



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 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 23 from 6 to 8:30 p.m. Approximately 50 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?



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

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 #3 – 2017 November 23, 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 potentially relaxing some regulations in areas that have higher density, and there does not need to be a limit on the number of retail stores in a particular area because the market will help control.

Retail Sales Regulations

Many participants felt that a merit-based system or combined merit-based and first come first serve system would be appropriate for accepting business applications and that previous business experience is important. Other license types for retail delivery, online sales and combined production and sales should be considered.

Production Facility Locations and Regulations

Participants were supportive of applying the regulations that currently exist for medical cannabis production facilities to recreational cannabis production facilities and felt that special consideration should be given to craft producers versus large scale producers.

Consumption Locations

Not allowing consumption in areas where youth are located, such as schools and parks, allowing for cannabis lounges and providing designated areas for consumption at special events were ideas that many of the participants were in favour of.

Residential Growing

Participants shared that they were supportive of residential growing in accessory buildings, but there were concerns about access by youth and overall security. There were also concerns about potential property damage if residential growing was permitted in rental units.

- ▶ 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](#)



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

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 #3 – 2017 November 23, 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 convenience, accessibility and walkability were important elements to consider for retail store locations.
- Some participants shared feedback on the potential stigma related to retail stores and that residents/landlords may not want stores in their neighbourhoods because of this perception.

Separation Distances

- Many participants shared that there is already an existing AGLC model that works and should be followed for cannabis retail stores.
- There was mixed feedback on whether additional sensitive uses should have separation distances.
 - Many were supportive of separation distances of retail stores from schools, but feedback was mixed on whether separation distances were needed for daycares, parks, etc.
- 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.
- Participants also shared that the number of retail stores in certain areas could depend on the density or land use in that area and that separation distances between stores could be less restrictive for those areas.

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 there needs to be some ability to control.

Retail Sales Regulations

Applications

- Many participants felt that applications should be accepted on a merit-based system or a combination of a merit-based with first come first serve system.
- A few participants shared that the process needs to be fair and should not be overregulated.

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, secured funding and a formal business plan.

Types of Licenses

- There was support for additional license types, including online sales, retail delivery, and combined production and sales.



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

Signage

- Some participants expressed concern that restrictions on signage would limit the ability to develop a brand or identity for businesses and impact promotion.

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 shared concerns that it would be difficult for a craft producer to get into the business and that the regulations should depend on the scale of operations of the production facility.
- 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.
- There were some concerns about what distribution from production facilities to retail stores would look like and how that might impact the quality of the product.

Separation Distances

- Most of the feedback indicated that separation distances for production facilities should be the same as existing AGLC guidelines.

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 and zoning should be used to indicate where facilities can be located and what the requirements are.

Consumption Locations

Public Spaces

- 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.
- Much of the feedback indicated that public consumption regulations should follow existing regulations, but feedback was mixed on whether they should follow tobacco bylaws, liquor bylaws or be a hybrid of the two.

Cannabis Lounges

- There was a lot of support for allowing cannabis lounges in 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.



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

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.

Residential Growing

Accessory Buildings

- Many participants were supportive of growing cannabis in accessory buildings as they felt that it would be easier to control and the plants would not be located in the primary residence itself.
- There were concerns about security and access by youth to cannabis plants growing in accessory 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.

Other Growing Opportunities

- Some participants indicated that there would be interest in providing other growing options, such as rental spaces or allowing others to grow for you.



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 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

- Don't want clustering
- Need to still be able to find location
- If other retailers okay with more competition
- Could have it be flexible depending on situation
- Don't want to see by schools/childcare/daycare/playground
 - Parks okay – green space okay
- YMCA okay to be by
- Want to limit exposure to minors
- No limit between liquor stores and cannabis stores
- Plan for convenience – 'one stop shop'
- No limitations between liquor stores and cannabis
 - Would restrict areas where we can put cannabis stores
 - Liquor stores also in prime locations
- Maybe some distance – consider alcoholics – creates risk
 - Could also just choose to go to a different store
- Discretionary
- Number of stores should be based on density/land use
- More foot traffic = more stores
 - E.g. Steven Ave
- Want to avoid having lineup out the door
- Healthy competition good – control prices
- Shouldn't limit number – better to have more rental options
 - Market will decide
 - Make accessible to limit the black market
 - Dangerous to have too many restrictions
- Westbrook situations? Can we develop here
- Odour concern for mixed use areas
- As long as fire rated wall on 3 sides, should allow anywhere (no restriction to different buildings)
- Should have distances between sensitive use
 - Daycare perhaps not an issue
 - Elementary/high school as these are impressionable
- Depends on location (busy street, etc.)
- Should be similar to tobacco laws
- Will already be restriction for owners
 - If compliant its fine



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

- If besides school would need to enforce more
- Look at why we have separation distances
- Careful of mixing alcohol/cannabis – compounded effect
- Already have beer/alcohol sales in public locations – not an issue
- Residents may not want in their area
- We're all adults – all responsible
 - Self-responsible
- No history of harm
 - Education (positive) will help the most
- Rigorous license = will be careful for who they're selling to – not an issue selling to minors in sensitive areas
- No one is consuming on/beside property
 - Just retail
- Who's going to want to lease to this many cannabis stores
- There is still fear/stigma – want to create more positivity by putting in prime locations – reduce crime
 - Should think about same way as alcohol
 - Attractive store fronts
- Putting in 'back alley' industrial areas will create risk – keep fear
- This will help with issue of people not wanting in their neighbourhood
- Use alcohol/liquor as frame work
- Maybe don't know where issues are going to arise
 - Watch and be flexible
- 300m limitation bad for business
- Putting together = ex-addict risk
- Separate standalone stores (no mix liquor/cannabis)
- This retail business – shouldn't limit, just like any other business
- Depends on neighbourhood for number of stores in an area
 - Retailers will coordinate – free market
 - Stores won't open all next to each other
- Depends on density/foot traffic
- Encourage of diversity
- BRZs to take active role/engagement to determine number of stores
- Careful of labeling neighbourhood as the 'pot stop'
- More alcohol stores than anything here
- Need to create accessibility
- Education on usages/effects
- Use to decrease hard drug use
- Create 'clean' stores
 - Shouldn't classify as a negative
 - Takes away from black market
- Creates jobs – pays well/creates good environment
- Can't loop in with tobacco/alcohol – it's a different use
- Distance restriction limits # of stores
 - No greater than AGLC



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

- Depends on community
 - E.g. Kensington – small area, but lots of foot traffic
- Changes every year – should be variability
 - Get some liquor stores closer
- Honour system
- Vancouver has denied on number of meters
- Think business will limit anyway
 - Will control number of stores in areas
- Limitations based on area
 - Free market will control this
- No more than AGLC
- Accessibility – don't limit to certain areas
- Stigma, if alcohol there, cannabis can be
- Should limit distances to school
- Consideration for security
 - Legalizing will reduce issue
 - Need to have in proximity to police response stations
 - Maybe non-issues
 - So freely available
 - Maybe just similar to liquor store security
 - Colorado has lower crime
 - Can't just have implied, must have same rules for everyone
- No regulation for distance from liquor stores
 - 'one stop shop' but in different buildings
 - Already can order liquor/cannabis to be delivered
- Easy accessibility
- Must be able to support demand
- Fear that pre-existing stores (hemp 1 will be soon out of business)
 - Merit based system
 - Experience
- Fear of needing to carry federal supply
 - Can't be lottery/pay to play
 - Will create poor business
- Tobacco and liquor – stricter of the two and create cannabis that way
 - Make regulations strict – weed out those who will actually be able to create good shops
- How to minimize proliferation
- Strip malls okay
 - Too open creates visual exposure
 - Not 'chinook' style malls
 - Kids there
 - However, would help to normalize
- Harvest medical in Northland mall
 - Creates accessibility – normalization
 - Smaller malls
- FREE MARKET



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

- Retail adj. to liquor okay
- Cannabis lounges make sense by consumption
- No need to separate liquor and retail
- Should spread out across city
- Should not separate retail and convenience
- Having liquor near retail increase convenience for consumers
- Follow liquor regulations for retail to retail and retail to schools
- Business decision for location for retail to retail
- No separation between production and retail
- Challenging for small business owners to get in
- Base it off of existing liquor will streamline process
- Medicinal – if already existing should not allow new to come in get space earlier
- Retail stores on campus are beneficial
- Sensitive uses – follow existing bylaw
- Follow liquor for age verifications
- Locations – starting point is medicinal (150m from minors)
- Follow existing BC (schools/liquor/other retail)
 - 300m (door to door/corner to corner)
- Concerns about separation distance for liquor to retail too tough to find locations
- Meet guidelines of no co-sales – works
- If adding daycares separation distance will further limit
 - More important to separate schools/high schools
 - Already have precedence
- Already have AGLC – follow same process
- Concerns about being too closely regulated
- Don't want to be too restrictive
- LU districts similar to medicinal
- Different prox. Rules for different areas?
 - Makes sense for more dense areas
- Some landlords could have concerns of retail stores being adjacent to similar uses
- Planning mechanism to add retail store use to Direct Control district? Land Use amendment time consuming
- Should be near liquor stores
- No limits for the number – market will determine
- If limit – increase black market
- We have craft breweries – should have craft dispensaries/production
- Concerns of too many production/retail
- DP help monitor smell/odour – don't need to be more restrictive
- Look at different models for proximity between stores depending on density
- Already have good framework in place liquor/medicinal



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

Retail Sales Regulations

- Merit Based (retail)
 - Requires some scoring matrix
 - e.g. Manitoba RFP/system
 - experienced liquor retailers would benefit business plan
 - business experience over cannabis advocate
 - organized crime element
 - mindful for honest business ventures
- Consider more than dispensary (in license)
 - Scale up to include other operations
 - E.g. lounges
 - What about license transfers?
 - How large of store? How many staff employed?
 - As part of merit!
- Can producers also sell & distribute?
 - Companies may be arm's length away and find loop holes – need fair system
- Yes- similar to liquor merchants (idea)
 - Or use courier system (possible)
 - No drop option – pick up only
- Mindful of advertising with youth
 - Still need to promote brand
- Calgary rep's high percentage of provincial population so good if align with province
- Maybe similar to federal tobacco act (idea)
- Significant fines \$
 - Compliance is important at start
- Keep same as liquor stores is good
- Encourage small business
 - What about genetically modified strains
- Combo Merit (second close) and first come first service (priority)
 - Not lottery, e.g. Seattle didn't work
 - Include business plan to some degree
- Criminal record check – non-violent crime maybe ok, not disqualify, maybe [illegible]
- Systems in place
 - Safety
 - Point of sale
 - Security
 - Age verification
- Increase business focus rather than 'cannabis passion'
- Merit = experience successful business, some financial consideration, timeline for license use
- May help retail business
 - May create specialization business
 - It could be benefit to those that can't leave house
 - Same person order must accept
- May already be restricted enough
 - Same as liquor stores



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

- Not as strict as tobacco
- Need to develop brand for businesses
- More logo/brand vs. product encouragement
- Maybe a normal identifiable logo
- City wide or province wide?
- Producers brand too
- Scaling fines and base on severity (warnings)
 - Compliance to license cancellation
- Same as liquor stores
 - Vending machines yes/no? possible no by feds
- Would like online ability
- Lottery with merit – capital and experience
 - First come/first serve ✓ good for competition
 - Valid application (merit)
 - Lottery = uncertainty
 - Time and effort to get ready
 - Application = merit or maybe screening advance
 - Fee and requirements met
 - Have non-refund/or partial application fee for license – ensure series application and set up for success
- Back ground checks
 - Health & safety standards – may be packaged different from producer
 - Include date of packaging
 - How long fresh?
- Yes – especially for those with mobility issues
 - Similar to liquor option
 - Good to reduce possible driving influences issues
- Like alcohol & tobacco or medicine – opportunity to not align with alcohol
 - Branding questions
 - Go with feds and prov. Regulations
- Fine \$ system – scaling
 - Depends on severity
 - Ultimate loss of license
 - Especially if product infractions
- Similar to liquor stores for recreational
 - Mindful of medical

Production Facility Locations and Regulations

- Size: incoming and outgoing traffic underground infrastructure
 - Players with 'small craft' facility are limited to get into the market
- Proximity locations
- Production is wide
 - Seeds, flowers, vegetative plants, starting materials



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

- Should there be different regulations for all aspects of production
 - Cookie production and where it can be consumed
 - Other edibles (regulations 2019)
- Are larger facilities going to be able to have dispensary facilities
 - Etiquette
 - What is allowed onsite
- Locations/ Separation
 - Large: growing
 - Craft: distribution/growing
 - Should they be combined
 - Co-location or licensing for having offsite distribution
 - Secure bay in same production building
 - Separate building/industrial
 - Risk: Level 8 9 or 10 in safety
 - In terms of distance from other locations
 - In high risk zones
 - Would prefer in low risk zones
 - Regulations: hard to get licensing if you share a wall with another business
 - What do the neighbours think?
 - Zoning requirements could stipulate that locations of facilities
 - Industrial zoning lands only and must have industrial around it? Wheatland county bylaw
 - Locate near police facilities or have additional security
- Should there be third party testing between distribution and production?
 - Should be licensing that X can ship to Y
 - Pre-packaged and ship
 - Easier to ensure proper packages to get to the right client (distribution facility)
 - There tends to be issues with the shelf life of product going through a distribution facility
- Production from residential property
 - Home business licensing
- Is there a limit on the number of sizes of facilities?
- Large scale production size is vague in terms of going through the application process
- Outside/outdoor growing facilities
 - What would that look like in Calgary
- Micro or Craft should be able to sell the products as well
 - New regulations that grow LPs need to be tested by a third party – Health Canada
 - Testing: AGLC or feds could do it onsite
 - It still needs to go through an LP
 - Minimal intervention or else what is the point of having these types of permits?
- Larger: industrial, regarding proximity guideline permitted use
- Micro Craft: core areas, discretionary use their proximity to residential, smell (can it be contained inside the building?), can you do a large style if smell exists
- Requirements for a production facility
 - Waste disposal, size, smell
 - Packaging – same as liquor



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

- Number of facilities limit
 - Proximity guideline for both production/retail
 - No proximity guideline if it is just production
 - Retail: high due diligence on proximity, different than liquor
- Separation:
 - What is the impact? If no impact then no proximity issue, no separation issue
 - Hospital – how close can you get?
 - Retail – yes, definitely needed
- How is a production facility defined (licensed producers)?
 - Any facility that changes cannabis from original
 - Transferred or grow the plants
- Can Licensed Producer production facilities put in applications for development? Yes
- Zoning permit for licensed producers
 - Light industrial and cannot be a major roadway
 - Not closer to 70m of residential
- Multi-Tenant Buildings
 - Federal rules say no – have to confirm effective date
- Standalone building – have to be the sole tenant
- What is the line between craft production and large scale
 - Currently there isn't one
 - Should we be planning for what it should be
 - Ways to transform products and the limitations and regulations associated with the type of production
- Larger security dictates how much you can produce
- If standalone is not required
 - Still in light industrial (IG (industrial general) land use) no residents within 75m – discretionary
 - NOT residential – too many complications
- Medical facilities do have labs on site so there currently isn't a restriction
- Discretion vs. permitted
 - Should be permitted since it is now a legal use
 - Calgary is the most open to production when compared to other municipalities
 - Transparent process
 - Discretion is bureaucratic
 - Barrier of entry to protect City and production with City
 - Meeting the criteria should be difficult but one in
 - Capitalized
 - Excellent business plan
 - High security measures
- Expensing the public to health risks is a concern
 - Pesticides
 - Mold
- Entry fee to be a small player?
 - Should they go through the same application process as the big guys?
 - How can I buy the product and transform it for sales?
 - Safety requirements less than large



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

- Testing requirements higher
- Look at the wine production industry
- Shouldn't be a limit to how many facilities in a zone as long as you meet the traffic requirements
 - Production and distribution in
- Growing cannabis at U of C for terms of research?
 - Possibly under different regulations
- Hospital/schools/residential – non-starters given current zoning IG, not within 75m

Consumption Locations

- Ensure away from children
- Mount royal
 - Current areas to smoke – will this be allowed for cannabis?
- Smell is a concern
 - Some citizens don't like that
- Production facility smells – need some sort of allowable space – smoking lounges
- U of C and Mount Royal not in favour of onsite lounges
- Issue/concern of smoking in residence buildings
- Can grow in own residence? Do we need increased security?
- Lounges may draw people away from public smoking
- Do we have technology for adequate air ventilation?
- On campuses concerns for employees as well as students
- Managing a cannabis lounge will be different than a bar
- Special events – separate cannabis from alcohol
- No major difference between beer garden than a cannabis garden
- Legal product – don't over regulate – too many rules won't work
- Could model 'liquor license' e.g. not over serving
 - Be a controlled environment
- Look to province for guidelines
- High rise/multifamily – challenge
- Issue of actual 'smoke' – edibles will be better
- Assumption being made that clustering cannabis has negative social-economic areas
- Need more research
- City of Calgary public property
- Treated like cigarette use for consumption location
 - Need a hybrid of alcohol (intoxication) and smoking policy
- Align with smoking bylaw
- Allow cannabis lounges (follow shisha bylaw)
- Responsible use, common sense
- If landlord and staff accept risk, should be allowed
- Should be able to smoke/vape in same areas as smoking
- Create designated areas
- Keep away from children



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

- Designated/controlled area
- Have designated space – separate from tobacco (only cannabis)
- Cannabis 'permit/license' for special events
- Acceptable on private property
- Support for retail and consumption in same place
 - May require separate license
- Support for growing and consumption in same location
- Decision criteria important for locations
- Hybrid of smoking and alcohol restrictions
- Maybe have a 'district' where high demand
- Pros Cons to separation distances
- Get a 'cannabis' license for specific date/event' can't regulate consumption on private property
 - Respect is needed
- Follow tobacco
- Possibly more strict
- Definitely away from kids
- Enforcement issues
- 2nd hand smoke around children a concern
- Need designated areas
- Hard to even tell if consuming cannabis
- Need enforcement for designated areas
- Control by designated area * A MUST
- Support lounge
 - Controlled area
 - Can control consumption
- Need premium ventilation system
- Free market model for clustering
- Some ok with distance separations

Residential Growing

- Accessory buildings
 - Not directly attached – absolutely note
 - not in direct control of homeowner
 - kids could have access *security*
 - Scale could be an issue
 - A whole greenhouse would go beyond personal consumption
 - Would need to require additional inspection/regulation
 - important to limit underage access
 - if in the house – up to the owner ex. Alcohol
 - biggest concern is children's access to cannabis
 - residences – university would make decision
 - sublets/leases – could damage property
 - doing it behind landlords back



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

- many variations – shed, garage, greenhouse
 - not enough security
- Costco shed = not secure!
- Odours are an issue * wild animals/pets
- Due diligence component ahead of time could reduce liability for City of Calgary
- Letters first from City (breach of bylaw)
- Add to residence's 'record'
- Is a cannabis plant:
 - Germinated seeds?
 - Flower plant?
 - What is the definition?
- Big concern for additional growth than what is allowed
- Home occupation permit – limited grower
- *dispose of waste
- Solves & creates problems
 - Solves: gets it out of the primary residence
- Rental spaces where you can grow (U-Grow)
 - Would not be on MRU Campus
- Some residences don't fall under residential tenant act
 - Can control/regulate better
- Grow tents (small, incubator, one stop grow shop)
- University concerns – electricity bill
- For landlords – insurance will be key
- Wouldn't want growth in property – taxing on property
 - Landlord will be on the line
 - Would a permit be required?
 - Restricted equipment?
- Easier to accept if tenants have permit
 - Will anybody be allowed a permit?
- Tenants could do the rewiring themselves – damaging
- Medical opinion – anybody should be allowed to grow
- Retail perspective – NOT anybody should be able to grow
- 4 plants – could yield much more product depending on light – could burn house down – safety
- What about neighbouring properties – could negatively affect your own property
- PERMITS NECESSARY
- More taxpayer's money for inspectors, permitters
- Rental incentive – could lead to huge security rise
 - Likely won't occur (advertise as 'growing' house)
- Good to have regulations/investigations to try to clamp down on black market
- Better in accessory building than in house
 - Someone else should quality you other than yourself
- Ways to get around 1m height guideline
- What qualifies plants? Seedings, mature plants...etc.
 - Need more clarification
- Ramifications
 - Loss of license for residence



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

- Fines, confiscation of plants
- Single plant – up to 1lb cannabis
- Education program required pre-residential growth
- E.g. driver's license – permits, fines
- How is it enforced? Would people police each other?
- Landlord will have ability to say no to growth at property
- What will happen if lease breaches occur? What are the ramifications?
- Electrical changes to home for growth could have a major effect on home sales, etc.
- Actual eviction process – what if it takes too long? What if additional damage occurs in the process?
- Currently, hard to endorse as it's hard to go up against medical documents (if one is growing more than allotted)
- Going to be hectic, lots of checking, backchecking, etc.
- Do have to limit it somehow vs. civil rights
- Current limit based on a personal use standard
 - But when comparing to home brew wine/beer, is there a limit? Likely not. Is it much different?
- If you're growing a lot of plants – likely because you are selling, which will not be allowed under new framework
 - Must be sold at a retail location
- Greater than 4 plants, a lot of electricity, safety risk
- What about residences that back on to schools?
- Fear mongering
- Education is key **
- Will likely be a very long process
- If you're over limit but not selling, probably ok
- Consequences once it becomes a grow-op
- Wouldn't want to see warrants for arrest
- Pay a ticket/fine – if permits are required then they should be pulled
- Pull permits for a certain period of time
- Should be similar to speeding tickets
- There should be something in place if you break the rules
- In Vancouver, a fine is handed out, that's it
 - \$250 for not having business license
- Should be able to grow wherever you want on your property
- Security/insurance up to the owner
- Keep away from children
- Current standards (medical) are that the plants need to be secure (behind locked door)



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 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?

- Proximity guideline as currently apply to liquor stores – 150m to schools, 300m to other retail locations outside or downtown
- Offsets with regards to liquor stores must not be too prohibitive, given 340 liquor stores in town, 25m may be too high. Adjacent strata units should suffice.
- Additional licensing around [*illegible*] consumption, lounges & special events, outdoor locations
- Should reflect liquor retail bylaws
- Retail locations should be located within areas zoned as business and not be out-of-the-way.
- No distance limit between liquor stores and cannabis stores
- Merit based scoring system for licensing. RFP info from MB can provide some exact criteria for the required merit.
- Open the door to max. Location
- Allow many and let businesses compete
- Follow liquor model but don't compare cannabis to alcohol. I.e. no distance limit between the two. Only limits from schools. Businesses decision on distance between dispensaries, a law is not necessary.

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

- Parking requirement should be no greater than 4/100m²
- Cafes are important – licensed consumers currently with children in home can't use at home. Rec. users with children may find the same problem.
- Database of licensed locations with inspectors will help 'weed' out licensed and not licensed stores
- Combination of merit-based and first come/first served. No lottery system.
- Signage should match liquor
- Don't over regulate
- Do not over regulate. Longer opening hours. First come/first serve for applications.
- Merit based licensing seems a good focus to start. There will be a balancing out period required before we can determine what the future actually looks like.
- Online sales by private locations should be permitted so long as age verification process is sound, tested and penalized for violations.

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

- Current rules are appropriate. If craft/micro producers are allowed they should have a retail component.
- Consumption & production sites (like microbreweries) need further licensing and zoning



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

- Allow them in the city and allow processing facilities as well when the licensing becomes available. Also allow craft growers similar to local craft brewers.
- Keep IG zoning. Really focus on compliance/safety

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

- Proximity guidelines to schools. Not allowed in public parks.
- Cafe's required for people with children at home, or other non-users
- We need rules around lounges, cafe's, and distinction around converting product, vaping product, and edibles.
- Lounges should be permitted with ventilation regulations reflecting grow regulations but to scale
- I am in favour of an Amsterdam model; i.e. cafes /lounges where consumers can consume the herb.
- Allow public consumption lounges and or other venues. Allow cannabis to be consumed at outdoor music concerts.
- Keep in mind medical use
- Allow locations for consumption but limit public consumption
- With the current focus on smoking cannabis the focus should be around smoking bylaws. Existing bylaws have the structure that should be utilized. Why reinvent the wheel?

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

- Enforcement is an issue. Licensing should be considered to allow for easier by law enforcement.
- Regulate high volume growers selling on black market with adulterants (e.g. crack, meth or fentanyl)
- I believe adults should be allowed their own allotment by individual rather than by household. I do not grow but this seems like something that should be one's choice.
- The regulations should be similar to alcohol; i.e. a residential owner should be allowed to grow and consume for his/her own use but not be permitted to sell
- No limit on plant height. Allow outdoor garden growing if the location can be made secure.
- Licensing should be purchased from City
- Certification and inspection regulations for install
- Insurance company inspection compliance
- Don't regulate anything
- Questions about how strata and other orgs that foster any kind of cooperative multi-unit dwellings will be permitted (?)
- To self-limit/regulate --- in high density housing should the limit be less than 4 plants for example



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
 Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 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	7	0	0	0
• Format of today's session	8	4	1	0	0
• Opportunity to provide my input	12	1	0	0	0
• Opportunity to hear others' input	12	1	0	0	0
• Session location	10	3	0	0	0
• Session time	6	7	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?

- Tables & discussions worked well.
- Clearer into on role of city vs. other orders of gov't would be helpful as conversations got sidetracked by items not in the city's jurisdiction.
- Meeting other stakeholders was key
- Input to city appreciated
- Format quite loose and broad but understandable given rapid response to provincial announcement
- Discuss online website regulations
- Discuss taxing on cannabis
- I thought this was a great approach to consultation and feedback and thoroughly enjoyed the discussion. A morning option or greater variety of timing might have been helpful. Thank you for running a great session and including the PSE Community.
- I really thought it was great.
- The format was excellent and conducive to discussion. Kudos to the City staff who were knowledgeable and genuinely interested in facilitating discussions!
- I enjoyed the workshop format and was happy with it
- Hear people opinion
- A little longer workshop to allow for more breakout sessions
- Breakout groups allowed for varied conversation, but one session was only myself and one other, could have used more people



The Legalization of Cannabis

What we heard at the workshops report back
Workshop #3 – 2017 November 23, 6 to 8:30 p.m.
2018 January

3. Which stakeholder organization do you represent?

- Planning consultant – x1
- Post-secondary institution – x2
- Business – x8