/wayfinding (info pillar) facilities;
  - (f) postering/neighbourhood information facilities; and
  - (g) public washrooms;
- (3) staff be directed to include a provision in the RFP requiring the successful proponent to fund (through a specified payment payable upon execution of the required contract(s)) a design study, to be administered by the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning, and other City officials as appropriate, linking bollards, pedestrian railings, tree grates, maintenance covers, sidewalk subway entrance portals and other street amenities deemed necessary, in the context of the chosen street furniture design;
- (4) the Toronto street furniture program be advanced on the advertising-funded model, as described in detail in the body of this report and subject to the controls set out in Recommendation (5) below, seeking proposals which shall be at no cost to the City and generate sufficient revenues to cover the costs of design, manufacture, supply, installation and maintenance of the specified street furniture, as well as provide a revenue stream to the City;
- (5) in respect of the advertising permissions granted, controls as outlined in this report, including but not limited to the following, be applied:
  - (a) provisions be made for a primary advertising format (illuminated, transit shelter-style advertising) and a secondary advertising format (smaller, non-illuminated poster style) aimed primarily at local business clients;
  - (b) no more than one advertising element be deployed at a given location or “cluster” of street furniture;
  - (c) minimum separation guidelines between advertising elements, based generally on distance between transit stops; and
  - (d) public service advertising and accommodation of BIA advertising as described in this report be provided as a condition of contract(s);
- (6) as a condition of the contract(s) for co-ordinated street furniture, no other advertising program be authorized on any other street element, and no future pilot program involving advertising within the public road allowance be approved by the City over the duration of the contract(s);

- (7) the City honour its legal obligations under all existing street furniture contracts and pilots currently underway, but all contracts and pilots be concluded at the specified end of their term with no expansion of scope;
- (8) the installation of one pilot infoTOgo pillar be approved, which would be the final one permitted under the previous RFP for the pilot program, on the north sidewalk of Dundas Street West, west of Yonge Street, as requested by the Minister of Tourism, Ontario, and described in a separate report of the General Manager, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism;
- (9) the RFP be based on the premise that one contract for the range of street furniture specified be awarded for the entire City of Toronto to a single corporate vendor or a consortium of companies on acceptable terms, and the term of such contract be 20 years;
- (10) the RFP set out specific terms and conditions required by the City to meet its objectives; the RFP contain detailed evaluation criteria and make it clear that proposals received will be evaluated pursuant to a detailed evaluation process and criteria; and the proposal(s) selected as best meeting the City's requirements in accordance with the evaluation criteria will be subject to negotiation of the detailed terms and conditions of the proposal and contract(s) for consideration by Council;
- (11) the RFP be formulated in such a way as to enable all aspects of a proposal to be evaluated as a package and weighting of the evaluation criteria be such that the design and functionality elements are considered prominently along with financial benefits;
- (12) the RFP contain the requirement that the proposal include evidence of financial wherewithal and a commitment to provide performance security under the contract sufficient to secure the performance of the contract;
- (13) authority be granted to select an independent jury, composed of City staff, City consultants or private citizens, with competencies and qualifications in a design discipline to evaluate the design aspects of the bids received; and staff will report to the Works Committee for confirmation of the individuals;
- (14) staff be directed to prepare and issue all the necessary RFP documentation and evaluate submissions received pursuant to the principles established by Council; in doing so staff are authorized to make any necessary refinements and amendments as their research and assessment continues, including amendments to the Design and Policy Guidelines document, however, in the event that a fundamental departure from the Council-endorsed principles arises, staff shall report such changes to the Works Committee prior to issuing an RFP;
- (15) a minimum period of four months from the date of issuance of the RFP be provided for interested respondents to prepare their bid submissions, in response to the RFP;

- (16) at such time as staff submit their recommendation report to the Works Committee on the award of contract(s) pursuant to the RFP, the Deputy City Manager report on any organizational adjustments made or pending related to the management and administration of the street furniture program; and
- (17) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

Background:

City Council, at its meeting of July 19, 20, 21 and 26, 2005 adopted, as amended, Clause 6 of Report 7 of the Works Committee, entitled “Co-ordinated Street Furniture Program.” In doing so, among other things, Council authorized the strategy outlined in the joint report (June 15, 2005) of the General Manager, Transportation Services and the Chief Planner and Executive Director of City Planning, for achieving a co-ordinated street furniture program as an important facet of the Clean and Beautiful City initiative.

Council also requested the project team to report in the first half of 2006 on:

- (a) progress achieved through the public and stakeholder consultation process;
- (b) the status of the Design and Policies Guidelines document;
- (c) the status of the Request for Proposals document; and
- (d) the end of life replacement being mandatory.

Further, staff overseeing the project, in consultation with Toronto Water, were asked to consider and report to the Works Committee on issues related to the provision of public restrooms as set out in a communication from Councillor Adam Giambrone.

Executive Summary:

This report is an important milestone on the path to securing a co-ordinated street furniture program for Toronto. Considerable progress on the project has been realized, highlighted by intensive consultation and outreach over the past few months. This work, in conjunction with various ongoing technical analyses and related research, is catalogued in key project design principles and other RFP and contract directions that are being advanced. The draft document, *Vibrant Streets: Toronto’s Co-ordinated Street Furniture Program Design and Policy Guidelines*, which accompanies this report delineates Toronto’s goals and objectives and establishes a design framework for an upcoming RFP. The project team will continue to refine the principles based on Council’s direction and other ongoing work, and fully develop terms and conditions for an RFP to be issued this summer. The previous report (June 15, 2005) highlights the fact that the timeline on this project is critical, as all provisions should be in place prior to the August 31, 2007, expiry of the current transit shelter contract.

A number of key decisions must be made by Council at this juncture involving fundamental project directions. This will enable staff to proceed with the development of an RFP within a clearly defined framework. This report contains a series of recommendations that address these issues.

First, it is necessary to confirm general over-arching design principles such as set out in the Design and Policy Guidelines document and this report. The design principles related to cohesive design, identity, flexibility, scale and context, modularity, functionality, durability, accessibility, safety, environmental awareness and placement, are just that at this stage – general principles. Endorsement of the design direction by Council will set the stage for these matters to be developed and detailed more fully in the coming months.

Details of the actual scope of the program and specific elements that will be secured under contract(s) must also be decided at this stage. A related issue is the fact that not all elements of the streetscape can feasibly be provided within the limits of this specific undertaking. Nonetheless, these other elements, like poles, landscaping features, tree grates, paving, etc., must be considered in terms of design links to street furniture. This report seeks Council's endorsement of the package of elements to be included and a process to achieve the objective of linking other streetscape elements through design.

Once it has been determined as to what the City expects to achieve (design framework, scope of elements), the next series of decisions required of Council at this point will establish how this will be accomplished. More particularly, the project will involve capital and ongoing maintenance costs as well as potential revenues, of significant order of magnitude. A decision must be made on the appropriate funding model moving forward. This will involve a directly related decision pertaining to the role of advertising in the program. A series of controls related to an advertising-funded model are also recommended. With the establishment of the funding model, the form of contract(s) – whether it be a single contract or multiple contracts in whatever configuration and length must be decided.

Finally, this report identifies, in broad terms, certain principles related to evaluation of submitted proposals that should be decided on.

The content of this report is divided into the following sections:

- 1.0 Introduction
  - 1.1 Consultation and Outreach
- 2.0 What is Co-ordinated Street Furniture?
- 3.0 “Design Matters”
  - 3.1 Scale and Context
  - 3.2 Cohesive Design and Identity
  - 3.3 Neighbourhood Expression and Public Art
  - 3.4 Functionality and Design Quality
  - 3.5 Placement – Pedestrian Circulation, Accessibility, Safety

- 4.0 Scope of the Program
  - 4.1 Elements to be Considered in RFP
    - Transit Shelters
    - Litter/Recycling Receptacles
    - Benches
    - Multi-Publication Structures
    - Information/Wayfinding (Info Pillar)
    - Postering/Neighbourhood Information Facilities
    - Public Washrooms
  - 4.2 Design Links
  - 4.3 Implementation Phasing
- 5.0 Financial Considerations
  - 5.1 Cost Considerations
  - 5.2 Revenue Considerations
- 6.0 Contract Issues
  - 6.1 Contract Structure
  - 6.2 Advertising
  - 6.3 Contract Term and Expiry
  - 6.4 Existing Contracts
  - 6.5 RFP Evaluation Principles
- 7.0 Program Management and Administration.

The guiding directions and principles set out in this comprehensive package will ensure the City's best interests are served in realizing its goals for a co-ordinated street furniture program within the broader realm of advancing vibrant streets.

Comments:

1.0 Introduction:

The state of Toronto's public realm, and particularly its streetscapes, has attracted considerable interest over the past number of years. Appealing, well-designed, well-maintained and accessible streets are essential in imparting a positive urban experience. The City, under the umbrella of the Clean and Beautiful City has launched a series of inter-related initiatives to strengthen, celebrate and ultimately elevate the quality of our public spaces.

The co-ordinated street furniture program, as a key element of this effort represents an exceptional opportunity to improve the look, feel, functionality and image of our streetscapes and City. It is emphasized that this program would be delivered across the entire City of Toronto.

### 1.1 Consultation and Outreach:

The work plan for the co-ordinated street furniture program emphasized that prior to an RFP being issued, the City of Toronto's goals and objectives in achieving high standards of civic amenities should be informed by public and stakeholder input. Accordingly, consultation and outreach has been incorporated as an integral element of the project.

The consultation process sought to address a number of objectives:

- learn what key principles and concerns various interests and groups held in regard to a co-ordinated street furniture plan;
- convey the City's desire to improve the look and feel of Toronto's streetscapes and generate broad support and awareness for the program and improvement of the public realm generally;
- provide opportunities for interested parties in all areas of the City to provide feedback; and
- frame design expectations that will be part of an RFP.

An intensive, multi-faceted plan was employed to gather advice and input from a broad range of constituencies. Various methodologies were applied to solicit views and disseminate information. A series of meetings and workshops afforded the public and key groups numerous opportunities to address the project directly, as described in more detail below. A project website including e-mail access is established and contains a variety of documentation, background information, meeting minutes, status reports and a presentation. A questionnaire to provide feedback was also made available. In some cases such as BIAs and neighbourhood associations, direct mailing was used.

Input from the array of consultation activities, combined with technical analyses and related research has been evaluated and many ideas and themes emerging are incorporated or addressed in the principles of the Design and Policy Guidelines draft document and the directions on fundamental aspects of the RFP as set out in this report.

The consultation and outreach activities were focussed generally around the following groups.

Internal: Day-to-day management of the program has been delivered by a small project team comprised of staff of Transportation Services, the Urban Design Section, Clean and Beautiful City Secretariat and Communications and Consultation, in conjunction with the Project Director, Robert Millward. A broadly-based Steering Committee comprised of Divisional executives was formed to oversee the conduct of the project and ensure the wide range of related activities and interests are captured. More detailed input and analysis on specific technical aspects is obtained through working directly with staff in affected Divisions, including the Toronto Transit Commission.

General Public: A prime focus of the consultation efforts was four public meetings, held in a workshop format, in each of the City's four Districts. The meetings were publicized through newspaper advertisements, the project website, notice to Councillors and other interest groups, and consisted of presentations from staff, a general question and answer session, then breakout into smaller, facilitated groups for a workshop session. Approximately 200 people in total participated. The participants were incredibly enthusiastic in their desire to contribute to the improvement of Toronto's streetscapes and generated a wide range of opinions and stimulating ideas. Valuable public input was also provided through the previously mentioned survey and the project's email address.

Interested Groups: Specific consultations were held with a variety of groups, including the City's Pedestrian, Cycling and Disability Issues Committees, TABIA and the BIAs, publication box interests and the Toronto Public Utilities Co-ordinating Committee. All residents' associations, BIAs and school boards were advised of the project. Discussions were also held with members of the Toronto Public Space Committee. The project team also received extremely valuable input from Mr. Gord Brown and the Harbord Village Residents Association on pedestrian circulation, the Metropolitan Action Committee on Violence Against Women and Children on safety issues and Benchmark on behalf of the Liberty Village BIA related to a street furniture art initiative.

Design Community: Given the prominence this program is placing on the achievement of exceptional design, it was seen as an imperative to include a strong component in the consultation program to tap into design expertise in formulating the principles of this project. Toronto is privileged to have a dynamic, vibrant design sector, possessing a wealth of knowledge, ideas and experience that could lend valuable insights in framing the project.

Initially, the work plan envisaged in a conceptual way establishing a design advisory panel. However, as the project progressed and our thinking evolved, it was determined that the breadth of design advice could be considerably expanded and enhanced through partnering with two key groups: the Roundtable on a Beautiful City and its appropriate Sub-Committee, and the Design Exchange (DX). In addition to apprising the Roundtable Sub-Committee on project progress and gaining its input, the DX organized two design charrettes to gather creative input and ideas from professional designers in a range of design disciplines.

Approximately 100 design professionals and City staff representing the fields of urban planning and design, landscape architecture, graphic design, industrial design, accessibility and mobility design and architecture volunteered their time and energies. After overview presentations, design teams worked through design challenges involving a number of diverse sites in all areas of the City. They were requested to sketch solutions and, in doing so, derive principles and design criteria. The DX has produced a summary report of the events and the principles that flowed from these charrettes have enriched the Design and Policy Guidelines document.

Industry Consultation: One of the stakeholder segments which was seen as possessing considerable knowledge and experience that could benefit the ultimate product is the industry itself, namely those local, national and international firms that may be interested in bidding or participating in bids on the future RFP. The potential enhancements that could flow to the project from the perspectives the industry sector may provide, from its experience in Toronto and other North American, European and Australian cities, must be balanced against the need to ensure that all participants have fair and equitable access in the consultation and no one potential bidding firm, group or interest gains any prior advantage in the RFP process. Therefore, the goal of this element of consultation was to seek comment on principles and not individual products or solutions.

In accordance with Council's procurement policies, a two-stage industry consultation was carried out pursuant to Terms of Reference authorized by Council at its meeting of February 14, 2006. The first stage consisted of an open meeting with the project team providing presentations setting out the context of Toronto's goals for the public realm and then detailing how the co-ordinated street furniture program relates to this. The project team provided an opportunity for questions and answers. The second stage involved individual sessions, along the lines of a deputation, with firms who expressed an interest in providing their input on principle and process issues. No questions were taken by the project staff in these second stage meetings. It was emphasized that participation by firms in any aspect of the industry consultation was strictly optional and participants were not privy to any special insight or information that would not be available to any member of the public and have no advantage as a result of the consultation, should they choose to bid on an RFP later on.

Staff indicated throughout the consultation and outreach that input received would be taken under advisement, assessed and used to help formulate the guiding principles for advancing a co-ordinated street furniture program for Toronto. The project team was very impressed by the breadth and scope of ideas and energy that came forward from all sectors noted above. We feel this process has resulted in wide ranging advice and insights. Many aspects of the Design and Policy Guidelines document and directions set out in this report are directly shaped by input we received. Throughout the process staff have posted summaries of the consultation activities on the project website, including minutes of the four public workshop meetings, notes from the Design Exchange charrettes, the DX summary report, notes from the first stage industry meeting, the TABIA/BIA meeting and the meeting with the publication box owners.

Of course, with a project of this nature and magnitude, there were many opposing or conflicting views expressed, however, these viewpoints provoked considerable thought, debate and discussion amongst the project team. While all of these divergent points of view are not necessarily reflected in the principles and recommendations, we have attempted to provide sufficient background to apprise Council of other approaches that might be taken, should Council see fit.

## 2.0 What is Co-ordinated Street Furniture?

Street furniture consists of a wide variety of elements and amenities installed in the public right-of-way for the use and convenience of the public. Familiar examples include, but are not limited to, transit shelters, waste/recycling receptacles, benches, publication boxes, information

pillars and phone booths. In a broader sense, it has also been suggested through this project that street furniture can be seen to encompass such items as utility poles, traffic signal hardware, bicycle stands, signs, planters, tree grates, bollards, maintenance covers, banners, mail and clothing drop boxes and many others.

For the purpose of providing a focus and clarity to this project, we have defined “co-ordinated” street furniture as:

“the harmonization of design, form, scale, materials and placement of street amenities in a functional and accessible manner, including for persons with disabilities, in an attempt to reduce clutter, beautify city streets and to give Toronto an identifiable streetscape.”

There are certain key themes in this definition that merit emphasizing as this project advances - the City is seeking to ensure cohesive and exceptional design quality, the function of the elements will be a priority and much attention to detail must be given in terms of safe and accessible placement of street furniture. These ideas are interdependent. They are emphasized and reinforced throughout the Design and Policies Guidelines document.

At this stage, it is useful to reflect on how a co-ordinated street furniture program fits within the cumulative efforts of the Clean and Beautiful City initiative. Through the expanse of input from the consultation and outreach, we have come to regard co-ordinated street furniture as something of a catalyst in achieving the City’s overall goals for the public realm. This program is certainly a landmark step, but it 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.

What the co-ordinated street furniture program will not do is substitute for or replace substantive programs like the City Planning Division’s Civic Improvement Program or BIA improvement initiatives. We have heard many suggestions and concerns on other potential improvements and opportunities like undergrounding hydro wires, upgrading decorative paving standards or rehabilitating bridge structures, as a few examples. These aspects in themselves can generate many exceedingly complex issues, not the least of which is affordability. If the street furniture program and RFP are used as vehicles to directly encompass all of these types of items, the project would likely become so unwieldy that its entire feasibility would be compromised. Accordingly, later sections in this report, as well as the Design and Policy Guidelines elaborate on design links between the program and the myriad of other elements in our streets.

### 3.0 “Design Matters”:

This phrase captures the essence of the co-ordinated street furniture approach and frames every action being taken toward the successful delivery of the program. Over time, numerous new street furniture elements have been introduced to Toronto’s streetscape as demand for amenities continues to grow. While there have been notable individual successes, the elements have generally not been designed in a cohesive fashion, nor has their placement in conjunction with one another or in relation to their surroundings always been well executed.

The emphasis of this project is on procuring a family of product(s) that encompass cohesive, flexible, functional and durable high quality design that reflects Toronto's identity. Equally important is the need to focus on pedestrian circulation and safety considerations; in other words, the ongoing deployment and placement of various elements must complement and work effectively in the context of the various and often diverse forms of physical environment that Toronto encompasses.

### 3.1 Scale and Context:

The City of Toronto is a big place. This is true on many levels, from its vast size, from the broad range of road and sidewalk configurations and resultant differences in available public space, to the diverse range, form and mass of development that abuts these public spaces. We have emphasized that "co-ordinated" street furniture does not imply identical. Clearly, a street furniture arrangement, in terms of size of elements, location, orientation and dimension that works well in a more suburban area will not necessarily fit a highly constrained downtown condition. Pedestrian activity, in terms of volumes and patterns, also varies widely. This leads to the important consideration of scale and context - the ultimate goal is a range of furniture elements that are appropriate to their location in the City and serve service needs - and a "one size fits all" solution will not be feasible.

### 3.2 Cohesive Design and Identity:

Two somewhat conflicting design issues have emerged through the process thus far. Conveying a "Toronto identity" through the family of street furniture has been advanced. Conversely, some groups, notably BIAs and others have advised against monotonous streetscapes and, in fact, aggressively seek to establish unique, distinct identities for their neighbourhoods.

Against the backdrop of the important scale and contextual relationships identified above, it is concluded that the idea of modularity in elements and a common design thread is desirable in Toronto in a co-ordinated street furniture program. Some cities have specified several different design standards in RFPs to be used in different parts of their cities. We feel that the emphasis for Toronto should be on flexible features as opposed to completely different design lines. This may involve customizable attributes, for example through the use of colour, or the opportunity of placing identifier plaques. It is analogous to the City's decorative street name signs that display the distinct Toronto shape and style, but allow for unique area identity to be displayed. This is one of the design challenges to be posed in the RFP.

It is also suggested that unique identity, be it the Waterfront, the Union Station precinct, St. Lawrence area, North York Centre or any number of the City's BIAs and neighbourhoods can be achieved outside the confines of the limited suite of elements that will ultimately comprise the co-ordinated street furniture program. These may take the form of planters, light standards, banners, decorative paving, gateway features, public art, etc. Again, this points to the need for appropriate design links with other aspects of the public streets.

### 3.3 Neighbourhood Expression and Public Art:

One of the themes that was prevalent through the course of our consultation activities was a desire to channel neighbourhood involvement and seek opportunities to incorporate public art in the co-ordinated street furniture program. The discussion in the section above outlines our recommended approach as far as procuring a family of street furniture that maintains a common design theme, while allowing some flexibility for customization. The street furniture program may provide the opportunity for community-related artistic expression for purposes of neighbourhood enhancement. However, the City has a longstanding protocol for securing public art, and this project is not intended to usurp this successful, proven approach.

With that said, however, the idea of neighbourhood expression and distinction amongst business areas must be addressed. The BIAs in particular have stressed this concern in strong terms. It is felt that certain features can be incorporated into the context of an RFP, through subsequent management of the program, and through other initiatives and frameworks already in place.

As noted previously, there is no reason that BIA priority streetscape projects involving unique paving, planters, landscaping, gateways, lighting, art and other physical features cannot proceed in concert with the defined range of co-ordinated street furniture elements. It is recommended that certain core elements of the co-ordinated program would be required (such as transit shelters, litter/recycling receptacles, information pillars and publication enclosures). However, other elements, like benches could be optional, should a BIA wish to provide its own. Ongoing implementation of the co-ordinated street furniture program within the guidelines and criteria established would be carried out in consultation with BIAs.

The second factor that will be specified in the RFP is the flexibility features discussed above to allow some level of customization within the selected design family. This would include the provision for some BIA branding. Of particular note will be the provision of poster kiosks as discussed later in this report.

A third aspect has evolved out of discussions held with the Benchmark program, inaugurated by the Liberty Village BIA. Under Benchmark, the LV BIA has transformed park benches into creative, accessible and functional public street art. This program establishes a process for the local BIA or neighbourhood to engage in a community consultation, selection of ideas, issuance of a call to artists and work on the art product. Again, as noted previously, the street furniture project should not be seen as a substitute for this type of approach. However, it can, within a controlled framework, provide the physical element or “canvas” to facilitate this type of neighbourhood initiative. Specifically, it is recommended that the RFP call for a number of benches, perhaps in the order of about 20 per year, that could be deployed at the request of neighbourhoods or BIAs to facilitate a Benchmark style public art process. Terms of reference for this dealing with the groups’, City’s and contractor(s)’ responsibilities will have to be drafted.

### 3.4 Functionality and Design Quality:

A theme advanced repeatedly through all aspects of the consultation was the need to ensure that street furniture is of consistently high quality, placed where needed and oriented in a manner to serve its users and the public, as opposed to simply providing a medium for advertising.

There are many inter-related elements to the important objectives of design quality and functionality. Toronto seeks an elegant, timeless design line in its street furniture and a cornerstone must be proven durable, high quality materials and assembly. These items are subject to harsh conditions including extremes in climate, physical challenges from vehicles, snow ploughs, snow windrows, construction, etc., and wilful abuse like graffiti, skrachiti, posterage and other forms of vandalism. A minimum lifecycle of 20 years for the core elements would be expected.

In addition to aesthetic quality and performance, street furniture elements will provide various services to the public. In doing so, designs must ensure ease of use and maintenance. For example, waste receptacles must be ergonomically designed, not only to encourage the public in preventing littering and participating in recycling, but also facilitate efficient collection. In this regard, technical parameters, as developed for receptacles by Solid Waste Management staff, will be further refined for inclusion in the RFP.

RFP terms and conditions will be 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.

Safety must be integral to any design. Considerations like protecting the users from elements, avoidance of sharp edges and projections, dangerous sightlines or other visibility problems, cane detectability and the use of lighting are important.

The concept of modularity should also be a foundation of design. Modular pieces, or a “kit of parts”, will support the goal of flexibility within a cohesive design line. The idea of interchangeable functionality could assist in reducing the amount of physical and visual clutter and also facilitate quicker, more efficient repair, relocation, replacement and changing demand.

Street furniture design should also take into account environmental concerns. As a minimum, the use of sustainable technology such as solar power, reusable or recyclable components will be specified. Currently the new design transit shelters employ solar powered roof lighting and the contractor is working towards using this technology for ad panels. Through the consultation a number of parties suggested such innovations as green roofs, water collection and tree planting. The RFP will invite proponents to incorporate such ideas.

Each of the foregoing design components are addressed in the Design and Policy Guidelines document and will be set out in the RFP.

### 3.5 Placement – Pedestrian Circulation, Accessibility, Safety:

Thus far, this report has focussed design goals for co-ordinated street furniture on the physical attributes of the elements themselves. Equally critical is the need to establish circulation and safety considerations; in other words, the ongoing deployment and placement of various street furniture elements must complement and work together effectively in the context of the sidewalk environment.

The Design and Policy Guidelines document deals extensively with this facet. It is noted that although many of the directions and parameters that are being established in this regard are certainly not geared solely to street furniture and will not directly translate into RFP specifications, they will have a resounding effect on how a successful proponent's plan is deployed. Accordingly, it is exceedingly important that these evolving requirements be understood as the project moves forward. The scale and context considerations discussed previously clearly work in tandem with the placement aspects of street furniture.

The roadside portion (i.e., from the curb face to building face/property line) of the public road allowance serves many competing demands: pedestrian circulation including those with special needs (wheelchair/scooters, visually impaired, carriages), utilities, cafes and marketing, trees and landscaping, subsurface installations, etc. The broad approach taken in deriving placement parameters is to view the roadside as a series of inter-related spaces:

Edge Zone – Immediately back of curb, providing clearance between the travelled portion of the road or parked vehicles and the other sidewalk/boulevard functions. This area provides a safety buffer against door swings, mirrors, etc., possibly accommodates sign and utility posts, garbage set out and snow windrow storage.

Service or Furnishing Zone – This area, which is back of the edge zone, may contain street furniture, trees and other fixed objects, and may be characterized by decorative paving features. Co-ordinated alignment of such services within this zone is desirable, and these features should be placed in a manner that does not obstruct the clear zone. This would represent a typical configuration in a denser urban setting, but may vary in more suburban conditions.

Pedestrian Clearway – This is the zone that accommodates pedestrian movement; a clear, straight, unobstructed continuous path of reasonable width to serve pedestrian flow.

Frontage Zone – The area adjacent to the building/property line that buffers pedestrians from windows, doorways, other building appurtenances. This area may contain various street furniture, landscaping or uses related to the abutting properties depending on space available.

The pedestrian clearway concept is an approach that has been extensively researched and developed by the Harbord Village Residents' Association (HVRA), and is being piloted this summer on the section of College Street from Bathurst Street to Spadina Avenue. Mr. Gord Brown and the HVRA have graciously shared their considerable work and efforts, and the Design and Policy Guidelines document reflects many of the resulting principles. Other key sources that form the basis of the placement guidelines are the emerging Streetscape Manual of the Urban Design Section, City Planning, the Accessibility Design Guidelines and other input from the City's Disability Issues Committee and a detailed submission from the Metropolitan Action Committee, on Violence Against Women and Children (METRAC).

Ideally, a minimum of 2.1 m clear width, in a generally straight alignment should be sought for pedestrian passage. With that being the case, however, it must be acknowledged that there are many, many streets in Toronto that are very vibrant and would be severely compromised if this dimension is set as a rigid standard. There must be some flexibility to allow for tight urban

conditions. In the many areas of the City where sidewalks are only 1.5 m or less, a setback of other street amenities should be pursued to achieve an appropriate clearance. This would result in limiting the placement of street amenities in some instances. Other factors that the Design and Policy Guidelines document addresses are clearances from services, setbacks at intersections to achieve sightlines, corner clearances and orientation of street furniture elements.

In order to achieve these goals, the four roadside “zones” discussed above do not necessarily exhibit the same characteristics or even arrangement, at all locations. The Design and Policy Guidelines document uses “typical” right-of-way configurations found in the City to demonstrate the principles. For example, in a wide suburban style corridor, placement of street furniture in the frontage zone, back of the sidewalk or pedestrian clearway is entirely appropriate. The College Street pedestrian clearway initiative has readily demonstrated that many aspects must be changed, both in terms of how we think about the public realm and existing regulations (for example, boulevard café provisions), to support and achieve these goals.

The other aspect regarding placement of street furniture that will be made clear in the RFP is that the City, while working collaboratively with successful proponent(s), will have final sign-off on the placement of street furniture elements. This may include restrictions due to the safety factors identified in this section, or could include any number of factors such as incompatibility with historic/iconic buildings or public art installations.

#### 4.0 Scope of the Program:

One of the key decisions at this stage is to establish the scope of the street furniture project, namely which specific elements will be called for in the RFP process. This decision will have ramifications on other fundamental considerations, including how contract(s) are structured.

The elements recommended below have been considered on the basis of input received through the consultation, staffs’ considerable experience with current street furniture contracts, discussions with City officials, review of other cities and estimation of potential need/demand based on current experience.

This chapter also outlines potential quantities of street furniture elements. These numbers, while having some relation to known parameters, are provided at this time strictly for illustrative purposes. As we continue toward the development of detailed RFP provisions, these calculations will be evaluated in more detail and likely adjusted.

A subsequent section of this report discusses the length of street furniture contract(s). It is assumed that in order to implement a program of the magnitude suggested, and hence cover the substantial capital investment, a long term arrangement will be necessary. Of course, with a long time horizon, the projection of future needs becomes less precise. In particular, two key areas of concern have been identified.

The first is changing technology. The contract must contain provisions to ensure that as technological advancements emerge, the chosen street furniture has the capability to incorporate such features. The second relates to the need for the specified elements in the quantities stipulated. If, for any number of reasons, particular elements are not required to the extent initially expected, the contract should incorporate formulae for substitution of elements or predetermined payments to the City.

In this vein, the City, over the term of the street furniture program may embark on large scale initiatives that would alter the work flow contemplated upon signing contract(s). One such opportunity is a potential bid for the 2015 World's Fair. The RFP will contain provisions acknowledging such contingencies.

#### 4.1 Elements to be Considered in RFP:

Transit Shelters: Currently there are about 4,000 transit shelters on the streets of Toronto; about 1,000 of the new design installed over the past five years and about 3,000 others of varying age, style and condition. Transit shelters should be a focal element of the co-ordinated street furniture program. Assuming the 3,000 older shelters, some dating back to the 1970s and 80s would be replaced, and in the order of 2,000 new locations added over a 20-year period (100 per year), a total of 5,000 new transit shelters may be deployed under the initiative. (There are 8,540 bus stops and 715 streetcar stops established in the City of Toronto today.) It is proposed that the approximately 1,000 new transit shelters installed under the current contract would remain (although some portion may be relocated), as these are substantial, attractive structures that represent a considerable value to the City. The ongoing maintenance, repair, cleaning and relocation of these shelters should be assumed under the new contract. This would result in a total inventory in the order of 6,000 shelters at the end of this period. Transit shelters should each be equipped with seating, lighting, a map frame, street/transit stop name, information tag to report maintenance concerns, and incorporate flexibility to add transit information technology as such service capability is developed by the TTC in future.

Litter/Recycling Receptacles: It is also proposed that the inventory of litter/recycling receptacles be included as an element of this program. There are currently about 3,800 stainless steel litter/recycling receptacles and approximately 2,700 stand alone garbage containers on City streets. In discussions with staff of Solid Waste Management, it is expected that in addition to the roughly 6,500 current locations, in the order of 2,000 new locations could be required over a 20-year period, for a total of about 8,500 new installations. It must be highlighted that the existing contract for the stainless steel receptacles runs through 2009, so installation of new receptacles under the co-ordinated street furniture program would have to be phased in a manner that the City continues to abide by its obligations pursuant to this agreement. All new receptacles should have recycling capability. Staff of Solid Waste Management are developing detailed requirements for future refuse containers, dealing with size, configuration, placement and ergonomic concerns that will translate into detailed specifications in the RFP.

Benches: Benches are also a logical candidate for inclusion in the RFP. A third party supplier currently runs a bench program in three areas of the City: Etobicoke, East York and North York. Staff are reviewing agreements and will have a better idea of quantities over the next couple of months, but preliminary indications are that there may be about 1,000 benches (not including those in transit shelters) on City streets. In addition, benches are installed at other locations,

outside the bench advertising programs. Some of these are through BIAs and others by City Divisions, although there is no formal City program for bench installation on streets, including maintenance. It is suggested that all legacy benches (contract and City) would be replaced. Benches installed by BIAs would not be removed under the co-ordinated street furniture program. Accordingly, it would be expected that the program may call for in the order of 2,000 benches, exclusive of transit shelter seating, although existing inventory activity now being conducted by staff will allow a more definitive specification in the RFP.

Multi-Publication Structures: One of the most common concerns we heard through the course of the consultation was the state of publication dispensing boxes, in terms of numbers, placement and condition. As Committee and Council will recall, extensive review of these facilities culminated in late 2005 with a new by-law to regulate publication boxes on City streets. Staff are currently rolling out the aforementioned dedicated work program to tackle the issues of inventorying and compliance under the regulations. The co-ordinated street furniture program offers an opportunity to address the boxes in the context of the overall street condition. There are ranges of options for dealing with the boxes: a more formal multi-publication box structure to replace existing individual boxes, a decorative fencing structure or reinstatement and more deliberate use of a “T-bar” or similar facility to ensure the proper organization of existing boxes. Each of these possibilities is probably appropriate under different situations in the City. At this stage, we feel that a number of multi-publication boxes, in the order of 500 (an average of 25 per year), could be specified in the RFP. In the order of 2,000 decorative fencing locations may be appropriate. Other locations, typically in more expansive environments, could be addressed through a T-bar approach, which would not be stipulated in the RFP.

Information/Wayfinding (Info Pillars): The project team has discussed the feasibility of integrating an information/wayfinding capability into the co-ordinated street furniture program with officials of the City’s Tourism Division. Tourism, in conjunction with Parks, Forestry and Recreation, has recently issued a Briefing Note updating members of Council on the “InfoTOgo” Information Pillar pilot project. Under that program, 25 such pillars were to be installed on City properties other than highways pursuant to an RFP (24 of these are currently provided, while the 25<sup>th</sup>, as discussed later in this report and in a separate report from the General Manager, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, is proposed to be installed on the north sidewalk of Dundas Street West outside the Tourism Ontario outlet at Atrium on Bay). The information pillars are intended to address an identified need for pedestrian-oriented visitor information and map signage. Improving visitors’ access to information about the City is an important strategy as set out in the Tourism Action Plan approved by Council earlier this year. The information pillars incorporate illuminated panels for third party advertising which funds the capital and maintenance costs of the pilot, as well as provides revenue for the respective City divisions.

Tourism staff have noted that because the terms of the pilot expressly prevented these installations from being placed within the road allowance, their orientation has been criticized and their effectiveness diminished. Accordingly, it is appropriate that the functionality of this project be incorporated with co-ordinated street furniture. This may encompass stand-alone structures like the current pillars or be modularly integrated into other street furniture elements. Tourism officials have stressed that if the latter approach is used, the information/wayfinding element must be physically denoted by some type of iconic marking, as it is very important that residents and visitors be able to quickly identify with the program. Such pillars or other form of device would be placed near parks, civic squares and areas of interest and provided with maps of

the neighbourhood, profiles of nearby attractions, heritage properties, historical information and parks and gardens. The pilot pillars have a coin operated map dispenser and some are being tested for more interactive electronic capability. It is expected that the RFP could specify in the order of 120 such devices. As with the current litter bin contract, any wayfinding/information pillar devices installed under the co-ordinated street furniture program would be done in a manner that respects the City's obligations contained in the pilot pillar contract.

Posting/Neighbourhood Information Kiosks: City Council has been grappling with the development of a by-law to regulate posting for a number of years. A balance is being sought to respect freedom of expression, while addressing the negative implications of indiscriminate posting, including littering, aesthetic blight and various hazards. The Planning and Transportation Committee, at its meeting of March 6, 2006, considered the Mayor's recommended draft by-law to regulate posting.

The draft by-law establishes a number of provisions concerning definitions, physical criteria, means of attachment and ownership related to posters. One of the key elements of the draft by-law would be the establishment of posting kiosks to facilitate the placement of posters. The by-law would not come into full force and effect until kiosks are installed and available for public use. In fact, the report (February 13, 2006) of the Executive Director, Municipal Licensing and Standards, notes "The design, installation and location of kiosks will form part of the review presently being undertaken with respect to the street furniture program."

A kiosk is defined in the draft by-law as, "A structure, approved by the General Manager of the Transportation Division, or his or her designate or successor official, placed on a highway within the City for the purpose of posting posters and includes a poster board, a designated wall or other designated locations."

Staff of Municipal Licensing and Standards have been consulted. At this time it has not been determined with any degree of specificity what a posting kiosk may encompass. This device could take a number of forms, including a three-dimensional stand-alone element (along the lines of a pillar) or a board or surface incorporated into other street furniture elements. Work will continue with MSL staff to further consider this issue, however, this is a design challenge that is properly stipulated in the RFP. In terms of an order of magnitude, it is suggested that 2,500 such devices be included, which would provide an average distribution of about 50 per Ward. It is also envisaged that the device will take different forms. Probably about one-fifth of the inventory would be of a more substantial kiosk type, while the rest would exhibit a much simpler form. The kiosk type may hold area or BIA information and directories as well as accommodate posting.

Public Washrooms: The Works Committee specifically requested staff to report on the feasibility of installing public washrooms based on the Boston and Berlin experiences, taking into account issues including hygiene, accessibility and maintenance. The report is to address the compatibility and impact of these experiences with the City of Toronto's advertising policy.

The issue of public washrooms in Toronto was last reviewed in detail in 1988. Over the decades, City policy has alternated between providing public washrooms and relying on the commercial sector, particularly restaurants, to meet this need. In 1966, Council adopted a policy providing washrooms at various points through the City and allocated budget to build 12 new public

lavatories. The decision was reversed in 1971. By the time of the 1988 review, only three public washrooms still existed. The report estimated that the construction of new underground washrooms in the street allowance would cost \$750,000.00 each and above grade structures \$300,000.00, keeping in mind this was 1988 dollars. The report concluded that there was no need for public washrooms in Toronto.

Research suggests that many cities, including the two cited in the Works Committee communication, are moving in the direction of providing public washrooms. Several hundred are installed in Berlin, while Boston has initiated public toilets within its street furniture program, with less than ten installed to date. New York City is also providing these facilities under its recently awarded street furniture contract, after many years of debate. In terms of public support in Toronto, there did not appear to be a clear consensus on this issue emerging through our consultations. Some felt it was a good idea, while others were quite concerned with the concept.

We have learned that the current generation of public washrooms is vastly superior in terms of technological advances. Models available are self-contained; they contain various sanitary features (sinks, mirrors, hand dryers, disposable seat covers), are constructed of durable materials, are wheelchair accessible, contain emergency communication capabilities and employ hygienic advances, including self-cleaning after each use. The capital costs of the facilities are in the range of \$300,000.00. They do require water and sewer connections.

In most, if not all of the cities we reviewed, these facilities are funded, in terms of capital and maintenance costs, with other elements of street furniture through advertising revenues. Typically a nominal fee is applied through a coin-operated mechanism, but this is more of a means to regulate use than raise revenues. In addition to the self-cleaning, regular manual maintenance on a cycle of about three times per day is a common standard.

Based on our assessment, self-cleaning, state of the art public washrooms should be specified on a limited basis for Toronto. It is suggested that that the RFP make provision for about 20 of these facilities.

#### 4.2 Design Links:

A city's uniqueness is manifest in many ways. Its architecture, public spaces, street design, parks, storefronts, neighbourhoods, cleanliness and signature sights all contribute to its character and appeal. The range of street furniture specified through this program represents one step, albeit an important one, toward achieving Toronto's overall streetscape objectives and elevating the quality of the public realm. With this in mind, the design quality and management of many elements on our streets must be considered through appropriate design linkages to fulfil the true potential of this project.

The concept that has evolved is described in the Design and Policy Guidelines document. It envisages a hierarchy of elements, starting with the core package of items to be secured through this program. The design template established through this process will provide the cue for a second tier of elements. These reflect commonly installed City infrastructure and may include bollards, pedestrian railings/splash guards, tree grates, maintenance covers, bike stands and wayfinding signs.

Three other items have also been raised on a number of occasions and bear particular mention, namely news vending kiosks, sidewalk subway entrance portals and telephone booths. With respect to the kiosks, which would be staffed, the use of such facilities has become nearly non-existent in Toronto over the past two decades. Due to considerable logistical complications and recognition of the coverage of retail outlets, it is not recommended that such structures be pursued at this time. However, it is noted that if there is a desire at some point in the future to revisit this concept, the proposed public washroom structure, in terms of form and massing, could certainly provide the design direction.

Sidewalk subway entrance portals in Toronto have been characterized as non-descript concrete bunkers that provide no weather protection and can be slippery and unsafe. It is suggested that these locations could benefit from an architectural treatment with some flair. Initial discussions were held with T.T.C. staff, and these elements should be viewed in terms of design linkages. Further discussions with the TTC will be necessary. Finally, phone booths have been considered. It is recommended that the RFP call for the street furniture package to include the capability for phone installation which would be the responsibility of a service provider.

A further tier of elements has also been identified. These may involve items of greater cost and complexity, provided by third parties or generally beyond the scope of a street furniture program. Nonetheless, these elements, including utility poles, street lighting, utility boxes, post boxes, planters, decorative paving treatments, boulevard café fencing, private signage and other features on abutting properties, etc., have a pronounced effect on the streetscape.

It is proposed that the street furniture program be used to lever the design consideration of these other elements, particularly those identified in the more directly related second tier. A Streetscape Manual is currently being developed by the Urban Design Section of City Planning that will play a pivotal role in shaping the City's overall streetscape directions. The Streetscape Manual is a comprehensive reference tool defining standards for the entire range of street types. It will lead to the incremental enhancement of quality and attractiveness of Toronto's major streetscapes through the consistent application of a common set of urban design principles. The suggestion is that an amount of funding be stipulated in the RFP, payable on execution of contract(s) by the successful proponent(s), to facilitate a design study that will focus on these elements and provide valuable input to the development of the Streetscape Manual.

#### 4.3 Implementation Phasing:

A fundamental aspect of the scope of the program involves the phasing of implementation, which in turn relates to demand for services and life cycle management.

The quantities indicated in the foregoing sections for illustrative purposes are gross estimations over the entire term of the contract(s). These elements will clearly not be deployed instantaneously and, in fact, will roll out over a number of years.

There will be many constraints in establishing phasing schedules. Some of these include legal obligations pursuant to existing contracts including end of term provisions, the design attributes of a selected family of furniture, the capacity of City resources to plan, manage, administer and inspect the installations and the desired pace for implementation, including geographic distribution. With regard to the pace, with most, if not all of the elements, it will be necessary to have the capability to install elements throughout the term of the contract(s).

On a very broad basis, it is expected that the first full calendar year (to the end of 2008) of the program would not see a large scale implementation of new street furniture, although some deployment would certainly commence. This period would provide the City and contractor(s) a period to familiarize with and assume existing contract requirements and initiate an intense planning phase. Installation would likely activate in earnest by the second full calendar year (2009) with a very intense construction schedule from Year 2 (2009) to Year 6 (2013), tapering somewhat for Year 7 (2014) to Year 12 (2019), and finally plateauing for the last eight years. Again, just to provide a very preliminary sense, cursory forecasts at this time would suggest that in the order of 60 percent of the elements may be installed within the first period, approximately 25 percent during the middle stage and the remaining 15 percent during the later stage of the term.

The RPF, in conjunction with confirming quantities of each element, will also have to contain guidelines on implementation phasing.

#### 5.0 Financial Considerations:

Issues around how the provision of a co-ordinated street furniture program should be funded, and more particularly, the use of advertising in the public street allowances for such a purpose, have figured prominently throughout the consultation and outreach for this project.

Staff have emphatically articulated the primacy of quality design, functionality and placement in the consideration of this program going forward. What cannot be overlooked is one of the key goals and objectives established in the strategy approved by Council in July 2005 for the program, which is to ensure economic viability. Clearly, there is no sense to embark on this initiative unless a secure stream of funding is available at necessary levels, to cover implementation and sustained maintenance over the long term.

A point of view that has been advanced very passionately and concertedly is that street furniture and the public realm should be of very high priority. Accordingly, street furniture should be considered among the many programs that the City provides and most of these are not expected to fund themselves, instead, relying on tax dollars. It has been suggested that the discussion should be about what quality standards we want to apply to our street furniture, which is distinct from the notion that we should be discussing the sale of our city streetscape. The argument is that the City does not leave things to fund themselves because when it is left to advertising companies to design public amenities, the result is “crappy” amenities.

Staff do not subscribe to the notion that excellent quality and design, and the use of advertising as a funding mechanism, albeit in a defined manner, are mutually exclusive. However, given the concerns, Committee and Council are being provided with an order of magnitude overview of costs that could be anticipated to supply and maintain a viable street furniture program, as well as revenue expectations associated with this form of advertising.

#### 5.1 Cost Considerations:

There are certain provisos that must be appreciated vis-à-vis the following numbers. First, they are largely based on two elements of the current inventory of street furniture: transit shelters and litter/recycling receptacles. While general cost projections on other elements, for example information/wayfinding devices, benches, poster kiosks, public toilets, etc. are available, these are not reflected in detail here. The rationale is that these two aspects can be quantified with more confidence based on known parameters through current contract provisions. The final important consideration is this assessment by no means reflects the depth or rigour of a net present value financial analysis that will be applied at the RFP stage, as detailed specifications have not been formulated and no detailed bids have been received at this time.

Transit Shelter Assumptions: For the sake of this analysis, as discussed above, it is assumed that a total of 5,000 new transit shelters may be deployed over a 20-year period, and a further 1,000 relatively new, existing shelters would be retained. Capital costs per new shelter based on the current design are in the order of \$20,000.00, including:

- shelter manufacture, shipping and assembly;
- site preparation, engineering, excavation, installation of reinforced concrete pad, shelter installation; and
- hydro or solar power, bench, map frame.

Relocating existing new design shelters supplied over the past five years that still have useful life is estimated to cost about \$5,000.00 for each shelter so moved.

It is noted that this capital cost figure, which has been presented at the public meetings, has been criticized. It is true that a lower cost is probably conceivable, if the City is willing to settle for bland, utilitarian elements of inferior materials and design standards. To achieve the goals that have been established for this undertaking, this cost is reflective of the quality product the City is seeking.

In terms of ongoing maintenance, costs to be covered include cleaning, repair (including vandalism, emergency, wear and tear), relocation (due to construction, etc.) and lighting. Based on a conservative value of five per cent of capital cost (shelter only), annual operating costs would be at least \$4.5 million.

Litter/Recycling Bin Assumptions: Capital cost of each of the existing stainless steel receptacles, including manufacture, supply and installation, is in the order of \$1,500.00. In accordance with the projections set out in the previous section, about 8,500 new receptacles may be installed under this initiative. Estimates of annual operating costs of the current stainless steel

receptacles are in the order of \$1 million. This could easily double to the \$2 million range with an increase in the number of receptacles, but also factoring in economies of a co-ordinated system. (City forces currently collect from the receptacles and this arrangement is assumed to continue.)

Other Elements: As noted previously, it is recommended that the RFP specifically address a number of elements that are either new or on which we do not have as solid of a basis at this time for substantiating cost information, including benches, public toilets, information/wayfinding structures, poster locations and multi-publication boxes. These will add considerable capital costs and annual maintenance requirements to the program.

Total Costs: Over a 20-year life cycle, and considering transit shelters and litter receptacles, a total capital cost of about \$100 to \$110 million (today's dollars) can be expected based on the current costs. Although there will likely be economies with the emergence of modular design principles and better co-ordination of placement, with the inclusion of other elements in quantities along the lines set out previously, a total capital cost expectation of \$120 to \$130 million is not unrealistic.

In terms of annual operating costs, about \$7 million, for a total in the order of \$140 million over the same time frame, without factoring in inflation, would need to be planned for.

## 5.2 Revenue Considerations:

The capital and ongoing operating costs identified above establish to an order of magnitude the requirements to provide and maintain a quality street furniture program for Toronto. This is irrespective of the funding source(s) applied to sustain the program.

Based on the known parameters of the transit shelter and litter/recycling bin contracts, it can be established with confidence that there is a considerable value associated with advertising under a street furniture program. Both contracts currently generate sufficient revenues to cover all capital and annual maintenance and operating expenses and, over and above, provide a cash payment to the City.

The revenue formula in the transit shelter contract calls for the annual pre-payment to the City of the greater of a minimum guaranteed amount (\$5 million in 2006/2007) or 27 per cent of advertising revenues. Under the contract for the stainless steel litter receptacles, the City receives a minimum monthly payment per bin (\$20.00 in 2006) plus 10 percent of advertising revenues, for a total revenue to the City of about \$1 million in 2006.

The current total annual revenue generation from advertising on these two programs as well as benches was about \$18.5 million in 2005. Based on the guaranteed payments to the City for 2006/2007 under the existing contracts, the total annual advertising revenue is set to be in the range of about \$21 million. It is noted that in the case of the transit shelters, slightly less than half of the inventory actually have an ad panel. Projected over a 20-year period, total revenues in the order of \$400 to \$420 million (2006 dollars) would be expected to be generated from advertising.

## 6.0 Contract Issues:

One of the most crucial and fundamental decisions that Council must make at this juncture in the process is how the project should be structured. In other words, what financial model and what procurement approach will most effectively achieve the goals and objectives of the street furniture and Clean and Beautiful City initiatives and protect the best interests of the City. It bears emphasizing that it is the City's interests staff have kept in mind, as a range of opinions have been expressed during both the public and industry segments of consultation. In formulating the advice contained herein, approaches in a number of other cities that have implemented co-ordinated street furniture in recent years have also been researched.

### 6.1 Contract Structure:

There are three key questions to be answered in deriving the methodology that will best move this project forward:

- (1) Should a co-ordinated street furniture program be funded on the basis of advertising revenue or should Council dedicate some other funding source (i.e., tax-based, other City revenues) to this purpose.
- (2) If the decision is to rely on the advertising model, should multiple contracts for street furniture be tendered and, if so, what would be the appropriate division of such contracts.
- (3) Directly related to No. 2, should one large contract be tendered covering all aspects of the specified street furniture elements for the entire City.

Funding Mechanism: With respect to the first question, there was much support and interest from many participants in the consultation activities in pursuing street furniture with no advertising. Under this model the City would implement a design process and commission the manufacture and installation of a suite of street furniture. All ongoing maintenance (repair, replacement, relocation, cleaning, lighting, etc.) would also be organized by the City. The discussion in the previous chapter of this report provides Committee and Council with the order of magnitude capital and operating costs, as well as revenue potential from advertising, to assess whether this approach is viable. In effect, given that funds for these types of purposes are not presently allocated in budgets, and in fact some Division budgets now benefit from significant revenue through existing contracts, decisions would clearly have to be made to re-prioritize amongst City programs to apply the significant amounts necessary to establish and sustain a quality street furniture program and cover the revenue shortfalls should advertising be abandoned.

A variation on this theme has also been suggested, namely that, as part of the City's street furniture supply role, the City itself could set up the infrastructure internally to sell advertising. Project staff noted that this would be a highly specialized field to enter and the City has no existing expertise in this regard.

Given the considerations noted above, combined with our research, which has not shown any cities where a comprehensive, co-ordinated street furniture program of any significant scope has been delivered through public funds or other methodologies suggested, the premise going forward is that an advertising-funded model is appropriate for Toronto and likely the only viable

approach at this time to achieve the City's goals. This is not a new approach for Toronto in any event, as advertising has been integral to the transit shelter program since the 1970s. That being said, however, it is again imperative to repeat that advertising considerations must not overwhelm the quality design, functionality, accessibility and safety objectives of the program.

Multiple Contracts Scenario: Staff has received consistent advice that it is highly advisable to ensure an integrated approach – from design, manufacture, installation and maintenance – to achieve the greatest efficiencies in street furniture elements. Where there is a clear divergence of opinion is in how the RFP and subsequent contract(s) should best be structured to ensure the City's interests.

The analysis is now focussed on the multiple contract option. A minority of groups providing input through the industry consultation indicated that a number of smaller contracts should be issued. Two subsets have been considered: dividing contracts on a geographic basis, for example four contracts, one encompassing all elements for each of the City's four districts; or a City-wide division of contracts based on the different street furniture elements to be specified.

Interestingly, we received no recommendation, nor have we come across any other city, that suggests such contracts should be divided geographically. In fact, the consensus in this regard is virtually unanimous. We concur that there are so many difficulties inherent in structuring multiple contracts on the basis of districts, there is no merit in pursuing this idea. Probably the most significant difficulty is the conflict in terms of design consistency. One scenario that could arise under this structure is four different entities are awarded contracts. Each one would propose a different proprietary design which would not be transferable, with the net result being entirely incongruent design attributes across the districts of the City. In addition, inconsistent service levels, quality of elements, fragmenting the Toronto market and thus devaluing the City's asset, and cumbersome administrative inefficiencies would be inevitable. The other possibility, and probably a more likely outcome under the geographic scenario, is that a particular proponent could end up winning more than one, and perhaps all four of the areas. This would negate the benefits of dividing contracts geographically in the first place.

The second approach to a multi-contract model would be to divide contracts by street furniture products or services. This scenario is recommended by a few parties in the industry consultation. Those who support this approach cite a number of benefits. It is suggested that some companies specialize in very specific product lines and have developed in-depth knowledge and experience through many years of research. They indicate that quality and performance would be sacrificed if contracted to a group focussed on revenue. A related caution raised by the current receptacle provider is that the City's curbside recycling program could be compromised unless receptacles are excluded from a combined contract. Solid Waste Management staff are reporting under separate cover on the pilot mega-bin project.

In terms of the design question, the position generally advanced by parties of this view is that design continuity, which is an idea that seems to be universally endorsed, can be achieved through clearly defined design parameters. In support, it has been stated that the three companies installing major street furniture components now, as well as a fourth which has recently installed a number of advertising pillars on private parking lots immediately adjacent to the street allowance, have already taken significant steps to harmonize the designs of their products.

One Contract Scenario: The majority of industry participants in the consultation advanced the position that one City-wide contract encompassing all elements should be issued to a single entity, which may be one company or a consortium of smaller companies with a lead proponent. This view was advocated by both large and small firms who participated. A central theme was that one contract would address the City's goal of achieving a cohesive design standard. This would ensure that all elements work together and encourage modular solutions. In turn, the goals of reducing sidewalk clutter and facilitating efficient maintenance would be served.

An issue of significant concern throughout is advertising. Although, as indicated previously, a goal of the program is to ensure economic viability, the multi-contract approach would open up the question of competing advertising and all of the difficulties inherent with it. Not only would this introduce the possibility of more advertising, it could serve to undercut the value of the City's asset by saturating the market with competing advertising opportunities.

Management and administration of a single contract would be more efficient, in terms of accountability, addressing complaints and service issues, tracking contractor responsibilities, construction co-ordination, liability, etc. Varying levels of service compliance would be avoided.

The main concern expressed with the one contract approach was the idea of awarding a contract of this magnitude to a single party. In fact, it has been suggested that a contract of the scope being contemplated under this program would be unprecedented. Performance standards established in the contract, backed by appropriate performance security, should be used to address this concern. In terms of encouraging a range of bidders, this approach would enable smaller companies with special areas of expertise to form consortiums.

On balance, it is recommended that the City's interests, in terms of quality design, co-ordination and placement, service, implementation logistics, financial viability and contract management, are best served by compiling the RFP on the basis of one contract encompassing all of the specified street furniture elements City-wide.

## 6.2 Advertising:

The design of new street furniture must, first and foremost, demonstrate appropriateness for its intended uses. The design must be driven by the needs of its users and the public must be instantly able to recognize the functionality of elements. The size and scale should not be enlarged simply to accommodate larger advertising panels. Advertising must be tastefully integrated into the design of street furniture, not vice versa. The design guidelines will be instrumental in achieving these objectives, and in addition, clear parameters for the use and role of advertising in the street furniture program must be applied.

Existing Situation: In order to establish the context for considering various options, it is useful to consider the current circumstances with advertising on street furniture. There are three formal venues (transit shelters, litter/recycling receptacles and benches) and two pilots (info pillars, mega-receptacles) where the City has authorized advertising. Generally speaking, the revenues generated by this advertising pay for all aspects of the amenity and provide a revenue stream to the City, as discussed previously in this report. In addition, the City receives a specified proportion of the inventory for public service advertisements.

Under the transit shelter program, some 1,900 shelters have ad caissons. (This is slightly less than half of the total number of shelters). Each caisson supports two, four by six foot backlit ad faces.

The stainless steel waste receptacles each support two, five by two and a half foot posters. With approximately 3,800 units in the system, some 7,600 ad faces of this format are available.

Finally, there are approximately 1,000 bench units with advertising, utilizing a six foot by two foot poster format. (Because the mega-bin and info pillar pilots are of such limited extent and have a finite test period, they do not appreciably increase the overall quantity of current street furniture advertising opportunities.)

The current arrangements involve three separate companies providing somewhat competing products. Accordingly, each of these formats is deployed at many locations, adding to the perception of excess advertising and clutter. Because each company relies on the revenues generated, the amenities are often oriented in a manner that best displays the advertising, but is not ideal for the functionality.

In addition to the awkward physical arrangement of “clusters” of street furniture at many locations, expert advice we received when harmonizing the transit shelter agreements indicated that this grouping of ads reduces their impact and thus value. It was recommended that transit shelters, being the dominant and more lucrative property, should stand alone at an intersection, and other formats be deployed elsewhere. This is a principle that was reiterated by several parties to the industry consultation.

Advertising Markets: Our initial inclination, given the concerns expressed by many participants in the public consultation, was to recommend limiting advertising only to transit shelters and other large format items (info pillar, public washrooms). However, it has been suggested by a number of local businesses that they require the opportunity to advertise their services and products to their local neighbourhood, something the larger scale shelter-style format does not provide.

There are distinctions between the types of advertisers who use the two basic formats. Larger “national” clients and agencies seeking maximum exposure (gross rating points or grps), wider coverage and generally shorter runs are the predominant users of the shelter format. “Local” businesses seek to display their message on an extremely limited and focussed basis with longer terms, perhaps one or two locations in a specific neighbourhood. The smaller scale poster format fits this need. It is recommended, therefore, that consideration be given to addressing both of these markets in the RFP.

Controls: In keeping with the objective of maintaining appropriate control on the quantity of advertising, a number of controls are provided:

- a primary advertising format, the illuminated panel, be permitted on larger scale street furniture specified in the RFP, i.e., transit shelters, public washrooms and info pillars;

- ad caissons would not be installed on every transit shelter, based on safety, visibility and other considerations, as is the case now. The vendor would work collaboratively with the City to determine viable locations, but the City would retain final sign-off.
- a secondary advertising format, based on the smaller poster style arrangement be permitted on other elements specified in the RFP, where appropriately designed (the exact configuration will depend largely on the design attributes and modularity of the products). Generally speaking, this means no advertising on stand alone elements like waste receptacles and benches, but again, depending on the design, may be incorporated in a cluster of elements;
- no more than one advertising element would be deployed at a given location or “cluster” of street furniture. For example, if there is a shelter or an info pillar with an ad caisson, no other ad would be permitted at that location;
- spacing guidelines for separation between ad elements be developed, generally on the basis of distance between transit stops, and in no event would more than one advertising element be located within a city block (unless in the vicinity of intersections); and
- no advertising on any other element within the street allowance outside of the permissions granted for elements specifically provided in this program. This means no advertising on poles, utility boxes, bollards, etc, and no pilots involving advertising outside of this program would be entertained. (This would not affect existing regulations under the City’s banner program.)

The Design and Policy Guidelines document sets out other stipulations regarding advertising in addition to the physical parameters noted here.

**Impact:** The recommended criteria above, combined with the design requirements that will be specified in the RFP, will have a positive impact in terms of the quantity and quality of advertising formats in the streets. The elimination of competing venues will immediately rationalize the situation (no duelling ad panels, advertising integrated properly into design, proper orientation of elements). The placement controls will result in a net reduction in the total number of ad panels. The current supply of about 1,900 shelter-style ad caissons would be expected to increase incrementally as new shelter locations, info pillars and public washrooms are established. Based on the preliminary projection of 2,000 new shelter locations and the current 50 percent ad to non-ad ratio, plus about 120 info pillars, and 20 public washrooms, a maximum increase of 1,150 of these types of ad caissons is possible. It is suggested, however, that actual additional caissons would be significantly less as the shelter ad market in Toronto is mature, and most of the viable locations would already have an ad caisson. With respect to the poster format, it is projected that in the order of 2,000 ad faces would result from the controls above. This compares to about 8,600 such ad faces currently, or a reduction of about 6,600 faces. 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 percent.

Public Service Advertising: Both the existing transit shelter and waste receptacle contracts secure the provision of free space to the City for public service advertising. The ratios are 6 percent and 5 percent respectively. (The cost to purchase this space would be over \$1 million annually.) It is recommended that this provision be increased to 7 percent in the RFP. It is noted that there is a great demand for this space from City Divisions. The expected reduction in the number of poster-style faces will impact the City's communications efforts. In addition, it is recommended that if street furniture elements containing the secondary format (i.e., poster) noted above are deployed within a BIA area, that BIA would receive one ad face for promotion purposes, free of charge. (This would augment the other opportunities for customization identified under the design guidelines.)

### 6.3 Contract Term and Expiry:

The RFP issued by the City must encompass an economically viable package in order to elicit reasonable bids. While it is true that the main concern of the City is to achieve an overall improvement of the public realm through the provision of a high quality street furniture program, it is equally true that any partner in this endeavour will be compelled to generate a sustainable rate of return on its investment. This is also the case for the City in the event it chooses a funding model without advertising.

It has been suggested that the scope of Toronto's program could well exceed other cities where this approach has been instituted. Our research to date tends to support this contention. It is also important to note that the first few years of the contract(s) will be extremely capital intensive for the vendor with a significant quantity of new products provided and installed. Our research indicates that a 20-year term is the norm for such contracts. It is, therefore, recommended that in order to attract the investment necessary to achieve high quality design, the scope of elements, substantial ongoing maintenance and cleaning, and revenue potential for the City, the stability of a 20-year term is required.

Contract expiry provisions must be carefully considered. It is recommended that at the end of the term, ownership of all street furniture elements should, at the City's option, revert to the City of Toronto. In addition, the City may reserve the right to require removal of all or a portion of the elements and the restoration of the public highway at the vendor's expense. Equally important, although ownership and copyright entitlement to all design specifications provided by a successful proponent will be vested in the proponent during the term, the City must be granted an irrevocable, royalty-free licence allowing it unlimited use of the design specifications and continued manufacture, modification and implementation of all elements within its boundaries after the contract has expired.

### 6.4 Existing Contacts:

A number of street furniture contracts with various suppliers are currently in effect. These cover transit shelters, litter/recycling bins, a pilot litter/recycling bin, benches and a pilot information pillar (although these items are beyond the street allowance). It would be the City's intent to abide by its legal obligations through to expiry of these agreements. At the same time, it is recommended that existing agreements and pilots not be expanded in terms of time or scope. It is, however, recommended that the installation of one infoTOgo pillar (the 25<sup>th</sup> as permitted under the previous RFP for the pilot program) be approved on the north sidewalk of Dundas

Street West, west of Yonge Street, as requested by the Ontario Minister of Tourism and discussed in a separate report from the General Manager, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism.

The City Solicitor is currently reviewing expiry provisions in the existing agreements and will submit an in-camera report to the Works Committee. The Solicitor's report will also address objections received from Eucan – Urban Equipment of Canada to the inclusion of waste and/or recycling receptacles as part of the co-ordinated street furniture program.

#### 6.5 RFP Evaluation Principles:

One of the most important aspects in compiling the RFP will be to ensure that the criteria established for prospective respondents are as specific as possible, recognizing that some degree of creativity and innovation will be encouraged, and that the basis of evaluating proposals is well articulated. This is essential in minimizing risk, ensuring a fair, defensible procurement process and satisfying the City's design and financial objectives.

It is recommended that proposals be considered as an entire package, including design, functional, technical and financial requirements. Respondents must meet the tests in each category for favourable consideration. The premise of this program is "design matters"; accordingly the critical evaluation elements addressing design and function issues will be weighted in a manner that will not rely predominantly on the financial criteria.

It is also recommended that to ensure appropriate attention is paid to design elements, a jury be selected which may consist of members outside of staff and project consultants, with design expertise. Staff intend to report at a later date on the composition of such a jury.

As the project team has presented the program in various forums, specific mention has been made on the potential RFP evaluation framework comprising the following key considerations:

- demonstrate a high and superior design and functionality in Street Furniture family that is appropriate for Toronto (will call for submission of models);
- use of high quality and durable materials and provides a realistic operations and maintenance plan;
- embraces a wide range of diverse design, construction and maintenance firms including Toronto and Canadian expertise;
- demonstrated ability to implement and manage large scope projects (would require successful proponent to maintain a substantial local presence and demonstrate financial capacity to deliver obligations);
- a realistic compensation package that stresses guaranteed over projected (must demonstrate viable marketing plan); and
- importance of design solution as well as analysis of financial proposal.

As staff continue developing the RFP, the evaluation scoring and weighting factors will be compiled simultaneously in accordance with the principles noted. Once the evaluation of submissions is completed in accordance with the factors, the qualified bid(s) will be subject to negotiation of the final terms of the proposal and contract for consideration by City Council.

In view of the scope, complexity and profile of this project, staff are making every effort to conduct the process as openly and fairly as possible. The services and expertise of several key support Divisions, including Purchasing and Materials Management, Legal, Internal Audit and Communications have been actively sought and provided from the outset as integral to the project and will continue through completion of the RFP and award. Staff have also acted on advice of the City Solicitor and considered guidelines endorsed by Council in July 2004 on the use of a Fairness Commissioner (Clause 11 of Report 5 of the Administration Committee). Council assigned staff authority to implement such a post for an undertaking when:

- the potential contract is so large that it can be reasonably expected that bidders will look for any weakness in the process if they are not awarded the contract;
- there has been a history of bidder disputes in previous bid calls;
- there has been a history of Council interest in the project or previous bid calls;
- there is a high public profile and interest in the award outcome.

This project certainly reflects all of these points, and to this end the services of The Honourable Coulter A. Osborne, Q.C., have been retained in this role. Justice Osborne will ensure the process leading to the issuance of an RFP and awarding of contracts has complied with all fairness, openness and transparency requirements. Justice Osborne's input is being provided through all phases of the process, not simply reviewing the results at the end, in accordance with a detailed work outline. Key activities include overseeing the development of documents for adherence to City purchasing policies, verifying roles and responsibility of the internal procurement management team, advising selection committee members on best practices relating to the City procurement policies, maintaining the measures of evaluation, reporting any conflicts or concerns and providing a report at the conclusion of the procurement process on compliance with rules of fairness, openness and transparency. The purpose of the Fairness Commissioner is to assess and provide assurance on the process, not its decision.

#### 7.0 Program Management and Administration:

The co-ordinated street furniture program has as its main goal the overall elevation of the physical quality of the City's streetscapes, both in terms of the direct design and functional attributes the specified elements will deliver, and the directions set for the general upgrade of these public spaces. The scope and complexity of the program, while introducing significant opportunity, will also bring challenges to be addressed.

To ensure the success of the program, it will be critical to provide an appropriate administrative support infrastructure and associated resources to adequately manage the many activities involved. There are two related aspects which must be considered over the next few months and years. The magnitude of implementing the street furniture program should not be

underestimated. Clearly, there will be many demands arising from a complex and intensive construction project characterized by significant quantities of work over the entire City. Moreover, this specific program, in turn, is one element of the overall management of the public streets, where there are many competing and conflicting demands.

The co-ordinated street furniture RFP will establish a number of key provisions to facilitate efficient management of the program. The successful proponent(s) will be subject to obligations concerning insurance, security, monthly reporting of revenue and audited annual statements, construction activities, provision of inventories and maintenance reporting. Many of these proposed terms are currently contained in the existing transit shelter contract.

The above provisions will form the contractual framework for managing the program, but equally important will be clear operational parameters. Staff have developed a manual for this purpose, the comprehensive "Transit Shelter Program Guidelines", September 2003, following an audit of the current program. This operations manual establishes a collaborative process setting out the responsibilities of the contractor and various City sections in regard to site selection, consultation, drawings, permit approval, construction, inspection and records, among others. This document will be updated and form the basis for field management of the program.

As noted, the magnitude of the program will require clear lines of responsibility to ensure proper deployment and placement of street furniture elements. As the RFP process advances, consideration will be given to the City's organizational response to this program. Although the detailed structure is not yet determined, it is readily apparent by virtue of the number of City Divisions that will be directly affected by street furniture (Transportation; Solid Waste; City Planning; Municipal Licensing and Standards; Tourism; Economic Development; Parks, Forestry and Recreation; Toronto Water, etc.), a multi-discipline approach will be required.

From a more global perspective, concerns have been expressed that there are so many issues related to the public street spaces, from utility co-ordination, cafes and marketing, vending, tree planting methodologies, pedestrian priorities and enforcement, as well as street furniture in its various forms, that no one group seems to have overall carriage.

The co-ordinated street furniture program will provide a substantial organizing platform for these matters. In addition, the development and harmonization of various by-laws will establish baseline rules. The recent publication box by-law sets the tone with its delineation of various dimensions, clearances and other criteria. These are currently being used in the development of a far-reaching harmonized Streets By-law. The poster by-law will also have an impact. Other legislation over time will facilitate clarity in dealing with the public streets.

The Streetscape Manual and related technical reviews are important components in addressing the physical configuration of the streets. Initiatives like the Toronto Public Utilities Coordinating Committee (TPUCC) are also developing frameworks for activity in the road allowance.

The above initiatives are a small sampling of the types of undertakings that will provide a clear management framework for our public streets. Again, the sheer scope and range of this work will require a number of years to bring all of the inter-related activities to fruition. It is recommended that the Deputy City Manager report back at such time as contract award is recommended on appropriate organizational considerations for managing the coordinated street furniture program and any initiatives related to furthering the overall streetscape goals of the City.

Contacts:

Andrew Koropeski, P. Eng., Director  
Toronto and East York District  
Transportation Services  
Phone: 416-392-7714  
Email: akoropes@toronto.ca

Robert Freedman, Director  
Urban Design  
City Planning  
Phone: 416-392-1126  
Email: rfreedm@toronto.ca

Elyse Parker, Project Manager  
Clean and Beautiful City Secretariat  
Phone: 416-338-2432  
Email: eparker@toronto.ca

Attachment:

“Vibrant Streets – Toronto’s Coordinated Street Furniture Program Design and Policy Guidelines – Draft, May 2006”, prepared by Toronto City Planning, Clean and Beautiful City Secretariat and Transportation Services (PDF Document)

(A copy of the “Vibrant Streets” report was forwarded to all Members of Council with the agenda of the Works Committee for its meeting on May 3, 2006, and a copy is on file in the office of the City Clerk, City Hall.)

**The Works Committee also submits the report (April 19, 2006) from the General Manager, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism.**

Purpose:

To report on a request from the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, to have an inforTOgo information pillar placed outside of the Ontario Travel Information Centre on Dundas Street West, at the Atrium on Bay.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no financial implications resulting from the adoption of this report.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the report be received by the Works Committee for information.

### Background:

In correspondence dated March 14, 2006, The Honourable Jim Bradley, Ontario Minister of Tourism, issued a formal request to Mayor David Miller to have an infoTOgo information pillar placed in front of the Ministry's Ontario Travel Information Centre, at the Atrium on Bay on Dundas Street West.

At the special meeting of Toronto City Council, held on February 14, 2006, Council approved the Economic Development and Parks Committee report Item 5a "Tourism Action Plan: Report on 2005 Tourism Program Visitor Information Services Projects (All Wards)."

As part of this report, Council endorsed the Tourism Program's direction toward enhancing the delivery of visitor information services. Improving visitors' access to information about the City is an important strategy for making them feel welcome and at ease. Visitors can only fully explore the City if they can readily find out about its attractions and where to find them.

In 2005, the City of Toronto's Tourism Program spearheaded the infoTogo information pillar project in conjunction with the Parks, Forestry and Recreation Division as part of a number of initiatives to address this priority.

Additionally in 2005, the City of Toronto participated in a successful pilot program to operate a 'Toronto Desk' at the Atrium on Bay location of the Ontario Travel Information Centre (OTIC). The pilot program was designed to address the goal of building a visitor-friendly city through visitor-focused services. At its February 14, 2006, meeting, Council approved the recommendation that the Tourism Program continue to operate and enhance existing visitor information services such as the Toronto Desk at the Ontario Travel Information Centre.

### Comments:

The Ontario Travel Information Centre at the Atrium on Bay is the main venue for the provision of tourist information in the City of Toronto.

Although this facility operates seven days a week, there are periods in the morning and evening when the facility is closed and no service is available. Augmenting visitor information availability with an inforTOgo pillar would ensure access to information about the City after the centre's closing hours. An additional benefit to visitors is the ability to consult both the information pillar and the centre at the same location. Presently, the closest pillar location is at Yonge-Dundas Square. Staff at the Ontario Travel Information Centre have indicated that at times, they have escorted visitors to this pillar location to demonstrate its various features.

The unique design of the inforTOgo pillar, inspired by the architecture of City Hall, includes way-finding maps specifically designed for each area. All pillar units display a backlit, international "i" icon to help make visitors aware that they can access information at each pillar location. Key sites of interest, historical locations, public transit and area descriptions are highlighted on the map. A built in, coin operated system dispenses a pocket-sized, fold-out, full colour Toronto map. The map portrays downtown Toronto on one side and the entire city on the reverse. The map offers visitors useful information on public transit, attractions, parks and other City services.

City Council approved the Information Pillar pilot project report at its meeting held on June 22, 23 and 24, 2004, awarding Astral Media Outdoor the contract for the design, manufacture, installation and maintenance of twenty-five information pillars for the pilot project. Council direction for locating pillars specified City-owned lands such as civic squares, areas adjacent to community centres and at street-level entrances to parks and ravines, but excluding public rights-of-way.

The Minister infoTOgo of Tourism requests that an exception to these location criteria be made for this particular location at the Ontario Travel Information Centre, given that the centre and the infoTOgo pillar would complement the efforts of the Province and the City in boosting tourism in Toronto.

It is important to note that the agreement with Astral Media Outdoor calls for twenty-five information pillar locations. To date, twenty-four units have been installed. City staff have continued to work with Astral Media Outdoor to find a suitable location that meets the Council location criteria. Positioning a pillar at the Ontario Travel Information Centre would secure a twenty-fifth location and satisfy the City's contract responsibility to Astral Media Outdoor with regard to the provision of pillar locations. All costs associated with the manufacture, installation and maintenance of the pillar unit will be the responsibility of Astral Media Outdoor per their agreement with the City.

The Ward Councillor, the Yonge-Dundas BIA, and the General Manager of Parks, Forestry and Recreation have been consulted and support the location of an information pillar at this location.

#### Conclusions:

The City of Toronto Tourism Program supports the Minister of Tourism's request than an exception to the information pillar location criteria be approved in order to permit a pillar to be located outside of the Ontario Travel Information Centre on the north side of Dundas Street west of Yonge Street. An infoTOgo pillar at the Centre will increase the visibility of the Centre and its services, provide twenty-four hour access to visitor information, and help to strengthen the partnership with the Ministry of Tourism to boost tourism in Toronto.

Further, this location enables evaluation of the pillar concept in a right-of-way location which will provide useful information to inform the work of the Co-ordinated Street Furniture Program Design and Policy Guidelines and Directions initiative presently underway.

The joint report by the General Manager of Transportation Services and City Planning entitled "Co-ordinated Street Furniture Program Design and Policy Guidelines and Directions Report" recommends this infoTOgo pillar location be approved.

#### Contact:

Duncan H. Ross  
Executive Director, Tourism Program  
Telephone: (416) 397-5395/Fax: (416) 392-2271  
Email: [dhross@toronto.ca](mailto:dhross@toronto.ca)

**The Works Committee also submits the report (April 19, 2006) from the General Manager, Solid Waste Management Services.**

Purpose:

To respond to the request from the Works Committee for additional information on the Eucan recycling/litter bin test.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no financial implications arising from this report at this time.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) the Eucan proposal for the new recycling/litter bins not be accepted;
- (2) recycling/litter bins be included in the Co-ordinated Street Furniture Request for Proposals (RFP); and
- (3) the Eucan bins installed for the test remain in place, under the existing terms and conditions, until a final decision is reached by Council on the award of the Co-ordinated Street Furniture program, subject to concurrence by Eucan.

Background:

At its meeting on January 11, 2006, the Works Committee had before it the report, titled "Test Results of New Recycling/Litter Bins." This report discussed the test results including the financial analysis, consultation feedback and bin performance issues including qualitative waste analysis. The Works Committee deferred this report to allow for the gathering of additional quantitative data on the recycling performance of the test bins; and to allow for the consideration of the results of the Eucan test simultaneously with the report on a Harmonized Street Furniture approach; and further requested "that the report be forwarded to the City Manager's Office for input prior to submission to the Works Committee and also with respect to Council's direction of July 20, 21 and 22, 2004." The Committee also requested that revised dates for the proposed Community Council consultation and the date for report back to the Works Committee on the outcome of such consultation be provided.

Comments:

Waste Audit of Recycling/Litter Bins:

This waste audit examined the material collected in the current recycling/litter bins known as the SilverBox compared to the new recycling/litter bins tested referred to as the EcoMupi and EcoBox. The study determined the quantities of recyclables captured, the contamination levels and the quantity of recyclables placed in the garbage compartment. City staff were responsible for selecting the sample bins to be collected and the collection of the material. To ensure that quantities and types of waste generated were comparable, an equal number of SilverBoxes and

new test bins were selected from similar locations. For example, if a SilverBox was near a high pedestrian flow corner, then a new bin was selected in the same neighbourhood on a similar corner or if a SilverBox was beside a transit shelter, a new bin was collected in the same area beside another transit shelter, etc. To ensure that the material was representative of the material typically collected in public spaces throughout Toronto, bins were selected from all Districts in the City.

In total, 37 SilverBoxes and 37 new bins (24 EcoMupis and 13 EcoBoxes) were audited. Two side-loading split compartment trucks were used to gather the material; one truck collected the material from the SilverBoxes and the other from the EcoMupis and EcoBoxes. To make certain that there was no difference in collection frequency of the two types of recycling/litter bins, both trucks collected bins in the same area at the same time.

The City of Toronto hired AET Consultants Inc. to conduct the waste audit and data analysis. On February 27, 2006, the consultant conducted the audit. AET had three staff that performed the waste audit. The City assisted the consultant by allowing the audit team to conduct the audit at a dedicated space at the Commissioner Street Transfer Station.

The performance of the bins based on the audits was mixed. The new Eucan bins tested contained less garbage contamination in the recycling stream than the SilverBoxes; however there were more recyclables found in the waste stream of the new bins than the SilverBoxes.

Please refer to Appendix A for the complete waste audit report; the following highlights some of the key audit findings. The SilverBox recycling stream, with 166.07 kg of sorted material, contained 6.48 percent (10.76 kg) garbage contamination. The new bin recycling stream, with 147.42 kg of sorted material, contained 2.64 percent (3.89 kg) garbage contamination.

Both the SilverBox and new bins contained similar recyclable categories with newspapers representing the largest category followed by glass and magazines, catalogues, telephone books and directories.

The SilverBox waste stream sample totalled 91.96 kg and contained 23.24 kg, or 25.27 percent recyclables. The new bin waste stream sample totalled 85.93 kg and contained 26.95 kg, or 31.36 percent recyclables. In both samples, newspaper dominated as the primary recyclable, in the new bins it was 11.61 percent and SilverBoxes was 7.75 percent of the total waste sample. It is important to note that the sample for the new bin waste stream was saturated with water and contained ice. Therefore, to provide more accurate weight results, the consultant calculated a ratio for the volume of wet to dry paper and determined a 3:1 ratio was representative (which has been factored into the results).

#### Co-ordinated Street Furniture Program:

City Council, at its meeting of October 26, 27 and 28, 2004, in considering Clause 1(a) of the Works Committee Report 8, entitled "Publication Box Strategy – Beautiful City Initiative", requested a comprehensive work plan to advance a co-ordinated street furniture program. This co-ordinated street furniture program was to take into account the expiry of the current transit shelter agreement in 2007 and to include transit shelters, recycling/litter bins, benches and other components in addition to publication boxes.

Transportation Services has submitted a Co-ordinated Street Furniture report to this meeting of the Works Committee, which discusses the public consultation feedback and provides the guiding principles and structure of a RFP for this program. Solid Waste Management Services supports the recommendations in this report including the inclusion of recycling/litter bins in the Co-ordinated Street Furniture RFP. If, however, the City does not receive proposals through the Co-ordinated Street Furniture RFP that meet our recycling/litter container needs, Solid Waste Management Services will still have sufficient time to release an RFP to acquire recycling/litter containers.

Under the terms of the current ten year contract with Eucan for the supply of SilverBoxes, Eucan owns the SilverBoxes and will retain them once the contract expires. There are approximately 4,000 SilverBoxes within the public road allowance that will need to be replaced once the Eucan contract expires on October 14, 2009. In addition to the SilverBoxes, a new recycling/litter bin contract would likely incorporate at a minimum, the replacement of the approximately 2,700 City-owned stand alone litter bins currently in place with new recycling/litter containers.

Given the magnitude of a new recycling/litter container contract and the need to ensure the synchronized transition of one contract to another, should the current contractor not participate in the RFP or not be a successful proponent, the City would need to release an RFP two or three years in advance of the current contract expiration. This would allow sufficient time to receive competitive bids and award a contract and for new bins to be manufactured and installed. If the Co-ordinated Street Furniture RFP is released in the summer of 2006, and the City does not receive proposals that meet our recycling/litter container needs, Solid Waste Manager Services will have sufficient time to release and award an RFP to plan for the end of the current Eucan contract that expires in October of 2009.

To meet our current litter collection needs, in accordance with funds allocated in Solid Waste Management Services 2006 budget and future years, Solid Waste Management Services will install a few hundred new inexpensive recycling/litter bins without advertising until a new contract is awarded.

#### New Bins Installed:

For the new bin test, Eucan installed 82 EcoMupis that currently contain advertising that the City receives revenue for, and 55 EcoBoxes that do not contain advertisements. Removing the units would cause disruption to pedestrians while sidewalks are repaired to their original state and would reduce the number of bins. It is recommended that the City allow Eucan to keep the EcoMupis and EcoBoxes in place, on the same terms and conditions already approved by Council, until a final decision on award of the Co-ordinated Street Furniture program is made by Council.

#### Community Council Meetings:

Extensive public consultation was conducted for both the Eucan Test and the Co-ordinated Street Furniture program. These consultations included meetings with: the public, Resident and Ratepayers Associations, Business Improvement Areas, Pedestrian and Cycling Committees and other interest groups. Since we are not recommending the acceptance of the Eucan proposal at this time and given that the Co-ordinated Street Furniture program has stringent deadlines to

meet to release an RFP no later than the summer of 2006, it is recommended that these reports not be forwarded to Community Councils for additional public consultation at this time.

**City Manager Review:**

As requested, the City Manager was consulted for input on this report and concurs with the recommendations herein.

**Conclusions:**

The recycling materials collected in both the new bins tested and SilverBox recycling stream were similar in composition, with newspaper being the primary material. The performance of the new bins compared to the SilverBoxes was varied. The new Eucan bins contained less garbage contamination in the recycling stream than the SilverBoxes; however the waste stream in the new Eucan bins contained more recyclables than the new SilverBoxes.

The results of the Test, described in the January 3, 2006 report, entitled “Test Results of New Recycling/Litter Bins” (Test Results Report), along with the further information on recycling performance found in this report, do not conclusively demonstrate that the new bins performed better than the current recycling/litter collection containers.

The January 3, 2006, Test Results Report noted that without actually tendering, there is no way of determining what the City’s advertising revenues could be after the current agreement expires. It also noted that the consultant, Education Plus, could not say with certainty that accepting the Eucan proposal would be financially advantageous to the City compared to maintaining the existing contract, purchasing 1,000 additional bins and tendering once the current contract with Eucan expires. Concern was also expressed about extending an existing contract by seven years without offering a competitive process.

Given that the test did not conclusively demonstrate that the new bins were superior to the SilverBoxes and the independent consultant could not say with certainty that the Eucan proposal would be financially advantageous, Solid Waste Management Services does not recommend the acceptance of Eucan’s proposal to extend its current contract in order to incorporate EcoMupis and EcoBoxes as part of the recycling/litter bin program.

Solid Waste Management Services therefore supports the recommendations in the Transportation Services’ Co-ordinated Street Furniture report including the inclusion of recycling/litter containers in their RFP. If the City does not receive proposals that meet the City’s recycling/litter container needs through the Co-ordinated Street Furniture RFP process, a new RFP should be issued for recycling/litter containers alone.

**Contact:**

Kevin Vibert  
Senior Analyst, Waste Diversion  
Solid Waste Management Services  
25<sup>th</sup> Floor, East Tower, City Hall  
Phone: 416-397-0203/Fax: 416-392-4754  
E-mail: kvibert@toronto.ca

## Attachments

Appendix A – 2006 Waste Audit Study

Table 1 – Sort Data

Table 2 – Top 5 Wastes in the Silver and New Eucan Boxes by Weight

(A copy of the Appendix A “2006 Waste Audit Study”, Table 1 “Sort Data” and Table 2 “Top 5 Wastes in the Silver and New Eucan Boxes by Weight”, referred to in the report was forwarded to all Members of Council with the agenda of the Works Committee for its meeting on May 3, 2006, and a copy is on file in the office of the City Clerk, City Hall.)

### **The Works Committee also submits the communication (May 1, 2006) from Deputy Mayor Sandra Bussin, Chair, Roundtable on a Beautiful City.**

The Roundtable on a Beautiful City on April 24, 2006, endorsed the staff recommendations contained in the Recommendations Section of the report (April 18, 2006) from the General Manager, Transportation Services, and the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning, regarding a proposed strategy for the development of a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a co-ordinated street furniture program for Toronto that comprises a design framework and fundamental terms of reference and contract elements.

### Background:

The Roundtable on a Beautiful City on April 24, 2006, considered a report (April 28, 2006) from the General Manager, Transportation Services, and the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning, regarding a proposed strategy for the development of a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a co-ordinated street furniture program for Toronto that comprises a design framework and fundamental terms of reference and contract elements.

The Roundtable also considered the draft joint report (May 2006) prepared by City Planning, Clean and Beautiful City Secretariat, and Transportation Services, entitled “Vibrant Streets – Toronto’s Co-ordinated Street Furniture Program – Design and Policy Guidelines.”

Mr. Andy Koropeski, Director, Toronto and East York District, Transportation Services, and Mr. Robert Freedman, Director, Urban Design, City Planning, gave a presentation on the status of the Co-ordinated Street Furniture Program.

---

The Works Committee also considered a confidential report, headed “Review of Existing Street Furniture Agreements” (April 26, 2006) from the City Solicitor, which was forwarded to Members of Council under separate cover; and further that, in accordance with the Municipal Act, discussions pertaining to the report be held in camera as the subject matter relates to the securing of the property of the municipality.

The Works Committee also considered:

- (a) communications with respect to the Co-ordinated Street furniture Program:
  - (i) (March 14, 2006) from Mary Kapches, Bosley Real Estate Ltd.;
  - (ii) (May 1, 2006) from Linda A. Irvine, President, Ontario Association of Landscape Architects;
  - (iii) (May 1, 2006) from David Leinster, Partner, The Planning Partnership;
  - (iv) (May 1, 2006) from Sybil Wa, citizen and architect, Diamond and Schmitt Architects Inc.;
  - (v) (May 2, 2006) from A. J. Diamond, Diamond and Schmitt Architects Incorporated;
  - (vi) (May 2, 2006) from Briar de Lange, General Manager, Bloor-Yorkville Business Improvement Area;
  - (vii) (May 2, 2006) from Alice Barton;
  - (viii) (May 2, 2006) from David Sisam;
  - (ix) (May 2, 2006) from Matthew Teitelbaum, Michael and Sonja Koener Director and CEO;
  - (x) (May 2, 2006) from Eva Bartlett;
  - (xi) (May 2, 2006) from James L. Robinson, Executive Director, Downtown Yonge Business Improvement Area;
  - (xii) (May 2, 2006) from Murray Lumley;
  - (xiii) (May 2, 2006) from Constance John;
  - (xiv) (May 2, 2006) from Andy Brown;
  - (xv) (May 2, 2006) from Anne McIlroy, Chair, Ontario Professional Planners Institute, Urban Design Working Group;
  - (xvi) (May 2, 2006) from Patrick Dinnen;
  - (xvii) (May 2, 2006) from Judy Waldman;
  - (xviii) (May 2, 2006) from Judy Adler;

- (xix) (May 2, 2006) from Sara Lipson;
  - (xx) (May 2, 2006) from Andrew Woodrow;
  - (xxi) (May 3, 2006) from Daniel Quinn;
  - (xxii) (May 3, 2006) from Lester Brown; and
  - (xxiii) (May 3, 2006) from Christopher McCormack, Chair, Toronto Society of Architects; and
- (b) communications with respect to the Supplementary Information on the Eucan Recycling/Litter Bin Test:
- (i) (February 16, 2006) from Mary Lemyre, President, Toronto and Area Council of Women;
  - (ii) (March 9, 2006) from John Loughnan; and
  - (iii) (April 10, 2006) from Paula and Alan Warren.

The following persons addressed the Works Committee:

- Joe Lobko, Joe Lobko Architect Inc., and filed a written submission;
- Rami Tabetlo;
- Narina Nagra, Safety Program Director, METRAC (Metropolitan Action Committee on Violence Against Women and Children), and filed a written submission;
- Jonathan Goldsbie, Toronto Public Space Committee;
- Michael Rosenberg;
- Alison Gorbould;
- Gord Brown, and filed a written submission;
- David Meslin;
- Doug Carroll;
- Dan Wigglesworth;
- Liam O'Doherty, and filed a written submission;
- Ron Nurwisah;

- Miro Wagner;
- Samantha Sannella, Executive Director, Design Exchange;
- Daniel Quinn;
- Kim Storley, on behalf of the Toronto Society of Architects and Brown and Storey Architects, and filled a written submission;
- John Bowker, Parking and Beautification Chair, Roncesvalles Village BIA; and
- Councillor Janet Davis, Ward 31, Beaches-East York.

---

**City Council – May 23, 24 and 25, 2006**

*Council also considered the following:*

- *Confidential report (April 26, 2006) from the City Solicitor [Confidential Communication C.6(a)]. This report remains confidential, in its entirety, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, 2001, as it contains information related to the security of the property of the Municipality.*
- *Confidential report (May 18, 2006) from the City Solicitor [Confidential Communication C.6(b)]. This report remains confidential, in its entirety, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, 2001, as it contains information related to the security of the property of the Municipality.*

---

*Deputy Mayor Feldman declared an interest in this Clause, in that members of his family have bought advertisements on benches.*

---

**City Council – June 14, 2006**

*Council also considered the following:*

- *Confidential report (April 26, 2006) from the City Solicitor [Confidential Communication C.1(a)]. This report remains confidential, in its entirety, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, 2001, as it contains information related to the security of the property of the Municipality.*
  - *Confidential report (May 18, 2006) from the City Solicitor [Confidential Communication C.1(b)]. This report remains confidential, in its entirety, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, 2001, as it contains information related to the security of the property of the Municipality.*
-

***City Council – June 27, 28 and 29, 2006***

*Council also considered the following:*

- *Confidential report (April 26, 2006) from the City Solicitor [Confidential Communication C.1(a)]. This report remains confidential in its entirety, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, 2001, as it contains information pertaining to litigation or potential litigation; and*
- *Confidential report (May 18, 2006) from the City Solicitor [Confidential Communication C.1(b)]. This report remains confidential in its entirety, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, 2001, as it contains information pertaining to litigation or potential litigation.*

---

*Deputy Mayor Feldman declared an interest in this Clause, in that members of his family have bought advertisements on benches.*