

**City of Fort Collins/CSU Center for Public Deliberation
Community Issues Forum, October 10, 2013
Raw Data Report**

This report includes the raw data collected at the community issues event run on October 10 2013.

Table of Contents of this Report

Forum agenda	
SESSION 1: RETAIL MARIJUANA:	2
KEYPAD QUESTIONS	2
INITIAL LIST OF CONCERNS REGARDING MARIJUANA POLICY	2
INDIVIDUAL POST-IT NOTES WITH PRIMARY CONCERN	4
SESSION 2: BIKE PLAN UPDATE	7
INITIAL KEY PAD QUESTIONS	7
REACTIONS TO OPTION 1-6	8
BICYCLE PLAN PRIORITIES	15
SESSION 3: EXPANDING SMOKING REGULATIONS – SURVEY RESULTS	17
SESSION 4: DOWNTOWN TRAIN NOISE	21
SESSION 5: RETAIL MARIJUANA – DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL REGULATIONS	24
INITIAL KEYPAD QUESTION TO PRIORITIZE CONCERNS	24
WRITTEN COMMENTS REGARDING REGULATIONS	24
NOTES FROM TABLES REGARDING REGULATIONS	26
FINAL POST IT NOTE: MOST IMPORTANT THING FROM THE NIGHT	31
ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS FROM SURVEY	33
PARTICIPANT NOTECARDS	35

Forum agenda:

6:35	Introduction
6:40 – 6:50	Purpose & goals
6-50-7:20	Session 1: Retail Marijuana – collection of concerns
7:20 – 7:45	Session 2: Bike Plan Update
7:45-8:00	Session 3: Expanded Smoking Regulations
8:00-8:15	Session 4: Downtown Train Noise
8:15-8:50	Session 5: Retail Marijuana – Discussion of Potential Regulations

SESSION 1: RETAIL MARIJUANA

Before we moved into small group discussions, participants answered two wireless keypad questions to get a sense of the overall opinion of the room.

1.) Regardless of your vote, what aspects ,if any, of Amendment 64 do you support? (choose all that apply) (multiple choice)

	Responses %* (count)	
The decriminalization of possession of less than an ounce for adults over 21	78%	38
Allowing retail marijuana businesses	63%	31
Allowing local municipalities to choose to ban or regulate marijuana businesses	71%	35
Collecting additional taxes for schools	69%	34
Other	12%	6
	100%	178

* Percent of people who chose that option (out of 49 respondents)

2.) Choose one, if you had to choose right now: (multiple choice)

	Responses (percent) (count)	
I want Fort Collins to ban retail businesses	18%	9
I want Fort Collins to allow and regulate retail businesses	71%	35
I want this issue to go back on the ballot for local voters to decide next fall	10%	5
	100%	49

INITIAL LIST OF CONCERNS REGARDING MARIJUANA POLICY

Facilitators began the small group discussions by quickly going around the table and asking participants what concerns they had regarding the opening, regulating, or banning of retail marijuana businesses. Facilitators captured these “primary concerns” at each table on a large piece of paper, which then served as a menu to organize the ongoing discussion. Below are the initial lists that were created at each table:

Table 1

- Understand amendment 64
- Education about influencing youth
- Daily habitual use when not regulated (with youth)
- US looking to CO (and WA) as models
- Factual, non-bias information and education about marijuana
- False/ negative connotations about marijuana users
- Mass production

- Black market when not regulated

Table 2

- Spotlight on CO and WA, we need to provide good model
- Availability to minors, DUI prevention
- needs to be done correctly and economically feasible
- Addiction problems, tax money → treatment programs
- Drug cartels moving in
- Many people are uninformed about regulations
- Needs to truly be treated like alcohol

Table 3

- Increased usage of minors and more access
- Regulation sufficient to prevent minors access
- Proximity to youth communities
- Have consistent regulations so that business isn't off/ on again, closure- either do it or not
- Ensure public understanding of what regulation brings to community/ do for community
- Keep controlled substances out of hands of minors
- Advertising/ marketing that targets youth
- Having access to someone who is able to answer questions about what regulation actually consists of, knowledgeable and cares, will answer questions
- Regulation of kids (even with parents) walking into/ being exposed to stores/ proximity to marijuana
- Clear/ transparent regulation

Table 4

- Marijuana as doorway to other drugs
- Education for people who do not know about marijuana
- How to get people to understand marijuana better → not as a gateway drug
- Pot tourism and relocation to Fort Collins, driving under the influence
- Aesthetics of signage, Foco as a beautiful place, regulation of signage
- Use of marijuana will exist, regulated & safe vs. hidden, let's have where we can see it

Table 5

- Enforcement of age limits
- Word choice of where the tax is going
- Possibility of a local ban and local vote on retail sale
- impact on kids
- Tax distribution
- Regulation of retail
- Discrimination criminal activities

Table 6

- Rather ban alcohol
- Other problems
- Indifferent, education/ enforcement

- Decriminalization
- Students smoking in neighborhoods
- Under-age
- Smoking in open

Table 7

- Voting educationally → decision made without emotions
- Will be voted down again once everything has been established
- Effects of marijuana on students/ youth
- Education as a whole about the issue
- The concern of the black market
- Too many retail stores
- Not giving through process quick enough from fear

Table 8

- Regulation over black market
- Public health concern
- Too available
- Becoming a social norm for all ages
- Addiction and day-to-day functioning
- Over regulation → encourage decriminalization
- Quality of community
- Privacy
- Misinformation

INDIVIDUAL POST-IT NOTES WITH PRIMARY CONCERN

After discussing the primary concerns people have as recreational marijuana is allowed and as the city council considers allowing and regulating or banning retail stores the table each participant was asked to complete the sentence, "I am concerned that..." on a post-it note. Below are the post-it note responses broken down into themes (themes were identified by CPD Associate Director from the post-it notes during the event in order to report out the key themes during session 5)

Another referendum

- Do not ban or send to another vote
- We will continue to talk and vote, on and on and on
- I am most concerned that there will be more tax payer funded referendums to clarify an already decided issue

Ban = Black market spike

- Dis-incentivizing criminal activity
- We over tax it and still have an incentive for the criminal element
- That the ban on marijuana retail will cause an increase in black market activity

Potential for Abuse

- I am most concerned that people will abuse the legalization of marijuana
- Vast increase in DUIs
- Lack of understanding of medical issues that can result from marijuana use by general population
- Using taxes for addiction counseling

Youth access

- I am most concerned that if this is put in action, availability to youth will rise
- Exposure and access of marijuana to youth population and child-prevalent neighborhoods clear public understanding of regulations and laws in effect
- Sending youth the right message, informed choice, parental guidance, safe practice
- I am most concerned that youth will have early engagement and their futures will be compromised
- I am most concerned that children will have an increased access to marijuana with little to no oversight/ punishment for people over 21
- Regulation might not be strong enough to prevent/ deter people who abuse the retail by purchasing too much (shopping around to amass a stash) and the selling it to youth

Potential ban

- Retail stores being banned or delayed
- A small (loud) group will sway the community or council to ban it, let's know it and relocate it and tax it
- I am most concerned about revoking ban marijuana retail
- Minority voice outweighing majority
- I am most concerned that the council vote will not be representative of the popular vote
- My concern is the ability of a minority of people to dictate to the masses majority and take away choice; I think there is a great deal of misinformation regarding this issue
- I am most concerned that a vocal minority leads the conversation one way or another

Not enough regulation

- That city will not have resources to enforce regulations, becomes a nuisance
- I am concerned over the regulation and enforcement of laws
- FoCo doesn't have adequate regulations in place

Quality of life/ community

- Most concerned about the quality of life diminishing because of the legalization of pot
- I will have to move to a neighborhood farther from campus
- Education of enforcement are not adequately addressed especially with respect to neighborhoods around CSU
- Reduced quality of life in Fort Collins
- Quality of community

Fair/ exemplary regulation

- I want to make sure that CO does a good job of handling legalization so that other states can look to us as an example, we need to “do this right” and encourage other states to follow, the country is watching
- I am most concerned that citizens will not know how much regulation will really do for Fort Collins
- Marijuana coming from drug cartels! I want regulation and taxation
- Treat like alcohol, banks must let companies make deposits, medicinal valuable → post stress (soldiers), can sleep, cancer patients can eat, pain killer
- Over taxation

Misinformation

- That the public be thoroughly informed about the regulations and nuances in the laws so people don't unwittingly get into trouble
- Misinformation about amendment 64 which might increase marijuana use especially in youth
- I am most concerned that people will have strong opinions with little to no facts or education to support their opinion
- The process not gathering adequate, factual information from all sides of the argument (no emotional responses)
- That mis-education will harm education
- Mis-information and false reports could influence proper results
- Improper education to the public and youth about marijuana and amendment 64. I am concerned those who are not supportive will twist information to their liking/ advantage
- Misperception and lack of education/ understanding
- The city will be influenced by a select few citizens that still think “reefer madness” was factual and not allow for regulation
- This issue will end up going to the public and some crazy religious self-righteous group will spew rhetoric and scare the shit out of everyone

SESSION 2: BIKE PLAN UPDATE

Participants were first asked some basic questions about their bicycling habits, and then walked through a series of slides responses to 6 different options for bicycle lanes from the perspective of a bicyclists and a motorist. Participants had some time as they walked through the options to make comments at their tables to be captured by the notetakers.

3.) Which of the following best describes your bicycling habits? (multiple choice)

Bicycle commuter-work and/or school
Recreational cyclist
A bike is my primary means of transportation
Occasional cyclist
Non-cyclist

Responses	
(percent)	(count)
19%	10
38%	20
9%	5
28%	15
6%	3
100%	53

4.) Which of the following best describes your comfort level while bicycling? (multiple choice)

Strong and fearless
Enthused and confident
Interested in bicycling, but cautious
I do not ride a bicycle and am unlikely ever to do so.

Responses	
(percent)	(count)
21%	10
54%	26
23%	11
2%	1
100%	48



Option 1: Bicycle Boulevard

5.) As a cyclist, Option 1 is: (multiple choice)

- Very appealing –A strong draw to that route
- Somewhat appealing –A moderate draw
- Neutral – it wouldn't affect my bicycle route choice
- Not appealing –Would try to avoid
- Not a bicyclist

Responses	
(percent)	(count)
28%	13
43%	20
24%	11
2%	1
2%	1
100%	46

6.) As a motorist, Option 1 is: (multiple choice)

- Very appealing – integrates bicyclists well
- Somewhat appealing – not ideal, but workable
- Neutral
- Not appealing – would be problematic
- Not a motorist

Responses	
(percent)	(count)
20%	8
15%	6
38%	15
23%	9
5%	2
100%	40

Comments captured at tables regarding option 1:

- Works great in a small town like Aspen, CO, but would not work in a big town like Fort Collins. Would need to be on very small streets, but would inconvenience cars.
- My family likes to drive fast through neighborhoods. It is not a good idea to have shared lanes for bikes and cars.
- Would not work for bikes to be in the middle of the lane with cars unable to pass.
- I like where it is right now with bike lanes designated on the sides.
- Not sure I want my street to be a bike boulevard: I would not want extra traffic P1

- Discourage bikers from using this route/boulevard
- If it is 25 mph, then it seems pretty reasonable
- "I like to ride non busy roads"
- I don't like the idea, because it is not necessary to put them together (cars and bikes)
- May attract families and non-educated riders
- Integrating bicycles and cars would not solve the problem at all
- Improving bike routes, especially around schools is key. Youth have less bike experience, little to no bike experience, and therefore need the best bike routes in order to protect them
- Great idea
- Anything that equalizes bike/vehicles in town is good
- Motorists won't respect cyclists
- Believe it will detour cars onto main streets and off neighborhood streets, which will allow more room for bikes and will be safer
- Hard to mix bikes and cars on this path, bikes have the right of way, too dangerous for some
- It is impractical. People will not avoid reckless cyclists
- As a Cyclist—doesn't show where the bike should go, separation between bikes and cars is needed
- As a Motorist—This makes me nervous as a driver, this slows down traffic

):



7.) As a cyclist, Option 2 is: (multiple choice)

- Very appealing –A strong draw to that route
- Somewhat appealing –A moderate draw
- Neutral – it wouldn't affect my bicycle route choice
- Not appealing –Would try to avoid
- Not a bicyclist

Responses	
31%	14
44%	20
20%	9
4%	2
0%	0
100%	45

8.) As a motorist, Option 2 is: (multiple choice)

- Very appealing – integrates bicyclists well
- Somewhat appealing – not ideal, but workable
- Neutral
- Not appealing – would be problematic
- Not a motorist

Responses	
(percent)	(count)
25%	8
34%	11
16%	5
22%	7
3%	1
100%	32

Comments captured at tables regarding Option #2:

- More defined lines help boundary indication, more preferable than option 1
- I would use it as long as you can yield to right and share the lane
- Do you share it with cars or is it just for bikers?



Option 3: Standard bike lane

9.) As a cyclist, Option 3 is: (multiple choice)

- Very appealing –A strong draw to that route
- Somewhat appealing –A moderate draw
- Neutral – it wouldn't affect my bicycle route choice
- Not appealing –Would try to avoid
- Not a bicyclist

Responses	
(percent)	(count)
55%	22
33%	13
8%	3
5%	2
0%	0
100%	40

10.) As a motorist, Option 3 is: (multiple choice)

- Very appealing – integrates bicyclists well
- Somewhat appealing – not ideal, but workable
- Neutral
- Not appealing – would be problematic
- Not a motorist

Responses	
(percent)	(count)
67%	22
15%	5
9%	3
6%	2
3%	1
100%	33

Comments captured at tables regarding Option #3:

- It would be nice to have all that space on every road, every lane and have all the stuff cleaned out of the bike lane that always gets thrown there
- I'm not a biker, so these don't really affect me
- I want to see an expansion
- Should be on every street
- Very unrealistic to propose in Fort Collins
- Division between bike/car lane symbolizes that bikes DO NOT belong on road
- But bikes can't keep up with cars so they need to be divided
- This is what we're used to



Option 4: **Buffered Bike Lane** (painted buffer between bike lane and motor vehicle travel lane):

11.) As a cyclist, Option 4 is: (multiple choice)

Very appealing –A strong draw to that route
 Somewhat appealing –A moderate draw
 Neutral – it wouldn't affect my bicycle route choice
 Not appealing –Would try to avoid
 Not a bicyclist

Responses	
(percent)	(count)
81%	35
7%	3
7%	3
2%	1
2%	1
100%	43

12.) As a motorist, Option 4 is: (multiple choice)

Very appealing – integrates bicyclists well
 Somewhat appealing – not ideal, but workable
 Neutral
 Not appealing – would be problematic
 Not a motorist

Responses	
(percent)	(count)
67%	20
3%	1
20%	6
7%	2
3%	1
100%	30

Comments captured at tables regarding Option #4:

- I would feel safer on a bike without the worry of trucks and cars going by fast and causing you to be unsteady
- Definitely safer to have a buffered bike lane and would feel safe in it
- Love it
- In comparison to option 3, I like this option much more
- It is nice but maybe a bit unnecessary
- Great, just more construction
- Where are you going to find roads that support this in FOCO?
- People need to understand that hitting a biker can be fatal and there are very serious consequences. There need to be lane divisions to protect bikers
- The vulnerability of bikers is extremely important
- This is the best so far
- This takes away room
- I'm concerned about what it would cost



Option 5: Protected Bike Lane/Cycle Track
 (with a physical barrier between the bike lane and motor vehicle travel lane)

13.) As a cyclist, Option 5 is: (multiple choice)

- Very appealing –A strong draw to that route
- Somewhat appealing –A moderate draw
- Neutral – it wouldn't affect my bicycle route choice
- Not appealing –Would try to avoid
- Not a bicyclist

Responses	
(percent)	(count)
51%	22
19%	8
9%	4
19%	8
2%	1
100%	43

14.) As a motorist, Option 5 is: (multiple choice)

- Very appealing – integrates bicyclists well
- Somewhat appealing – not ideal, but workable
- Neutral
- Not appealing – would be problematic
- Not a motorist

Responses	
(percent)	(count)
46%	16
17%	6
0%	0
29%	10
9%	3
100%	35

Comments captured at tables regarding Option #5:

- This looks like a very expensive option. Rather have people simply obey the rules without a barrier
- Around campus this would be a useful option, specifically shields
- Is this necessary in FOCO?
- If you're that scared, don't ride on the road

- Might as well just cover the road entirely
- Too much money
- Not that much safer
- Not realistic
- Would be difficult the access bike lanes
- Dangerous when bikers are separated by different lanes because then motorists
- This is practical, but not for residential areas
- It's probably expensive
- There might be safety issues for bikes and cars at night



Option 6: Shared Use Path

15.) As a cyclist, Option 6 is: (multiple choice)

- Very appealing –A strong draw to that route
- Somewhat appealing –A moderate draw
- Neutral – it wouldn't affect my bicycle route choice
- Not appealing –Would try to avoid
- Not a bicyclist

Responses	
(percent)	(count)
71%	29
10%	4
10%	4
7%	3
2%	1
100%	41

16.) As a motorist, Option 6 is: (multiple choice)

- Very appealing – integrates bicyclists well
- Somewhat appealing – not ideal, but workable
- Neutral
- Not appealing – would be problematic
- Not a motorist

Responses	
(percent)	(count)
55%	18
3%	1
24%	8
3%	1
15%	5
100%	33

Comments captured at tables regarding Option #6:

- “As a cyclist, I love it”
- It is dangerous because you have people on the bike trails working on their race skills, so it is hard when they speed by at 15-20mph. You have to watch out for kids, walkers, rollerblades, etc. Dangerous to ride on with so many modes and speeds.
- What about pedestrians?
- Good if bikers use of bells
- *People freak out when you say something to pass them

Summary of Key Pad Data – Bicyclists	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
Very appealing –A strong draw to that route	28%	31%	55%	81%	51%	71%
Somewhat appealing –A moderate draw	43%	44%	33%	7%	19%	10%
Neutral – it wouldn’t affect my bicycle route choice	24%	20%	8%	7%	9%	10%
Not appealing –Would try to avoid	2%	4%	5%	2%	19%	7%
Not a bicyclist	2%	0%	0%	2%	2%	2%

Summary of Key Pad Data – Motorists	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
Very appealing – integrates bicyclists well	20%	25%	67%	67%	46%	55%
Somewhat appealing – not ideal, but workable	15%	34%	15%	3%	17%	3%
Neutral	38%	16%	9%	20%	0%	24%
Not appealing – would be problematic	23%	22%	6%	7%	29%	3%
Not a motorist	5%	3%	3%	3%	9%	15%

17.) What do you think the City’s top three priorities should be in order to increase bicycling and improve safety? (top 3 in order) (priority ranking)

	Responses	
	1st place votes	Pts
Improve bicycle routes and connections	27	95
Improve Education	9	54
Improve Enforcement of laws	5	31
Increase Bicycle parking	0	19
Improve intersection safety	4	45
Expand encouragement programs	1	10
Adopt new laws and policies to support bicycling	0	22
Other (please elaborate in focus group discussion)	0	0
	46	276

NOTES CAPTURED DURING SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS ABOUT BIKE PLAN PRIORITIES:

- Why does all the snow end up in the bike lane?
- What are bikers supposed to resort to in extreme conditions?
- Education is a very important factor here. People need to understand what each bike sign means so they are not breaking the law or putting bikers in danger
- How would we educate?
- Newspapers, mail, advertise an informative website
- Option 3 and 4 are both problematic because they are dangerous for the biker. The bike must be visible from the car.
- The farther we push bikes off the side of the road the more dangerous it is.
- Enforcement- bikers should be ticketed if they are going the wrong way. Motorists should also be held accountable and be ticketed if they infringe on cyclists.
- Comments made after the slides included:
- We do a great job with bike lanes and biker safety
- Construction zones are dangerous
- Improving bicycle routes, bicycle education, and bicycle parking are most important
- New laws would encourage biking
- None of it works well without education

SESSION 3: EXPAND SMOKING REGULATIONS

During session 3, participants completed the hand-written survey below about their experience with smokers in Fort Collins. 48 surveys were collected:

		Old Town	Parks	Trails	Public Events or Festivals	Total
How often do you frequent those locations?	Often	66%	57%	45%	31%	50%
	Occasionally	26%	38%	40%	50%	39%
	Rarely	9%	4%	15%	19%	12%
How often do you encounter secondhand smoke at these locations	Often	32%	4%	0%	39%	19%
	Occasionally	38%	28%	15%	35%	29%
	Rarely	30%	67%	85%	26%	52%
How much of a problem do you feel second hand smoke is at these locations	Major	21%	6%	4%	30%	15%
	Minor	49%	32%	28%	34%	36%
	Not a problem	19%	55%	57%	21%	38%
	No opinion	11%	6%	11%	15%	11%

In order to provide those in the room a sense of the opinion in the room, participants were also asked the final question on the written survey with the keypads. Results were:

How much of a problem do you feel second hand smoke is at these locations	Old Town	Parks	Trails	Public Events	Total
Major	29%	7%	0%	35%	18%
Minor	41%	29%	17%	40%	32%
Not a problem	20%	56%	74%	21%	43%
No opinion	10%	9%	10%	5%	8%

On the written survey, participants also had the opportunity to add specific comments:

- Ban smoking city wide
- When it comes to old town, especially in the evening, a lot of people come down to drink and smoke. Bars should be allowed to offer the customers some smoking option. Indoors it has been banned. Some bars voluntarily ban it. Those who was to allow it on their patios should be allowed to do so.
- Even if it's not harmful its really nasty, ban on patios on old town sidewalks. Trails and parks becomes a litter problem

- I think we need to think cigarette and pot smoke. It is going to continue problem in old town
- I think it's a matter of density. Events and festivals increase the opportunity of encountering second hand smoke, second hand smoke can be encountered in parks and trails but enforcement would not be a priority
- Public events or festivals are only problem I have experience but it has been relatively minor, must consider MJ smoke as well as cigarette smoke
- Cigarette littering in parks is a huge deal-it negatively impacts children. Smoking in old town is prevalent and is a huge negative impact on families in old town. Designated smoking areas still cause a problem because the smoke is still in the air and impacts innocent bystanders
- Old Town Square is the worst.
- Some people like to smoke (tobacco) cigarettes at musical events that serve alcohol

Comments captured by notetakers at the tables regarding the small group discussion regarding the outdoor smoking regulations:

- I am all in favor of banning smoking at public events.
- Yes, banning at public events would be great
- Yes, it is dangerous to the health of others, but they should still be allowed a place for them at the back of the festival where the wind won't blow it. We must be inclusive of the community because there are a lot of people who smoke and we can't tell them what they can and can't do simply because we don't like it.
- It still affects the health of everyone around them, though. Secondhand smoke is harmful.
- Maybe we could have a tent that would isolate their smoke in a contained area, but the could still do it.
- Yeah, but then they are taking in both first and secondhand smoke so...
- We should make sure that they have designated ashtrays because I hate finding cigarette butts everywhere. I'm ok with they smoking outside, but we need to add more ashtrays for them.
- Colorado is not the most flame-retardant state, so having more ashtrays is a good idea so cigarette butts don't get everywhere and start fires.
- Maybe we could add a designated buffer zone for smokers between them and non-smokers. We could have it away
- Festivities, events, and wind really affects no matter where you are
- Sounds like a tradeoff between liberty and safety/health..
- I always end up walking behind a smoker
- I hate cigarette smoke
- Need to Enforce the 20-foot rule better
- ENFORCE the rule because businesses don't really do a good job about it
- Make business owners more accountable
- Ban all smoking. I have a no tolerance policy.
- That might be little much but it would be nice if they actually enforced the current laws.

- What are the current laws?
- Have to be 20 feet away from any entrance.
- They don't enforce that?
- No, at least not in old town or on campus
- Any other places we think its important that smoking laws are enforced and abided by?
- On trails because of risk of forest fire
- There should also be a designated smoking area in parks that's far away from areas where kids play
- The amount of people in one place at a given time is when second hand smoke becomes an issue. When the density is high, then it is an issue. Places like festivals and in old town it is an issue. It's not as much of an issue at parks
- The density of people is the biggest issue about whether or not it's actually an issue
- It will also be important to start considering pot smoke and what those impacts are
- There seem to be places in old ton where the 20 ft from entrance rule applies, and others where is doesn't. The enforcement is inconsistent.
- If there were designated smoking areas you could avoid the area
- Designated smoking areas might be ineffective
- You still cant get away from designated areas
- Cigarette butts in parks and trails is seen as a problem à this led to the thought of enhanced littering fines
- In favor of ban in patio but a ban everywhere was an overreach of power.
- Problem with enforcement
- If there was a ban in Old Town: where would employees smoke
- There was a comment that they would have to walk several blocks to go smoke, emphasis on a residential area
- I own a house and I want them to stay there and not come smoke where I live
- It would be conducive/beneficial to separate smoking and non smoking areas
- !F Would the group support designated smoking areas in Old town specifically in the back of buildings?
- In back and in front
- People smoke when they drink alcohol, banning is too extreme so there should be designated areas
- Cigarettes in parks an issue. Lots of trash. Dangerous to park goers.
- Thinks parks are a major concern. Interest in attending a city work session.
- Surprised parks are a concern
- How many cigarette ends are left there on a regular basis?
- How can the regulation in old town be 20 feet when people smoke wherever they want down there?
- Mountain AVE filled with a "grunge atmosphere" OT SQUARE is the worst. I don't want to smell that.
- No one can follow the regulation. They would be smoking in the street.
- We appreciate the laws in place

- Enforcement is an issue, people smoke less than 20 feet from entrances
- Uncertainty with e-cigarettes, some people think they can use them indoors

Participants in the small groups were also asked a specific question regarding potential regulations regarding major public events: Would be helpful to have a designated smoking area, or ban outdoor smoking altogether, or keep the current policy? Comments captured were:

- Not really necessary
- Focus on personal politeness instead
- Ask to be considerate
- I understand civil liberties, but c'mon
- More consideration
- Plus there are a lot of little kids at festivals
- It's hard to avoid at these activities
- A designated smoking area would be nice but I don't think it would actually be enforced
- Me either and frankly police have more important things to be watching out for and doing at those festivals
- People should just use vaporizer cigarettes in public so they don't give off any smell or smoke
- Not sure how realistic that is
- Interest in increasing the amount of public events where alcohol was not served and not have smoking: family friendly events and emphasis on how to advertise to rely family friendly environment
- Designated Areas are a good idea - doesn't stop the danger of second hand smoke.
- Anything can be done with a permit ? Why should we ban it? Smoke fills the air anyway ? Is this different than MJ smoke? What is the difference?
- MJ smoke dissipates quicker. Still a carcinogen.
- We need to protect kids from this.
- Secondhand smoke shouldn't be released on/near public sidewalks
- The time of day affects when people want to smoke, perhaps banning certain times of public tobacco use
- Secondhand smoke exposure is hardly noticed by some
- We can work around people who smoke
- People in/outside of bars should be allowed to smoke
- Festivals are a major problem, maybe have designated smoking areas
- Any additional thoughts or comment on the smoking regulations conversation or process?
- If students banned it on campus first it would set an interesting example of the city!

Session 4: Downtown Train Noise

22.) The City should prioritize quieting the trains downtown (multiple choice)

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Strongly Agree	38%	15
Agree	31%	12
Neutral	18%	7
Disagree	3%	1
Strongly Disagree	10%	4
	100%	39

23.) If the train horns could be quieted through the use of gates at intersections, I would support that effort (multiple choice)

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Strongly Agree	58%	22
Agree	26%	10
Neutral	13%	5
Disagree	3%	1
Strongly Disagree	0%	0
	100%	38

24.) If the train horns could be quieted through the permanent closure of an intersection(s), I would support that effort (multiple choice)

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Strongly Agree	8%	3
Agree	5%	2
Neutral	18%	7
Disagree	41%	16
Strongly Disagree	28%	11
	100%	39

25.) I support the city spending funds to silence the trains (multiple choice)

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Strongly Agree	18%	7
Agree	31%	12
Neutral	23%	9
Disagree	18%	7
Strongly Disagree	10%	4
	100%	39

Comments captured by notetakers at the tables on the train noise issue:

Quieting the trains and what it might take

- I'm concerned about 18-wheelers crossing the curb at Mason and getting stuck. They can't move when you get stuck like that. What do you do? It is a safety issue. We need barriers, but an 18-wheeler can't move with barriers.
- Drunk drivers create the same problem of jumping the curb and getting stuck, but they can move. But an 18-wheeler getting stuck could derail a train.
- Mason does not have a lot of 18-wheelers on it, though. Not a concern for that street.
- If we were looking at a different area like Prospect, then maybe it would be a problem. We would need to look at the types of traffic on the road.
- Gates would be a good option
- I think they could do a lower cost option (Lights)
- Bypass the FRA
- Good point mentioned about the decibel level
- Lights or strobe lights are a good option
- The trains are really slow, so it wouldn't take much
- If you're driving you need to be paying attention
- Pedestrians trying to beat a train
- Closing Mason is a terrible option
- Just east and west of the intersections at Mason could be closed at a certain time?
- For anything that will silence the train
- Even in the day work stops when the train goes by
- It needs to be consistently quiet day and night
- The train does go faster now so that's good because it doesn't take as long passing through
- Not bothered by the train. It is part of Fort Collins, there are other issues that are more important
- Since the recent changes in the railroad, it seems like there are more trains and not enough room for cars to get off the tracks
- The impact on traffic is the biggest issue, not the noise from the train.
- The train is not a priority issue
- Not personally impacted by noise of train
- Gates will be more irritating, because of look, malfunctions and slowing of traffic
- There is increased amount of train traffic through mason corridor
- Fort Collins should not have to pay: wanted more action with FRA
- Expensive and change is not worth the money: P3
- Improvements on roads and reducing train noises: city should flip a coin work grid by grid to repair it, which would eventually shrink the zone that needed to be repaired.
- Fort Collins is accommodating and wanted more interaction with FRA: FRA needs to be more involved and wanted it to be a more collaborative process
- Saw repairs on roads, bridges, and general infrastructure to be more important than dealing with the train noise first.

- If they (the city) silences in a way I don't approve of, I don't approve.
- Closed intersection is stupid
- Don't think that it is much of a priority. the city already has transport issues. Connectivity is extremely important.
- How much control does the city actually have?
- Train owns the track
- It is really loud though. It can be heard miles away.
- Decibel levels can damage the ears. Follow the city noise ordinances.
- Tough issue. Safety is important. Don't want to say I want less safety. Optimum safety.
- There are more pressing issue that the city needs to deal with.
- Most people agreed in this discussion that the downtown train noise is a problem that should be dealt with
- Can't believe city isn't doing something already
- Nighttime and day-time regulations are important, night-time is a higher priority
- Extending the curb would be awful for traffic
- It would cause more harm than do good.
- I think extending the curb would be okay if it allowed bikes and pedestrians a way to get through
- It depends on how many junctures were talking about expanding the curb
- One or two might be okay but not more than that
- There is increased amount of train traffic through mason corridor
- Fort Collins should not have to pay: wanted more action with FRA
- Expensive and change is not worth the money
- Improvements on roads and reducing train noises: city should flip a coin work grid by grid to repair it, which would eventually shrink the zone that needed to be repaired.
- Fort Collins is accommodating and wanted more interaction with FRA: FRA needs to be more involved and wanted it to be a more

SESSION 5: RETAIL MARIJUANA – DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL REGULATIONS

Participants were first provided a summary of the concerns expressed about marijuana as captured during session 1 with the final post it notes (pp. 4-6 of this report), and then organized and themed by CPD associate director Katie Knobloch. Ten themes were captured and reviewed, and then participants reacted to those themes with the clickers. Ginny Sawyer then briefly reviewed the regulations that were part of Initiative 301 for medical marijuana dispensaries as a baseline to consider for potential regulations for retail centers.

26.) Which concerns are most relevant to you? (top 3 in order) (multiple choice)

	Responses	
	1st place votes	Pts.
Misinformation	13	50
Providing Fair/Exemplary Regulations	9	46
Quality of Community/Neighborhoods	2	23
Youth Access	4	25
Going to Referendum	0	9
Minority outweighing Majority	1	15
Potential for Abuse	0	8
Potential Ban	3	5
Not Enough Regulations/Costly Regulations	1	6
Ban would lead to Blackmarket	4	20
	37	107

Participants were then given time in the small groups to react to the concerns and consider potential regulations. They were also given worksheets organized by the key areas of regulation that were reviewed:

General regulations

- Just be careful that the cost of regulation doesn't drive "business" back underground...If we allow it and regulate it, there must still be a price market must bear?
- Like medical
- Ok, like liquor, in commercial areas, 14 medical centers
- Allow MJ business to sponsor community events and be advertised in those brochures, playbills, flyers, etc
- Sting operations should be consistently held
- Default to state laws
- Sanitation and health regulations for any business selling or making food products (edible). Have a balanced marijuana board in city for planning and public information
- Feel better knowing these regulations are in place
- should be same as "medical"
- smoking areas, just smoke in your own home

Location Requirements

- Strict Signage Regulations. No giant leaves in day-glow colors.
- Not in Old Town
- in all areas of the city
- Not near schools, not in residential areas
- I like the 301 Regulations
- laboratories do not pose risk of diversion or product so setbacks on zoning should not be as stringent
- I believe that location requirements should be the same as for liquor stores, for retail stores.
- Manufacturing should be less regulated if at all. Labs not at all. Cultivation should be the same as retail
- Zoning distance requirements away from neighborhoods, childcare, churches, schools, parks, playgrounds. Perhaps even distance between facilities
- Cannot be within 1,000 ft of schools, playground, and religious facilities
- Grandfathering of current MMJ dispensaries at current locations
- Strict enough to limit sales location, larger setbacks will make no location eligible
- Agree with current
- Not w/in 1000ft to school
- should be the same as "medical" pot stores
- Beware of places where there are a lot of young kids and around preschools

Number Limits

- Let the market determine the proper equilibrium
- 0 through 2, Fort Collins is a small town, how many would we need
- maybe per capita limits, but I don't know how many exactly. No more than medical-allow no competitive preference-if more players want to compete, make them smaller
- as market demands
- Start with current limits, then potentially expand
- at least the 14 allowed now medically to start
- then not to exceed the number of under 21 residents/500 (same logic as number of medical dispensaries)
- Let those who were kicked out in 2012 have the first opportunity to re-open. Then allow capitalism to let it grow sometime later
- Distance requirements will naturally limit the number of facilities
- No limits
- Distance requirements are so large, caps not required
- No. Distance setbacks will limit how many come in anyhow. A set number is silly
- limit to existing stores
- limit to existing shops
- that may be a good idea, too many weed stores was strange

Other

- no cash on premises overnight
- suggest that a responsible retail marijuana group gets formed
- I would like a more common sense solution to combating DUI's for Marijuana than blood testing on arbitrary numbers
- Patrons to retail stores only be allowed to buy one ounce in a week
- Need to enforce public smoking prohibition
- smoking areas, education especially for kids, we need to help them see the impact of use on their brains as opposed to the adult brain

Notes captured at the tables regarding the small-group conversations about potential regulations:

- I like the regulated part about the retail stores. All those who were kicked out in 2012 should have the first right to reopen. We should take it in a measured way. There should be no specific number. Demand will dictate how many and where.
- I am in favor of limiting the number, but not sure how to determine the number other than supply and demand. Naturally, it will happen and determine the number with how far apart they need to be. The city should not limit the number, but it will naturally happen.
- I would like to see a limit, but I'm not sure how to determine that number.
- We should start with the okayed medical shops (allow them to do retail until we figure out whether to expand or not). We should then set up precedent similar to the 1 to 500 medical card holders. Maybe we should not exceed adults over 21 divided by 500. There should be no less than 14, but no greater than the residents over 21 divided by 500. Consistency is good, so maybe that would work.
- We should allow the market forces to play out. We will not see a whole lot popping up all over. Demand will drop if there are a ton of marijuana stores, so that would force closing of some.
- It should be the same as it is for liquor stores.
- Out of the businesses produced from marijuana, there should be no worries or regulations for the four types of facilities (labs, retail, etc.) because they are all closed buildings. The regulation of retail stores should be like liquor stores. This could be a problem around CSU campus, though, because it is such a large area and demand may be high there.
- Cultivation needs to be regulated. I am worried about the quality with large growing operations.
- Distance regulations need to be kept.
- Labs should not be taken into the location regulations. I'm not worried about kids coming into labs to take a small amount that is used for testing it.
- Growing of marijuana needs to be the same regulation as retail, though.
- Will there be hours associated with retail stores?
- It will be the same as medical. Council can't change that.

- What did they decide about edible products like candy, drinks, sweets, etc.?*The packaging has to come out of the sales establishment. It has to be tamper proof and not look like it is marijuana product or appealing to kids in any way. Basically, it has to have invisible packaging. Packaging was a problem before, but the outside of the package now cannot look appealing to a child. Once it is open, there isn't a way to child proof it, but when it is sold, it can't look like it is appealing.
- Would we need more regulation of other spots that we haven't covered such as advertising or other areas?
- No need to further regulate. It is like telling a baker you can only bake donuts.
- Larimer county has already banned manufacturers. They didn't agree with the advertising of pictures of edibles. Will council consider adding advertising back in?
- Did they determine an acceptable THC level?
- *100 milligrams per serving.
- Taxes. The taxes currently in place are not enough to cover the regulation of it. Some of the cost is being unaccounted for. I am worried about the taxes not being enough to pay for everything with enforcement and regulation costs.
- It hasn't been studied enough about taxes and costs. I hope some of the voters would look into that before deciding.
- There are a lot of banking restrictions for marijuana businesses, right? How are you affected by banking? (question directed to the laboratory owners at the table)
- I just say that I am a laboratory. When they ask more specifically, I saw I test organic plant materials. I never use the word marijuana and it usually isn't an issue.
- How does that work for retail, though? Or medical retail?
- There are banking solutions being put together currently to allow banks to take the money and recognize the cash.
- Some owners may have had businesses in other industries before, so those sit on top of their marijuana business and then they just always pay in cash. It isn't as much as a safety issue in Fort Collins, but in Denver it can cause issues.
- Dispensaries in the communities should be allowed to participate in the community. If they try to do more in advertising than the state suggests, dispensaries should be able to sponsor events, put their names on programs, hang banners at sporting events, and be treated like other businesses. They should be able to sponsor 5Ks or whatever else they want to do for advertising.
- You should still give a choice to universities and others whether they want to be sponsored by a marijuana business or not, though. The choice should be up to others.
- There should be a responsible marijuana retail group with responsible advertising policies. There is an alcohol retail group that monitors responsible retail policies for them, so if there are marijuana retail stores here, there should be a responsible advertising group for them, too. ((much agreement from the table on this thought)
- I think it should have a cap on the number of stores allowed
- Limit it to medical stores ONLY
- Establishments already allowed -- Turn into stores
- Some people don't know what they are doing when they grow

- I don't see a reason for limits... It's legal, so who cares about how many we allow there to be (as long as they are in the zoning limits)
- It's all about perspective
- FoCo would add more regulation
- We are pretty highly regulated already
- We are a model, so we have to get it right
- It would be nice to see how it is done (growing)
- They should come up with a standard testing model that tests harmful things to marijuana (pesticides, herbicides etc.)
- Maximum of 2, do we really need more than that?
- I mean probably because each patient is registered at one medical dispensary and they can't go anywhere else
- We keep tabs on people so we know that they are not cheating the system. They have it heavily regulated already.
- There's also a capacity each dispensary can provide
- If it's at capacity for medical then they need to figure out a certain percentage they can keep open for recreation so each spot only has a certain amount of recreational capacity as well.
- High regulations protect business.
- But if there becomes too many regulations then people might get fed up and revert back to the black market and we wouldn't benefit from the tax money.
- The number of stores will drive down the cost of marijuana.
- But from a business perspective it's better to have less stores.
- It's easier to watch out for and regulate fewer stores.
- There should be a limit by population or not a per capita amount. Did not know directly what number it should be: P4
- There would then be less competition for the existing stores: P3 à P4 agreed with this statement and stated the reason for having a per capita amount of recreational stores was because the opposition to recreational marijuana stores don't want a large amount of marijuana stores
- There should not be a limit: the City should let the free market adjust because there is enough regulation already
- There would be 2 spots within Fort Collins for stores to be created à would have to look at recorder and data directly
- What should be the amount of retail marijuana regulation?
- Maintain current regulation that 301 already established. Grandfather in existing medical marijuana dispensaries à by Grandfather in that would limit the amount that would be established and P5 agreed.
- Participant question: Should retail and medical marijuana stores be the same?
- The store would have medical inventory and recreational inventory
- There would be a difference in advertisement: marijuana focused on health for medical themes, and "Get blitzed" over the weekend à this would attract different type of people and there would be a different tax rate for the two.

- Focusing on misinformation: is there a difference between medical and retail marijuana
- Input: for misinformation amendment 64 have a wide range of reasons to vote for and city council wants to have public feed back
- Regulate like alcohol: and even allow alcohol stores to sell it
- Liquor outlets would have an advantage: alcohol and marijuana are not the same: P4 and P3 both agree
- For Marijuana stores: have 1 owner to one store: keep large corporate firms out
- All 4 types of stores should have retail establishment If have cultivation
- Zoning regulation needed to get more
- No one should have more than one store → there should be a cap on the number of stores a person can own
- Note; there was a good discussion here: I feel as though you should go over what was said to get very detailed account. Very speculative and wide-ranging ideas.
- What is the difference between retail and medical? How much can patients buy?
- Depends on patient's condition etc.
- What kind of balance? How many centers are needed?
- Don't think there needs to be a cap. Free enterprise. Already a strict process.
- Distance restrictions will dissuade business. Could effectively zone out a cap using zoning regulations.
- Use the same regs. Don't want a MJ district.
- No monopolies allowed.
- State supports vertical integration.
- We don't want our property values to decrease as a result.
- This round of discussion was one of the more fruitful discussions of the night, there was a tension about regulation details that got many people thinking
- Some participants at the table believed that this issue, since it is so new, must be dealt with slowly, and that the transition between our current system and retail stores must be done slowly and correctly to ensure economic success. They also believed that there shouldn't be more retail stores than medical stores, and that stores should operate under the per-capita system that medical systems currently operate under. There is too much prohibition in place to jump straight into the economy. D.U.I's are still a problem that needs to be dealt with
- Others at the table believed that too many laws and regulations on the store-cap are pointless, and that these laws would treat us like irresponsible kids. We are adults that should be able to make our own choices. Other commodities aren't capped. We are the guinea pigs that could lead the way, attracting a great deal of tourism. We should make small barriers to entry into the retail marijuana market, to ensure small-business success. There are close to no car accidents attributed to marijuana intoxication
- But its legal across the whole state so maybe Fort Collins wouldn't be the designated spot for marijuana tourism
- Lots of other states are ready to jump on legalizing it because its about money and business and it has the potential to boost economies.

- Politicians look at it as a way to raise money for the state and can say that without actually supporting smoking marijuana.
- What do we think about putting a cap on retail stores?
- Less concerned about capping it. I don't say this often but let the market take care of it.
- If sketchy people try and open up stores they will most likely fail on their own or won't be able to compete with the legit operations.
- What if Fort Collins didn't have a store front?
- We could manufacture it here but not actually sell it?
- I'm not sure how that would work out and not sure if we would benefit from the money it raises without having a storefront.
- The nation is watching CO
- We need to model good behavior and figure out what exactly that means for this to work.
- Could there be certain zones where marijuana could be smoke?
- No, you don't do that with alcohol. Alcohol is only allowed in a designated facility or in the privacy of own home. There can't be marijuana zones.
- Should there be a different level of discipline?
- Maybe. But what level of penalty would really make them quit?
- Extremely Strict enforcement
- The police reaction time is not quick enough after people are reported for smoking weed outside of homes. Not urgent or strict enough.
- CSU can discipline for students behavior off campus
- There is a fundamental lack of respect from CSU students for the people living nearby. Residence halls are the number one problem, the students are a nuisance when they leave dorms to come to the neighborhoods to smoke
- The 21 and up law wouldn't even affect the neighborhood situation because the problem is the students that are under 21 in the dorms
- The medical use of marijuana was when the issue of students in the neighborhoods became an issue
- Maybe it will evolve to be understood that it is similar to alcohol and is illegal to smoke underage and in public as time goes by
- Once regulations are put in place, will the situation improve?
- No because its part of CSUs culture. There are new freshman every year, and it will be relayed to them. It will never change.
- Colorado is the go-to state for incoming college students due to marijuana legalization.
- Dangerous grow ops
- Smoking becomes even more harmful if FoCo ban retail

Final Post It Note : At the end of the event, facilitators asked participants to write down the main thing they wanted to tell council from the whole evening.

- Regulate marijuana retail like alcohol establishments.
- Smoking on patios, marijuana, bikes, trains... Please seek out public ... put on issues that are actually important to the city.
- Keep up the good work as to bringing issues to your public. Never forget that we the people put you in your job. Regulate and help show we are compassionate.
- Bike Regulations- campaign and spread information on the topic of stop as yield.
- Marijuana- The city needs to continue taking resident/member input, while increasing education on the topic not only to the general public, but also with the city officials. Make sure that everybody has received the same info.
- Smoking- It is important to decrease second hand smoking, especially in areas where children and families are present.
- We must open retail stores ASAP!
- Back yard grows: detailed regulations
- Regulate it!! Marijuana will always be (?). Let's decide where it comes from: Cartels or licensed businesses.
- Implement now.
- Most important thing... the 64 question is important & complex. This level of deliberation & discussion is essential! Thanks!
- Marijuana regs: limit ownership of MJ retail outfits to one per natural person (regardless of legal entity) As we do for retail liquor licenses.
- This open forum works and should be expanded.
- Regulation of marijuana can lead to lack of access to (?) and youths.
- Regulate retail marijuana ASAP! It will provide a safe and regulated environment that follows the will of the people that voted in the last election.
- Please regulate marijuana sales carefully.
- The passing of Amendment 64 is more dangerous than Colorado understands.
- Very organized, very hot topics
- Most important issue: Please work hard to help silence the train. Huge quality of issue... Property values, business productivity, ETC.
- Opinions are great, but please stay with the facts. Labs, mdg, grows, and retail are all different and should be treated and regulated differently.
- There should be stricter than alcohol regulations/consequences when of age people buying or gifting for children.
- Bike safety is so part of creating a sustainable future for Fort Collins.
- Marijuana Regulation: Regarding placing limits on the # of marijuana locations, my worry is that this will result in anti-competitive behavior down the line. Whenever the govt. restricts entry into a market, existing businesses will always fight to keep out competition. We must balance the interest in restricting proliferation with the interest in having a competitive market.

- Become better informed about the facts about MJ. Ask yourselves, if not from a retail establishment then where will adults get MJ?
- To respect the wishes of the voters and get a system for retail marijuana in place.
- I want the council to educate people more about Amendment 64, so that people would understand the regulations and that marijuana use has not been completely legalized.
- The most important thing I would want city council to know is the need to look at the facts and decide what is true and what is not.
- City council often gets hijacked by a vocal minority on issues despite the large effort staff makes with outreach. All issues discussed tonight are subject to that effect. These typed conversations are crucial to promote understanding of issues & good public discourse... Wish you had chance to have more people involved. These discussions became part of staff's outreach on individual issues.
- I think bicycle transportation should be a high priority. I would support more shared traffic lanes with signs informing motorists that bicycles are legit traffic. (Whatever happened to critical mass?)
- Information & education is surrounding what is legal & illegal and what would be allowed with respect to retail & medical marijuana.
- Please listen to voters and pass A64.
- I think the most important thing would be to realize that when Amendment 64 is put in action there will be a drastic change and there will be backlash no matter what.
- Train whistles not harmful to our ears! Don't panic re: marijuana – it is a medicine- need to allow. Hemp.
- We need to have a community wide convo about legally allow. Thanks.

Participants were also asked to complete a short assessment survey.

How did you hear about this event?

- Email list—16
- Friend—3
- PSD Think Tank—3
- Ginny—2
- Online—2
- Newspaper—2
- Martin Carcasson—2
- Sensible CO
- Business partner
- Through CPD
- Phone call from the city
- City Employee
- CPD mail list
- Executive director at KRFC
- Knobloch

Did you like the format of this event?

Yes—26 (74%)

Somewhat—7 (20%)

No—2 (6%)

Would you support the City and the CPD hosting this type of event once or twice a year?

Yes—17 (77%)

- I'm curious however how much the city council will take the results into consideration if they weren't part of it themselves
- Really helpful, not only for giving city key info, but also lets community know about our opinions

Somewhat—4 (18%)

No opinion—1 (4%)

I was satisfied with today's small group discussion

Strongly agree—10

- All were respectful and insightful
- This is a good forum, a good process for discussion

Agree—17

- Time was limited, but our group was good in having diverse opinions and backgrounds that made for interesting conversations
- Wish there was more time for the small group discussions
- I wonder about the constraints

Disagree—1

- People with one interest to one another dominant in some areas and quiet on other issues

The facilitator was helpful

Strongly agree—19

- I always appreciate a good facilitator

Agree—14

- I feel as though they kept talk more for work and on pt.
- Not too much intervention, which is good
- Facilitator keeps the focus on the topic and prevents a dominator to bully the group
- As helpful as they could be with a difficult group. Need better large group facilitator

How can we improve this event? Or improve public outreach/engagement in general?

- During the discussions, sound was sometimes difficult. Perhaps a larger room with space in between tables would help
- Great turnout! Keep up the good work
- Attract more people
- These are odd topics to put together. I only came because of interest in one topic, but had to sit through other topics that I'm not interested in. that part was a waste of my time. And the talk on pot went on and on and on, which started the other discussions and information/ explanations. Biking section didn't educate people very well about safety issues around bike options so people voted w/o data and perhaps based on stereotypes placed on bicyclists (that they should be in different lanes than cars for example). O.M.G I cant believe marijuana even got 2 sections in addition to taking the most time. :p
- Less time presenting issues and more discussion time
- GET A NEW CITY MANAGER
- Host it with live internet forum
- Be able to long into a live feed on the internet and participate
- I would love to see more community members here. Pizza?
- I did not see any advertisement for this event, perhaps spread the event though out city boards, commissions, and on social media to get a different type of community members to show up. Felt like most of the people came for the MJ discussion
- Do more often
- More PR to get more people in here
- Focus on maximum three topics only
- Let us know when voting changes, larger group facilitation. Make sure people know that is isn't just free comment time. Don't allow the presenter to talk so much
- Frustrating to have MJ @ start and end of event, making one stay the whole event
- Don't try to cover many topics in one meeting
- Don't know, I really liked it as is
- Fewer topics, give more time per topic

Participant notecards

Throughout the process, participants had the opportunity to write additional comments on notecards. Below are all those comments, organized, when clear, by topic area.

Notecards regarding bicycle plan:

- Do not push snow into the bike lanes, education in schools about biking
- I want stop as yield
- Bicycle parking establishments
- Paint bike lanes with green paint on busier streets, i.e Denver
- Concerned about parking and cutting off bicyclists when turning. Shared tail intersection with roads offers some problematic options. Bikers sometimes don't follow traffic laws and ride on the road, forcing motorists to go really slowly. Children need to know the rules in biking and be encouraged to ride, collaborate with health campaigns. Public biking services (rent/borrow bikes)
- The 1995 bicycle plan (Drake and Assec) mentioned maintenance. The 2008 update failed to mention this mistake
- Too much focus on promotion and not enough focus on education. Also, please enforce laws more
- Enforcement of laws, I hate bikers that don't obey street signals
- How can we be a "platinum" bike city when we do not have bike paths to all our schools? (Poudre!)
- Connecting North south and east west routes

Notecards concerning marijuana policy:

- Too costly for marijuana growers, manufacturing, and retail. It should be affordable for small businesses
- What support people can get when addicted to MJ?
- Availability to youth, and enforcement of DUI
- Increase in taxes
- Taxes
- My concern is that the rest of the country is watching and we need to set a good example for legalized marijuana so that other states may follow our lead
- That people be fully informed about the regulation in the city so they don't get into trouble
- There were robberies when the law was just passed in the state. Don't want to see more of that kind of chaos in the city
- Retail sale of marijuana: none, handle like liquor. Legal, affordable, tobacco
- Kids will find MJ where they can get it. We are working with T.F