



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 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 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 6 to 8:30 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 Calgaryians 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 #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 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 allowing free market to balance out the competition and consider community standards before any stores are opened. Participants also indicated that separation distances between retail stores and places where youth congregate is important to the process of deciding locations.

Retail Sales Regulations

Many participants felt that regulations for retail sales should follow the existing AGLC regulations and guidelines for liquor stores. Participants were mixed on how applications should be accepted: lottery, merit-based, or first come first served, but did indicate that background checks should be a part of the process. Participants felt that advertising and branding are a large contributing part to the success of any business and would like to see regulations similar to AGLC guidelines.

Production Facility Locations and Regulations

Participants shared that industrial areas or outside the city limits would be the best locations for production facilities and indicated that separation distances between locations is not necessary. Participants felt there should be minimal barriers to enter into the industry in order to provide opportunities to all levels of businesses from large-scale to small, local operations.

Consumption Locations

Participants' feedback was mixed whether current tobacco bylaws or current liquor bylaws provide a better approach to implementing cannabis bylaws. Participants expressed nuisance concerns, particularly around odour; however, they felt that consumption locations should remain on private property.

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. Participants requested more clarification about the differences between types of seeds and plants and how the new bylaw will affect existing licenses for medical cannabis growth.



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 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. 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 #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 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 retail store locations should stay away from areas where youth congregate.

Separation Distances

- Many participants shared that there is already an existing AGLC model that works and should be followed for retail stores.
- 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.
- Some participants felt that there should not be too many restrictions on separation distances between retail locations because the free market would provide some control with oversaturation of retail stores.

Retail Sales Regulations

Applications

- Many participants felt that regulations for retail sales should follow the existing AGLC regulations and guidelines for liquor stores.
- Participants were mixed on how applications should be accepted: lottery, merit-based, or first come first served, but did indicate that background checks should be a part of the process.
- Participants suggested that it is important 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.
- Participants indicated that background checks should be implemented for all applicants.

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.



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

Production Facility Locations and Regulations

Regulations

- Some participants indicated that production facility regulations should follow the same land use bylaws as medicinal cannabis production.
- Many participants indicated craft producers 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 or outside the city limits in order to accommodate the size of facility required.

Separation Distances

- Feedback indicated there is no need for separation distances between production facilities; however, they should be located away from residential areas.

Limit in Certain Areas

- Participants expressed that there did not need to be a limit on the number of production facilities in an area in order to reduce the barriers for businesses of all sizes to enter into the industry.
- Overall, participants were supportive of production facilities being located in industrial areas.

Consumption Locations

Public Spaces

- Participants' feedback was mixed regarding whether current tobacco bylaws or current liquor bylaws provide a better approach to implementing cannabis bylaws. Participants felt that cannabis bylaws should be stricter than tobacco bylaws.
- 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.

Private Property

- Participants shared that they felt consumption locations should remain on private property.
- Participants raised nuisance concerns, particularly around odor, and expressed concerns about youth access. Some feedback indicated that education around the topic of cannabis consumption is very important to address health concerns and to limit youths' access to cannabis.

Special Events

- 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

- Some participants expressed concerns about the enforcement of cannabis bylaws and indicated that allowing public consumption indoors and on restaurant patios may result in challenges to the existing tobacco bylaws.



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

Residential Growing

Accessory Buildings

- Many participants were supportive of growing cannabis in accessory buildings; however expressed concern about how the same regulations could apply to single family dwellings verses multi-family dwellings.

Rental Units

- Participants shared concerns about the increased potential for property damage to rental units which would become the responsibility of landlords and property owners to resolve.
- Participants felt that the decision whether to allow cannabis growth or not should be up to the landlord or property owner and that the City should provide support for the landlords/property owners to do so.

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

- 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 #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 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

- Keeping it away from kids
 - Schools, parks, 7-11??, daycares, malls, wherever kids congregate
- Same regulations as AGLC
- It can be near a convenience store
- Stricter than the AGLC
- Same plan as a liquor store – if we don't apply AGLC where will we have these shops (in places that we do not go to)
- It is going to be hard to put a 150m distance between liquor & cannabis store
- Cannabis and liquor stores need to be the same, in the same spot
- We should have separation distances (AGLC)
- No separation/ you have increase in sores/saturation
- From the health perspective we should not have them together
- Why aren't we talking about tobacco??
- Calgary allows production and consumption of alcohol
- Do not allow production and consumption at the same site (safely, health issues)
- Go back to the separation distance AGLC
- Keep it away from retail, tobacco, production, and alcohol
- No schools, high schools, daycares
 - If you limit not to daycare, the suburbs are out
 - Not in the line of sight (not apparent)
- Follow the AGLC rules
- Available throughout the city
- Separation distance between cannabis, not liquor stores (cannabis to liquor)
- Prime locations might go first, it's not fair to small business
- Not necessary to have separation distance, market will work itself out
- Away from a halfway house
- No separation distance between production & retail stores
- Rely on a setback distance, finding a location will be tough (landlords) Let market decide
- Restricting it too much will make people go to a black market
- Keep it out of the mall
- Content: a lot of landlords, will have an issue with this, hemp shops are having a hard time with finding locations
- 'Whole Stores' should follow same regulation as stores
- Their needs to be a fair process for all applicants, then should be some kind of a merit system to evaluate/grade applications and apply that to areas and assign space locations that way



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
 Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
 2018 January

- AGLC process followed/similar
 - Fi add pharmacy could be impact with liquor store already near
- Greater distance from pharmacy than in Victoria/Vancouver
- Increase separation from 300m to 500m (DSA)
 - Or is there value to congregated locations (e.g. care dealer areas)
 - Increase competition for consumers
- May limit options for cannabis stores if increase distance – side by side may be ok → different product
 - Could be beneficial for public perception
- Less store option could increase delivery model
- Liquor store less of a concern
 - Maybe pawn shops and money mart
 - Yes, near schools and daycare
- Start increase distance with discretion to bring down
- Production follow retail distance (for comp) – may affect small retailers
 - However, could be allowed with flagship store (idea)
 - Depends on scale of producer
- Medical already has distance regulations
 - Yes, especially in residential areas
- Use framework for AGLC (idea)
 - Note current restriction for area
- All stores may be distribution/logistic - already set up wholesale
 - Set distance from each other and schools already set up
- Distance from cannabis to liquor store doesn't seem needed – unless cannabis sold at liquor store
- Question: What about at locations such as cannabis lounges
- Question: May be unintended consequences comment on locations
- Craft brewery rules – cannabis could have more security challenges (risk)
 - Moving out of industrial to more popular areas → is this losing land use and regulations?
Same for cannabis?
- How does an 'area' get defined?
- Land use could be discretionary based on requirements met
- Congregate in lower economical areas (e.g. Colorado & Washington)
 - Chicken vs. egg issue and public health
 - How can this be addressed?
 - Limit in an area – ideas → what is best? Unknown
 - How does store get approved (lottery system)
- Balance of healthy competition with risk for vulnerable populations
 - IDFA licensing system
- Normalizing smoking behaviour is a risk – consider
 - E.g. locations away from schools
- Health risk known when used with tobacco
 - Tobacco not zoned
 - If 300m used then would reduce all areas near convenient stores



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

Retail Sales Regulations

- First in First out → as long as criteria met
 - Needs qualifying component
- Criterial of qualified conditions
 - Criterial mirror liquor store
 - No criminal record → follow procedures
 - Qualify provincial 1st , then City
- AGLC may do this
- What is the qualifying criteria?
- What are regulations for locations?
- Why not co-locate like-minded industries?
- Refer to Edmonton
- Yes, on delivery as a business model
 - It takes away of source of revenue of their margins
- good for potential impaired drivers
- Desired serve me
- Good for economy
- Remove black market
- Done on alcohol
- Signage – don't restrict
- Some don't think billboards are appropriate (kids see)
- Store front – definably allow
 - Must be able to 'brand' like other businesses
- Should be able to promote via social media
 - Crucial for business survival
- Hours – mirror liquor stores
- Signage – concerns of children being able to see advertisements
- Feel should be comparable to alcohol
- Critical for business survival/operation
- Cannabis will be 'stand-alone' product = must like alcohol
- Cannabis dangers not as bad as tobacco so should be treated same
- Are under age children allowed to enter dispensary?
- Does each individual store get to make the decisions?
- Impaired and able to purchase?
- Advertising in window – could have some warning labels?
- Mandatory 'warning' labels on each strain/product
- Effect on brain for development → packaging
- Should mirror alcohol signage
- 3rd party advertisement
 - Have right to make it
 - Have right to advertise
- If legal should be able to freely advertise
- Margin on delivery – revenue mark up, margin unknown, mirror alcohol (which allowed), flush out black market, reduce impaired driving



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
 Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
 2018 January

- Delivery: safe way to get product to consumer
- Advertising and education both very important
- Are there limits on potency level?
- Operating hours: mirror liquor stores – off sales
- Location study – a criteria for licensing
- No lottery (not fair)
 - Do based on criteria and application date
- Confirm requirements and notify potential retailers of them
- May want to do a ‘heat map’ for ideal locations
- First come first serve
- Prioritize people in the industry
- Liquor stores – background check
- No lottery, first come first serve
- Calgary has liquor store set back req.
- Another model is lottery
- Should not be lottery
- Cannabis should fall under same as liquor
- There will be big desire to enter industry
- Landlords may be hurdle, don’t desire business on property. City should reduce hurdles
- Background check should be req.
- Current system of criminal check is working – apply to cannabis
- Will there be application fees, will they be refund
- What impact do well-funded chains have?
- Will small suppliers have a chance?
- Should there be separation between product/supply. Prevent vertical integration?
- Need policy to prevent monopoly, encourage small producers
- Let both big retail (Shoppers) in but also encourage small
- Need to give business freedom for hours
- Provincial control of online sales
 - Ensures minors don’t get product
- Issues with providing to minor. Should all be ID’d. Concerns with mail delivery, certifying delivery. Mobile sale (pot truck)
- Still regulated by government still licensed
- How do they ensure product is safe?
- Advertising
 - Feds allowing no advertising, may be relaxed
 - Store front should be different entity
 - Should be same as liquor store
 - Store fronts
 - Liquor stores can’t have bill board
 - Same as liquor stores
 - Needs to be identifiable
 - How will edibles be regulated. Huge variety of product available.
- Fines – need education about how to comply with regulations from 3 levels



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
 Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
 2018 January

- Need course similar to pro-serve
- 10am-2am
- No preference to existing org.
- Based on merit/business plan/organization
- Set back distances under consideration
- Maybe lottery is appropriate to prevent first into neighbourhood
- Prefer liquor – liquor, cannabis – cannabis separation. Different types of stores
- Could do an initial lottery to start (1 week)
- Good business plan, money to stay in business
- Why would you have to do business plan for pot store when you don't for any others
- Make record checks in line with alcohol. Keep it simple
- Remove morality, look at logistics
- Yes, retail delivery should be allowed
- No issues with mail delivery. Need ID check
- Selling a product, you want people to buy it
- Same signage rules as any commercial use
- Liquor store signage – regulated by province
 - More permissive than cigarettes
- Don't regulate beyond province
- Don't target a specific industry for being immoral
- Legalization will evolve
- What are ramifications for liquor
- Bars can be shut down, revoke license, fines & warns come first
- Should not be different than liquor
- Important to education, follow reg. for selling to minors
- Edibles should come quick, avoid smoking nuisance
- Same as liquor 10am-2am
- Combination
 - Background checks important
 - Ensure no over saturation of store
 - If there is high density, run into social issues
- Don't think delivery is a smart idea
- Store front signs should be basic. Name of store. No symbols, not flashy
- Keep windows opaque (can't see through)
 - Also, dangerous – robberies
- Security standards should be in place (barrier, similar to liquor store)
- Don't need extra signage ban them all same as cigarettes
- What about marketing magazines
- Execution for selling to minor
- Not liquor store hours – 12 – 7pm max.
- Too late, encourages robberies
- Ease of purchase means this won't be an issue



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

Production Facility Locations and Regulations

- Security in clustering
- Level of acceptance in community if clustered
- Free market
- Private business friendly
- Ease of applications
- Public health
- Economic impact on other sectors of the economy/province → Alberta's stigma
- Edibles should be part of the discussion
- Incentives for inviting industry head offices to operate out of Calgary
- Consistent production is important – consumer choice
- Barrier to entry into market
- Will there be limits on number of prod.
- Local growers may be a better solution for higher quality – no pesticides/chemicals
- Different regulations on level of production?
- Equal playing field
- Accessibility to small/local businesses
 - In order to remove black market
 - Increase regulations will prohibit small business
- Similar to ACMPR (medicinal) Therefore depending on level of production (micro grower vs. mass growers)
- Out of residential areas, located in industrial areas – ordinary in appearance
- No preference for that. Benefits to being close together for security, community, etc.
- No limits
- 400m or follow current liquor guidelines
- Micro growers – limit barriers to the industry – concern about monopoly on a few L.P.s
- Not necessary to have separation distance between production and retail; liquor → two separate entities
- Separation
 - Cluster facilities, security could be better if all together
 - Current licensed facilities have very high security
 - Level of acceptance for growers if all in same area
 - 2 DP application for facilities in YYC
 - Many more inquiries
 - Small towns e.g. Ontario
 - Huge revenues
- Limits
 - Taxation → still unclear, any other retail
 - Private business friendly
 - Let the market dictate the limit
 - Away from schools & certain public venues
 - Nowhere near suburbs, neighbourhoods, airports
 - Easy access but not in city
 - Current growing facilities do exist in cities, very normal looking buildings



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
 Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
 2018 January

- Industrial/commercial zones
- Public safety → what if there is a fire?
- Facilities will be inspected, or should be to a high standard
- What about allergies to products, impact by proxy if an accident occurred
- Impacts people in different ways
- Do we want Calgary's economy to be known for cannabis growth and production?
 - E.g. current image of oil, stigma around oil vs. cannabis
- Industry should have a quota
- Licensing process currently 2 years, very hard to get license
 - Very difficult to obtain license to grow
 - Audits are constantly occurring
- How should it be regulated?
 - Industrial zone, away from schools, retail – minimize smell
 - Part of ACMPR regulations -- no odour emissions
 - Emission control
 - Use same regulations as ACMPR
 - Issues (potential) with micro growers and these regulations preferred areas
 - Inside cities, don't push out
 - Rural areas
 - Dealers and production facilities under same regulations
 - Acquiring it vs. production
 - Current regulations → cannot process at retail
 - 400m from residential, school, daycare
 - Why 400m → 100m not enough
 - Ventilation
 - Social perception of distance – e.g. cannabis vs. deep fryer at McDonald's
 - Need lots of space → is this possible in the city?
 - What about micro-growers? Could need less space
 - Must be approved by municipality
 - Meet municipal rules
 - Need space → cost
 - Probably won't be in city
 - Should get farmers to capitalize on potential CBD production
 - Are all cannabis production facilities going to be regulated?
 - Depends on health vs. agriculture
 - Medical: already regulated
 - Should regulate these same way
 - Have to have control → controlled substance
 - AB model will follow Colorado (couple of years)
 - First couple months, will run out
 - Same regulation between suppliers
 - Of current licenses, only same are allowed to grow/sell
- Distance between production & retail
 - Security, not pedestrian friendly
 - No visits
 - Runs counter to retail



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
 Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
 2018 January

- Colorado: must produce 40% of product
- No rational reason for any distances between any production facilities, should be left to free market
- Should follow alcohol guidelines (retail)
- Smallest: 5-10,000 ft² – where is this in city? Not many locations
- Craft micro operators** → could operate in smaller facilities
- Edibles: could operate in smaller facility
 - May not necessarily be growing in large amounts
- Question of edibles should also be discussed now
- Dealers license
- Food packaging → concerned with edibles down the road
- Testing labs
- Incentives head offices in Calgary
 - Tax break
 - Class A office space
- Will there be a limit of the number of production facilities?
- Where should facilities be?
 - Industrial areas
 - For the size you need, won't be residential
 - Regulations should be different for micro growers regarding large scale growers
- Separation distance
 - Not from each other
 - No one should know you are growing
- Shouldn't be recalls with stringent testing
- Balance of regulation and quality and access for everybody
- Quality product at a good price
- Potential of people selling cannabis at lower cost still if dispensaries are selling
- Low end or high-end product → needs to be consistent\
- What about research facilities?
- Micro growing → micro research facilities
 - How stringent will it be? Will take a couple of years
- Regulations could follow that of the AGLC
- Large warehouse won't be in residential areas
- 10 vs 10,000 plants, moot point
 - Security requirements and others is so stringent
- Likely not going to advertise growth
- Micro growers*
- Are 3-4 massive companies going to come in and take over?
- Smaller LPs will have to band together to survive
- Be careful not to over-regulate, it won't be accessible
 - Will create black market
- Price of convenience will eliminate black market
- Biggest concern: barrier to entry into the market
- Local growers



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

Consumption Locations

- Consumption sites
 - Can't smoke in cigar store
 - Okay if properly ventilated
 - Shared space provides knowledge base
 - Would create pressure to smoke indoors in pubs. Opens debate
- Cannabis treated like liquor
- Yes, vaping lounges, clear separation from smoking. Age limit.
- No – allowed in home only
- Pot trucks – mobile retail
- No
- Quality control
 - Need to have standard verifying
 - Need health standards for small scale production/sales
 - Reduction of regulations for cannabis is slippery slope
 - This separate issue from tobacco
- Modeling/normalizing smoking behaviour
 - Look at places where children frequent
 - Look at public events
 - Visuals seeing people smoking normalizes this activity to sensitive groups
- Should look at prohibiting same way as liquor
- Should limit at public events and parks
- Water pipe hookah facilities → how to address this
 - Children currently allowed in these facilities
 - This should be limited
 - Already cannabis being smoked here
 - Concern of this facility turning to a cannabis 'lounge' upon legalization
- No restaurant patios
- Public Events
 - How to regulate private events
 - Consideration for 'beer gardens' → but how to control smoke?
 - How to tell what people are smoking
 - How to enforce tobacco vs. cannabis
 - Should control it all at once
 - Shouldn't be allowed on City of Calgary public property
 - How to control events like 420?
 - How to provide resources to regulate?
 - E.g. for Node hill park
 - Support vaping → harm reduction
- Social housing → what is City of Calgary going to do to reduce impact in multi-unit housing
 - At risk population and children
 - Can City of Calgary step in or will regulations be decided by building owners?
- Where can we smoke?
 - Your property
 - Balconies



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
 Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
 2018 January

- Backyard → careful of creating social norms
- Self-responsibility → public exposure is concern
- Must include public education and policies
- Can't be regulated like liquor – It's a unique product
- Might start as a novelty – expect a die down in public consumption
- Flexible regulation?
 - Yes, should monitor usage and adjust regulations
- Should add public events and parks to 'no smoke' areas (e.g. Stampede/Children's fest)
- Candy products will require heavy control
- Cannabis lounges
 - No cannabis smoking
 - Cannot smoke indoor
 - Doesn't clarify type of smoke
 - Might limit public consumption
 - Possibly vaping lounges
 - Limited public exposure
 - Might limit public consumption
 - Good option because where else would it get smoked
 - Edible café's – could cause exposure issues
 - Need to consider workers
 - Could consider separate building to limit safety
- What stops usage of tobacco in their facilities?
 - Goes back to allowing smoking inside
 - Should not allow combustibles
 - Vaping only
 - It's the workers choice to work in these locations – they know implications
- Keep away from schools, liquor stores, tobacco
- Issue of cannabis retailers gathering in disadvantaged areas (lower economic neighbourhood)
 - Equity issue → don't want divide to increase
- Parks/public events omitted
 - Move smoking bylaw that way too
 - Must also be enforced → not well enforced at this time
 - Allow only smoking/consumption in the home
 - Possible exceptions for medical
 - Patios are a 'common area' in condo's
 - No smoking here
 - Need to present a consistent message to kids → learned activity from view smoking
- No consumption of City of Calgary public property
 - Think if there will be children here
 - Get off the condominium property to smoke
 - Issue of smell in condominiums
 - Don't know where the odor is coming from, possible impacts
 - Vaping in condos a safer option
 - Smoking in back yard creates issue due to smoke
 - Can't emit smell from your property to another → there is a bylaw to prevent this



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
 Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
 2018 January

- Don't have resources to properly control it
 - Community standards by law have reduced tobacco smoke
- Kids might see it as a social norm
 - Possible long-term impacts to children development
 - Mental development
- Air purification systems for condos
- California cannabis smoked at home
 - Reduce public smell/impact
- Further pushing smoking by law to parks/public events → promotion of public health
 - Publicity will need to largely act to public education
- Condominium bylaws to override the cannabis bylaws → need to know who's consuming in the building
 - How do we define 'private space' in this situation?
- What is defined as a home?
- Smell/public smoking is the major concern
- More education in schools – cannabis is not the norm
 - Elementary/Jr. High
- Exemption for shisha
 - Doesn't always contain tobacco (loopholes)
 - Risk of these bars converting to cannabis bar
- Regulate all smoke the same way
- No more restriction on consumption location
- Difference between smoking/vaping – no smell issue
 - If it doesn't impact others, no restrictions should be placed
- Good to keep similar to smoking bylaws
- Important to include education as a part of this
- Aromatics could create more complaints in public spaces
- 50-100 yards from playgrounds
 - Try to not create a stigma
- Careful of modelling behaviour
 - Don't good job with tobacco → fine having cannabis be the same
- Liquor is intoxicant → same with cannabis
 - Why aren't we regulating the same way?
- Need to also consider liquor laws in conjunction with cannabis regulations – don't want intoxicated people walking around
- It is different than both tobacco/alcohol must be considered uniquely
- Veterans (Medicinal) – limited access to flowers
 - Restricted in where they can get their medicine
- Different consumption methods have different results → hard to limit vaping vs. smoking in certain locations → impacts medicinal impacts
- Festivals
 - Depends on form of consumption
 - Oil usage – not harming others, should be limited
 - Controlled entry at festival
 - Cannabis tent – proper location consideration



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
 Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
 2018 January

- Create safe space to consume rather than keeping secret
- Yes, not same as tobacco
- Do same as typical smoking regulations
- Restaurant patio – concern – needs to be further discussed – public space
- Condo – balcony smoking is a nuisance
- Backyard is fine
- No regulations
- Doesn't depend on store type
- Same rules as liquor stores
- Issue is not to have fear mentality for kids
 - Should focus on education of children
- Legislation on morality not viable
- As long as we're ID'ing properly, no risk to children
- No conflict for lounge/retail store distances
 - No foreseeable harm
- Restaurant patios – open tobacco smoking debate
- Open air fest? – can't really control
 - Samples of cannabis products to be distributed?
 - BC can give alcohol samples

Residential Growing

- Promote growing in external spaces
 - Keeps away from children
 - Better way of monitoring use/quality of cannabis
 - Moisture problems can be contained
 - More opportunity for upkeep (sprinklers/lighting)
- Condo's/Apartments
 - They should have the same rights as everyone
 - Complicating things by restricting condo's/apartments from growing cannabis
 - They shouldn't have to ask if you will plan on growing or not (e.g. security checks?)
 - Recreation vs. medicinal – banning use from apartments
 - Regulating plants should be reasonable
 - CBD plants vs. THC plants (4 of each?) – unlimited?
- Ramifications
 - Should depend on the number adults/household
 - Fines like speeding (how many plants you're over, you will get penalized \$ more)
 - Trafficking – double the fine for how many plants they have -- criminal offense? Yes
 - Difficult to enforce
 - Need education first – public workshops on safety
 - Lean on readily available resources for education
 - Warnings and then a small fine if you exceed 4 plants/household
 - You should base plant restrictions based on person NOT household (4 plants/person)
 - Med. Users in the same household as reg. users will have to share if they grow over 4 plants



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
 Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
 2018 January

- Try not restricting people with med. Vs. rec. users
- Medicinal users may not grow much because their needs are different than rec. users
 - Quality over quantity
- Growing is a process – not just a small project – time consuming and dedication
- Growing depends on whether you learn the sex of the plant – trial and error in growing needs to be considered – more than 4 plants may be grown in the trial process
- No further restrictions should be in place in regards to growing
- Using resources (online education via government) for education on growing plants – as a viable option
- Where to buy?
 - Licensed producer
 - Retail sales (private)
 - Online (government) – LPs
- Are they seeds?
 - Best price for the best product
- If you grow recreationally, you should be able to connect with those who grow medicinally
- Growing plants in enclosed external space in households:
 - Humidity/moisture
 - For young children – good to keep separate from house
 - Better ventilation
 - Protect growing equipment, low traffic area
 - If you're allowed to have wine kits, you should be able to grow cannabis
 - EDUCATION is needed on growing practices
 - Safety
 - Proper resources
 - Strong deterrence for cannabis in apartments/condo's ONLY in residential (multi-family)
 - Getting permission from condo board or landlord
 - Using self-contained tents
 - Regulate by putting on a private sector
 - Having an education provided for setting up a growing system in your own house
 - Approved method for growing needs to be defined clearly
 - Single-family dwellings vs. multi-family dwellings – should one be allowed over another?
 - How much do regulated enclosures cost? About \$1000?
 - Third-party facilities for growing cannabis should be allowed
- LED lights has helped w/moisture issues in growing
- Should they be allowed to grow cannabis in external facilities – yes?
 - Concern with how to regulate 4 plants/household
 - Smells, ventilation, exhaust smell
 - Security
 - Separate from pets/children
- Height? Not on the table – SME?
 - Federal government removed height regulations
- Landowners to make their own regulations regarding cannabis consumption – as part of condo/apartment lease – tenant bylaw
- Restrictions on enclosed growing spaces

The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

- Moisture
- Safety/security
- Proper ventilation/filters
- Distance should be considered (sheds too close to other homes)
- Smells from consumption
- Sensitivity to smells – be considerate of others who live nearby
- Concerns about odor (second hand) consumption
- The people growing will be the 'green thumb' not just anyone
 - 4 plants/household will not be that big an issue
- Insert new regulations for external growing spaces
- Landowners could manage through inspections/lease agreements
- Ramifications – for not abiding by 4 plants/house
 - Fines
 - Warning...then a fine...then removal
 - Using proceeds from fine for public health use
- Separate legislation for growing and consumption
- Need clarification on what qualifies a 'plant' → seed? Flowering?



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 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?

- Clarification on rules regarding AGLC. Will distance between liquor stores be the same for cannabis retailers and liquor stores? (can they be next to each other or not)
- Keep it the same as liquor store regulations. Allow cannabis stores to be in the same area as liquor stores, do not allow franchises to dominate
- What type of studies have been conducted with markets that have legalized?
- Allow for Vancouver to lead
- Same as alcohol
- No restrictions as to how close are retail location can be from another
- Should permit craft edibles
- Should be allowed to be closer together
- Should cluster with other adult businesses
- Agree with not congregating in disadvantages neighbourhoods
- Other than this congregating let the market dictate how many stores

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

- Allow private retailers to deliver and sell on-line
- Use liquor store regulations
- KYC Practices – how do the requirements to authenticate retail sales differ to medicinal?
- Method of sales should allow all transactions
- Licenses should be merit based
- Package need warnings and THC/CB levels like alcohol and cigarettes
- Let retail sales/reg. same as alcohol

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

- Reduce barrier to entry
- Allow production facilities to be in industrial areas or micro grows to use microbrewery regulations
- How do you regulate quality for the smell production facility? What have we learned from other markets or the micro brewery industry?
- Industrial parks
- No restrictions on number of producers or distance to another producer or retail location
- Yes, micro producers should not have to abide by the stringent LP mass producers. Laws – or black market will continue

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

- Allow consumption sites (when allowed) where bars are allowed



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

- Bill C26 – have we considered a case study from markets that offer on-site consumption services. Think of (word unknown – flagged) shop. Why should that be treated any differently?
- Smoking should not isolate the medical patients, isolated to smoking/vaping
- Distinguish between smoking/vaping and consumption of capsules or oil
- Keep away from High Schools – at least 30 min. walking distance
- Follow tobacco. Pub health have done a wonderful job curtailing kids and smoking and disseminating information and education about tobacco

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

- Landlords need protection on this matter. Municipalities and province should work together to protect landlords.
- Do not impose further restrictions than Fed/Prov. Regulations
- Allow residential growing in outbuildings & outside
- Almost complete deregulation as will not be able to control anyways
- Only fine if distribution/sales

6. Other comments:

- I would have loved to hear from AGLC staff at this workshop because there are so many connections between cannabis legalization and the AGLC (liquor regulations)



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
 Workshop #2 – 2017 November 22, 6 to 8:30 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	6	1	2	0	0
• Format of today's session	8	0	1	0	0
• Opportunity to provide my input	9	0	0	0	0
• Opportunity to hear others' input	8	1	0	0	0
• Session location	8	1	0	0	0
• Session time	8	0	1	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?

- Ban marijuana in Alberta completely
- Participating in more than 3 tables
- The exercise and format was great. Exposure to the different topics in order to provide bylaw that satisfies all.
- More topic specific discussions. Make discussion topics more specific.
- Really good format
- Worked great!
- You did great! Would've loved to visit every table. Wish I could come back again to sit at the tables I missed.

3. Which stakeholder organization do you represent?

- Business – x2
- Rental/housing associations – x1
- Other – x4