



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
2018 January

## Project overview

The Government of Canada introduced legislation in the spring of 2017 to legalize and regulate non-medical cannabis use. Cannabis will remain illegal as the bill moves through the legislative process. If it is approved by Parliament, the bill could become law with a target date of 2018 July. On 2017 November 16, the Government of Alberta introduced Bill 26, an Act to Control and Regulate Cannabis, based on its cannabis framework. The Government of Alberta has indicated that municipalities across the province will have a role in developing policies and regulations for recreational cannabis that are within their control and responsibility. The City of Calgary, like other municipalities across Canada, is currently reviewing what this legislation might mean for our city and our organization.

## Engagement overview

In 2017 November, The City of Calgary held stakeholder workshops with representatives from community and business organizations to discuss policy and regulation areas regarding business licencing, community standards bylaws, land use planning and other affected bylaws. From 2017 November 20 to 2017 December 10, The City of Calgary hosted an online survey on its engagement portal at [www.engage.calgary.ca](http://www.engage.calgary.ca) to solicit feedback from Calgarians. Input from both the workshops and online survey is being used to help inform changes and updates to affected bylaws, and inform whether new bylaws or policies are required to respond to the legalization of recreational cannabis.

This workshop report back includes a high level summary and the verbatim feedback from the workshop that was held on 2017 November 22 from 2 to 4:30 p.m. Approximately 40 stakeholders participated.

## What we asked

### Retail Sales Locations

1. Are there preferred areas where cannabis retail stores should or should not be located? Why?
2. Should The City apply the same separation distances outlined by the Alberta Gaming and Liquor Commission (AGLC) regarding the separation distances for liquor stores to cannabis retail stores? If not, why?
3. Should The City apply the same separation distances outlined by the AGLC between liquor stores, and schools or daycares to cannabis retail stores as well? If not, why? What are the other uses where separation distances should be considered?
4. Should there be separation distances between cannabis retail stores, production facilities and liquor stores? If so, why?
5. Should there be a limit on the number of cannabis retail stores within a certain area? If so, what should that be?

### Retail Sales Regulations

1. How should The City accept cannabis retail store applications? Why? (E.g. lottery, first come first serve, merit based system, combination).
2. What should the decision criteria be on whether or not to license a cannabis retail store include? Why?



3. In July 2018, private retail sales of cannabis will be limited to standalone stores. If other license types are permitted by the Alberta Government beyond 2018, what license types should be created (e.g. cannabis production, cannabis counselling)?
4. Should retail delivery of cannabis be allowed? Why or why not? (different than mail delivery)
5. Should storefront signage regulations for cannabis retail stores beyond what is outlined by the Government of Alberta be considered by The City? Why or why not? If yes, what regulations?
6. Should third party advertisement regulations regarding the sale of cannabis (e.g. billboards, temporary sign (bold sign) beyond what is outlined by the Government of Alberta be considered by The City? Why or why not? If yes, what regulations?
7. What should the ramifications be if there is a failure to comply with the bylaws? Why?
8. What operating hours do you think cannabis retail stores should have? Why?

## Production Facility Locations and Regulations

1. How should commercial designated cannabis growing be regulated? Why?
2. Are there preferred areas where cannabis production facilities should or should not be located? Why?
3. Should there be separation distances between cannabis production facilities. If so, why? (See example of Liquor Store Regulations)
4. Should there be a limit on the number of cannabis production facilities within a certain area? If so, what should that limit be?
5. Should there be separation distances between cannabis production facilities and schools or other uses? Why? What are the other uses where separation distances should be considered?
6. Should there be separation distances between cannabis production facilities, retail stores and liquor stores? If so, why?

## Consumption Locations (smoking, vaping, oils)

1. Should The City further regulate where cannabis can be consumed in public spaces beyond what is outlined by the Government of Alberta? Why or why not?
2. Where should Calgaryans be allowed/not allowed to consume cannabis? Why?
3. Should the consumption of cannabis be allowed at public events such as outdoor concerts and festivals? Why or why not?
  - a. If cannabis was allowed at public events, what regulations should be put in place? Why?
4. Should the consumption of cannabis be allowed on City of Calgary outdoor public property? Why or why not?
5. Should the consumption of cannabis be allowed outdoors on private property (e.g. backyard, balcony or restaurant patio)? Why or why not?
6. If permitted in future (e.g. beyond 2018), should Calgary allow cannabis lounges? Why or why not?
  - a. If yes, should the method of usage be regulated? (E.g. no smoking allowed, only vaping/edibles or only edibles?)
7. Should there be separation distances between cannabis lounges, retail stores, and production facilities? Why or why not?



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
2018 January

## Residential Growing

1. Should The City ban growing of cannabis in accessory residential buildings (e.g. garages, sheds, greenhouses)? Why or why not?
2. What should the ramifications be if there is a failure to comply with the bylaws?

## What we heard

### Retail Sales Locations

Participants shared that separation distances between retail stores should follow the existing Alberta Gaming and Liquor Commission (AGLC) regulations for liquor stores. However, The City should consider potentially relaxing some regulations in areas that have higher density. Participants also indicated that there does not need to be separation distances between liquor stores and cannabis stores because it would severely limit where retail stores could be located.

### Retail Sales Regulations

Many participants felt that regulations for retail sales should follow the existing AGLC regulations and guidelines for liquor stores. A fair system open to everybody, combined with a merit-based system, is most appropriate for accepting business applications in order to provide opportunities to all levels of business from large-scale to small, local operations. Participants also indicated that the applications process take into consideration community standards and fit.

### Production Facility Locations and Regulations

Participants shared that industrial or light industrial areas would be the best locations for production facilities and were supportive of applying the regulations that currently exist for AGLC for liquor stores to recreational cannabis production facilities. Participants felt that special consideration should be given to craft producers versus large scale producers. Feedback was mixed regarding the need for separation distances between production facilities, regardless of size.

### Consumption Locations

Allowing for cannabis lounges and providing designated areas for consumption at special events were ideas that many of the participants were in favour of. Participants felt that current tobacco bylaws provide an established approach to implementing cannabis bylaws to address the concerns brought up around second hand exposure.

### Residential Growing

Participants shared that they were supportive of residential growing in accessory buildings, but there were concerns raised about how landlords would approach residential growing in rental units. Participants felt that education around best practices for residential growing is key.



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
2018 January

- ▶ To read a more detailed summary of the input see the section: [What we heard – Summary of Input](#)
- ▶ To read all verbatim comments received see the section: [What we heard – Verbatim Contents](#)

## Next Steps

Public engagement on the legalization of cannabis was completed on 2017 December 10 and this What We Heard Report was shared with Calgarians on the City's engage portal at [www.engage.calgary.ca](http://www.engage.calgary.ca). Feedback will be considered and a 'What We Did' report will be shared in the winter of 2018 to show how public feedback informed the proposed amendments to bylaws and potential creation of new bylaws. The proposed bylaw amendments are scheduled to be presented to Council in 2018 April. If approved by Council, the changes will be implemented and the development permit process will be initiated to prepare for legalization in 2018 July.



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
2018 January

## What we heard – Summary of Input

### Retail Sales Locations

#### Preferred Areas

- No specific preferred areas were identified, but participants felt that convenience, accessibility and walkability were important elements to consider for retail store locations.
- Several participants suggested that there be special consideration for more retail store locations in areas of higher density.

#### Separation Distances

- Many participants shared that there is already an existing AGLC model that works and should be followed for cannabis retail stores.
- Many were supportive of AGLC guidelines for separation distances between retail stores and schools, and also suggested considering separation distances from places of worship.
- Much of the feedback indicated that there should not be separation distances between retail stores and liquor stores as this would severely limit where retail stores could be located.

#### Limit of Stores in Certain Areas

- Most participants felt that there did not need to be any limits to the maximum number of retail stores in certain areas as they felt that the market and store success would be able to control for oversaturation of stores.
- Some participants expressed concerns regarding having too many retail stores clustered in one area and that consideration for variety and diversity of retail stores is important to many communities and areas throughout Calgary.

### Retail Sales Regulations

#### Applications

- Many participants felt that regulations for retail sales should follow the existing AGLC regulations and guidelines for liquor stores.
- Participants suggested a fair system open to everybody, combined with a merit-based system, is most appropriate for accepting business applications in order to provide opportunities to all levels of business from large-scale to small, local operations.

#### Decision Criteria

- Most of the feedback indicated that decision criteria for applications should be the same as existing AGLC guidelines.
- Several participants indicated the importance of applicants having prior business knowledge and experience, and a formal business plan, including trained and experienced employees and safety/security protocol.
- Some participants felt that applicants should also consider community standards and fit as part of their applications.
- Some participants indicated that background checks should be implemented for all applicants.



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
2018 January

## Types of Licenses

- There was support for additional license types, including online sales, retail delivery, combined production and sales for craft cannabis and edibles sales and production, and cannabis paraphernalia stores.

## Signage

- Some participants expressed concern that restrictions on signage would limit the ability to develop a brand or identity for businesses and impact promotion. However, some participants indicated that regulations be placed on branding/signage such as location and visibility, use of specific signage/symbols to indicate type of business and limits to large-scale advertising.

## Ramifications

- Participants were supportive of a scaling system for failing to comply with license requirements which included initial warnings, fines and loss of license, depending on the severity.

## Production Facility Locations and Regulations

### Regulations

- Some participants indicated that production facility regulations should follow the same guidelines as the AGLC for liquor production.
- Many participants indicated craft producers in general may need a different set of regulations, including the ability to have retail sales as part of the production facility.
- Some participants indicated that production facilities should be located in industrial or light industrial areas in order to accommodate the size of facility required, to limit contamination levels to surrounding businesses and to keep production facilities away from residential and retail/commercial areas.

### Separation Distances

- Feedback indicated that separation distances should be in place between the facility and retail or liquor stores, but that there is no need for separation distances between production facilities. Some participants felt clustering production facilities would help with security concerns.

### Limit in Certain Areas

- Participants expressed that there did not need to be a limit on the number of production facilities in an area as long as all the application requirements were met.
- Overall, participants were supportive of production facilities being located in industrial areas.

## Consumption Locations

### Public Spaces

- Much of the feedback indicated that public consumption regulations should follow existing regulations, and that The City should look to the tobacco bylaws as a framework to develop cannabis bylaws.



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
2018 January

- Participants indicated that there should be designated areas in public spaces for cannabis consumption separate from alcohol and tobacco and to address second hand exposure concerns.
- Many participants shared that it is important to keep areas where cannabis can be consumed away from where youth may be located, including schools and public parks.

## Cannabis Lounges

- There was a lot of support for allowing cannabis lounges in the future as it would be easier to regulate consumption, and help limit consumption in public spaces.
- Some participants indicated that specific regulations would be necessary for cannabis lounges, in particular around proper ventilation and consumption of edibles.

## Special Events

- Many participants indicated that consumption of cannabis should be allowed at special events such as outdoor festivals, but only in designated areas similar to beer garden models (permit/license).

## Enforcement

- Participants expressed that it would be challenging to enforce cannabis consumption regulations as it can be difficult to determine if one has consumed or is consuming cannabis.
- Some participants felt that education and clear signage in and around designated areas would aid in the enforcement of the cannabis consumption regulations and in understanding potential second hand exposure risks.

## Residential Growing

### Accessory Buildings

- Many participants were supportive of growing cannabis in accessory buildings for single family residences and suggested The City apply a permit system for growing in auxiliary buildings.

### Rental Units

- Participants shared concerns about the increased potential for damage to rental units which would become the responsibility of landlords and property owners to resolve.

### Enforcement

- Participants indicated that it would be very difficult to enforce the residential growing regulations and requiring growing licenses or growing permits should be considered.

### Ramifications

- Participants were supportive of warnings, fines and confiscation of plants for failing to comply with residential growing regulations and if permits/licenses are to be required then loss of permits/licenses could be considered as well.

### Education

- Some participants indicated that there is a large education component in order to implement best growing practices, to reduce the risk of property damage, to minimize youth access, and to understand and be aware of the health risks associated with growing cannabis.



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
2018 January

## What we heard – Verbatim Comments

Following is a record of the feedback capture during the workshop.

**Please note:** Personally identifying information, as well as any portions of comments not in compliance with the City's Respectful Workplace policy are removed from participant submissions, the intent of the submissions remains.

### Retail Sales Locations

- Preferred Areas
  - Where ever can open within reason
  - Liquor store model
  - Similar separation to liquor?
  - Malls?
    - Not much exposure
  - Illegal should be shut down?
    - Vape shops
  - Separation
    - Relax 300m. in some locations
      - 17 Ave
      - Downtown
      - Based on density
    - With liquor stores, bars, pubs:
      - No, too many
      - 25 year head start
      - There would be none
      - No combined liquor/cannabis
      - No liquor converting to cannabis, unless they go through relicensing?
    - School/daycare
      - Same as liquor
    - Others
      - Shelters etc.
      - Not daycare
      - Don't correlate
  - City should be careful about setbacks
  - Use liquor store rules
  - Enforced by competitors
  - Should be re-located
  - Limit on stores in an area
    - Most of city – same as liquor
    - Market sorts that out
    - If area becomes 'destination' community will step in
  - Side by side with liquor okay with separate addresses
  - Similar areas to liquor stores
  - Commercial complexes



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
 Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
 2018 January

- Not enough space – 300 m b/w locations in big centers
- Not Preferred Areas
  - Schools
  - Places of worship
  - 300m is flexible
- Land use bylaw needs to reflect population density – execution is not measurable
- Medical marijuana – retail locations
- Where?
  - Same as liquor
  - Negative list approach – where you can't and separation
  - Liquor & cannabis separation
    - Side by side – maybe not sub-division
    - Same complex
    - More separation between cannabis?
    - More profit
    - Not City's concern – market will sort out
    - 300 is ok – most the same as liquor
    - Strong will survive
    - Market will decide
  - Schools – liquor is 150; works for liquor, keep same
  - Other sensitive uses?
    - Shelters – rehab?
    - Discretionary
    - DP process will look after that and stakeholder engagement
  - Disp. & production separation – Fed. Rules about that
  - Limit in area?
    - Liquor rules; market will determine
    - Separation rules will do that
    - More in dense areas?
      - Main Streets? – possible if market allows
      - Look at similar cities – Denver
      - Don't based on area population because it changes
- No concern about liquor stores and cannabis retail
- Define why there is a distance b/w liquor and cannabis --- province legislation and separate point of sale
- No separation – seems unnecessary b/w liquor and cannabis – amount of liquor stores influences the amount of cannabis retail
- Specific parameters – stand alone
  - Need clarification on what 'stand alone' means
- NOT adhering to AGLC
- Reasonable, non-restrictive licensing
- 300 m is a big restriction starting businesses
- AGLC will be the biggest hurdle
- Timeline
  - Starting in April – only gives 2 months for policy changes to begin applying everything



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
 Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
 2018 January

- Need to view 'start date' as just the initial starting line
- City needs to be prepared for July
- For
  - 300m separation distances should be implemented
  - Not near schools, daycares, places of worship
  - Need variety and diversity
  - Separation is consideration of youth (150 m b/w schools)
  - Walkability in neighbourhoods (vices w/m equal distance)
  - Changing 300m restriction to be more reasonable
  - City to research separation guidelines – esp. liquor stores abundance
- Against
  - 300m is too restrictive (liquor stores – too many)
  - Need variety and diversity
  - City to look into changing 300m (retail space)
  - Reasonable distances
  - Walkability – everything is near each other – accessibility increased
- Changing 'Image' of Cannabis
  - Needs to employ safety, image needs to be considered
  - Amsterdam as an example of 'attractive dispensary' society
  - Changing land use by laws will be very difficult
  - 300m in terms of Walkability is reasonable
  - Regional centers – distance could be reduced from 300m
  - Corridors should have separation (300m) MU1 + MU2
  - Building on the outskirts could be a result of restrictive separation distances
  - Using other cities to see which set up works best (system)
  - Using clustering as advantageous
  - Target – downtown core for the highest density/demographic currently can be 'singles' but it's important to consider communities do change
  - Need diversity instead of clustered businesses such as cannabis/liquor/bars...etc.
  - Using other cannabis-friendly cities planning as examples
- Places of worship should be considered
- Check adhering to AGLC separation laws (300m)
- No issue with liquor stores and cannabis in close proximity – unfair advantage for new cannabis businesses coming into areas where liquor is already sold
- AGLC distance requirement is limiting also – certain locations especially
- Alberta equals high addiction stats
- Conflict of interest (\$\$) – lifestyle changes for negative? Social; need to recognize the dangers.
- Real estate issues will arise
- Calgary – accreditation, credentials
- Alcohol & Cannabis to be regulated equally – marijuana practices to be monitored the same as liquor
- Goals
  - Need to take out the 'black market'
  - Limit exposure of cannabis retail to not match how many liquor stores in Calgary
  - Addiction/recreation/medicinal – very different things
  - Are we encouraging addiction? What are the stats for usage?



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
2018 January

- FREE MARKET to self correct
- Managing how many retail stores will sell cannabis?

## Retail Sales Regulations

- No different from other retail
- Open to everyone
- Same steps as other applications
- First come first serve → meeting minimum requirements
- Level playing field
- Disagree with First come First serve – merit basis → what is it based on
- Cap on licenses?
  - Issue licenses in waves
  - Could cause license in limbo
- Conflict between AGLC license
- Further distances between retailers
- Expert Answer:
  - similar to liquor stores (building license)
  - set up under discretionary license?
    - Could work with policy to guide discretion
    - Permitted use faster, but could create issues
    - Meet rules you get permit, don't meet don't get license
- Favour Discretionary
  - Put them in same places as liquor stores
  - Liquor stores next to Cannabis stores may not be accepted by community
- Very high demand – do as a lottery, limit # of licenses each person gets
- Merit as opposed to First Come First Serve
  - FCFS could cause industry suffering
- Need business experience
- Provincial licenses and municipal
  - Disconnect between City and Province
  - Streamline
  - Vet to ensure they qualify for provincial license
  - Change to get one license before the other
- Could block out other stores from opening → land uses without opening the stores
- Separation between business and land use license?
  - How do we coordinate?
  - How to decide who gets land use licenses – choice between competitors if 2+ in same area?
    - Then FCFS for business license in these areas
  - Will see huge rush for land use licenses
- Online, quick, efficient – already AGLC regulations
- Don't put up boundaries for small business
- Will cause push back
- Issues with proximities to sensitive use/creating diversity



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
 Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
 2018 January

- Should it be City decided or community
- One type of business/loss of retail could be an issue
- Must maintain diversity
- City to push to get right people in
- Need to be careful of loop holes in land use designation
- Cannabis/alcohol sales
  - Walkability to pick up → accessibility
  - Don't see bad correlation between alcohol + cannabis use together
- Locations for retail stores limited by liquor stores if we fix regulations for distances
- Could have community push back already
- Merit based on previous experience
  - Experience in other districts (e.g. Vancouver)
  - Experience in cannabis industry
- Open to all, no experience necessary – business plan, etc.
- Merit may give benefit to bigger pharmas, unfair to smaller businesses
- In favour of open and let success/saturation dictate like liquor
- Anticipate 'rush' of application (concerns)
  - No limit, but RFP process
  - RFP concerns: benefits to bigger companies
- Merit based
  - Very few qualified businesses based on 'experience'
  - Experience in retail ✓ customer service ✓ E.g. outside cannabis industry
  - Only cannabis experience disqualified many businesses
- Lottery encourages black market/black market quality
- Merit based
  - Skills, location, etc. meet should be fair game
  - Lotto is unfair/dangerous, caused backlog in Colorado
  - 'Qualify' into a pool/lottery
- Discretionary, based on skill sets
- US provides certification and training, City should incorporate into merit e.g. smart serve, zoning, criminal checks
- First come/first serve them merit
  - Only if a limit is placed
  - Big capital would be 60%
  - INFO is provincial/CoC taking applications → only for businesses licenses after AGLC approval
- Align with AGLC regulations
- Merit based with spec criteria to be fair
- Clear to businesses to receive apps
- Evaluation criteria
- 1<sup>st</sup> business friendly, 3<sup>rd</sup> community focused (Note: there was no 2<sup>nd</sup> point written down)
- Not criminal record
- No existing illegal operations
- Alberta based – local business preference
- Background check



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
 Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
 2018 January

- Criminal background
- Financial stability
- Store opening/operation time frame
  - Define starting date
  - Restart application if expired
- Apply for provincial license
- Any illegal distribution, illegal dispensary, barred
  - Perhaps should not be considered for license first
- Should be on an individual basis (Schools/Place of worship to be considered)
- City to lead engagement sessions
  - Good that they're already putting applications online
- Discretionary licenses
  - Downside of needing volunteer hours
- Just want a safe/comfortable place to live
- Community Association and Educators to be involved
  - not enough time – a lot on business owner to self-educate
- Flexibility and open to changing regulations down the road
- Too high criteria will discourage smaller businesses (again)
  - Adequate education and research/training NOT in business license but elsewhere
- AGLC regulations have been successful in 10-15 years/growth
- Liquor has more monopolies in industry, unfavourable
  - No barrier to enter but let successful models thrive
  - Limit dispensaries per company, etc. to limit
  - Disagree, let it be free market
  - If limit business/area, then bigger can 'pay to play' thus encourages monopoly rather than competition
- Must pass criminal check
- Same as AGLC plus municipal, streamlined, quick – land use is coming very late
- AGLC as step #1
- Easy to follow and clear to ensure meet or not qualifications vs. 'gambling'
- Separate distances
- Power centers would be able to buy all available in distances from each other and liquor stores, daycares, etc. huge proliferation and grandfathering, correlation to crime
  - Not a level playing field
  - Liquor locks up good locations
  - Can understand no 'dispensary city' but not convenience if had to space between liquor and cannabis
  - Payday loans is 400m
  - Not enough availability of retail of too many regulations
  - Wil push out to residential/complaints
- Follow the AGLC
- Discretionary vs. permit land use
- Online Deliver
- Micro-growery 'Boutiques'



- Small/Medium businesses
- 'craft groweries'
- Cannabis Cafés → Colorado
  - Purchase and consume
  - Cannabis infused products
- Extraction companies to be discussed
- Clarify 'stand-alone'
- Should be in malls/own buildings
- Need places to sue → limits sales
  - Café's as a possibility
- Consideration to employee health
  - Can we even consider café's?
  - Reserve tobacco laws for this
- Should be a separate use (not purchase + consume on site)
- Medical to have higher quota
  - Concern of phasing out medical
  - Will diminish but still need medical expertise
- Consider Amsterdam style? Different business models
- No need for production and retail in same location → safety issues
  - Issue with smell
- Delivery not probable – not necessary
  - Maybe through use of 3<sup>rd</sup> party but overall bad idea
  - Risk to children
- Does 'black market' experience have merit?
  - No punishment for previous experience from federal regulations
  - Public like to support trusted individuals (experienced)
- Licensing for cannatherapy, topicals, flours, different products – oils, teas, lotions, etc. – do they need licensing?
- Future coffee shops/consumption locations
  - Provincial regulations (future) will apply
- Stand alone medical facility? (affect each other)
  - Education may be unfair – expensive business model
  - Medical should be separate
  - Certification and education not necessary in recreational
    - Benefit NOT regulation
    - Consumers will dictate need/preference
- Consider the quality of recreational vs. medicinal
- Worry about what's in front right now
- Too many to speculate
- Counselling buying licenses to build 'merit' is unfair similar to grandfathering
- If unlicensed, can lead to proliferation because City wasn't notified, look at Van + Vic successes – good businesses citizens
- Unregistered day homes establish and then flip to daycares won't flag distances
- Open to other uses



- How will online delivery correspond with gov. delivery?
- Add procedures to apps for verification
- Delivery should be allowed, will have to clarify verification process
- Depletion of small retail from online sales
- Safety issues (limits risk of impaired driving)
- Allow companies to have drop off driver
- What about consumption limits?
- Maximum # ordering time
  - 30g single use or 30g possession – self responsibility
- Licensing → no regulation or deliveries now
- Business delivery will need regulating
- Too far with tobacco sales – don't want to follow tobacco regulations
- As long as follows provincial regulations and fits with community
  - Want opportunity to interact with product
  - Need to openly communicate about it
- Can we allow pop-up stores? Shared space?
  - How is this regulated?
- YES!!
  - Mimic alcohol delivery
  - Confirmation of age, etc.
- AGLC regulations mandate, users immobile, self-medicating, etc. shouldn't drive
  - 'duber' happening where legal already
  - If too restricted is courier intuitive
- Disabilities
- Discrete purchasing
- Tax concerns – City doesn't reduce taxes?
  - Only for mail order, no issue with retail
- Driving safety
- Helps with zoning issues, convenience
- Follow AGLC for verification, guidelines
- Lots of skepticism/hurdles – cannibalizing b+m sales
- Not needed?
- Need to advertise to gain clients
- Should be up to land owner
- Could be an issue with attracting children
- Nothing additional required
- Follow provincial guidelines
  - Issue for franchised if municipal controlled
- Already done (same as cigarettes)
- Abiding by province
- Using a 'symbol' for cannabis business
- Stick with AGLC & provincial
- 300m rule will apply & help over saturation
- Should be allowed to choose types and styles (80's) packaging



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
 Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
 2018 January

- More information is better ‘flags’ it for minors, safety
- Legislation is already robust and inclusive
- Communities deal with signage proliferation
- Similar to adult shop ‘black outs’
- Safety for frequenters and public
- Signage to identify to let know product and no minors to clarify type of business
- Similar to liquor stores
- 3M security vs. bars on windows? (Fed Regulation?)
- Signage must be tasteful, no posters facing road
- Consider streetscape options and environment for community options (less regulations)
- Not visible outside
- Similar to liquor, if more regulated then regulate liquor too
- Nothing beyond
- No additional regulations
- City should leave it to province
- Stores should be allowed to individual advertise
- Limit to prevent big monopolies (bill boards adverts)
- If regulating, should be based on health, not fairness
  - Too much regulations will harm small businesses
- Labatt vs. craft beer
- Focus fairness on other areas & privileges
  - E.g. only allowed to sell at Stampede
- AGLC ramifications already apply
- Will inspections apply? Most likely
- Safety, sales, security will come from AGLC in future
  - AGLC is fairly aggressive
- Focus on ‘best bar none’ – focuses on better retailers
- Ramifications for businesses already operating??
- Is there dis-preferences for counseling
- Give them a ‘red flag’, unfair to people ‘playing by rules’
- Identify the ‘grey’ businesses and ‘punish’ for breaking law, to level playing field
- Nothing beyond
- Same as liquor
- Shut down after x # of violations
- Timeline for reapplying for license
- Follow alcohol and tobacco guidelines
- Any review should look at all products not just cannabis
- Less is more
- Cease and desist, 30 days, shutdown – may be fined
- ‘Grey market’ should be punished/shut down – bring burden of proof
- Same as existing bylaw penalties
- Similar to liquor store
- Earlier hours than liquor store



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
2018 January

- Less than liquor stores
- Consistent
- Same as liquor stores (x2)
  - Need flexible hours to reduce illegal purchases
- Paraphernalia shops should have to re-apply to start selling cannabis → does this experience give them merit
  - No favourability to existing stores
- Can landlord restrict a company from starting to sell?
- 24/7
- Liquor stores
- Same as liquor stores 10-2am
- 'nothing good after 12pm', but let choose
- Retailer discretion on cost/safety
- Special event licenses (Stampede, etc.)
  - Should be same as liquor
- Special hours for events like Olympics, etc.
- 10-2am ✓ AGLC is ok
  - Pro: 10pm is too early (party starts, illegal delivery)
  - Con: 10pm is too late

## Production Facility Locations and Regulations

- Branding is a concern
- Expect regulations to be similar to medical
- Micro cultivators won't go to direct retail
- Put production in commercial
- If you put producer in industry could be contaminated water etc...
- As city sets info from growers on what they need for growing, city can decide on where?
- Not necessary to separate growing facilities
- Next to similar facilities (e.g. Pharm)
- Social responsibility – not near liquor stores
- Tough to have large separation from liquor stores due to proliferation
- Does location depreciate home values
- Standard for retail, parking etc.
- Fertilizers in certain quantities need industrial
- Micro growers licensed to sell
- Growing from perimeter in city
- Large growers use chemicals
- Micro growing maybe not in industrial
- Micro growers mostly organic
- Nuisance with clustering facilities
- Whatever rules apply to liquor productions
- Why can't a production facility retail product



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
2018 January

- Small growers to sell retail not large production
- Current growers (illegal) know the successful model
- Planning discussion should be around appropriate use not competitive advantage
- Certain uses not appropriate around a production facility that produces edibles (consumables)
- City to focus on zoning
- Security measures for producers and transportation
- No additional REGULATIONS for industrial production
- Flexibility from city and on approvals
- Due to fledgling nature of business- new ideas should not be mired in red tape
- Where can edibles be produced?
- Desire to be above board- all info should be on the table and clear
- Should producers be clustered in agri.
- Health Canada is stringent – no need for extra regulations from city

## Consumption Locations

- Hybrid situations events
  - Consider events where there are children
- Smoke garden
- Designated areas
  - I.e.: smoking areas vs. cannabis smoking areas at senior facilities
- If you're predisposed to mental illness, exposure to cannabis could be a trigger
- Current medicinal smokes are consuming in common areas, what is the impact when legalized for recreation?
- Use on private property should be allowed
- Consideration of areas where there are kids
- In some areas 5m deters from use anywhere
- No outdoor public use -> impact on passerby's
- Because it's a burning substance, people with COPD, asthma, etc. are having lives put at risk by smokers (could worsen cannabis)
- No to a cannabis bar
- Experience up crime at existing shisha bars
- Positive of cannabis lounge keeps it all in one place
  - Needs proper ventilation
  - Where to locate? Hours?
- Separation between locations is a concern
  - 300M from other locations, liquor stores, schools
- Liquor stores are asking to sell both concerns with concentration of location
  - Social conditions (social disorders)
  - Higher family violence
  - Community standard go down
- Can you directly collate cannabis use to crime rate?
- Have seen small cannabis shops work well in Amsterdam (not dangerous or unpleasant)



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
 Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
 2018 January

- Restrict spaces to smaller/ manageable sites (i.e.: small café lounge vs. large bar)
- Locate next to food source
- Don't want to smell product outside of where its located
- Against coffee shops serving cannabis
- Cannabis location should be a standalone distribution location
- Reduce fumes
- Where do you go if in a condo?
- NO PUBLIC USE
- Don't want to smell it in private backyard.
- People will ignore rules if too many restrictions.
- Novelty will likely wear off over time
- Might have more consumption initially
- Cannabis usage is same locations as cigarettes
- Designated outdoor spaces
- # of mature adults who can use cannabis and get out of control is low
- Cannabis lounge
- Consumed as edibles should be allowed
- Tobacco vs. cannabis vaping (currently treated the same)
- Medical cannabis users don't want to be smoking next to tobacco users.
- Infused foods
- As a parent, everyone who chooses cannabis over alcohol is a win because the cannabis use is less impaired than alcohol user.
- Designated space at festivals
  - Separated from alcohol
  - Don't facilitate mixing of cannabis and alcohol
- Nuisance of fumes aligns with second hand smoke
- It should be play to have a business to buy and consume on same location
- Vape lounges is desired for: multi-residential buildings.
  - Could also offer non-alcoholic drinks
- Stephen Av. Should accommodate vape lounges
- Chasing the scream, Johann Hari, book as possible reference
- Allow on private property
- Allow vaping in high density areas
- Vaping is less intrusive
- Vaping on restaurants patios+
- Medical user with kids -> would benefit from cannabis lounge
- Lounges are a great idea, let's be on the forefront
  - Edible
  - Vaping
- Separate area in public bar with adequate ventilation
- Don't want to be exposed to the fumes
- Alcohol, tobacco, cannabis so completely diff.
- Lounge means less exposure for other patrons
  - Designated space



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
 Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
 2018 January

- Capitalize on the freedom of the mind – lounges
- Be with like-minded – lounges
- Can alcohol and cannabis both be at the same event/ outdoor festival?
- Licenses for cannabis tents (IE: stamped tents)
- People will consume regardless at outdoor festival
  - Don't want a lot of expense towards monitoring
- Education will be key
- Limitations from public entrances, will this result in open use down the block?
- Should be allowed on private property
  - Condo board need to work through this
- Perception/ stigma- kids seeing cannabis use vs. alcohol use (education)
- Transparency (educational opportunity) vs. secret usage (problems)
  - I.e. ADHD -> pot cookie (much research is needed)
- Don't have at restaurant patios to avoid alcohol/ cannabis mix
- Safety is up when buying from licensed growers
- Party bus or limo where you can smoke on bus (i.e.: Colorado)
- Patterns of consumption are difficult
- Dedicated space at special events?
  - License for this?
  - Conflict w/ smoking bylaw
- Smoking/ Vaping
  - Align w/smoking rules
- Edible
  - Align w/ liquor rules
- Jurisdiction; who makes rules vs. who enforces
- Rules align with existing age frameworks, exposure rules? May require tweaks.
  - Makes sense
- Dedicated space (private, commercial)
- Minimum government over site should align with restaurants and lounge zoning frameworks.
  - Market solutions to locations
  - Setbacks need to be the same?
- Do the sales/ retail vs. consumption
- Market based approach to types of locations. Consumers will sort it out for us.
- Co-locations issues (cannabis & liquor vs. retail & consumption)
  - Not worth trying to go too hard on the cannabis & liquor rules
- Impact on non-user
  - Smell & smoke vs. intoxication?
- Likely may see early spike on public use but not long-standing increases. May not need regulations because there will be no change.
- Use existing infrastructure and policy where possible
- Methods may have a greater impact on what regulation is appropriate
  - Smoke vs. vape
- Property sights should come before government regulation.
- Not a lot may change. This is already happening.



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
 Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
 2018 January

- Vape & smoke may be a difficult issue than edibles.
- Property/ condo rules around smoking currently may create conflict. may require city and provincial coordination to address this.
- Private property vs. neighbor impacts
- Current tobacco regulations may be appropriate
  - Not being enforced though
  - Rules need to be enforceable and there need to be repercussions. i.e.: Off leash bylaw
- Roles of social norms and community expectations
  - Protection and education of rules
- Tobacco guidelines may provide model
- Rules around regulating health impacts (i.e. second-hand smoke) vs. rules around regulating safety impacts (i.e. intoxication)
- Method maybe key
  - Smoke vs. edible vs. vape
- Medical consumption trends away from smoke may not be an issue
- Age demarcation for exposure
  - Is this fair if you are already non smoker for example
- Dedicated sites
  - Look to Nevada to see where being restrictive has not been successful
  - Amsterdam model of cafes seems to work
  - No different than a bar?
- Need to identify goals and then set regulation to meet these goals
- Market solutions & market benefits
- Need data to make better decisions
  - Need clarity around purpose for their rules...Why?
- Can , should city messaging/ education align with similar education around alcohol or smoking
  - It is still new enough that additional messaging would be beneficial.
  - Understand myth vs. fact
- Inherently social activity
- Smoking bylaws have been strong, but successful
  - There are differences with cannabis though it can be beneficial.
- Labeling → informed choices
- Complex issues
- Is already happening (acknowledge that public consumption is already happening)
- Concern about tying too close to tobacco bylaw
- Desire to not be heavy handed
- Public/ private space distraction
- Challenge of medical use vs. no-smoking bylaw
- Patterns of use (tobacco vs. MJ) are different (smoke breaks)
- Prescription affords duty to accommodate (link to safety & zero tolerance policy)
- Does medical vs. recreational use require different rule.
- Fear about creating a bylaw “cash- cow” alignment/ risk w/alcohol consumption rules.
- Equity of enforcement. Not over-impacting vulnerable populations.



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
 Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
 2018 January

- Context of consumption is key ‘concept is different from bus shelters’, people may need to understand the type of event or venue
- Idea of spaces dedicated/allowed tasting rooms, vaporizers, bylaw applies to both burn & vape may allow tasting rooms
  - Challenge is employee exposure & OHS
  - Special exemptions may allow tasting rooms
  - Tricky in that is that 1 size does not fit all
- In other jurisdictions, industry has found a way to make distinctions in types of sites well understand
- Idea that consumption effects aren’t limited to site, people walk and go from space to space
- Flexibility & common sense, just because you can, doesn’t mean you should, need a framework but allow for exemptions.
- Process w/bylaw
  - Allowed, prohibited, discretionary, may allow context
- Economic impacts vs. community impacts.
- Retail vs. consumption
- Bylaws won’t be perfect not everyone going to be happy (on both sides)
- Should city further regulate?
  - Don’t want to restrict tourism
  - Current provincial framework
  - Smoking is thing of the past, don’t base regulations on that
- Festivals
  - Cannabis gardens
  - People need to understand regulations
  - Cannabis focused events
  - Clear signage
- City Outdoor Property - Same
- Private Outdoor - Yes
- Cannabis lounges
  - Yes
  - Code and HVAC issues
  - Vape technology would allow
  - Open to all uses
  - Would sale be allowed?
  - How would that make \$?
- Separation- Lounge/ Production/ Dispense
  - Side by the side
  - Rezone
  - Going there anyway
  - No need to invest time and go beyond provincial legislation
  - Edibles make this must point
  - Won’t have same disorder of alcohol



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
2018 January

## Residential Growing

- No restrictions
- Green house growth positive
- What is considered residence
  - Rental suites (legal)
- What are proposed considerations
  - Definitions -> non prov. + fed to date
- Use Fed & Pro regulations
- What are the risk under regulations
  - Mold
  - Lighting (hydroponic system)
- Who is legally (responsible) owner vs. retail? Both?
- Why 4 a limit?
  - 4 seeds vs 4 full plants
  - Clarification needed or City vs. Federal fines
- Is a (does) secondary suite considered another residence 8 plants 4x2
  - Recommended suite must be legal -> how is it controlled?
- Growth restricted to house versus a green house or garage on property?
  - What about an attached garage?
- What is (practice) for indoor residence growing?
  - Regulations and safety considerations
- WEED ( slang) = growth capability
- Compared with beer/wine is point for pack numbers personal consumption? Why 4? 3/7/15
- Seed sellers -> do they sell 4 pack only? Seeds may fall under provincial licensed retailers
- If retail sold clones would be sure of success/gender (or more so)
- Why not garage or greenhouse?
  - Zoning = is the issue security (would like more info)
- Property vs. dwelling
  - Different for medicinal
  - Idea for having {permit} for on property; not in dwelling
- What is rights of individual vs. landlord or condo?
- Is there insurance risk?
- What about medical users?
- Condo values maybe impacted (TBC)
  - Condo board legal rules
  - Impact (TBC) permits?
  - Can the city do this?
  - Priority safety considerations
- Can landlords say no to plants like pets? What are rights?
- No criminal components for not following bylaws
- Green house stores
  - How to sell all supplies for optimum residential growing? "hydroponics" – support
  - Like wine/beer kits?
  - Growing not using supplies



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
2018 January

- Ramifications? If not following
  - Destroy plants
  - Fines/ warnings -> funds? Health care, educational research/enforcement?
  - Criminal?? I.e. house full of plants
- Fines to enforce
- Multi-family dwelling
  - Gov. is leaving it up to owners/ boards
  - Yes recreational / no medical
  - Lots of potential issues



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
2018 January

## Comment Form

### About the legalization of cannabis

#### 1. Do you have any additional feedback you would like to share about retail sales locations?

- Retail sales location for cannabis should be the same as alcohol locations
- Work with AGLC to understand their restrictions to avoid wasting city time with unqualified retailers
- Minimum distances equals based on best practices
- Ensure prohibited/discretionary land uses where appropriate – never automatic approvals – No permitted uses
- Communities should not be inundated with applications where retail doesn't belong
- Really want to emphasize the need for at least 300 m. Also – how important it is not to allow a saturation/monopoly of one type of business, especially if it relates to intoxication-oriented substance. Pedestrian, Main Street health requires a vibrant, diversity and no capacity to cluster.
- I like the liquor store model and feel confident this model will work for cannabis retail sales
- It's very prohibitive to Cannabis retail sales if there is a separation from alcohol retail locations. There won't be any good retail locations for dispensaries!!
- Separation of distance from liquor & school should be mandated
- Distances between liq-liq/Cannabis-Can/should be established
- Different to be made to liquor to cannabis; limits revised
- Any distances between Cannabis dispensary and retail stores would very negatively impact – Cannabis retail. Almost every plaza in Calgary has a liquor store. They must be allowed in the same plaza.
- Following existing model for alcohol. There should be no restrictions on location a retail sales facility next to or near a counselling centre.
- Mimic AGLC
- Don't put radius exemption on dispensary & liquor stores...there will be no locations left!
- Same as AGLC
- Offsets could be flexible, e.g. high-density areas should allow more stores
- Same as liquor stores
- Had a full discuss similar to liquor retail model. If too restrictive, the only companies with deep pockets will be able to serve locations
- To be monitored, quality and assurance protocols. Investigations randomly.

#### 2. Do you have any additional feedback you would like to share about retail sales regulations?

- Retail sales location for cannabis should be the same as alcohol locations
- Work with AGLC to understand their restrictions to avoid wasting city time with unqualified retailers
- Zero tolerance for consumption
- Context is key-dependending on community
- Do research on best practices regarding distances from liquor stores and retail



- Best practices guide for businesses – meet with community at pre-application stage
- I would like to see edible sales legalized in 2018 (July) at the same time as cannabis flowers & oils. Edible sales in Denver account for 50-60% of markets.
- Please peg advertising to the same level as alcohol. Not more restrictive than alcohol. Please allow delivery, to serve areas without stores, to prevent illicit market to thrive there.
- Merit based is the only way. Even playing field for everyone. Don't grandfather counselling centres, bong shops, etc.
- Hours of operation, could be similar to AGLC
- Daycares – under certain numbers do not need to have license to operate, will this be put as guideline? How can you keep distance from unregistered day homes??
- It should be merit based special training by staff and owns should be required. Criminal record chains for owners. Staff should be mandatory.
- The City need to find a fair way to allocate licenses. Existing dispensaries should be barred from getting a license.
- Other then I'd like to see various scales of LP providing product e.g. personal growers, MMPRE, MMAR
- Mimic AGLC – they do a great job!
- First come, first serve
- Branding is an option to set apart wrt quality, experience
- Keep it Alberta, Calgary and local. Lots of people from BC and Ontario coming and local should be priority
- Consistent, in alignment with social issues, demographics and data

### 3. Do you have any additional feedback you would like to share about production facility locations and regulations?

- Production facility locations & regulations should be the same as alcohol locations
- Don't know enough about production to comment on this
- As an edible company owner, I would like to bake my products in an AHS approved kitchen, regardless of location of kitchen
- Keep away from residential and retail commercial. Industrial general is fine.
- More information of contamination of products? Location in light industrial.
- They should be located under light industrial
- Treat same as breweries!
- Outside of Calgary
- Production facilities in industrial areas only, may have concerns of contamination from neighboring businesses
- Keep them all in one area – follow federal rules on security
- Don't know enough about production

### 4. Do you have any additional feedback you would like to share about consumption locations?

- Consumption locations for cannabis should be the same as (a) tobacco when smoking/vaping and (b) alcohol when edibles



- Use same as AGLC & Alberta Framework – allow tourists to consume
- There needs to be an outlet (e.g. cafes), not all bars
- No blanket change, communities should be consulted
- Certain areas are never appropriate (e.g. transit shelters)
- For some events, individual licenses would be appropriate (after land use is approved)
- Once again, regulation of location distance, capacity and ability of CAs to BIAs to really have some voice at the discretionary DP levels, but to keep in mind that the approval process is hard on CAs & BIAs, time consuming and after the outcomes are not in favour of the CA or BIA.
- Cannabis Cafes & cannabis bars should be legal asap
- Please allow businesses to allow onsite consumption, including outdoor vaping
- Please allow festivals to have a smoking/vaping zone and please do not force co-location with tobacco
- Vape/smoking lounges should be permitted. This could deter people from consuming in shared, open public spaces.
- Private property, no public consumption – festivals – similar to beer garden
- Bylaw-like fire pits for private outside
- Cannabis should be allowed to be consumed in same places where tobacco is allowed
- Consider that medical/recreational users are going to use anyway. They need somewhere to consume.
- Same as cigarettes
- Same as tobacco laws
- Cafés etc. needed for adults with children at home licensing these will prevent underground venues
- Same as liquor and cigarette, no public intoxication
- Not by schools, places of worship, addiction centres

## 5. Do you have any additional feedback you would like to share about residential growing?

- 4 plants per household discriminating against the number of adults in the household (shared production)
- I don't think I have anything to add that was not discussed. This was a very informative event and hopefully we can have more after the city comes up with new or revised bylaws next year.
- Impacts on neighbouring dwelling units/parcels should be clarified
- Health Canada guidelines are fine (4 plants)
- None should be allowed; damage of properties; no regulations/lack of standards for personal consumption. Be similar to making 'moon shine'
- Absolutely, no residential growing should be allowed
- 4 plants as per federal government
- Should let greenhouse grow
- Business licensing first week April (land use bylaw) February, April 5 for bylaws in place
- Single family homes should be allowed to grow in auxiliary buildings or greenhouses. The City could apply a permit system.
- Impact on housing markets



## The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
2018 January

### 6. Other comments:

- Cannabis at work
- Thanks for the opportunity



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
 Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
 2018 January

## About the session

### 1. How satisfied are you with today's session?

	Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Not Applicable
• Clarity of information provided	14	5	0	0	0
• Format of today's session	16	2	1	0	0
• Opportunity to provide my input	18	1	0	0	0
• Opportunity to hear others' input	18	0	1	0	0
• Session location	19	0	0	0	0
• Session time	19	0	0	0	0

### 2. What worked for you about the workshop format and activities today? Is there anything we could do differently to make it better?

- There should be a hard copy of the review materials and the questions particular to each session group (the ward & pdf. documents)
- Better info prior to session
- Not that I can think of, Great job
- Satisfied
- All good
- Group discussions were well encouraged; some participants were however closed-minded to others opinions in an unprofessional manner
- It was very well put together. Great job! Thanks for the snacks.
- It was a good session. Thanks!
- The opportunity to engage with the different focus groups and meet new people
- Perfect
- Everything was good
- I liked having robust conversations with good facilitators. It was great to have city planners walking around available to answer questions and give input.
- No



# The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back  
Workshop #1 – 2017 November 22, 2 to 4:30 p.m.  
2018 January

### 3. Which stakeholder organization do you represent?

- Business – x15
- Community associations – x1
- Business improvement areas – x1
- Other – x4