CITY OF HAMILTON

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
Planning Division

Report to: Chair and Members Economic Development and Planning Committee
Submitted by: Tim McCabe
General Manager
Planning and Economic Development Department

Date: May 28, 2008
Prepared by: David Cuming
(905) 546-2424, Ext. 1215
Ida Bedioui
(905) 546-2424, Ext. 4605

SUBJECT: Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) Logo Proposal and Payment of an Honorarium for a Submitted Design (City Wide) (PED08144)

RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) be advised that their request for a logo not be approved at this time, and that the matter, as set out in Report PED08144 for the use of a logo for an individual Advisory Committee, be directed to Corporate Services staff for inclusion in a future report to be forwarded to the Governance Committee for further consideration.

(b) That the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) be thanked for their efforts and contributions to date in the matter of a logo design, as set out in Report PED08144.

(c) That Evelyn Kelch, graphic designer, be recognized for her work on the draft logo with a letter of thanks from the Mayor, together with a selection of the City of Hamilton’s published heritage posters.

Tim McCabe
General Manager
Planning and Economic Development Department
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) is requesting the use of a logo for communication purposes. An initial design has been produced by a graphic designer at the request of the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) without staff or Council input or direction. The Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) is also seeking to provide the graphic designer with an honorarium of $50.00 from City funds. The Municipal Heritage Committee is established under the **Ontario Heritage Act** to advise Council on a variety of cultural heritage matters under the Act. The Municipal Heritage Committee functions as part of the City’s administration and reports to Council through the Economic Development and Planning Committee. The Municipal Heritage Committee is not a separate entity from municipal organization and the City’s committee system and cannot issue correspondence independent of Council.

Staff is of the opinion that the adoption of a logo for the Municipal Heritage Committee is inappropriate at this time, and is in conflict with established City policy. The volunteer design efforts undertaken to date should be appropriately recognized in a non-monetary form.

Given some of the related issues and implications of the use of logos for all other volunteer advisory committees to Council, staff is recommending that the matter be forwarded to the Governance Committee for further consideration.

BACKGROUND:

Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee), at its meeting held February 28, 2008, approved the following motion:

(a) That Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) submit a delegation request to the Economic Development and Planning Committee in order to present its proposal for a logo.

(b) That the Economic Development and Planning Committee be requested to approve the payment of a $50.00 honorarium to graphic designer, Evelyn Kelch, for her volunteer work to create the proposed logo design, and that the monies be charged to the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) “poster and marketing account”.

On March 18, 2008, the ED&P Committee approved the delegation request and representatives from Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) are before Committee today to present their request.

The intent of the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) initiative is to present a proposal for a logo that would assist in providing an identity and focus for the Committee. This initiative was led by the Education Sub-committee of the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) without Council or staff input or direction.
The design of the logo was prepared by a graphic designer, Evelyn Kelch, and appears to have been undertaken as volunteer work. The Education Sub-committee and the Municipal Heritage Committee are now seeking monies, in the form of a $50.00 honorarium, to be charged to the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) poster account for this work.

The “LACAC Poster Account” was established during the 1980’s by the former City of Hamilton, which was used by the former Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee (LACAC) for the production of material celebrating Hamilton’s cultural heritage. The material produced included the popular “Doors of Hamilton” poster (now out of print), the “Stone Terrace” watercolour print, and the “Customs House” poster. The account had been established as a capital account and staff is required to report activity on a quarterly basis.

Since amalgamation, the account has also received funds from the sale of the book “Beyond Paradise”, sponsored by the former Town of Dundas. The fund has also been the source of financing for the recent “Pigott Building Windows” poster, currently on sale in a number of Art Galleries and other outlets in Hamilton.

The “LACAC Poster Account” has functioned as a self-sustaining revolving fund and is used for special projects beyond the usual activities of the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee).

**ANALYSIS/RATIONALE:**

There are two issues that arise from the request of the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee):

- The appropriateness of adopting a logo for the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee); and,

- The appropriateness of providing City funds, regardless of amount, for work that was not commissioned, approved, or otherwise directed by staff and/or Council.

These two matters are discussed in further detail below.

**The City Logo:**

On August 14, 2002, City Council approved Item 29 of Committee of the Whole Report 02-028 as follows:

**29. City of Hamilton Logo (CSE02021) - (City Wide) (Item 5.1)**

That the ‘Bridges’ logo design be approved as the official City of Hamilton logo, according to the specified design (Appendix “A”) to Report CSE02021.
The aforementioned Report (CSE02021) explains the rationale for approving a City logo and a copy is attached as Appendix “A”. As outlined in the report, the City’s logo is part of the Branding and Corporate Identity Project and it was “implemented throughout the City for use on various applications including:

- Stationery, letterhead and business cards
- Advertising and direct mail”

A usage and standards manual was developed for the use of City departments to maintain consistency and uniformity in the design and application. Anyone using the logo is required to complete an online request form, which is processed and approved by Communications staff.

As stated in the report, “a City of Hamilton logo aligns directly with the City of Hamilton’s Strategic Commitments, by supporting the goal(s) of:

- establishing a City identity/image.”

“The logo will allow for a uniform and distinctive representation of the City of Hamilton, both throughout the City and outside its boundaries, to symbolize change, momentum and commitment to service excellence. It creates a powerful identity that builds awareness and recognition for the City of Hamilton.”

There are approximately 57 sub-committees of Council with citizen members. The creation and use of distinct logos for each Subcommittee would undermine the City’s corporate goal to establish a City identity and have uniform representation of the City of Hamilton. At this time, there are no sub-committees of Council that have Council approved logos.

The proposal of the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) is, therefore, contrary to existing City policy. The Municipal Heritage Committee has been established under the Ontario Heritage Act as an advisory committee to Council to advise on cultural heritage matters under the Act. The Municipal Heritage Committee functions as part of the City’s administration and bureaucracy, and is not a separate entity. As such, it cannot issue correspondence without Council’s approval, and such correspondence would be sent on City letterhead.

Furthermore, Report CSE02021 indicates that the logo of “the High Level Bridge reminds us of our strong heritage - the proud and determined people with heart and the industrial strength that built the foundation for future prosperity.” The concept of heritage is already represented by the existing logo.

Staff is of the opinion that a logo, regardless of design, is not warranted at this time and could set an undesirable precedent for other Committees of Council. Discussion under “Alternatives” later in this report suggests a course of action if Committee wishes to pursue a new logo design. Staff recognizes that some of the related issues of logos for all volunteer advisory committees to Council may warrant a broader forum for
discussion and direction and is, therefore, recommending that this matter be forwarded to the Governance Committee for further consideration.

**Payment of the Honorarium:**

The availability of the amount of $50.00 requested by the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) is not at question here as there are adequate City funds to cover this cost. The key issue is one of principle, in that regardless of the amount requested, the work that was undertaken was not commissioned, approved, or otherwise directed by staff and/or Council. Moreover, the sum appears to be a discretionary sum determined by a subcommittee of volunteers. The scope of work appears to have been less than $5,000, and if this had been an approved City project, it would have been sole sourced to an authorized supplier.

Staff is of the opinion that an appropriate way to acknowledge the volunteer design efforts should be a letter of thanks from the Mayor, and the donation of a selection of heritage posters to the designer.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:**

**Honourarium**

Council can direct staff to issue an appropriate sum for an honorarium to recognize the volunteer efforts of the graphic designer to date.

**Logo**

Council can direct the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) to continue with its exploration of concepts for a logo in concert with staff and to report back on an appropriate course of action.

Staff notes that the adoption of a logo is contrary to Council policy.

**FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

There are adequate funds to accommodate the $50.00 honorarium requested by LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee), as discussed above. If Council chooses to award a financial honorarium, funds are available though the City’s “LACAC Poster Account” (8109555020).

**POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:**

The policies respecting the adoption and usage of a logo have been discussed previously under “Analysis”.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION:

The Policy and Communication Co-ordinator was consulted.

CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:

By evaluating the “Triple Bottom Line”, (community, environment, economic implications) we can make choices that create value across all three bottom lines, moving us closer to our vision for a sustainable community, and Provincial interests.

Evaluate the implications of your recommendations by indicating and completing the sections below. Consider both short-term and long-term implications.

Community Well-Being is enhanced. □ Yes □ No
Not applicable.

Environmental Well-Being is enhanced. □ Yes □ No
Not applicable.

Economic Well-Being is enhanced. □ Yes □ No
Not applicable.

Does the option you are recommending create value across all three bottom lines? □ Yes □ No
Not applicable.

Do the options you are recommending make Hamilton a City of choice for high performance public servants? □ Yes □ No
Not applicable.
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SUBJECT: City of Hamilton Logo (CSE02021) (City Wide)

RECOMMENDATION:

That the ‘Bridges’ logo design be approved as the official City of Hamilton logo, according to the specified design (Appendix A).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

As part of the Branding and Corporate Identity Project, a new Logo was determined necessary for the City of Hamilton. This logo design would be implemented throughout the City for use on various applications, including:

- Signage throughout the City and its properties;
- Stationery, letterhead and business cards;
- Collateral materials;
- Uniforms;
- Advertising and direct mail;
- Videos;
- Sponsorship packages;
- City vehicles;
- Public transit vehicles; and
- Electronic (web-based) applications, including all “e-government.”
Departments will use the logo as set out by a usage and standards manual to maintain consistency and uniformity in the design and application. The manual will be developed by the consulting firm of Jan Kelley Marketing in conjunction with the City of Hamilton, in order to provide a uniform identity and a consistent logo on all applications where the logo will be used.

Research was conducted through the services of Jan Kelley Marketing to determine the most suitable logo amongst the three main stakeholder groups, encompassing City of Hamilton residents, businesses and employees.

A selection panel, including the Mayor and representatives from both the community and Senior City staff determined three finalist logos. These logos were then taken to research and based on the results the recommended logo for the City of Hamilton is:

![Logo](image)

**Logo Rationale**

Solid and traditional, this logo exemplifies the strength of character that can be found in a dependable, upright and stable community.

On an immediate level, the “Bridge” symbolizes two widely recognized City landmarks – the High Level Bridge on York Boulevard and the Skyway Bridge. Their significance represents both the past as well as the present and the values and aspirations associated with these periods in our history.

The High Level Bridge reminds us of our strong heritage – the proud and determined people with heart and the industrial strength that built the foundation for future prosperity. The Skyway Bridge represents both present day and future opportunities for the City with the emphasis placed on innovations in established industries like steel and growth in new sectors such as health care and education.
The pillars and spans of the bridge take the form of a stylized letter “H”. The six amalgamated communities are represented by the six supporting pillars of the bridge, making it a very appropriate symbol for the City of Hamilton.

**BACKGROUND:**

On May 8th, 2002, Council approved the awarding of a contract (C4-2-01) to Jan Kelley Marketing to provide their services as a strategic communications firm in the development and delivery of an integrated Branding and Corporate Identity campaign.

As part of this campaign, the first deliverable was to take three design logos to research to determine which logo would best represent the City of Hamilton. The three finalist logos were chosen by the panel and were selected from 12 logos submitted by the four finalist firms vying for the Branding and Corporate Identity Project.

The three finalist logos are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunburst</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Bridges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON</td>
<td>HAMILTON</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES:**

The process to determine which of the three logos would best represent the City of Hamilton involved surveying three distinctive groups within the City - residents, businesses and employees (see Appendix B for survey).
The final survey results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Businesses</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Results were rounded to the nearest whole number.

(See attached Appendix C for City of Hamilton Logo Research Results)

The overall percentage when each of the stakeholders groups is combined is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Results were rounded to the nearest whole number.
The preference for Hamilton's new logo is statistically accurate at the 95% level of confidence (margin of error +/- six percentage points), given the overall sample. The breakdown of the City resident survey sample reflects the population distribution throughout the various communities as per Statistic Canada’s most recent census.

**FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

In November of 2001, Council approved $600,000 for the Branding and Corporate Identity Project to be financed from reserves as part of the Transition Costs/Funding Report. Subsequently, in May of 2002, Council approved the award of this contract to Jan Kelley Marketing to provide their services as a strategic communications firm in the development and delivery of an integrated Branding and Corporate Identity campaign. The logo design and research to identify the preferred logo by the three identified stakeholder groups (residents, businesses and employees) is part of that funding.

The new logo will require that it be submitted and filed as a registered trademark of the City of Hamilton, such that its use will be protected and governed by the City.

**POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:**

N/A

**CONSULTATION WITH RELEVANT DEPARTMENTS/AGENCIES:**

City of Hamilton:

- Businesses
- Residents
- Employees

Mayor Robert E. Wade – City of Hamilton – selection panel member
Ian Cowan – past President, Chamber of Commerce – selection panel member
Neil Everson – Executive Director, Economic Development – selection panel member
Anne Louise Heron – Executive Director, Corporate Secretariat – selection panel member
Tom Poldre – Director, Communications – selection panel member
Brandon Trpcic – Manager, Project Management – selection panel member
CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:

A new City of Hamilton logo aligns directly with the City of Hamilton’s Strategic Commitments, by supporting the goals of:

- attracting and retaining business;
- keeping Hamilton connected;
- putting our best face forward; and
- establishing a City identity/image.

As part of the Branding and Corporate Identity Project, the development of a new logo is a key deliverable that has had extensive input from City residents, businesses and employees. The logo will allow for a uniform and distinctive representation of the City of Hamilton, both throughout the City and outside its boundaries to symbolize change, momentum and commitment to service excellence. It creates a powerful identity that builds awareness and recognition for the City of Hamilton.

It helps build awareness of the City among a variety of business audiences for economic development purposes.

Attached – Appendices A, B and C
Appendix A

‘Bridges’ Logo

Hamilton
Appendix B

CITY OF HAMILTON LOGO SURVEY

On the following pages you will see three logos that are presently being considered for the City of Hamilton.

We would like to know how you feel about each of these logos.

1. Please indicate how appealing you personally find this logo.

Choose any number, between 1 (Not at all Appealing) and 5 (Very Appealing), which best describes your feelings.

```
  1  |  2  |  3  |  4  |  5  
------------------
Not at all Appeal\n  o               o               o               o
                     o               o
Very Appealing     o               o               o               o
```

Please indicate how appealing you personally find this logo.

Choose any number, between 1 (Not at all Appealing) and 5 (Very Appealing), which best describes your feelings.

```
  1  |  2  |  3  |  4  |  5  
------------------
Not at all Appeal\n  o               o               o               o
                     o               o
Very Appealing     o               o               o               o
```
Please indicate how appealing you personally find this logo.

Choose any number, between 1 (Not at all Appealing) and 5 (Very Appealing), which best describes your feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hamilton</th>
<th>Not at all Appealing</th>
<th>Very Appealing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Which one of these logos do you personally feel would be the best logo for the City of Hamilton? SELECT ONLY ONE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hamilton</th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Which one of these logos would be your second choice? SELECT ONLY ONE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hamilton</th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: July 15, 2002

City of Hamilton Logo Research - Final Results

Logo Design Highlights

Questions: Which of these logos do you feel would be the best logo for the City of Hamilton? Which of these logos is your second choice? How appealing do you personally find each of these logos - please use a 5-point scale where 1 equals not appealing at all and 5 equals very appealing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online Survey</th>
<th>Bridges</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Sunburst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best Logo for Hamilton:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1st or 2nd Choice:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appealing (4 or 5 rating):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not at All Appealing (1 rating):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Technical Background**

This research was based on random selection of names from existing lists, as follows:

- City residents - telephone directory
- City employees - staff records
- City businesses - Chamber of Commerce members

The sampling procedure randomly selected names from each list, with 5 callbacks before substituting another name. This approach ensures the survey provides projectible, representative opinions for each group interviewed.

The initial telephone survey to measure the City of Hamilton's image was completed with a total sample of 901 surveys, equally divided by group.

The preference for Hamilton's new logo is statistically accurate at the 95% level of confidence, (margin of error +/- 6 percentage points), given the overall sample. While the breakdown of the City resident survey sample reflects the population distribution throughout the various communities as per Statistic Canada’s most recent census.