

Project overview

In response to public desire expressed in the Parks and Pathways Bylaw Engagement, Calgary Parks wanted to explore allowing liquor consumption at picnic sites in Calgary Parks. Allowed liquor use in parks would be strictly for picnic sites only, as per AGLC regulations which indicate liquor can only be consumed at assigned, designated picnic site, and can only be consumed with food.

Verbatim Comments

A What we Heard Report can be found [here](#). All of the comments below are verbatim as received. The comments are divided into questions asked. They are unedited, including spelling, grammar, use of contractions, etc. The only exception is where there is profanity or personally identifying information, this is indicated in brackets.

Due to a large volume of comments, this is document three of four.

Q5: When booking a picnic site, would you be willing to pay more to book one that allows liquor consumption? If yes, how much more would you be willing to pay?

- No! That's a ridiculous tax grab!!!!
- No.
-
- No
- NO!
- No I would not be willing for anyone to have the ability to pay for the option.
- No
- n/a
- See #4
- no
- I'd rather not. What would the rationale be for paying more?
-
-
- Definitely not
- no
- Why a need to book? Open this to all parks. This doesn't change in intoxication in public or other bylaws just allows responsible adults to be responsible adults.
-
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- Absolutely not.
- Yes, if it is for a family event I would be willing to pay \$25 for people to enjoy a beer
- No
-
-
- No.
-
-
- Yes, maybe like \$10, tops.
- No.
- No because i will just drink anyways so why pay more.
- No, you shouldn't have to pay more for a liquor allowed site. Don't nickel and dime everything!
- No
- Should be the same price
- No
- No
-
- No. High taxes should cover it
- Doubt it. The city can recycle bottles left behind in bins and use that money towards parks.
- no
- all sites should be able to have liquor
- No
- No
-
- \$2
- no, why we should pay more?
- No
- No! This should not be a revenue grab
- No, public parks should be open for everyone to enjoy without huge over payments to have a beverage.
-
- No. It shouldn't cost anymore when the use would still be the same.
- No
- Absolutely not
- yes, maybe like a corkage fee at a restaurant maybe \$5, booking a site is a good idea as there is someone identified as to any damage or littering to be responsible.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- wouldn't book one. Who would be enforcing the "rules"?
- No.
- No
- Yes - \$10
- No difference in cost. Track and see what's going on to see if people are littering etc. Of they are then fine them as they are not the norm
- No. We pay enough in taxes.
- No
- No
-
- No
- No. It should be available in all areas that allow for booking. People shouldn't be punished for being allowed to do this. They have already paid the vice tax on their liquor.
- No.
- That would depend on the price. Maybe \$10 or \$15 more.. but not more than that
- No. Why pay more?
- n/a
- Probably would. I don't know what the fees are but would think a \$20 fee
- No
- no nothing
- Not applicable to my view
-
- no
- No.
-
- No, there is no need to charge extra for liquor consumption. Just like you wouldn't charge those who smoke.
-
- No.
- NEVER
- No
-
- Never. I had to book a picnic site that allows liquor consumption, I would ask for a discount.
- Yes, but only a nominal fee (like for dealing with possible breakage/new litter). \$10 would seem fair.
- no
- No
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Absolutely NOT. I would consider that a money grab
- Yes. \$10 more
- No
- No. there is no additional service being provided on site so there should be no increased cost
- NO
- Yes.
- No
- No. That would be a money grab. No different than booking a site for a bbq. Tired of the city overcharging for every little thing.
- I would not pay more. It's a public site. If payment was required, I would simply conceal it to avoid payment.
- Is this the goal? Revenue generation? Shame on you City of Calgary Parks & Rec... Here's a question "What is the City willing to pay individuals who's enjoyment of a city park is diminished by the group who's party has disintegrated \$200 \$500? per person!
- no
- Nothing. Consuming liquor does not add to the cost of the site. It is currently not allowed so "enforcement" already exists.
- No, I think the amount of tax paid on alcohol should more than cover this.
-
- No...there is no reason for the site to cost more than any other site
- No
- No
- No
- No. But I think if this is approved, people should have to pay more because there will be more clean up and more problems (ex. partying).
- no, why we should pay more?
- I am against having them, but if they are approved, please charge enough to have a bylaw officer permanently at that park, because you are going to need them.
- No. I think all picnic sites should allow liquor so there should not be a price increase.
- Yes....\$20
- No. SHouldnt have to pay more. Not getting any additional services.
- No, the city takes enough of my money, you don't need any more.
-
- No, we will just hide it like we do now
- We do not book picnic sites. We bring snacks in a backpack.
- No, it makes no sense to pay more since no extra service is provided by parks and rec
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I guess so, if it was like between \$20-50.
- No.
- No
-
- no
- No! Why should we? What extra cost does city have that we would have to pay? As long as there are garbage and recycle bins nearby, there should be no extra cost to city.
- Probably not, unless there are more facilities associated with that picnic site
- I would not book a site which allows liquor, nor would I book a site near to such a site.
- No!
- I never book or pay more for a picnic site that allows liquor consumption .
- Yes, 5-10\$ per site (not per person)
-
- I guess what ever the fines/criminal conviction/lawyer fees would be after being entrapped
- No. Allowing liquor should in no way affect how much a site costs to rent.
- No
- Yes \$5
- no
- That would be dumb. And non-sensical.
-
-
- I might pay more to book a picnic site. But I'd prefer this was not a cash grab and rather just a shift in our society to give Calgarians an opportunity to prove that they can be responsible and enjoy a beer or cocktail out in the sunshine.
- No, all sites should permit this. Paying more for a site permitting is a ridiculous proposition.
- No
- no, and I would not pay any amount
-
- No
- No
- No.
- No, as I don't need drunken idiots next to me in a park.
- \$10 more a day.
- YES. \$1000 seems fair
- No, there is no additional cost incurred to allow this at a site therefore having an associated charge is not warranted. This will only encourage people to consume illegally as they are now.
- Yes, double regular fees.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, I think it needs to just become the norm.
- No
- No
- No
- I don't know what the cost currently is.
- Yes, 5-10% more
- No, I think it would discourage people to plan public activities and people would continue home-based gatherings.
- Yes. As long as it's not more than a liquor license
- No
- Yes. 25%
- 5-10% more.
- Unsure
-
- No.. They should all be the same price
- No, I don't see how that makes sense other than to cover possible damage from drunk people
- No
- n/a
- No
-
- No
- No
- Nope.
-
- TBD
- No.
- No.
- Yes - but I don't know how much it costs now ... ? Assume those extra fees collected will go into cleanup and monitoring/policing of issues?
-
- No
-
- Of course not. I would go to a non liquor site and just keep a low profile. So will almost everyone.
-
- No
- nope. would just drink anyways
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No - there is absolutely no reason why a picnic site that allows liquor should cost more. Every person is responsible for cleaning up after themselves; this applies to sites with liquor or not. This would clearly be a money grab for the city.
- No because I have no desire to use but do believe charge should be higher to cover increased costs
- No, I don't think that is a reasonable request to have to pay extra for a choice that is already legal.
- NO, I'm not sure how allowing liquor would increase the cost of maintaining that site. That would seem like just a money grab to me.
- I would, recognizing that there is increased liability. The AGLC private non-sale SEL licence is \$10. I think this is a good starting point. I wouldn't think upwards of \$20 unreasonable.
- I'd be willing to pay a bit more
- No
- Yes. \$5.
- No
- This should be a standard everywhere and shouldn't effect what's already being done at picnic sites
- No, it doesn't cost the city anything to relax the rules. The city needs to get away from this idea of charging more for everything.
- No, being able to drink or not drink should not cost more. This shouldn't be a money grab. If some where legal and some not but the legal spots cost more id book the cheaper and drink anyways.
- I would rather all sites allow it, but if the numbers are limited I would be willing to pay an addition five dollars for the option.
- no I wouldn't but would support the city charging more if this goes ahead to cover increased costs for management/policing
- No
- No. Most of times I've been to one of the sites you see people consuming anyways.
-
-
- If the price is set higher for "liquor consumption" picnic sites, people will just book the other sites and drink anyway.
-
- No. Having to pay more is unfair.
- No. And if the reason for an additional fee was for some initial increased enforcement, then please just raise my property tax.
-
- No, there should not be a user fee for this.
- No
- \$25 more

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, only 5 or 10% more.
- No I wouldn't be booking such a site and would not frequent the parks that do.
- No, against liquor at picnic sites
- No, I would not pay for what should be a right.
- No
- No additional fees. I believe that I will be supplying my own bottle of wine, so that is the additional cost that I am willing to incur. There should be no corkage in parks... unless the city wants to supply someone to pour?
-
- No.
- No, there is no reason to pay more. I think the possible fines for things like unruly behaviour and littering cans and bottles should be enough.
- I think it is unfair to charge extra for liquorm, there are already a lot of costs connected to the purchase. I would reccommend more something like a damage deposit for ALL sites depending on the condition it's left in.
- Yes. 10% more.
- No
- I will stay away from parks that allow drunks.
- No. I don't think the city should charge more for these sites.
- Yes - I think \$10-15 dollars is reasonable.
- as above
- No. No interest in consuming alcohol or cannabis in public.
- no.
- No - this will just lead to people sneaking liquor into sites that don't allow it
- No. I don't think extra cost is necessary.
- Yes. Not more than 15%
- No.
- Not sure how much.
- No
- No.
- Yes, I'd be willing to pay \$10 more if it helped with enforcement.
- Probably not
- Yes, only a fraction of the booking price though (maybe 10% more)
- No
- Yes, I would pay a fee equal to that of the deposit I would get from returning my cans/bottles.
- Yes, perhaps 10% more.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, a small nominal fee - if it comes with additional safety / security measures
- what would the money be needed for?
-
- No; I'd probably book the cheaper one and drink anyways.
- \$5
-
- No
- No.
- No, park are free for use as my city property tax funds them. Why should I pay more for wanting to use a park that is a consumption site?
-
- No, I will not use a park that allows public intoxication at any price.
- No, it doesnt cost the city any more.
-
- No. I feel there is no need to "punish" responsible liquor consumption. If done responsible, it doesn't cause additional stress to the system.
- No it's not relevant to my use so I wouldn't want to pay more for that purpose
- No, I would not be willing to pay more for booking a picnic site (a public site - which our tax dollars help support) to drink alcohol.
- NO,
- No more than the cost of a liquor license
- Yes, of course. I would pay double the current fee.
- yes, \$3
- I'll pay if it permits me to enjoy some ciders with a bbq burger, but I don't think it's reasonable to penalize an adult with more fees for consuming something perfectly legal. I'd be willing to pay around \$10 more, but anymore than that I'll cook at home
- \$5 more
- Are you nuts? Now we are going to have drunk idiots fighting in parks too? You know it will happen. I am tired of seeing drunk, angry, stoned beggars all over downtown to the point I cannot go down there anymore for safety reasons.
- I hadn't thought of that. Are there going to be problems policing non liquor vs liquor sites b/c some ppl don't want to pay the extra charge?
- Not. All sites should be the same price.
- Why would you have to pay more?
- I have never personally book a picnic site, so I do not know what the cost that would be involved. I assume it would make sense to pay more for the added benefit, within reason.
- No - this shouldn't be a money grab

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
-
- No. I shouldn't have to pay more for a "liquor license" at a picnic site, unless there is a valid reason.
- I would not pay to book a picnic site.
-
- Yes, but to a reasonable amount
- Not sure.
- Up to 10 % more
- No
-
- No, stop trying to nickel and dime your citizens at every turn. this is an easy choice that makes peoples lives better.
- No. Why would it cost more? Unless the City is paying for extra park supervision it doesn't make sense to charge extra.
-
- No
- Yes, but marginally more \$5
- I don't believe it should cost more. This shouldn't be a money grab.
- No
- Yes
- No
- No. The city wouldn't incur more costs so why should people have to pay more?
- No way. Why does the city need to profit from what is culturally acceptable in other cities all over the world.
-
- Not willing to pay more. You overcharge for everything as is.
- No.
- Keep this simple, for the love.
- No, why would we be charged more to simply be as we are?
- Definitely NOT!
- No, I think that would defeat the purpose.
- No.
- No
- No
-
- I would be willing to pay a nominal amount more. Otherwise I'll just go to a patio for lunch and a drink.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- No - it's common knowledge that people do it now anyways.
- No. I don't believe the cost should be determined by what you plan on eating or drinking.
- yes. I would not pay more than \$25 for a permit for such a site.
-
- Yes. I don't know how much it costs currently, but probably 25% or so more.
-
- No
- No
- No, its a public space should be able to do what we want.
- No. There should be no fee or booking requirement.
- I'm not certain.
-
- \$10
- No.
-
-
- no.
- No
- Probably. Not a lot though.
- Yes - However it would feel like a ripe off!
- No
- Not willing to pay more.
- I think we all paid enough at the til when buying liquor.
- . would pay, but shouldn't have to . generally opposed to a complex network of user fees for this, that and everything . how much/ anything reasonable in relation to the cost of a bottle of wine .
-
- No
- No.
- No
- No
- No. If it cost more, I'd probably skip the picnic site, or just drink anyway.
- No.
- Yes, I would pay double the going rate.
- no, its not necessary
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, 20%
- Yes
- Yes. A nominal fee to cover costs such as recycling bins of cans and bottles onsite or necessary resources would be acceptable.
- seriously?
- No. There shouldn't be a difference in cost. This realistically shouldn't require increased bylaw. Again, this behaviour is happening now anyway. It seems ridiculous that an adult can't have a single drink while at a picnic/bbq.
- No
- Not willing to pay to picnic with liquor consumption privileges
- Potentially \$5 more.
- No, it should not be any different.
- No.
- yes but not much, maybe \$20
- I would pay a little more. \$5-\$10 but don't think that's fair unless there is a very good reason
- No, because this seems like it should be a reasonable right in conjunction with the reasonable use of *our* public spaces. Alcohol use creates no more cost/cleanup/issues when used responsibly.
- Yes, but not much more.
-
- Yes, up to an extra \$10-15 or so? Would probably depend on the overall cost...
- I would never book a picnic site. A change to the law that requires booking with an increased fee would be discriminatory.
- No. I don't see any justification for why it should cost more. I think people should be accountable to clean up after themselves. I don't see any additional cost of enforcement that would necessitate a higher booking fee
-
- No I would not
- We're going to pour the liquor into red cups at any site that doesn't allow liquor so let's just skip the play acting, eh? So, no, I won't pay extra.
- No.
-
- No.
-
- Yes, I would be willing to pay double.
- Yes. \$15

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I'm not inclined to book picnic sites, let alone pay to book one. If I was organizing a group picnic event (the only situation I could see myself booking a site), then yes I would be willing to pay up to twice as much to allow liquor consumption.
- No. Adding alcohol is not really important.
-
- N/A
- No.
- Yes \$12, like a liquor license price.
- yes I would but I don't know the cost now so I cant provide an answer to the \$ amount. Maybe \$10 more than now?
- Yes. Not sure on costs.
- Yes, maybe \$5 more.
- No. That is the most ridiculous suggestion. That is a kind of discrimination. Which parks go free and which go pay? Ghettoize parks. Terrible idea.
- Nope. If I have to pay more I'll just pour my drink into a coffee mug and pretend its coffee
-
- No
- No
- No need to gouge people
- No, it's a park
-
-
-
- Nope
- No
- No. There should be no additional cost
- Yes - \$10
- No
- No I would not chose a picnic site that allowed liquor consumption.
- I wouldn't be booking one that allows alcohol and likely would be less likely to book a site if they are allowing alcohol.
- No. Why should you charge more??? Cash grab
-
- maybe depending on how much more.
- No
- Not willing to pay more.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, double the rate, to cover enhanced monitoring and park maintenance
-
- I don't support the increased
- Yes
- No
- Yes, I would pay a premium for the site but I think it needs to be affordable so that it doesn't limit access to the wealthy. I'm willing to pay up to \$40/\$50 for that site, but many can't afford that. Should be as affordable as possible.
-
-
- Yes.
- No.
- No, we all do it already
- NO. Why should the city gouge us even more for a simple site?
- I suppose I might, though sites should cost the same regardless of liquor use rules.
- Yes
- No. shouldn't have to pay more.
- No. The law is archaic. If people can smoke cigarettes in the park without paying extra I should be able to drink.
- . yes . but shouldn't have to . opposed to complex webs of user fees for everything in site .
-
- Why would I need to pay more? I'm bringing my own food and drink, regardless of where I am.
- I don't understand why it would cost more and I think this is simply a way for the city to charge more for no reason
- no. if there is a cost to booking a picnic site there should be a universal cost, unless additional amenities are provided at different sites then the cost should reflect that.
-
- No, there should not be additional charges.
- No. This should be free to all taxpayers.
-
-
- No. I pay enough taxes as it is. This shouldn't cost the city anymore.
-
- No
- Yes, a small, but reasonable amount.
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No.
- No fee should be charged for liquor.
- No.
- No
- No, should be equal.
- No
-
-
- No
- No.
-
- Yes, \$10
-
- No I would likely pick a site that is most convenient to where I live
- Within a few dollars
- Yes but not much. Maybe \$20-\$30. I'd be more willing to put a damage deposit down then pay extra.
- No
-
- No.
-
- no
-
- No. I am also disappointed that Theatre Calgary and the Calgary Philharmonic have changed their chairs to accommodate glasses to encourage patrons to drink during performances.
- No
- No
- No
- No - price should be the same.
- I do not think there should be a price difference.
-
- No!
- no
- No
- No
- If necessary whereas I do not believe ones that do not charge more wont still have liquor consumption.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
-
- Not really.
- yes
- Yes. 20\$ more.
- This seems more like a money grab. Shouldn't be at a increased cost. Is there a increase cost to city to do this? If not, why pass on?
- yes. 10
- Yes \$10
- \$20 ish
- No
- No
- I think you should have to purchase a separate permit to allow liquor. People no consuming liquor should not be penalized with higher rental fees
-
-
-
- No
- Maybe a bit, I think that as long as the extra funds were going towards additional cleanup or security or something
- No
- No. Why should you pay more?
- No. It should be the users responsibility to clean up after themselves regardless of liquor use
- No
- No, unless there are more amenities to go along with it
- Yes, only \$5
- yes. 10%
- no
- This is a [removed] question that promotes elitism. Nobody should get to or have to pay for their right to be in a park and have a good time.
- Yes - I would pay an extra \$20-\$50 for the booking.
- not at all
- Do not support alcohol use in the park so not applicable.
- Never.
-
- Yes, to cover site clean up's, etc. I would be willing to pay 5-15% more.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
-
- No
- No
- No
- No, I would not pay more for site that allows liquor although that may curtail negative alcohol related behaviour. The revenue stream from this DOES NOT justify the 'policing' necessary. Allow seasonal, licensed beer gardens that have a business owner.
- yes - \$15
- Yes, \$5/booking. Although it would be hard to monitor, and like I said, people drink either way so people would buy the lower priced ones and still drink.
- Depends on the situation
- Yes, an additional \$50
- It shouldn't be more expensive to book than a regular table that's just cashing in on idea of it
- Definitely NOT
- No. The current fees are enough. If people do not clean up after themselves, they should be charged just as they would leaving a non-liquor site as per current rules and regulations.
- Yes. A \$10 surcharge.
-
- Possibly depending on the cost
- Yes, double the fee to cover additional policing, cleanup, and maintenance required.
-
- yes, 5 dollars
- No.
- No
-
- Probably not.
- No
- I don't think a situation that penalizes those unable to pay is appropriate.
- no
- No.
-
- No.
- no
- No
- Accept only refundable deposits
- NO

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- no. I would just have a drink at one that doesn't allow it.
- no - i would not pay to book at a picnic site, with or without liquor allowance
-
-
- No
- No - I think that would be ridiculous to do. I would just book the best site I could get (location, park, size), and bring my drink anyways. I won't be disrespectful of the park or my neighbours there, I'll just enjoy my beer while I enjoy the day.
- Yes. Maybe \$25
- Yes, up to \$20 more
- No. \$0
-
- No
- No
- It should be the same for both.
- Yes, but not very much. Most likely, the cost would be split between adults in a group so it wouldn't be too bad. However, no charge is always better when you are trying to spend time outside.
- There shouldn't be a difference in cost.
- never. Utterly pointless to make people pay more just so that they can enjoy their own drinks. I would not pay at all.
- No
- Not much more.
- Ten dollars
- Yes no more then \$30
- No
- No.
- No, no and no!
- N/A; not in favour of this idea
- No
- Yes 10 dollars
- No. No reason to charge more.
- No, I don't believe that I should have to pay extra if it's allowed.
- No I would not.
- No. All sites should allow for drinking and not cost more. Alcohol should not be some higher standard and be made different. Normal levels of consumption should be normalized.
- no this is called gouging, [removed] off i'll drink at a regular site then stupid
- Yes, but not a lot. \$25 would be reasonable.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- There should not be a fee. If there is no fee to have a cigarette, there should be no fee for a drink.
- Yes
- It should not matter. If they would like to drink in a public space they should have to pay more. If said person does not clean up OR damages the area, who will have to pay for it?
- There shouldn't be a higher fee to book a picnic site that allows liquor consumption.
- Yes. \$20
- No, not willing to pay more.
- Possibly a bit more, but I'm not sure how much regular sites cost to book.
-
- again. Absolutely NOT. I should be able to use any park and at any time without extra charges
- why do you feel you need to have your hand out for this
- No, this should be a rightful rule not make money
- Definitely not
- Yes
- Yes. Maybe an extra 20 or 30
- Sure. Maybe \$25
- no
-
- No
- Yes. A small fee
- No
- Yes. Less than a liquor license and more than free.
- No
- Yes
- NO
- NO
- Yes. \$25.
- Would prefer not to pay extra
- No, it should be the same cost.
- Maybe, +\$5?
- No. Why should we have to pay more?
- Yes. ~\$50 more
- No
- No.
- Yes. I'd pay a 10% premium.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- Yes I would but not more than \$10
- No
- No, it shouldn't be necessary.
- No
- Yes would be willing to pay more. Not sure of current rates, but enough for consumers to understand liability and costs for clean up
-
- No!
- Possibly. Around \$10.
- No
-
- yes, \$50
- No, you either allow it and dont punish people who want it or you dont and keep it all consistant. Just because someone wants to consume liquor doesn't warrent needing to pay more in my opinion.
- No, I would not be willing to pay extra for liquor consumption.
- No
- No
-
- Yes
- No, since this doesn't require the purchase of a liquor license for every booking I would not be willing to pay extra.
- Yes. I would consider paying about \$50 more.
- Yes. 10 dollars.
- Yes nominal maybe 10% more
- No.
- No - that is ridiculous.
- I think it should be free, but if I had to pay a very small cost (no more than a few dollars), I would.
- What? No. I'm not even sure why you have to charge for them in the first place. Put a deposit in at most, automate it, and make people clean up after themselves.
- not sure - probably
- No, will drink to the site next to it.
- Possibly. As long as it isn't much more
-
- No, I would not book a site that allows liquor consumption.
- yes
- Absolutely not.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- no.
- No
- Yes, \$10?
- I would not be willing to pay extra
- No
- Yes but it would really depend on the site and the facilities around it and again the occasion
-
- No. I'd rather ignore the current unenforced restrictions.
- Yes, but not too much more.
- Yes, though I'm not sure how much it costs to book a picnic site currently. I'd possibly pay 10 to 20% more.
-
-
- No, free
- Yes
- 10%
- No, that is ridiculous.
- Yes, I would be willing to pay another \$25 to allow us to consume liquor.
-
- Yes.
- No
-
- No
- No
- No
- Yes, but only a refundable deposit. City can keep the deposit if the site is not left as it was when they got there.
- Yes.
- Yes, but not much, maybe \$5. Once again, people are probably already drinking anyways.
- No I wouldn't.
- No.
- NO, that is ridiculous
- Yes. Double the price if it includes some kind of license /insurance
- yes
- A small permit fee.
- Yes, \$10
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I believe parks should be available to the citizens of Calgary free for their enjoyment. Paying to have alcohol in the parks does not address my concern and only another money maker for the City.
- No
- No... it seems like prejudice against drinking which is legal if you are over 18.
- None, I don't think there should be a price difference
-
- NO!
- Yes. Depends on size I'd say roughly \$5-10 per table.
- Yes. 10% more
- It really depends on what kind of event your having. Cost should be fair and reflect event size.
- Yes, up to \$5 more.
- No. What is one paying for? The use case of the picnic site is not changing.
- No
- No.
- Yes
- I'd pay 10% more.
- A loonie or toonie would seem a pittance, a twenty would be out of the question. Friends, I believe a fiver would suffice.
- Yes, \$25
- Yes
- No. That's an absurd suggestion. We already pay too much tax on alcohol. Why add this tax?
- I feel sites should be standard rates based on the park and location or it creates a disadvantage to those who want a site particular site and aren't consuming liquor.
- That seems unfair, one picnic site should be treated just like another.
- Yes, but not by much.
-
-
- Yes \$25
- Yes, though I am unfamiliar with the current prices so cannot really speak to how much I would be willing to pay. Alcohol consumption in parks, however, should not be restricted to picnic sites.
- No. It should be kept the same price
- No
- No, that would seem unfair to me. All sites should allow liquor and be priced at an equal rate which supports their maintenance
- Yes
- Preferably not, but if there was a cost of monitoring/cleanliness it would have to be borne.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- Yes, I would probably be willing to pay \$10-\$15 extra.
- No. Charging more becomes a penalty or deterrent to what you are asking to enact.
-
- I'm not aware of what the price is now.
- No
- No.
-
- I would be willing to pay a higher risk management fee, but I believe the rental rate should remain the same. I would be okay with a double risk management fee for liquor consumption.
- no
- No, this should not be a new tax grab.
- No. That's ridiculous. Why should people having a glass of wine with a picnic lunch pay more than anyone else? Especially those cooking?
- Absolutely not - you should not have to pay to enjoy a drink in a public space - gives the initiative a very restrictive approach, as picnic sites are limited and we don't always plan that far in advance. Keep it simple.
- Since allowing drinking does not increase the cost to the city, there should not be a price increase.
-
- I don't think so. I would assume rules may require the individual to take back all they bring in. Paying more for liquor consumption at a site assumes that there is some service that is provided.
- No,
- No. Liquor is already taxed above and beyond other goods, so we need not double up on the "sin tax" concept.
- no
- Nope
- Yes, a 10% increase would be OK
-
- Probably not. Seems like a tax grab.
- Perhaps
-
- Absolutely not
- No
- yes, \$10
- Only on special occasions.
- No.
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, up to \$20 more.
- No, what's the difference? We'd still be expected to supply/clean up after ourselves. What 'service' would be 'offered' for this fee? If the argument is extra policing, I'd argue that people who would abuse public drinking and cause damage, already are.
- Yes. I would say a nominal fee to start but one high enough to ensure people are serious about the implications - \$20-\$30.
-
-
- no
- Liquor should be allowed at ALL picnic sites, so there should be no differentiation in fees.
- I don't think charging more for a site that allows alcohol will be worth it. People will just book a non-alcohol site and continue to "sneak" in their own liquor like they have been.
- I'm not going to book a visit to a park. That is insane.
- 25%
- Not certain
- Yes - \$10-\$20
- No
- No
- No, the fact you need to pay to book a site is silly. Only people who can afford it can enjoy the rule change even though everyone is paying taxes and should have equal access to the park and amenities
- No. Because they should all allow liquor and have the same rules to decrease confusion.
- No because I think all picnic sites and table should allow liquor
- I guess so - depending on whether the extra covers something specific or not. Not knowing how much it costs now I can't comment on a specific \$ value.
- Yes but I would not prefer it
- No. Too many fees exist already. Ridiculous.
-
-
- I don't think this should cost more. People are already drinking alcohol at regulated sites, they are just concealing their alcohol. This will continue as people won't want to pay more for something they are already doing
- Not at all
- nothing
- Yes, if it goes directly to any extra city cost to police/maintain these parks
- No
- N/a

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Absolutely. up to 50%.
- Yes, \$15.00,
- Yes, but only marginally (like an extra \$10).
- That is silly, but very capitalist of you
- I'd be willing to pay more
-
- No, why pay more. Are you allowed the drunk people to leave the site dirty???
- No, there should not be any additional fees or people will just flaunt the rules.
- No. Just make it legal to consume in parks. You're not approving drunk and disorderly behavior, just responsible consumption.
- Yes. Pay to play. I don't think the maintenance of the potential adverse effects should be an overall burden to taxpayers.
- No there's no additional cost to the host for customers liquor consumption if there is they should ban those people from the liquor consumption sites.
- There should be no distinction.
- No
- No, because it won't be overly profitable
- Yes, up to 5% more. I don't believe this should be a chance for a cash grab!
- Cash grab? No. Everyone sees through that ploy, and the fact that you're even charging for picnic sites to begin with astounds me. Shame on you.
- No, but I would pay extra for recycling services if the area is remote. The cost should be covered by the city.
-
- I would, but I think this is unnecessary.
- No
- No - I don't expect costs to expand as a result of consumption being permitted, and so the fees should be the same.
- No
-
- Yes.
- No.
- No, as I believe that allowing liquor consumption does not materially raise the maintenance costs of a site.
- Why would you have to pay more? This to me is another money grab for the city if extra is charged.
- No.
- No.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes but only slightly, around 10% more
- No
- No, I don't think it should cost more to allow liquor.
- No
- No.
- Yes, but not sure what increase
- No.
- N/A
- Sure... Maybe \$5.
-
- yes If it could be explained why it costs more. If it's just because then no, because I don't see why it should have to cost more?
- NO
- yes
- I don't think it should make a difference. So no.
-
- i think this might be a good idea if you are going to do it, as then its contained to a specific site and not an open public area
- No. If it did become legal I would not pay more.
-
- NO
- No. Stop taxing things.
-
- Absolutely not. I don't drink. Why should I subsidize those who do?
- No I would not be willing to pay more for something that should not require me to pay more.
-
- No.
- 20% more?
- No. I don't think there should be a fee increase with alcohol
- No
- Yes - small fee - defeats purpose if too expensive / matches cost of hosting at home/going to a restaurant patio etc.
-
- Yes
- No because it should be allowed either way. The government already taxes your food and drink anyway. I don't see a point of being double taxed essentially.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, doesn't make sense. A family with a bunch of kids is probably going to cause more wear and tear than people enjoying a drink
- Yes, I'd be willing to pay a small amount more. 5 to 10% more.
- No liquor
-
- Yes, \$10
- No
- No.
- 5 dollaz, obviously would prefer 0
- No. Same price.
- No.
- No.
-
-
- No
-
- No
- No
- Quit trying to make a buck on a new rule.
- no
- No, either it's allowed or it isn't.
- No. I don't think fees should be charged
- No, stop taking my hard earned cash, no reason this should have a fee for [removed] sake.
- No.
- Yes. \$10 more.
-
- No. If this is just a dangling carrot to facilitate yet another cash grab by the city, forget it.
- No. If there is a fee, it should be included in the fee, regardless of whether there's consumption or not.
- I would pay more for a site that is far from ones that permit liquor.
- No.
- No, it shouldn't matter whether you drink liquor or not
- No
- no. the rule should apply to all picnic sites, not only sites that are bookable
- No. I would think the city would be missing the mark to collect money for citizens to drink their choice of beverage.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No.
- If you choose to allow liquor, then for sure there should be an extra cost and a specific permit that people would have to obtain
- Yes. 15%
- No. I would only be booking a picnic site that does not allow the use of liquor.
-
- \$25
- No
- No.
- 10%
-
- No. But I would levy a fee if empties are not properly disposed of.
-
-
- No, for individuals, families, and small groups. But for larger groups, perhaps require a significant deposit (\$500?) that is refunded if no confirmed alcohol-related problems are reported to park authorities.
-
- The rates are already high enough, paying more just for the right to consume alcohol is just rude and a cash grab. No I would just choose to leave the city or use my backyard.
- No
-
- Yes. \$5.
- I would not book one that allows liquor but I do believe that they should be paying more to drink in the area
- No
- No
- Not sure of the current cost but might be willing to pay a dollar or two more.
- No
- No, because I don't believe it should be allowed for many safety reasons.
- \$5-\$10
- No-----if you were to pay more, does that give you permission to drink more?
- No, because I'm a grown up.
- Yes
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Paying for the privilege to drink in public seems elitist however it could curb other groups from taking advantage of the rules around public intoxication
- No. Why is this even on the table? Use of public parks should not be a revenue stream for the city.
- No. Is this the City's plan, just another cash grab from tax payers. Now my rights to go to a city park will be taken away as it infringes on my religious beliefs. I never did receive any money back for the elimination of the green /black cart recycling.
- No
- Yes, I'd say a licence for the day of \$5-10
- No
- No.
- Yes, I am not sure the current rate of booking a picnic site but possibly \$50
- no liquor please
-
- No
- No
- No.
-
-
- Definitely not, there is no extra cost to the city...ut would be a money grab
- No
- no
- Yes - 100\$
- No
- NO! It should be allowed everywhere in parks. This is blatantly capitalizing off of something that is already allowed in most places around the world.
- No. Choosing to drink an alcoholic beverage at a picnic site should not cost more.
- No, [removed] off with the fees and taxes already, we are taxed enough
- No.
- Sure but only for a very minimal charge. And as long as the reason for the fees are transparent (ie, used for insurance/liability)
- No. I don't see what the purpose of this extra fee is.
- no.
- Yes, but only slight increases. 5 - 10%
- no, there should be no cost for this.
- No. That's a cash grab
- No
- Absolutly.easily a \$10-15 charge for the ability TO consume would be prefectly acceptable

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- Open liquor display yes. Covert no. Depends upon the park. Probably amount necessary to guarantee a spot.
- It shouldnt cost any more than a standard site
- I think I would depending on the occasion. I would be willing to pay an additional 25%
-
- No
- No. Also, if all parks eventually allow alcohol consumption and if I didn't want to consume at a site, I am now paying more for something that I didn't want in the first place, which is unfair.
- No
- N/A
- There should be NO additional cost.
-
-
- No
- No
- No way. Don't turn this into a cash grab.
- No. It cost the site not more for me to bring my own food or beverage . Garbage/recyclable containers should already be in park..so no additional cost there. I would even bring all my garbage back home. Do not make this a tax grab!!!
- Nope. Liquor is already all taxes. Stop charging residents for enjoying public spaces.
- No
- Yes
- Yes. I would pay \$20 extra to book one that allows liquor.
- No. We would avoid these sites completely.
- no, there should not be a tax on this
- NO !!!!!
-
- Maybe
- Yes, \$10 more. Please don't create a restriction because my idea of fun includes a drink.
- No. It pointless, if you can pour liquor in a plastic cap.
- I'm not willing to pay for booking any type of site.
- Yes. It too much more, a couple dollars, too much more I'd just rather stay home
- I would be willing to pay the same amount as the regular sites.
- Yes, \$10
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No i will not book that place ever
-
- No
- It should follow the same requirements you would pull a liquor license for a private event like a wedding etc.
- No. Price should not change.
- No. Charging more for these sites will just encourage people to drink at the non-permitted ones and cause an issue.
- Not sure, not willing to pay more for that.
- No. There is no need to charge fees for this.
- Yes, depends on the restrictions and length of time are is booked. \$10 more per hour seems reasonable...
-
- Yes. \$10.
-
- No
- Maybe
- I do not want to pay more. But you can get deposit if anything destroyed by that particular group.
-
- Sure \$20
-
- No that's a bit ridiculous
- No
-
-
- No
- Yes, not more than \$50
- This is actually stupid. Why would I pay more to be able to drink? If you charged more, I would not use them.
- No, because there is no additional cost (as I understand it) to the city, therefore, the citizens should not have to pay more for these spaces
-
- I don't think you should pay more to consume liquor at parks because people already sneak alcohol in parks. If you make it pricier, people will just do it behind your backs or not use the site at all.
- No
- no
- Maybe a small inflation for extra recycling bins and maybe park Patrols?

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- no
- No-unless there is a good reason
- No considering users are bringing their own liquor and only renting the same space.
-
- No I wouldn't find having to pay appealing
- Yes
- No. See #3.
- No
- No
- Don't charge, that's ridiculous
-
- Not unless Parks can determine that there are additional costs that result from allowing alcohol in parks.
- No
- Yes. I don't know what they cost, so it is hard to saw how much more I would pay
- no , should not be an extra charge
- No
- No. Why should there be a cost premium??
- I would but it shouldn't cost more money. This shouldn't be a profitable venture for our government. If the idea is to charge for extra cleanup, etc. why not use the littering and public intoxication tickets currently in place?
- Yes.
- No, maybe a small fee for cleanup but not much.
- Yes, it would depend on surrounding venues and their pricing. The picnic site would need to have competitive pricing.
- No
-
- No
- No!!!!
-
- See 1
- No. I'll just drink illegally then.
- Yes. \$50
- No
- No. Don't see why that should be an added fee for those that threat parks respectfully. Perhaps a fine if picnic site is left filthy, which I believe already exists.
- NO

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, I would not pay more for a freedom that should already exist.
- Yes, depends on the cost. I haven't reserved a site before so not sure what would be appropriate above and beyond that. Depends on the number of people.
- Yes. If it was a nominal increase and not absurd.
- no.
- No. There shouldn't be a fee for this. Stop trying to make money off of everything!
-
-
- Yes, \$20
-
- Yes, just a couple bucks, max 5 more
- No I don't think this is a necessary fee.
- Yes
- No, Liquor should not be allowed in the parks.
- Yes, maybe 10-20% increase.
- No, maybe 10% more
- Tons more
- Probably 20 more
- Yes.. doesn't matter
- Yes
- No, we already pay taxes on liquor.
- Yes and a few dollars
- While I would be open to the idea of paying more to book a site that allows liquor consumption I would be more interested in seeing the reasoning for going this route. Some sites can currently be booked for free; not convinced a surcharge is needed.
- yes absolutely. if the liquor license is for private events \$10 then is add this to the fee. if liquor is for sale at the public event, then you should charge substantially more.
- I would say no and make them all able to consume.
- No
-
- no, this should be allowed for free
- \$5
- No.
- No, I don't see how this is relevant.
- Is this about revenue??? I'm even surprised you're using a survey to put words and thoughts into people's minds!
- No, it isn't going to cost more.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- There should be no price difference, as there is no increased cost or additional usage than a non drinking site.
- No alcohol allowed in parks.
- No
-
- No. Find safe spaces for people to consume. If your going to tax it as heavily as you do it's your responsibility to have approved drinking locations in parks
-
- No
- Yes-
-
-
- Liquor should not be allow at public parks
- No. It's a park. You shouldn't have to pay. Don't be dumb.
- No. I think it should be like in Europe where responsible drinking is allowed.
- Maybe 5% - 10% more
- Yes - 10-15\$ more?
- No
-
- .. to drink in the park it WILL at times get out of control and the laws that were there before to prevent people from drinking in a park won't be able to be enforced until AFTER they are drunk and disorderly and causing distress to other park users.
- No
- 5_10\$
-
- No, I don't think there should be an increase in fees at all.
- No. If there's a cost to bringing alcohol, I'd rather not consume any alcohol in parks.
- I would not be willing to pay more as i believe all sites should have access. If the overall cost goes up because of this then so be it.
- No
- It might be a way to collect money to the municipality but compare to the problems this might create is not worth it.
- Probably not, I pay a lot of tax
-
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I do not believe that there should be an increase in the cost of booking a site that allows liquor. Again, the model prevalent throughout European should be followed.
- No it should be the same
- If this is a way to increase the price no. I wouldn't. People will end up sneaking liquor anyways so might as well make all of them equal.
-
-
-
- It should not cost to go to a picnic site and it definately shouldn't be more if you want to drink liquor!!
- No. It should be the same for everyone.
- No no no
-
- Yes, up to 50% of booking fee
- Nope
- no
- Yes, but not if it was significantly higher.. seems like a money grab
- No. It shouldn't cost me extra. I should be able to wander the park with an open container.
- If it ensure that the parks can be kept clean and there is a proper way to dispose of empty bottles then gladly. An extra \$10-\$15 feels reasonable
- Yes - up to 25 dollars more.
- No
-
- no
- No. That's silly.
- Yes. \$20.
- No, City should not jump into liquor business. Picnic sites are for all calgarians to enjoy with family, in sober state.
- Yes I would. I can't say a dollar amount but that's a reasonable way to do it
- Not applicable.
- No, shouldn't be an extra fee. There's already fees of damage or garbage is left.
-
- no
- Hmm I don't think it should cost more. If it did, just minimal. A few bucks maybe.
- No
- Yes
- small nominal fee
- Yes

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, maybe \$5-10 more, it's a privilege not a right so it seems reasonable to charge for it.
- No
- None!
- I wouldn't want to pay.
- 0 because what's the difference between a coke can and a beer can.. they both go into the same recycle bin
- No
- Yes
- no to this cash grab - enforcement alone would cost a fortune
- No, because I would be bringing my own alcohol. Using the same space should not be priced differently based on people's choice to drink
- Unsure
- \$10
- No. Why would I pay extra (or at all) for a picnic site that is already paid for by my taxes.
- I would be willing to pay more if it includes extra amenities such as bottle recycling bins. Not more than 5 to 10 dollars though.
- Yes, ~\$10
- If it is able to be a guaranteed spot and the money goes into the licensing and upkeep I'm all good for that.
- No
- NO!
- No, that's ludicrous
- \$5. This shouldn't be a big cash grab
- Probably. approx \$10
- No - the consumer of liquor rather than a non-alcoholic beverage does not change my use of the site or my impact on the park surroundings
- No ... its cheaper to conceal liquor consumption
- No
- Yes because I enjoy a glass of wine with friends.
- I would pay, if it allowed us other perks, such as able to have music playing and no children around
-
- NO
- No. This is a free country.
-
- I think it would have to be more.
- No
- Not interested

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- no
- No
- 20-30 dollars
- There is no reason it should cost more for me to have a beer than a softdrink, unless irresponsible use increase policing costs.
- No.
- NO. What does paying more provide me with?
- No.
- No
- No
- Yes.
- Why would I need to book a site at a park?
- \$5+ depending on size of party, but if smaller picnic sites with no booking should be free. I don't think that should be a cash -in, charge if behaviour is unruly or folks are leaving a mess. Earn extra cash that way.
-
- Possibly. I think it is ridiculous that its prohibited to begin with.
- I will not pay to use public space, period.
- Yes - \$15-20 more.
- Yes. A very slight amount though.
- a nominal increase
-
- Yes. \$5! Plus this means there likely won't be as many children.
- No.
-
- No! Why should that make a difference?
- Not really. I would rather stay home and drink in a backyard or something that doesn't cost extra.
- Yes - \$25
- No. There is no need to charge fees for this.
- Yes, a reasonable surcharge would be fine. (10\$/person?)
- If there was a small fee, it could eliminate possible delinquencies. I would be willing to pay \$10-\$25
- No
- No - but I think it a great idea for the city to charge more and then reapply that cost benefit to the local non-profit addiction treatment programs
- Waste of money
- No, I don't see a difference in garbage from a picnic or a beer can.
- willing to pay \$20

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- yes \$20
- no
-
- Yes- probably up to \$20
- No
- Not applicable to me
-
- \$5
- on the fence. I see why we would charge but I also don't want to pay. Maybe a fee per head? why pay for kids who are not drinking.
- No
-
-
-
- No
- No
- No
- Maybe. Not much more.
- Yes, \$50
- I don't think it should be an extra fee to drink alcohol at a picnic site, the city would make more from the increase in picnic site bookings alone.
- No, ridiculous they would charge more.
- I don't see any reason why a site that allows liquor should cost more then one that doesn't. People still have the same responsibility to keep the sites clean after use. The city isn't providing any extra services in allowing this.
- No
- No I would not be willing to pay more
- No - no additional cost to city and city could also benefit from deposit return on empties
- No
- Yes I would. Not sure on amount.
-
- No.
- Really wow talk about cash grab
- nope there is no need for booze
- no
- No! Should be free otherwise people will just "hide" consumption

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I wouldn't personally pay a premium - as mentioned several people are already drinking alcohol in the parks.
- No.
- Nope, but someone would probably. Ask someone with disposable income.
-
- No - it should be free as the parks are
-
- No
- No, they should all be open to liquor consumption.
-
- no; why would I have to pay more? i am already paying taxes when buying the liquor.
- Yes \$5-10
-
-
-
- I'd potentially be willing to pay more. Not really sure how much more though.
- Yes. But not significantly more.
- yes
- No, should be universal
- Sure would!!
- Maybe, depends on the occasion I'm booking for.
- No.
-
- No. Why would I pay more to have to bring my own alcohol? I'll pay more if there is a kiosk selling the alcohol I suppose.
-
- No,
- No
- Yes. Double.
- No
- Yes, for a nominal fee say \$10.
- Not sure, how much ate picnic sites now?
- It depends on how long we would be there, but I don't think it's fair to charge usage fees in a public park.
-
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Should be no difference in rate.
-
- I would not mind paying more for a park that allows for liquor consumption. It certainly would make for a fun party.
- Yes I would be willing to pay more. I think \$20-\$30 more.
- Definitely not.
- No payment should be required. Unless there is selling of alcoholic beverages which the algc should be contacted for a permit to sell liquor.
-
-
- no
-
- No.
-
- I would be willing to pay more for sites all together IF this prevents liquor to be allowable.
- Depends...it would be nice if there was no fee, but maybe \$5.00
- I don't know. Would the AGLC get a cut of this? What would the extra charge be there for or used for?
-
- No, there should not be any fee associated with it. As people will then just book regular sites and bring alcohol anyways.
- 50 bucks
- No, because I will drink in one that does not allow drinking because a red Solo cup and a bag for empty beer cans is not hard to come by.
- No. What's the added benefit from the city? Recycling beside the tables?
- no
- No. Not at all. I'd rather stay home on my back porch then pay to drink somewhere else.
- No, your sites are ridiculously priced as is.
-
- I'm not familiar with booking picnic sites - but, I suppose \$10 extra would be okay.
- No
- Yes-max \$20
-
- No
- If it was like 5\$ just as a precaution then yes, but if it's a huge price difference then no.
-
- no

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- no, shouldn't charge extra
- Yes.
- No. It should be the same price.
- NO
- Absolutely not. There is no reason to charge more. Just because we are in an economic recession does not mean the city can make even more money from alcohol consumption. It is already taxed way too high.
- 20% more
-
-
- No it shouldn't cost more money.
-
- Yes but I don't have a comparison
-
-
- yes, i guess. i wouldn't expect to have to book picnic sites, but i guess it would be worth a bit more.
- No
- No
- No
- No
-
-
- Yes- \$10-20 depending on the site
- Yes, and maybe a 15-20 dollar difference.
- Why would you pay more - unless you see some sort of additional cost associated, it shouldn't be an extra charge
- Absolutely not. It should not differ from any other picnic site.
-
- No
- I don't think there should be a higher rate. Should just be allowed to book and drink (within reason). That's the way it is everywhere else in the world.
-
- Yes, but you shouldn't have to pay more
-
- No. It shouldn't matter if you are drinking or not. Price should be the same
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
-
- no
- Unsure
-
- No.
-
- NO, and NO
- no
- No
- NO
- Would not want to pay more. The recycle bins could provide added revenue.
- No
-
-
- sure.
- No, because liquor should not change the price of a picnic site.
- No
- No
- No
- No
- I'd happily pay up to \$ 10 to allow a group to consume alcohol.
- No
- No.
- Definitely not.
- No
- No
-
- No
- No, I don't think it would be fair to have to pay more without receiving any additional services.
-
- No
- No
-
-
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes. \$5
- N/A
- No
- No
- No
- yes - but only a LITTLE bit more.
- No.
- No. Don't want public liquor.
- No
- A refundable "damage" deposit would seem appropriate.
- Sure
- No
- No
- no
-
-
- Yes
- No
- Sure. \$20.
- No
-
- No. There should be no additional charge for this. The same anti litter laws will be in effect and people caught breaking them will be ticketed and fined appropriately.
- No
-
- No, there should not be a differentiation. A picnic site is a picnic site. That said, if there are increased services (really you're just booking a picnic site so there shouldn't be) then an increased cost would make sense.
- No
- No
- no
- I would pay more if I had to but WHY would I have to? What is the difference between renting a site without alcohol? Wait a minute, is this a disguise to get more money out of us?
- I do not see a reason to have increased fees as long as people are cleaning up after themselves.
- No, access should not be cost based if no additional services are provided.
- Sure but only if very reasonable. Like \$2 extra
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
-
- no
- No
- No
- Yes. About \$5.
- No
- No.
- No
- No
-
- No
- No
- Maybe.
- No
- no..should be included int he price
- No, it should be the same rate.
- Yes. I would pay up to \$25 more
- I would not but I would allow someone else to do so
- Yes
- No, I would not be willing to pay more
- Yes
- Nothing
- \$25
- \$50 max
- I would not book that site however if liquor is allowed, the fee should be significantly higher, 1.5 to 2 times.
- No
- Yes. \$5.
-
- Probably not
- Possibly, but I think they should all just be included.
- No
- Perhaps. Maximum \$25
-
- No
- no, I would just hide it as I do today

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- yes, I'd pay up to \$5 MAX more. a Liquor licence is like \$10 for an event, so just to have a picnic where there's not a ton of drinking, \$5 is reasonable.
- NO.
- No
- Maybe \$5, but I do not see point in charging more?
- I would be ok with paying a little more so long as it is a negligible amount.
-
- yes
- No
- n/a wouldn't attend a picnic site allowing alcohol
- no
-
- I can see now...its all about money right! its a profit source for the city.....
-
- no
- Z E R O!! to sit near DRUNKS??? YOU WOULD HAVE TO >>PAY ME<< TO GO THERE!!!!
- No there should not be a up charge for having a site that allows liquor consumption
-
-
-
- Yes, within reason.
- No. Why have to pay extra for something legal. Ridiculous.
- Not willing to pay - numerous cities in Australia and New Zealand allow consumption in parks and Ive yet to see any incidents
- Yes, \$5-\$10
-
- Maybe \$5 per day - maximum
- It should not be payable, those who want to drink should pay
- No, the government doesn't need to needlessly tax people more for no reason.
- Yes and not too much more
- no
- No. I would not book a site that allows liquor consumption. There are bars where adults can drink and not affect children. Or in their homes.
-
-
- No but I would pay \$5 max
- No you shouldn't have to pay more, it should be about personal choice

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, paying more for a picnic site that allows alcohol does not make sense.
- yes, approximately \$100-\$150 more
- No.
- No, but there should be fines for people who leave behind cans and bottles.
- What is the purpose behind paying more? I don't think it's anymore likely that someone will leave behind a beer bottle vs a Pop bottle and both require cleanup.
- No, I don't need alcohol to have a good time with my kids.
-
- no Easier to say all picnic areas than enforce a few. simple rules.
- No,
- I can't fairly answer this question as I have never paid for a picnic site but I don't think paying any price the city reasonably set would be out of the question.
- Likely; \$15 -\$20 Premium.
- No. why should the number of parks I go to be restricted, I pay my share of taxes and want all parks to potentially be available.
- No I wouldn't. People will just sneak in booze like they do now if there's a charge here
- No
- No
- No. Why discriminate?
- No
- No alcohol in parks please
- Yes \$20 more
-
- Yes. \$5
- Yes. 10% more
- No, they should all cost the same.
-
- No, I don't see why this would be necessary.
- No, because it should not be limited to picnic sites
- Liquor should not be allowed at any picnic site
-
- No , why pay more !? That's a cash grab. I'll just drink in my yard then.
- Yes. An extra \$20
- No.
- No
- Yes. The cost of a liquor licence for a small event seems like a fair price. I believe they are less than \$20

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- If there was a legitimate reason for the price increase, then perhaps, but I don't see why there would be a need for a price differential.
- No.
-
- Absolutely not
- I suppose. But I don't think that people should have to pay more either way
- No just make them all accessible.
-
- Yes for a small amount but I don't believe the ability to consume alcohol should be monetized. Any extra revenue would be consumed (and then some) enforcing new rules
- Yes, for about 5 dollars extra.
- Sure, 2\$ - anything more would simply be greed.
- no
- Yes. Perhaps paying a deposit for orderly celebration, and I would pay \$20 or so for extra clean up (I would make sure my guests recycle containers, but not everyone would hold guests to the same standards that I would)
- I'll be willing to pay no more than \$10 more.
-
- No, it should not be more expensive than regular picnic site
- No
- No, that shouldn't matter
-
- I can not see how it would cost more to operate a site that allows beer than one that doesn't so if there was a higher fee it should be modest.
- If it was for an adult party then I assume I would, or I assume others should as they have more responsibility to take care of people being disorderly.
- No
- Not apply
-
- no. all should be treated equally.
- No. It should be included.
- No. We pay high enough taxes as it is. Not another tax grab. This is about families and friends being responsible. Tax grab by fining violations under Alberta liquor, gaming and cannabis act.
- No.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, if people want to drink they will find a way to drink.
- I'd never pay to book a picnic site.
- \$5.00?
- Yes, only if a sensible price to mitigate for potential increased litter or damage to the site. Perhaps \$5-10.
- Yes, I would pay. Fee depends on size of booking. \$5 for a single table, \$50 for large bookings (50 ppl) of multiple tables
- Yes! 5-10\$
- Yes. \$10
-
- Yes. \$30
- Maybe \$5 more
-
- Yes 20 percent
- No
-
-
- I suppose I'd pay a little more if that was the case. But I feel the added cost would be put towards damage caused by the few bad users. Those people will damage things regardless of the alcohol ban. Don't punish the responsible drinkers that enjoy parks
- no, that is ridiculous.
-
- No, no reason for that.
-
- No, should not cost any more
- I think the picnic sites already are expensive enough. So I would prefer not to pay more.
- no, not at all
- No, because I shouldn't have to pay for the privilege. The pot smokers don't have to pay extra. Or the cyclists using the bike lanes don't pay for that
- No. But it's a good idea. Call it clean up fee and deposit for damage or something. Charge more so ppl will be more responsible. Charge more and after assessment give the deposit back.
- no
- No.
- Yes
- No, why would it cost anything?
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Maybe a flat 10 dollar fee
- no
- Really, is this another method that Council is considering to tax Calgarians?
- yes. \$5
- Yes \$15-20
- If the additional cost was minimal. Yes
- no this should not be an option.
-
-
- no
- No - I would avoid them
- Yes I would, likely \$10-20, however it's not clear why there would need to be an additional fee.
- no
- Yes, a reasonable amount
- No liquor in park
- No, I'd just go to a cheaper one and bring liquor anyway, like everybody already does. That sounds like a cash grab.
-
- Yes, \$5 more
- no
- Yes - \$10.
- No.
-
- No
- No. I do not drink. But if people do drink, increased fees makes sense to cover potential issues relating to misuse.
- no
- No, don't want liquor in any parks.
- No.
- Yes
-
- I don't think there should be a payment required. All sites should allow consumption.
- Yes, any decent amount
- no all sites should be equal
- NO
- I wouldn't go to a place where I'd have to book a spot in advance, and certainly wouldn't pay for one.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I no not know what the current cost would be but would be willing to pay 10% more to consume liquor
- No
- Perhaps. It would depend on the cost and the rules imposed, and where does the money go to? Park infrastructure, management, or into city coffers. I suppose I would be willing to pay 20\$ to reserve a picnic spot.
- Yes
-
- Possibly a small amount more.
- No. This would only benefit those able to pay to consume liquor in a picnic. That is classist and unfair. I strongly dislike this idea, as it will only benefit privileged park goers.
- Not much, maybe 10% more
- No cause you shouldn't have to profit over me wanting to have a beer
-
- No. What would the price increase help? What would that money be used for?
-
- No, it's not a priority
- No
- No
- No, why would it cost more?
- No
-
- Yes. What is the cost of licensing an event? 10\$
-
-
- No
- Another fee grab by our city, to charge taxpayers who paid for the parks is crazy. Another tax we don't need
- Yes
- No, it's not that important to me, if it means another kind of fee increase than I would not support it
- No, unless the city is supplying the liquor. I would assume that a Picnic site would already have tables and garbage cans so what would the extra fee be for?
-
- No I would not be willing to pay more.
- No, it shouldn't be any different than bringing any other food/drink to the park.
- Yes. Depends on the size of the group & picnic site I am booking.
- No more than \$20

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, this should not increase the cost associated with picnic sites
- No. Oh I see what this is about now....a \$\$ grab for the city! Ha!
-
- NO
- No.
- No
- No, thats just another cash cow for the city.
-
- no
- I do not want liquor in parks.
-
- Yes
- I have never booked a picnic site for a cost but I would be open to a token amount of increased payment.
- No.
- No. Why does the city need to add an extra charge. What service am I paying for?
- No
- [removed] that. Why would I be willing to pay more? I'm not an alcoholic, and I'm already paying for the booze.
- No
- No taxes are fine
- No.
- No.
- Why should there be a difference? This literally costs the city no more money.
- No
- No
- I suppose so but there would have to be a reason for the increase such as going to pay for higher security levels of the liquor licence of park. If the higher cost was just because Im consuming alcohol then no.
- No
- No, the fee should be the same. Non-alcoholic drinks are purchased in the same bottles so there is no need to increase the fee.
- No. It should be the same.
-
- I would be willing to pay up to \$25 extra.
- No
- Yes - depending on the type of event I was having. I wouldn't pay more than \$20

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- \$50
- No, because the same rules apply to everyone at every site.
- No.
- not sure
- No
- I will not book a site, I'll go use it for free.
-
- Probably a bit more. Maybe \$25-\$50.
- No
- I don't understand why it would cost more but if I did know why, and it seemed to be a reasonable cost, and I felt the need to book a site where alcohol could be consumed, then I would make a decision at that time based on the details.
- No, this should be a free service.
- Yes, I'll pay double the normal fee if I have to
- no. if that was the case I would go to a 'liquor free' site and continue to hide it like everyone else currently does.
- Yes, I'd be open to paying more at a reasonable amount (maybe 25% to 50% more?)
- Yes
- No, liquor sites should be the same price.
- No
- No. All picnic sites should cost the same amount. The only reason I can think of that costs would increase is increased police or bylaw costs to enforce the law and enforcement of civil and safe behaviour should be happening anyway.
-
- Yes as long as the increase in cost was directed at cleaning up the area. Otherwise I don't want to pay additional fees that just goes into the coffers.
- I wouldn't book one that allows liquor consumption!
- Yes. I would be willing to pay a small fee, under \$20
- No. We are on a budget.
- No
- I wouldn't pay anything.
- No
-
- Yes
- No
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
-
- No
- No.
- No, this shouldn't cost anything additional. There would be no different maintenance or anything to justify an additional fee
-
-
- Why the hell should we be charged for that?
- Absolutely
- No
- Perhaps, but no more than \$10-\$20
- I don't think there should be an additional cost.
-
- No
- No
- Maybe, depending on price not anymore than 5 to 10 dollars
- No
-
- No, as they should all be the same and liquor should be allowed
- Yes.
- nope
- It should be the same price. To the issue of drinking and driving - address this by giving people alternatives! It frustrates me to no end that the we spend so much on silly rules from the AGLC, but we won't invest in things like 24-hour public transit.
- 25 dollars more might do the trick
- I will not be willing to pay more to book one that allows liquor consumption. In fact, I would refrain from booking a picnic site where liquor consumption is allowed. The city is going to lose revenue from my booking at least.
- No, but it would help highlight the sites where alcohol is being consumed.
- No.
- yes, but not a big difference.
- No.
- Yes, \$5.
- \$5-10 more

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I would prefer the money to come from bylaw enforcement and due to fines of those with disorderly behaviour or littering etc.
- N/A
-
- Not much more, but yes. Though I'd rather see a small price increase overall than a targeted price on certain sites-- the latter would likely lead to people booking the cheaper site and smuggling their beers in.
- no
- No, because I do not drink.
- No
-
-
- No. Allowing the public to consume alcohol that they have purchased themselves, and have paid tax on is enough. There should never be a fee for consuming alcohol in a park. This shouldn't be a cash grab by the city. The city takes enough tax from us.
-
- No
- No.
- No I would not.
-
- No.
-
-
- Definitely not.
- No
- yes
- NO
-
- No that's ridiculous
- Maybe ... I understand there may be additional costs related to monitoring, and I would probably pay an extra \$20 or so.
- No
- No
- No
- Not likely willing to pay much more , but maybe a small amount ? \$10? \$20
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No, I don't think I should have to pay more
- There is no increased cost for allowing someone to consume alcohol so there should be no increased fees, it would just be a money grab. People already enjoy alcoholic beverages, they just conceal the fact.
-
- No.
- Maybe, if under 10% difference
- No
- No
- Yes a couple dollars
- No there should not be an increased cost for freedom of choice
- No
- No - should be equal
- Yes, \$5-10 more
- No
- No
- No, I don't think this should be considered a luxury
- No - why should I pay more for drinking a can of beer vs a can of sugar water (Coke).
- Yes. Around \$20
- yes, but not a big difference.
- No
- No. I don't drink so I wouldn't pay more to do so.
- No I don't think you should have to pay more
- Yes. 10 dollars
-
- No. Open use of alcohol in public spaces and parks is allowed in many major cities across the world without a cost associated with it.
- Pay more to bring my own beverages and cups..... why the hell would you want to take something good and make it a cash grab?
- Yes, it depends. Probably a percentage.
- yes within reason.
- no
- No I would not. That is as silly as charging people for parking at the LRT (which I refuse to do)
- No. I do not believe this privilege should have a charge associated with it.
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, 20 bucks
- No.
- No I would not.
- No, unless it was nominal, under 5 dollars. More would sound like a cash grab for the city. There will likely be large amounts of returnables the city can capitalize on.
- No
- no
- I already said I wouldn't be booking a picnic table where alcohol consumption is allowed so the question is moot.
- no.
- No
- no
- Yes - but we shouldn't need to. That would just be a blatant cash grab and revenue raiser for zero additional benefit for the drinkers.
- Yes, I would expect to pay more.
- I'm cheap so I probably wouldn't book a site where I had to pay to drink liquor. Then I might as well go to a bar.
- No. There should be no additional fee for this.
- Yes, but about 10%. Cost is no less now anyway with respect to the market.
- No
- I would not be willing to pay more, Parks Canada sites do not discriminate between sites that allow liquor consumption and sites that do not and I refuse to support an increased fee.
- No, I hope all sites will allow liquor
- No
- absolutely not, no way would I pay to have a picnic
- No
- No. Cost shouldn't be a factor of enjoying a beverage outside. That's dumb.
- N/A
-
-
- No
- No. Hopefully all parks will allow it without paying.
- No I don't think it should be more expensive
- Yes and 15
- No
- I don't like that idea that we would have to pay, people are already taxed enough.
- Additional \$10-20

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, double the cost
- No
- Yes. But how would this be enforced? Parks attendants are not going to have the staffing to check on what drinks people have.
- Yes, \$20.00
- Yes, 3 dollars more.
-
- Yes. Maybe 5% more.
- Not sure why the price would be increased but if so, then yes.
- Yes, but I'm not sure I agree they should be more. I'm not entirely sure how much more.
- Yes, as long as that means a separate liquor licence for the picnic site would not be required. The cost of a liquor licence for a private function where the liquor will not be sold in Alberta is \$10; the extra cost should not be more.
- Possibly, depending on the event.
- NO
- NO
- If the city does approve this - then yes there should be substantial additional revenues collected to cover the annual policing costs of this new policy. I as a taxpayer do not want those costs put on my tax bill.
- No, that's silly
-
- yes, \$10
- No
-
- Wouldn't book one
- Why should it cost more?
- No, they should be the same price rather you are consuming alcohol or a pop
-
- No
- No, they should still be free
- No
- No
- No
- no
- no,
- No.
- Not willing to pay more

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
-
- No, seems unnecessary as it's the same amount of waste/recycling. No new disposal bins would be needed.
- No
- I don't totally agree with paying more but maybe 10-15% more would be within reason if their needs to be a price difference.
- No, Park site booking should be free no matter what the site.
-
- Yes, I would be willing to pay \$20.
- No this should t happen
- No. allowed liquor consumption should not cost more to book.
- No
- Yes
- Yes. Not much.
- No
- Shouldn't have to pay anything.
-
- No. They are free now in most major areas I can think of so why would I pay for one?
-
- No. I don't see why it should cost more if I am the one providing the alcohol for myself. There is not cost difference for the city so there should not be a higher cost.
- No, there should be no difference in fees.
- Sure. Small fee. Maybe \$10.
- 5-10 more
- No.
- No.
- Not sure what current rate is so can't say. Shouldn't be more expensive though.
- No
-
- Yes, because if you are booking campsite on a nice sunny day, it adds to the experience.
- \$10 as a nominal charge (similar to getting a liquor license).
- Yes
-
- I would likely pay a little more, but I think that turns into a tax grab that is all kinds of wrong.
- Yes, maximum of a extra \$10 fee
- No. See #3.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. Why should it matter if alcohol is permitted or not? All picnic sites should foster respect for the community, public, and the environment.
- Yes, if it would be much less than spending money in bar and restaurant, probably not more than 5 to 10\$
- Yes, if that's what I was looking for, I would.
- NO. We pay enough in taxes already. This shouldn't be another revenue stream for the city.
- A few dollars more, maybe.
- yes, maybe 15\$ extra or so
- No there is no need for that
- No. That makes it inaccessible for poor people
- Yes, \$10
- no
-
- No
- Yes, \$5.00 per site more.
- No
- No
-
- \$10
- Yes but would depend on how much. If it is \$20 or more I would not book it.
- I don't think there should be a fee just because you/people you're with may consume alcohol. It should be the normal fee (if any) to make it fair for everyone.
- No, shouldn't be charged for having something that should be a basic freedom. The city makes enough and this should not be a cash cow.
- I think I would if I were booking for a large party, but I imagine my consumption would only be with at most a few friends. That kind of party, to me, wouldn't warrant a higher cost.
- I would not be willing to pay.
-
- no
- Yes, maybe 5-10% more.
- Not needed. Would be a discriminatory policy. What? will city hire and send park monitors for specific sites? Would be a waste of money.
- No, sin charges are ridiculous and founded in judgemental opinions.
- No
- Yes. Not sure how much though.
- No they should all allow liquor don't turn it into a cash grab!

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes. I would be willing to pay what the additional costs of licenses, maintenance and management, if any. No more than 25-30%
- Again, why do we need to over regulate. It shouldn't cost more if you have a drink with you or not. Let's focus on an equitable solution.
- Not at all.
-
- I'm not sure
-
- No
- No, why would a citizen have to pay any more?
- No
-
- No.
- No
-
- Yes, CAD20
-
- No. Let's not pull NIMBY on this one either. Litter, safety, noise, cost --- and most importantly, impact on an already burdened CPS.
- No, I dont consume liquor on picnics.
- No
- NO
- No, people shpuldn't have to pay or purchase a liquor license unless they are renting a hall or indoor venue.
- no
- No
-
- Yes, don't know how much do I have to pay currently so I would pay a little extra for "permit" consideration
- No it shouldn't cost more, especially when you are bringing your liquor.
- I don't understand the rationale for charging people to consume their own goods that they have already paid for...
- No. I don't understand why I would have to pay more.
- no. The allowance of liquor consumption should not generate profit/cash flow for the city
- Not interested
- Potentially. \$5-\$10
- Nope I can drink in my yard for free.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I think some would, and some would just book one that doesn't allow it but still consume alcohol but try to hide it.
- None, public parks should always be free of charge
- Not interested. I can have a drink at home or restaurant.
- Yes
- No
-
- no
- No
- Yes. Maybe ten bucks ?
-
- Why should it cost more?
- We are ambivalent on this as we do not drink alcohol ourselves-it would depend on the cost per user
-
- No
- Not applicable to my view of the poor use of City resources that are already stretched. Employees in many divisions would be impacted...more police intervention, more court appearances, more litter removal and garbage services required. The list goes on.
- I would not be willing to pay extra for a site for upgraded privileges. Why should I have to pay more to consume an alcoholic beverage on my camp site
- I would not be willing to pay more for a site that allows liquor.
- No
- Yes - not much more though. Maybe 10-15?
- No
- No liquor in city run public picnic sites at any price.
- No
- NO NO NO NO NO NO NO
- I would - 20% more. But shouldn't have to.
- No.
- No
- No
- as above. There is no demonstrated need and this would cost taxpayers more money in the long run.
- No
- No
- No it should not cost more to use the park in the same way as other people.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, there isn't an argument to why you should pay to drink what you want outdoors. In this case have people pay more for smoking outdoors etc..
- No, Unless there were other additional features at the site that were of interest to me... ie) fire pits, nicer seating, larger space
-
-
-
-
- Yes. A charge under 15\$ would be nominal
- Yes, around \$10.00 more.
- No
- No. I think we already pay for police and by-law enforcement through existing taxes so attaching a fee to what should be our right is over-taxation and fundamentally wrong.
- No, I would not. If I want to pay a premium to enjoy a drink I will go to a bar.
- Yes. \$5.
- No.
- People are going to drink, they are just more discreet about it. I see intoxicated people on transit and on the streets. No reason why tax payers shouldn't be allowed some time to unwind out in nature.
- No.
- No, as I believe that it should be free. What would we be paying for exactly? Security in these areas? If it's only allowing alcohol consumption and no extra strain on the city what would we be paying for exactly?
- Yes \$10-20
- No why pay more
- No, there is no reason it should cost more.
- No. This should be progressing not a new tax bracket.
- No. This feels like an obvious cash grab by the city.
- No
- No
- Not willing to pay more
- No
- No
- yes. Amount?
- 5 bucks
- No
- Fees for consuming liquor at a park should be high to cover cost of cleaning up after and damage that may be caused.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes. Price would depend on cost of nearby sets. Up to \$25 more
- Yes. Small increase.
- No
- No
- \$10
- No
- No
- Yes, \$5
- Not sure.
- Yes any amount
- No - what is the increased cost to the city that requires an increase in the fee?
- No
-
- Depends.
- no.taxes will go up every year at cowtown kremlin no matter what
- No.
- No. No additional operational costs to city.
- No, why should it cost more?
- No. Why should there be a need to pay more? The existing rules are so overbearing, that I see this proposal as a move towards what should have always been normal.
- No, there should be no extra costs but instead fines for those who do not follow the rules
- No. All sites should allow liquor so there would be no reason for a surcharge.
-
- yes - \$10
- No, I don't drink
- NO
- No
- No. If this about making money for the city, you are making a big mistake.
- No, it should be allowed free of charge as there is no reason to charge more.
- No.
- Yes. A modest permit fee would be okay.
- No
- Not sure, I generally don't book picnic sites that you need to pay for. It defeats the point for Q#3
- Yes, \$5-10.
- It has to be reasonable- really people drink by the river in any case, this is a way to regulate it in a way. If it's too expensive, then it's less likely I would do it. I think between \$10-\$20
- I don't want pay more for liquor

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I think having two separate sections will cause confusion. There are not two sections in restaurants. This should be piloted and changes made if required. Over regulation takes away from the changes in the first place
- No, I believe it should be allowed everywhere and not incur an additional cost
- I suppose so - \$25 per site
- no-if they're going to permit liquor in parks it should be every park and picnic site
- Yes. No more than \$20 otherwise people will just keep hiding booze like they do now.
- yes, around 15\$, as a liquor license for events
- No, I usually do it anyways just have a thermos to cover it up.
-
-
- No
- No.
- Yes
- No, I would never book a site allowing liquor.
- N/A
- n/a This question makes me wonder if you are only interested in the money intake, and have no interest in public opinion at all.
- Yes. 10-20
- No
- No. We don't need to tax every small thing. We are taxed way to much already
- Perhaps, would depend on the event and group of people I was with
- It depends on how much more, but it seems strange that one would need to pay more, so I'm not really on board
- I'm not sure why we would have to pay more. I would pay a small fee - \$5?
- no
- It is reasonable that there would be an alcohol permit. \$5-\$15 perhaps.
- No, why would you need to pay more if a park allows liquor consumption? The chances of someone making a mess/damaging anything are just as high as when it's not allowed.
- I don't know
- No
- No
- No. I would not pay extra for this.
- I would but I'd like to know why I'm paying. Is it to offset the cost of the AGLC license? If so, what is that cost and how is it divvied up by picnic areas and users. Otherwise, do we have to have an additional charge on top of renting the space?
- Yes. Maybe around \$20.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Generally not interested in paying anything for park use, unless as part of larger, organized group.
- Yes, a marginal increase (say 10%)
- No
- No, I would not pay more.
-
- No, and this would really make me feel ripped off, if the prices of sites increased, regardless of whether the patron was consuming liquor or not.
- Yes, but not much more. Maybe \$5.
- No.
- I have never paid for a picnic site reservation in Calgary and was not aware I ever had to pay to reserve a site. I will always picnic where there are no fees. If that means leaving city limits, c'est la vie.
- No, it should be allowed everywhere at no cost.
-
- it should be free
-
- If there were additional costs to the City due to liquor consumption in Parks then yes. If it's just a cash grab, then absolutely not. I'm all for user pay but I'm not for having to pay for something that doesn't cost any more than the table beside me.
- No, all sites should be allowing it.
- Yes - \$20
- No
- No, we should not be paying for them now
- No - should not be an extra fee. Public parks are for the public's recreation. I think it is ridiculous we now have to pre book and pay for a public picnic site in the city
- No
- Not willing to pay more for a site, but maybe if alcohol was only allowed at specific parks I would be willing to pay more to go to that park.
- No, same price. Get real.
- Unlikely. Why add this bureaucracy?
- NA
-
- No.
-
- Pay?
- Yes. 25% more.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Suspect those who want this option won't pay for it.
- that's ridiculous. no.
- N/A
- I would not pay more.
- Yes, additional \$20
- No
- Maybe ten dollars
- No, if some are allowed and some aren't I'll save the money and have a beer at the other ones anyways
- I think it would be great to designate certain parks as liquor friendly and others as liquor free. This would create safe and friendly park use experiences for all users. I do not think that there should be additional fees for liquor allowances.
-
- No liquor
- No
- No, because I don't believe that having liquor consumption would adversely affect the state of the picnic site.
- No.
- I don't like the idea of having to pay more, but I would if it was by a small amount (\$5).
- No. Is this the city trying to get more money?
- Sure
- Yes. I would probably pay 50% - 100% more.
- I wouldn't book such a site.
- No I don't use paid picnic sites
- No
- Yes. No more than \$20
- It should not be allow to consume liquor in the parks
- No
- No
- \$5
-
- no price should not change
- I'd probably avoid doing so in that case. The whole point of the freedom of public parks is to go there without having to pay.
- No
- No. Public parks should allow liquor (and marijuana) at picnic sites at no additional fee.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Plan is harmful,
- I would not be willing to pay more - that is ridiculous. What is the extra money funding? we are bringing our own alcohol; that would be a rip off and another example of the being taken advantage of by the city (money grab).
- No, I wouldn't pay more.
-
-
- No. There are no additional costs associated with allowing citizens to act responsible
- Yes - \$50 to \$100
- Yes, a small fee - maybe \$5-\$10 for a group (not per person).
- No. And if this comes down to money the City should have security on site and utilize the new impaired driving legislation and have people do a road side sobriety to get access to their cars
- Yes, 10-20\$ more
- No.
- Maybe, but preferably this would be applicable to all sites, or selected sites without any additional costs. Responsibly consuming alcoholic beverages shouldn't be punished or subject to additional costs.
- Sure. \$10.
- should be the same price.
- I don't think anyone should pay to book a picnic site.
- I dont think we should have to pay more or at all to book picnic sites
- no, that seems silly. Why would I pay for something I have to bring myself?
- Yes - one million dollars (just kidding). I actually have no idea what is the existing cost to book a picnic site. Maybe a surcharge of like 25 bucks would be enough to discourage ne'er-do-wells from abusing the system?
-
- No.
-
- No
- No
- That I don't know how to answer
- Yes
- Yes. For a small group I would be willing to pay \$15.
- No
- Yes (20-30 more)
- no
- no

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I think we should be allowed to have the freedom to drink (with responsibility) in public at a site regardless of the cost.
- No
- I would like to not pay, however, I know that it would be required for upkeep. 5-10\$/hour seems reasonable.
- Maybe
- No
- No
- No, the city already charges a lot of user fees. Property axes have increased dramatically over the past 5-6 years, charging people would only make them drink at a non designated site anyway.
- no
- No. If the city is going to allow alcohol consumption at picnic sites it should be across the board.
- No
- Depending on the event, yes.
-
- no
- No. Not unless for some reason one costs more to maintain than another.
- No
- Yes, 50% more
- Yes, \$25
- No
- No
- No, i would rather not drink than pay. I could go to a bar and pay.
-
- Sure would
- I would pay more, but I'm not sure how much more. It shouldn't be a prohibitive cost.
- No.
- Maybe
- Yes, 20% more
- Yes. Nominal amount
- Yep. \$10-20 more is fair I think
- Yes, maybe 10 more dollars
- no
- Yes. Would be willing to pay \$15-20/booking depending on how large it is
- I don't know enough about the booking prices currently to have any comment on this.
- no
- I don't think there should be an increase in costs due to the possible intake of liquor.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, it should be the same price.
- Yes. I am unsure how much it costs to book a picnic site as is without liquor, but I would be willing to pay an additional \$10 or so.
- No
- No, freedom should not come at a cost
- It must never be allowed to become legal. We are fooling ourselves if we don't think it is already taking place.
- No.
- no
-
- No
- No.
- Possibly , probably not much more. Maybe \$1-\$2 more.
- No
-
- \$10 more
- Maybe. 5\$
- yes, perhaps 10.00 per table
- No
- NO.
- No I would not.
- All should be equal.
-
- Yes I would. Up to 25 dollars for a small group. 100 dollars for a larger group.
- No
- No. I will see it as another government money grab. If governments have their way we will all have parking meters in front of our homes. Start using the money we give you more intelligently. Don't ask for more.
- No.
- No and nothing.
-
- No, I think that if people wanted to bring liquor to a picnic site they would hide it rather than pay more.
- Yes. \$25.00 max extra. Not per person. Total. Anything more than that and I would just hide it like I have been.
- No. There is no difference between a site that allows drinking and one that does not; i.e no other infrastructure or maintenance. There should be NO difference in cost.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes... 5-10\$
- No
- 10\$ more.
- No
- The money coming into the City from this charge is not worthy; families will think twice before going to the park (it will be a shame since Calgary has beautiful parks). The City will need to spend more in supervising , cleaning and maintainace.
- no, why would you charge more? Would you charge extra if soemone chose to eat hot dogs instead of hamburgers?
- Yes, Up to \$5.
- No, I would not pay more.
-
- No I would not be willing to pay more. I don't see how simply allowing something requires a fee. However if there is increased security required or legitimate administrative costs, then yes.
- No
- No that's just stupid and something only the idiots that work at the city of Calgary would think of
- No
- No...this is a terrible idea.just look at the uk..it's meant nothing but trouble
- You shouldn't have to pay more
- Yes
- Only if the City is providing the booze!
- No. Liquor consumption should not affect price of booking a site
- Yes. \$5 more.
- No. I should have to pay to exercise my right to alcohol consumptionn.
- no, there is no reason why engaging responsibly in a legal activity should come at a surplus, particularly when there is no cost to the city for allowing it...
- if it was a big event
- Maybe
- Sure
- No
- No. I'd rather just stay in my backyard then.
- I don't think we should have to pay more for this option.
- No
- no
- No
- Yes. 25% premium, like with campsites that offer wood/fire permits for extra.
- Yes, \$20 more.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. \$0. People are already covertly consuming alcohol in public spaces at risk of fines. Charging for the privilege will lead to this behaviour continuing.
- N/A
- I wouldn't book a picnic site that allows liquor.
-
- Not applicable
-
- I don't know how much it costs right now to book one, but probably \$5-\$10 more.
- Yes -\$5
- no, that seems unfair. especially if it is the only site available and you don't plan to drink. ALSO people will just rent the cheaper ones and drink anyway. That is a silly thing to do. A site is a site.
-
- No interest in booking a site that would allow liquor.
-
-
- No. I think the cost to implement and enforce that would be too high if the goal would be to offset the cost. Parks throughout Europe allow this without requiring people to pay.
- No
- To be honest I would not pay more for an alcohol consumption site. Other Canadian cities are able to sustain the practice without extra cost to public.
- No
- No
- N/A
- Yes. I don't know but let's be reasonable about the price. If it's too much Calgarians will do what they're doing now. Drink in parks but hiding it
- Quite possibly depending on the event \$25-50 per table
-
- Sure , about 25% more
- No I wouldn't pay more
- No, I want to enjoy parks for free or by paying taxes for their upkeep.
- No.
- No.
- No
- no
- Yes; \$10
-
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- Yes, 25% more
- No.
- Not really because at that point I'd have people over at my house
-
- No, what would be the justification in charging more?
-
- No.
- Yes
- No. I don't see any justification to charge more for a site simply because alcohol may or may not be consumed there.
- yes, only a little. i think all parks should allow it anyway
- Yes \$10
- Yes-25 dollars
- No. This should be a permitted use with any site
- No, I don't see why there should be an added fee and would avoid it on principle if one was implemented
- I don't think we need to charge more for booking a site that allows alcohol.
- No- this is not something I would be willing to pay more for.
- No additional cost should be applied.
- Yes. Hundo.
- No. I don't understand why there would be a cost associated with the option to consume alcohol. What would that cost be covering?
-
- No. Cost should be equal. There is no extra monetary cost to allowing this. Lets be honest, people drink at these sites responsibly all the time.
-
-
- I feel like a fee should only be applied in the event of an incident/not properly recycling bottles and cans.
- No - should be the same price.
- No, I don't think it's fair to pay for it when you're bringing your own product.
- Yes- \$10
- No.
- No
- NO - should be the same price
- Yes, 5-10%

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I shouldn't have to pay to have a picnic outside
-
- None, since I don't think it should be allowed.
- Yes, I will be saving compared to if I had gone out drinking at a restaurant/bar etc.
-
- Yes I would be willing to pay a substantial amount more for this privilege, maybe 10-20% if the total picnic site booking cost, but hopefully one day we could move into a society that allows public alcohol consumption at no extra charge to the public
- No
- No.
- No
- no.
- \$10-20
-
-
- No.
- I don't think it should cost more.
- Yes
-
- No
- No.
-
-
- No
- No
- No. It should be allowed. That's like saying we should charge if you bring food, its ridiculous.
- No
- No
- Definitely not.
- No. If this about making money for the city, you are making a big mistake.
-
- No.
- Yes, maybe \$5 or \$10 per table
- no
- Yes. \$20
- No.
- No, I would pay not have POT or alcohol at the park

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- An extra \$5 to go toward liability costs, etc. And yes, I would pay more.
-
- No
- Not at all
-
- None
- Yes
- No
- NO
- no
- No
- I think that you should pay more to book a liquor consumption site. Perhaps 30-50% more than the base fee for a regular site.
- No
- Should charge enough to pay for increased Police and Parks staff to deal with this stupid idea
- Possibly, but I do not like this idea. Restricting public consumption to limited areas or to only those people willing to pay for it will not create incentives to break the rules.
-
- Yes I would pay and price contingent on occasion
- Zero
- No
-
- Yes, but only a nominal fee. I don't see the logic for a surcharge, that seems discriminatory
- No
- Yes, maybe 10 or 20 more.
- no
- No
- No
- I don't think implementing a fee is the way to go here.
- Yes
- Yes, depends on the site.
- Not interested in booking one that allows liquor consumption.
-
-
- No into allowing liquor in any parks
- yes, 10-15\$
- You have to pay for a picnic site??

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes. I don't know how much.
- No. I would not be willing to pay more. I don't see any additional expenses to the City for this option.
-
- No.
- no
- Liquor consumption must be allowed at all sites and they should cost the same.
- No.
- No
- No, I would drink concealed liquor at other sites for cheaper prices. Thats insane.
- No.
- Yes, double
- No and why should I
- I don't know if you need to charge people to have a drink. I think that's silly. You gonna charge people to open up water too?
-
- No
-
-
- No. I don't think this should be monetized.
- N/A. Not going to consume liquor in public parks
- I would not pay for a booking of a picnic or a day use area, I already pay high and full taxes to cover that cost
- Yes. \$5-\$10
- No
- Yes. It would probably depend on number of guests attending.
- No
- No.
-
- No, I would avoid those allowing liquor
- No
- Yes, \$20
- No
- no, please don't monetize public spaces.
- No
- No ,not willing to pay extra
- No
- Maybe a little, but it would have to be reasonable.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. Wouldn't go there!
- Yes, \$20
-
- No, it shouldn't be a higher price tag to allow only some people to enjoy an alcoholic beverage. Doing so is asking for people to break the rules. Cant afford the fee? Well just drink illegally over here while these rich people drink legally 10 feet away.
- Ni
- Cost should be equal to non sale liquor license
- No
- No, it should be free for all Calgarians to enjoy
- No
- No, I wouldn't go through the trouble of booking a picnic site if I had to pay for it, unless the money went to park conservation
-
- Maybe \$5-10
- No
- No
-
- Noues
- I think that is ridiculous. You don't pay more to sit at a special restaurant table that allows a drink. There is no justification for it beyond a money grab.
- Non
- A little more. \$10? Not more than the booze itself!
- Yes, 15-20% more
- No, that is discrimination and would just encourage illegal drinking
- Depends how much extra it costs \$15.
- no
- No
- No this just seems like a cash grab.
- We can have Adult only parks where children don't go
- No
- No
- Yes, \$10 as part of an overall reservation.
-
-
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No - I will stay home in my backyard
- Yes, an additional \$25 on the 1-25 rental rate
-
- No
- No
- No. Why should I pay more to partake in a legal activity to appease the unproven hysteria of a few naysayers.
- yes 10.00
- Yes. \$20?
-
- No. I should not need to pay extra for this.
- Oh, so this is a money making thing. Just as i thought. How can be generate more income for the city? Let me guess. Pot was legalized and will be a great income generating thing, why not drinking?
- No
- No, why would you pay more? Liability and risk? I think that the sites are over seen enough to prevent disorderly confuct, charging more does not seem like a good idea.
- \$10
- No. Picnic sites shouldnt charge period.
- 10% more
-
- No there should not be a charge.
- No - what is the rationale for charging more?
- No.
- No
- No
- no
- Yes, I would pay a small amount extra (up to 25% more)
- No.
- No
- None
- I would not even book in that park who allows liquor
- no -- would chose a backyard or home for indoor picnic
- No
- Prices should not vary.
- No, shouldn't be required.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes. \$10 for a private non-sale SEL licence. That way somebody is responsible for damages. I realize this may not be possible as not all sites are available for booking.
- yes. no more than a 10% premium.
- No.
- no
- Yes \$40
- no more than \$10 per group/family
-
-
- No
- Of course no
- No
- No
- Yes - not sure how much but I would be willing to pay extra.
- NO
- No. But if this goes ahead, there should definitely be a fee for liquor sites for enforcement and cleanup.
- no.
- I don't support liquor consumption in parks
-
- \$20 more dollars per site
- Never
- No, I believe it should be the same. Fines for those who litter/pollute, as you would regularly, but for responsible people enjoying liquor in the park, they should not be made to pay extra.
- No
- Yes, \$50
- No
- Yes
- No
- Yes, a slight increase in fee
- I don't think it should be allowed.
-
-
-
-
-
-
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- NO
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No.
- No.
-
- No
- No
- no
- No, but I would pay to attend a beer garden or small events where alcohol were allowed within a park.
- Yes. No more than \$25 for the total duration of the stay.
- no
- No
- Yes depends on Rates
- No
- Yes. Less than \$20
-
- No. I would prefer to be allowed to enjoy a glass of wine and a snack in the evening along the river without having to reserve a picnic table (which will now become quite difficult).
-
- No. Not sure why it would cost more. It doesn't cost more to drink in public places anywhere else that allows it. (Example: Las Vegas Strip, Germany)
- yes
- Yes, \$10 - 20
- Yes. \$20/hour
- Zero
- no
-
- No.
- Picnic sites should be free to use.
- No.
-
- No
- Yes.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- \$10-15 more.
- No. I don't believe that people who drink are any more expensive to curate to than any other population
- Not at all, should be my right
- No because that's ridiculous. You aren't adding extra things to these sites. If you had built in beer coolers maybe.
- Liquor should not be allowed at park picnic sites!!!!!!
- Yes. I believe a small fee of \$10 or less would be appropriate.
- No
- Not willing to pay anything to enjoy the outdoor park areas in Calgary
- I don't consider the option of allowing liquor to be so important that I would be willing to pay more for that use.
- yes, 10%
-
-
- No, but I agree it should cost more.
- No
- No, it should be a part of the standard pricing for picnic sites.
-
- No, why should there be additional cost?
- No.
- No. It defeats the purpose. People will drink anyway.
- No
-
- no
- yes - 50% more
-
-
- Yes, however, not sure what the reason for the fee would be? \$10.00
- No.
- I don't want liquor in picnic site
- No as there is no understandable reason
- i wouldn't rent one if it allowed alcohol
- \$10
- There should not be any extra cos associated with this option
- no.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, \$5-\$10 more
- No. I feel like it should be the same price. We are already paying tax on liquor
- Should be all allow liquor or nothing for sites.
-
- NO. That would be discrimination.
-
- I'd prefer not to pay more but if I must then up to 10 to 20 dollars.
- yes I would as I think their might need to be a bit more Bylaw or Police presence in the beginning. Maybe a bit of extra maintenance to take care of the empties. I would be willing to pay 10 - 15% more
- Since I currently don't book picnic sites I doubt I would pay to start. However if this helps lower my taxes I'm all for it.
- no, there should be no difference
- No, I do not think so.
- No - these are public lands
- No
- No more than 5 dollars more.
- No. Why should it cost more? It should cost less if the empties are left behind.
- Yes, but I wouldn't want to pay more than \$15 more
- Not sure. I've never booked a park site before
- Yes, maybe 5-10% more.
- No
- They should all allow liquor. I would be willing to pay a very small fee only. But I do think it should be FREE
- I will book only those sites where it is prohibited.
- No
- Yes - \$25
- No.
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes, an extra fee of 5-10 % is acceptable
-
- Yes, it will only make sense because it will involve additional expenses to regulate public liquor consumption. Not sure how much more though
- NO!
- Yes, maybe \$5 per hour max. I also think the parks need to be more regulated if liquor will be consumed, therefore these people will need to be hired to do so.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I will not pay for a park that allows liquor, nor I will book that park.
- No
- fee should be higher to cover cost of cleanup etc, plus a damage deposit. say \$50 plus a 250 deposit.
- No
- don't care
- Yes but a minimal amount, people shouldn't be financially punished for wanting to have a glass of wine responsibly
- no
- I've never paid for a picnic site so I'm not sure the cost.
- I've never booked a site before and have no idea what they cost. Maybe \$5-10 for a guaranteed site that will allow liquor. But again, consuming liquor shouldn't require a booking.
- This would mean that I book picnic sites, which I don't, so no.
-
- No
- No
-
- Slightly more, yes. Say \$20 .
- Nope. If I want to drink, I'll stay home or go to a restaurant or something.
- No, fee should be same for all
- No, absolutely not. There's no reason for this to be a government cash grab.
-
- Yes, within reason. 20-25% However, it would stand to reason that a large number of picnic site participants do not book sites in advance, and simply show up.
- Yes I would but it would depend on what the rules would be and whether or not the increased cost would be a value-added piece.
- Again no. Not interested.
- No, I do not see how having a bottle of wine or a case of beer should increase fees for a group of people enjoying the outdoors.
-
- no
- No
- No.
- no
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- no - what for, its the same site and view whether or not is allows for alcohol consumption. Just a further reduction in the number of sites available if you do not want to be beside a group of loudmouths.
- Absolutely not. It shouldn't be judged differently than a non alcoholic beverage.
-
-
- Sure, maybe \$5 more
- No
- No I would not
- If the park did allow liquor, I would be willing to pay 5% extra of the original price of the booking
-
-
- no
- No I will just hide my beer
- Yes, \$5-\$15.
- Yes. But not much more.
- No. If it cost extra money I would just stay at home
- No. There should be no additional cost from a maintenance perspective. Garbage/litter will be a problem regardless of whether alcohol is allowed or not.
- No, I see no need to charge more for a specific service when nothing about the service has changed.
- That's silly.
- Yes, reasonable amount such as \$5 to \$10
- I would not pay a cents.
- No.
- No
- No
- No
- I would be willing to pay more for a site that allows consumption. I imagine a range of \$10-\$20 extra would be appropriate and no more than \$40 per site.
- No, I would just leave the alcohol at home.
- \$5 maybe it depends I guess on the details and size of gathering. I don't think there needs to be a surcharge.
- Yes, like an additional \$25
- Yes, again depending on what the event/plan is. But paying a small premium for that would be fair. In terms of how much, I have no idea! Not a huge increase over a normal booking would be ideal.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No.
- No
- \$25
- Yes but only a small amount.
- I wouldn't book it
-
- no
- no, it should be the same amount of money. why would it cost more to have liquor
- yes, 10-15%
- I don't know why it would cost more unless you are going to have staff monitor behavior & clean up?
If it was only slightly more I would pay an additional \$5.00 for the booking.
-
- No. I wouldn't pay for a picnic spot in general when I can find free spots.
- no
- Pricing should be equal
- Yes, 5%-10% from the site booking cost.
- No. Unless the City is planning to provide unneeded extra enforcement specifically for picnic sites which allow alcohol, I would not be willing to pay extra. It seems like a money grab.
- No
- No.
- No.
-
- Yes, 20 percent more.
- If necessary, but why? Nobody will be serving me will they? I don't see the need for any extra services or supervision.
-
- Twice the fee. The extra amount would be used to offset cost to enforce controlled consumption and damage.
- Yes, maybe 10%.
- No.
-
- Yes and 10 dollars same as private liquor license
- No
- Yes, but not much more. Maybe \$10.
- No, it should be free for tax payers
- You should not have to pay to book a picnic site....

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. See #4.
- no i would not be willing to pay id rather drink at home for free or do it somewhere else
- No.
- Yes it should cost more but no more then \$20 extra
- NO NOT WILLING TO PAY MORE, WHY WOULD IT COST MORE?
- I do not want liquor in park
- No.
- No, it's ridiculous to pay more for zero increase in service value.
- I think that is a little ridiculous personally. This is not 1920, people should be able to consume a beer in peace without having to pay more than someone drinking a coke.
- 20
- I would pay up to \$25 more
- No.
- No.
- Not at all
- No. There shoul not be an additional cost to consume your own liquor.
- Yes, \$10 per hour
- No
- Sure
- No I would not pay more.
- No.
- No.
- No
- No, if operating costs are no different between the two types of picnic sites then why should one site cost more.
- No
- Liquor in park should not been seen as revenue making by City. It will have way more adverse effects.
-
- no thanks
- No.
- No. I'm getting sick of extra charges.
- pay more why? No enough with this temperance mentality thsi should of been done years ago.
- No, should be the same
- Yesl300
- Yes
- Yea

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- Yes if the consumption requires services to clean up/dispose of bottles etc.
-
- Not the site cost but I think each person should need to purchase a permit approx \$5/day or \$40/season; verifying drinking age, legal accountability transference to the drinker, designated driver etc
- No
- Possibly, depending on the price.
- It depends how much more and why would there be a higher cost because of a type of beverage that can now be consumed?
- no
- No I would avoid at all costs
- No. I'm not a drinker nor my family.
- Probably not. Price should be the same unless there are specific issues that increase costs for the city at liquor-allowed sites.
- Possibly
-
-
- yes
- possibly, even so - is there an overarching need for this revenue? can't imagine there is much revenue to be gained. Is the new revenue worth the risk - i doubt it
- I have no idea what current rate is, but let's say 10% more.
- No. It should be included.
- No
- No
-
- Shouldn't cost more!!!
- No, why to charge more.
- Yes I would. I think \$10-\$20. Something to recuperate costs from any increased clean-up that drinking may cause.
- I would rather go to one with no liquor option to be safe.
- No. Parks should be a free public commodity
- Yes, 25% more although all sites should allow this by default.
-
- No.
- No
- I would not book any sites if alcohol was permitted on any site within park boundaries.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
-
-
- Probably not... well it might depend on the fee, but if unless it is really low I would probably just go to a patio (pub or bar).
- I would never use a public place or allow children in a place where liquor is being consumed
- No
- Maybe, depending on the difference in price
- No
- No.
-
- No
- Unsure
-
- yes... reasonable amount .. as long as it is justifiable
- No
- No. You drink alcohol, with respect, anyway.
-
- No.
-
- n/a
- NA
- Reasonably
- No.
- No
- No
- Yes. \$10 more
- Yes, up to %10 more
- no
- No
- No
- Yes \$ 10.00
- NONE. I am 100% against this idea.
- Yes
- No.
- Yes, \$10-15.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Yes. \$50.
- up to 25% more
- no, cause [removed] you
-
- No. There shouldn't be any difference.
- No. Prices should be the same
-
- Yes - the amount of a liquor license.
- Yes but not much. Maybe \$5
- no
- Yes, would depend on what is needed to keep the park clean and safe
- absolutely not . Less rules, less costs that should go into teh DNA of Calgary Administration at large
- No, this should just be free.
- No. Alcohol should not be allowed st picnic sites. It's not the place for it.
- No
- No. That's not necessary as making alcohol permissible does not increase costs to the city.
- no, would just move back out side the city or simply ignore the by-law as it been done in the past.
- Never. Nill
- N/a
- No - we should keep up with the rest of the world who has open liquor in their parks which are already paid for by our taxes.
-
- Yes. 20%
- I don't think people should have to pay more for this. It shouldn't be discriminated upon for a price.
- Should be allowed everywhere not just parks
- No
- Yes, 20%
- No,
-
- Yes, 5.00
- No. I do not think there should be an increased cost of booking a site that allows liquor. There are no extra facilities required.
- N/A
-
- NO. Drink at home the public parks are for the public which includes everyone and not drunks.
- No or just enough to cover a liquor permit if one is required

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- I would be willing to pay more only if it was necessary to cover insurance or something for the city, don't charge just to make it a tax grab
- Yes, \$10-20
-
- I don't think there's a reason to have to pay more, this just demonizes alcohol when it doesn't have to be, there is a reason prohibition failed.
-
- No
- No, I mean, the bylaw would hopefully allow alcohol consumption in all parks, so it shouldn't need a separate fee. But nice attempt to generate additional revenue lost from bylaw infractions. I bet Jeromy came up with that one!
- No.
- no
- Yes, but not much more. Maybe \$10 more for 1-25 people.
- No. I would pay exactly \$0 for such a site, because I wouldn't book one.
- No. There shouldn't be a cost difference. A picnic site is a picnic site.
- Noo I would not want to pay for it,
- There is no reason to turn this into a tax grab when it will mean less enforcement.
- No. That makes no sense.
- No
- I think the price should depend on the location. I do not think ones that allow liquor consumption should be more expensive
- no, unless the city is supplying the drinks why would I pay to drink my own drinks
- Yes \$50
- No. Why should we have to pay more? That's a total sin tax for no reason.
-
- This isn't something I have budgeted for. Same as a regular aglc liquor Licence for an event?
- No, that is silly. People may still wish to book one that allows consumption, and not consume any liquor, because they like the location! I would simply add an additional fee if the group wishes to have liquor. Like a liquor consumption tax per se.
- No, we pay enough in taxes!!
- No I would not be willing to pay more and neither will the majority since the majority ignores the anti-drinking laws anyways
- No - probably not. I don't understand why it would cost more other than supply and demand.
- Yes, it depends. May be 5-10% extra.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
-
- Liquor consumption is already taxed enough upon purchase. There should not be any sort of additional charge as the activity on the picnic site is identical except for the contents of the beverages. This is a ridiculous idea.
- No
-
- No
- No - I feel this would be a deterrent for most people and most people would just go ahead and do it anyways
- No, we just don't bother booking a site-have meals at home which limits use of public parks. Know that others just bring alcohol and hide it.
- Yes. \$10 per reservation (will require increase in recycling receptacles and subsequent pick up.
- Please make sure that enough is charged to cover the site cleanup and reimburse the family for there loss of income of the parents either injured/killed or just jailed for drunk driving.
- Yes, but Depends on the size of the spot.
- No, I do not feel there should be an added cost for this. It sounds like another way the government is trying to make more money that is not necessary. Alcohol prices and transit costs enough.
- Depending on # of people, \$10 per person/ hr -> Very likely they will not opt for it - Save it for special events, weddings etc.
- No, that is ridiculous.
- Would not want to pay.
- I'm not sure the current rates, but I would accept a small charge of something like \$10.
- No
- No I think it should be same across the board whether you choose to drink or not. By attaching a larger price tag it discourages people from going out in the first place. If you want people to use the park, create the incentive.
-
- Yes- \$5, I think there shouldnt be a cost unless you litter or cause chaos
- Why do have to pay anything
- Yes
-
-
- Nope
-
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- O
-
- No
- Yes. Nominal additional amount.
- No. That seems unreasonable to me.
- No
- I would be willing to pay a little more. I can't answer to how much as I don't know the usual amount a site costs
- No
- no
- no, it doesn't cost the government anything to permit drinking at a park
- I don't think you should have to pay more but I would think it shouldn't be much more.
- Possibly, not a lot more though. If one is responsible and cleans up after themselves and causes no harm, shouldn't have to pay exponentially more or an absurd amount just to consume a product
- No
- Yes, \$5.
- Yes, up to \$10 more
- No
- This shouldn't be looked at as a "cash grab". All parks whether booking in advance or walking down spontaneously should allow liquor.
-
-
- No
- Unsure
- If I felt assured disorderly conduct wouldn't be a problem which I'm not. If guaranteed quiet and not unruly, maybe 30% more
- No
- No
- No. Shouldn't have to
- There should be no discrepancies between alcohol or non alcohol use . Why pay extra ?
- No
- No.
-
- I'm against the idea of grabbing more money from alcohol.
- No
- Noyes
- Yes - I don't know what the current cost is so don't feel I can comment

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No I would not pay more
- No would just stay home
- No
- No
- No.
- No. Sin taxes are already more than high enough. Stop punishing people making legal decisions.
- All picnic sites should be free to Calgarians
- No.
- I already pay my city taxes, so I don't agree with any extra charges
- No we are already charged for things we shouldn't be
- Yes I would pay more. \$20.
- No. It is church people who should have to pay more for the use of any public facility.
- I don't recall the current cost of site bookings but I know they vary by site type. It would make sense then for an extra fee to vary depending on size of the site / how many people would possibly be there.
- No
- \$5 per person
-
- It shouldn't cost more.
- I don't think I should have to pay more
-
-
-
- No.
- No
- No. Individuals who wish to consume liquor at a picnic site should not be penalized by having to pay more for the pleasure of doing so.
- No
- Yes
- NO
- No
- N/A
-
-
- No. I will purposely avoid it. The public park are not supposed to be used to make money please.
- No. That is stupid. People with kids should pay 3x more than single people. Would that be ok too?
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Absolutely Not!!!! I'm not willing to pay any money for sites that allow consumption of alcohol in any form!!!!
- This should not be a cash grab... it's not about the money
- Do you have to pay for picnic sites now? I don't know if any you do..
- Yes, I think a fee would be fine, to compensate for more recycling bins
- Maybe. No more than \$5
- Oh [removed] right off.
-
-
-
- No, booking fees are already too expensive. Why should have to pay more unless more services are being provided within the park.
- ABSOLUTLEY NOT! I can't believe this is even being asked!
- Yes, 10-25\$ more a site.
- No
-
- I would be willing to, but why does it have to cost more? If there are two options: 1) book a site to have a BBQ and drink pop/juice/etc. and 2) book a site to have a BBQ and drink beer/wine/etc.. I don't know why the costs should be different.
- A small fee more yes I would, I would say give or take (a small few) 10% more
- No, I would not pay more. In fact, I disagree with charging for a single table booking in the first place.
-
- I would be willing to pay no more
- No
- No why should it cost more. That's they city being greedy.
- Yes, \$20
- No. Alcohol should be socially acceptable to consume at any park bench.
- No, I would not be willing to pay extra to consume liquor at a picnic site.
- No - why should I have to pay to bring something I already own?
- No
-
- No
- \$20
- No, should be no extra cost!
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. That's taking something that's illegal and making it ok to buy your way to legality. It just sounds wrong. Either everyone can do it or no one can, a person's cash flow shouldn't determine if they get a fine or not.
- No way.
- No.
- yes , 50% more
- Yes. \$25
- Yes
- Yes fee to help for licensing or helps cover costs of employees and help.with maintaining parks beauty and heritage as well as events.
- No
- No
- No.
- Certainly not!
- Not applicable.
- Yes, \$5
- I don't feel this is fair, but yes I would pay a small amount more
- No
-
- No
- Would not be willing to
- Absolutely not!
- No. Not going to book.
- No.
- No
- No
- no
- No. That would lead people to hide it. If it was a small amount like 50 cents, I would.
- Yes, I would say maybe \$10 more
-
- No.
- Yes, depends on the site
- No more than \$5
- No I would not since I do not drink so it would not be something I personally benefit from. But I am sure others may be willing to pay more to partake. The fee should not raise too much though or that could upset people.
- no

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes if it is within reason.
- No
- No
- No
- No. Won't even book.
- no
- Yes. Whatever the cost of a liquor license is.
- No
- Yes. \$10 dollars or so. It should be tied to the additional potential clean up required
- No
- No.
-
- No they should all allow liquor without extra cost
- No, it should be the same price for all sites.
-
- Not at all
- No. All sites should allow liquor.
- No
- No I would not want to pay more
- Yes I would be willing to pay double. I understand this would be due to increases policing around these areas.
- I guess but I don't see why it is necessary in anyway. Why not allow people to socialize in this way and use parks more (that our tax money already pays for)?
- No
- No. I think it is ridiculous to even propose an additional fee.
- No
-
- There should not be an incremental fee, this option presents savings to the city
- NO...Why would I pay more for something that is free and not controlled in other countries?!!!
- No
- No.
- No. There's already police and other services in most parks I don't see why we would need to pay more.
-
-
- No
- Yes, I think a reasonable surcharge is acceptable. It should go to monitoring.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. Providing law abiding citizens the ability to have a drink in public should not have a fee attached to it.
- No - i would rather have an option to donate money to a charity or cause worthwhile instead. But have an option to leave the empties in a recyclable bin to go towards maintenance of the parks
- There should not be a premium on sites where you can drink liquor.
-
- No opinion
- No!
- No
- N/A
- NO!!! Parks are public. If this exercise is just to find another excuse to squeeze dollars out of Calgarians it will fail and I will campaign to vote OUT anyone on Council who approves a paid-park proposal.
- No alcohol, thanks! How about removing bans on having sex in picnic sites too?
- No. I'll just keep my beers down or in a different container.
- Possibly
-
-
-
- No
- No, it shouldn't cost anything to use spaces we already pay tax for.
-
- No
- No - should not be a cash grab for the city.
- Yes. \$5-\$10 more
- Yes - but I have no idea how much picnic sites cost to book, so am not sure how how muchmore I would be willing to pay. Maybe \$20?
- Yes if it was around \$10. More than \$20 would be annoying.
- \$5... Why should it really cost that much more?
- No. There should be no extra charge for a site that allows alcohol consumption.
- Yes, but not much more
- Nope!
- \$5 more. If you're cleaning up after yourself why should there be an extra charge?
- I'd pay what I have to, to get a site with NO liquor consumption
- No
- Yes, although I'd admittedly prefer to see a non-reservation based option,. If booking a small site is approx. \$65, of happily pay \$10-20 for the option to legally enjoy liquor.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I don't pay to use our free public parks.
- No, as I said drinking shouldn't be allowed in parks and it's offensive that any of my tax dollars are being spent to even consider the activity.
- Nothing
- No
- No, charging to book any picnic site is assinine and a poor reflection of the city
- No.
- Not applicable
- 5-10 dollars
- No, I wouldn't.
- 10-25% more
- No
-
- Yes, however it should not cost extra
- No, I would not pay a penny more. The park can profit off my recyclables.
- No.
- Yes about \$10.
- No
- No
- Not at all
- yes. \$10 more
- \$5.00 more
- No
- No.
- Depends on the reason - for a larger event, I might be willing to pay 10-20\$ for a site, but for just for a picnic, I would not be willing to pay anything
- Depends on the cost and the event.
- No, what extra services are being provided that need to be offset by fees. If fees are needed clearly there is no benefit to having alcohol in the park. What do you expect that would require fees to cover and are those expectations good for everyone?
- Not really - I don't know why I would need to
- Nope
- 2 bucks
- No.
- Yes - \$10 to \$20
- Yes. \$5.
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- no
- Nope
- NO
- If a wedding site and it is regulated it should be done by the hour at a fair rate not the cheap cost we have now.
- No I wouldn't.
- No
- No
- Not interested
- No. The parks should remain free and there should not be a cost associated with enjoying a legal activity.
- no. WHY ?? Is there a shortage of places to drink in Calgary ??
- Yes. Up to twice as much.
- I would prefer not to pay more for a site that allowed liquor consumption. As there are no incremental costs for the city related to allowing alcohol consumption at a picnic site, it should not cost more than a regular site.
- Max \$50 per day
- Yes. How much more would depend on other benefits included with the higher price tag. More washrooms, empty bottles/cans collection etc.
- No. No additional cost to allow liquor consumption, therefore, a user fee is unnecessary
- Absolutely not
-
- No
- Yes
-
- YES - not sure
- No, I don't think charging money for outdoor alcohol consumption is fair, but there could be a higher ticket fee for littering alcohol containers
-
- Yes, maybe a liquor lic. Option when booking?
- This is unnecessary administration, I would just continue to have an illegal glass of wine at a normal site if this policy was implemented.
- \$10 more
-
- No
- No. It shouldn't cost money.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No. If this is strictly a cash grab for the city then don't bother. Parks are supposed to be free for everyone.
- no, why would it cost more? That seems strange.
-
- No I don't want
-
- no
- No.
- No
- Yes, 15%
-
- 20% more
- No
- No. There should be no extra charge
- No. Why should this cost more?
-
- Yes
-
- No
-
- No
- No
- Yes if it meant that there was a guaranteed police presence so I understood what the extra \$ was paying for.
- No
-
- No
-
- Tax payers pay for the sites, I don't think we should have to pay anymore
-
- No
- Yes. 5%
- They should all be the same price.
- No, maybe minimally.
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- No
- NO
- Yes, only if the money is put towards maintaining these picnic sites. I would be willing to pay an additional \$10-20.
- No
- Yes
- No. There should not be a charge because you are consuming alcohol. Parks are to be enjoyed by all citizens of YYC at no charge. We pay more than enough in taxes to cover this if done properly.
- not sure why I'd need to pay anything extra
- Yes, I would pay 15% more for a picnic site that allows liquor.
- Yes
- No
- \$5
- No.
-
-
- NO
- No
- No
-
- Yes. For a site, \$5 - 10 more, sounds reasonable.
- No
- No
- Yes. Maybe \$5-10. Any more and it's just a cash grab for the city.
-
-
- Yes betwee 5-15\$ more
- No.
- \$25
- No
- Yes. up to 30% more
- Yes, \$25
-
- Yes \$20
- no

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
-
-
- 10-25%
- yes, \$5 or \$10
- See #4 above!
- I don't think you should have to pay more.
- Yes. Don't know.
- No
- No
- No
- Yes
- No
-
- Preferably not
- Yes
- Yes, probably around twenty dollars.
- yes, minimal
- No
- Yes, 50% more
- No
- Yes.
- No at all I can. I think why would be like that. Will be no fair.
- No, liquor consumption should be permitted at all picnic sites.
- No
-
- No
-
- This sounds like a money grab for a potential small cross section of users. I don't believe the added required police costs would be worth the unnecessary freedom for consumption
- No, picnic sites should be alcohol free
-
-
- Absolutely. I think a fee of 10 dollars a head would be reasonable.
- No. If I'm bringing my own food and beverage, I don't see why I should pay more for a site that allows alcohol.
- No. There's no reason for an increased fee.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
-
- No
- Not really. I think requiring a \$20 liquor license would do the same thing. It would make me pay more to have this privilege. This is also an existing process, so nothin new to administer; cheaper for The City.
- No but I would be willing to pay a deposit in case the site isn't cleaned up properly.
- No I am willing to pay more for the facilities which bans alcohol consumption on site
- Nope. Odds are I would drink anyways at a non liquor site.
-
- Not in my neighborhood, please
- No
- No
- Yes
-
-
- NO
- No, I feel like an initiative like this should be even across the board.
- I wouldn't book one, but I agree with charging more
- No, i think it should be included in the normal price
- No
-
- Nope. Bad idea.
- Depending on the reason for the booking, yes. Probably in the neighbourhood of \$15-20 would be the most I would consider
- yes
- No one
- Yes. 50% more
- We need to abandon our puritanical views on drinking in public. Normalize responsible use.
- not really
- No, you wouldn't get a discount booking a hotel if you choose not to drink.
-
- No
- No. The provincial act allows for users to consume liquor with food in public parks, and I don't feel the City of Calgary should profit from that or be charging a user for an approved activity.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes
- I don't really see a need to pay more. It isn't going to cost the city anything to allow liquor to be consumed. Don't make it a cash grab.
- no, why?
- Yes, \$5
- No. Safety reasons
- No
- No that's lame
-
- No they should be equal but have the option /extra fee if you want to drink in public
- Yes probably only five or ten dollars
- no
- No! Why should we pay more ? Other countries have these allowances and there is no reason to charge for such a thing.... really!
- No
- I would pay more but I should t have to. This would just be a greedy cash grab.
- Maybe \$5, but that seems a bit cash-grabby tbh.
- I would, but only marginally so. Cost should not be prohibitive to the success of the pilot project
-
-
- No
- no
- Absolutely. Depending on how long you could book them for, but I'd pay 100\$ of it was for the day.
-
- No. This should not be a monetization scheme. Let people responsibly consume alcohol in public places. We are not kindergartners.
- No
- No
- Yes, not sure
- Yes. \$8
-
- No
- No way. Pay more for one that doesn't allowing alcohol. \$20.00
- For the amount of picnicking I do, probably not. But when I imagine larger gatherings of families like I see in Fish Creek Park, I would imagine paying extra to have liquor consumption would be a nice choice, to have the option.
- No! What does paying more have to do with having a drink on a blanket in a park

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, but shouldn't have to pay to book a picnic site.
- Twice rate
- no
- No
- No
- Yes - I think it should be significant, not token. ie: \$20 or more (the price of a cheap bottle of wine!)
- no
- No
- No
- No
- No
- Yes. \$5-\$10
-
- No
- No
- Yes I'd the cost directly applied to the clean up/enforcement costs that may arise from being allowed to consume liquor.
- No
-
- No
- No
- no
- My being retired I would say no. On a very tight budget.
- I'd be willing to pay a littleness bit more.
- No
- Not willing to pay
- Nope, we shouldn't be spending on this.
- No
- If consumption is allowed then the fee should be \$200+ to allow for repairs due to possible damage
- No
- No
- No
- No, unless the site came with additional features
- No
- No it shouldn't incur s charge. We are providing our own food and drink.
- Depending on the cost. Probably not as it's not that important to me. It seems wrong to charge extra for the ability to drink.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. No alcohol.
- No. What would be the need for charging more?
- No, I don't think you should have to pay more to be a responsible adult and have a drink
- No
- No because we drink there for the regular price now
- No
- Yes. approximately \$5 for each member in my group
- No, when people book they may or may not know at the time whether there may be liquor
- Not a chance
- n/a
- No
- No. That's absurd.
- no, would avoid
- Ideally it would be a free service.
- No!!
- no
- No. It should not be tied to making money off people that choose to imbibe.
- yes, up to \$20.00
- No
-
- No, I don't like alcohol that much.
- No, if I want to drink I can do it at home.
- Yes. Whatever the amount is, within reason.
- No.
- Yes
-
- Yes, prob 10.00 to reserve a site
-
- I would not be willing to pay more for a site that allows liquor consumption. I would rather have the option to spend time outside & enjoy a drink with friends, but if it's cost prohibitive to myself or others there are many bars/restaurants available.
- Are we expected to pay now? I thought picnicking was free and I think adding the option of alcohol consumption should not alter that.
-
-
- No
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- NO!
-
- Yes. I don't know what sites cost to book, but maybe \$30 more
- Yes, \$5 more
- \$10
- No
- No I would not.
- No
- No
- No
- Should add any cost ... user fees already in place
- no. There should not be a fee.
- Yes. I am unsure of going rates for picnic tables but I'm sure if the table was \$10/table more then most people would have no concerns with this extra pay for the freedom but what differentiates an alcohol allowed table or not?
- Yes - \$10 the standard AGLC liquor license fee for private consumption. Having a liquor license on the person renting the space would be a good way to hold people accountable.
-
- No.
- Yes, I absolutely would pay more. Not 100% sure what the cost is, but maybe add \$10
- We have enough places to enjoy liquor
-
- No.
- No!!!!
- \$100 - \$200 more
-
- Yes, I'd be willing to pay more but I have no idea what the cost to book a picnic site is so I don't know what a reasonable increase would be.
- No
- No
- No
- No.
- No
- No.
- No. All sites should be for everyone. No special treatment
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- Slightly more, if there were extra costs involved with providing it.
- Yes, only a few dollars. I think if you charge too much then people would just book the non liquor spots and still drink there.
- No way.
-
- Unsure
-
- I don't think it should cost more. No
-
- No
- No.
-
- No
- No. No way and how could you manage it? Silly concept. The city is not paying for the alcohol so why would we lay more for it? I don't think you should need a picnic table anyway.
- no
- Not at all
- no
- No
- no
- No I dont think it should cost any different! It's about allowing for growth in society around alcohol not about making money!
- No. I Wouldn't pay more, but if allowed fee should then cover any additional costs associated with enforcement and liability insurance etc.
-
- No
- No
- No, there should be no price increase because of liquor.
- No. Why should we have to pay more to consume a beverage. One should have to then pay to consume soda. We all know how bad sugar is for us
- N/A
- Yes, not sure what the value should be
- No
- No, I do not think this freedom should be capitalized upon
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. Actually, if City goes ahead with it I will not book any site at all.
- Yes - \$10 more
- No
- No
- No
-
-
- No
- It should not cost more, I feel like that is unfair towards drinkers and seems prejudice
- No
-
- No.
- Yes
- Yes. \$50.00.
- Yes
- No
- No
- No
-
-
- Sure, but something minimal \$5.00
- No
- Will not be paying extra for Liquor
- No. We'll drink anyway!
-
- Up to an additional 20 dollars at most.
- I would as long as I intend to consume alcohol; if not, I don't want to have to pay more because that is all that is available.
- No.. it should be allowed in the first place
- Yes. Based on a per/person per site to accommodate ensured funds for additional clean up of the sites. A per person rate should be considered that would allow for additional resources to ensure clean up. I believe a \$25 surcharge would be a good start.
- Yes, a few extra dollars.
- No
-
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes \$10
- Yes. \$10.
- No the price should be the same
- No
- No
- No.
- Nope. Would not pay more, would simply continue to hide my alcohol.
- NO
- No
-
-
- Ah ha, here's where someone makes more money.
- no
- No
-
- No.
- No
- No i would not be willing to pay as the City already expects all Calgarians to maintain a clean picnic site after using it. Why charge more? We pay enough fees in this city for everything.
- Not interested at all
- No. I would just sneak the booze like everyone currently does
- No. That's just a tax grab
- Why would we pay for something that we are not buying??
- No
-
- No. There is no need for an extra cost as nothing special is going in there.
- This should be free not a paid extra.
- Yes, I don't know
- No
- Yes. \$50?
- No, there is no need for a charge to allow drinking. That is just a cash grab.
-
- Absolutely not.
- What a crazy idea. That would mean people who get drunk would all be together and there could be fights.
- No
- Yes \$15

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Maybe
- NA
- No
- I didn't know you had to pay now. Probably \$25 would be the gushiest I'd pay.
- No
- Nope
- Ha Ha Ha, I won't go there but if any park is allowing that they should charge more and be on their own. They should not get tax payers money for maintenance.
-
- No
- No, I think that's a money grab. I think it should be allowed across the board, without cost.
- Yes
- No
- No
- No
- NO! We pay enough taxes - if you want money, try to capitalize on cashing in on recycling fees
- Yes a small amount
- Yes
- None at all. Please stop this evil
- Be interested in paying a refundable deposit to ensure no damage is done to the site
- Probably not.
-
- Maybe. But I don't see the reasoning behind charging more to have liquor. How would you regulate that? Seems like a cash grab. It's either all or nothing in my opinion.
- I would expect to pay a liquor license, but not a change in a park fee. Responsible use should have no implications on park use.
- no and \$0
- no
- I don't think you should have to pay extra.
- not applicable
- No, it should be the same. Maybe include liability paper to some how hold renter accountable for any damage to picnic site?
- No. But if you're going to go ahead with this, perhaps the surcharge can be applied to monitoring the amount of liquor people take to the site.
- No and since I wouldn't plan on bringing drinks, I would be very annoyed to pay more.
- No you shouldn't have to pay more. It will just make people drink where ever they like
- Yes but only slightly. Maybe \$20

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Non applicable
- not applicable
- Yes. Unsure how much more, but there should be an increased fee if it passes.
- No. Why should someone who drinks alcohol be paying any more than someone who is drinking sugar... an equal if not more addictive substance.
- not applicable. I would avoid such locations. And what about the garbage?
- Yes. \$20 or \$30.
- Not sure. What would be the rationale for charging when the picnic sites would be no different than they are now?
- Maybe, \$30
- No
- Not willing to pay more.
-
- No
- No
- Yes. Comparing to how much it is paid at the pub, paying a fee to book a picnic site would be a problem. Around 10cad would be acceptable.
- Not applicable
-
- Yes. I'm not sure what is reasonable other than the increase in prices should cover any additional city resources required to make this change successful.
- No, we would not consume any liquor at the park anyway
-
- Yes, I would be willing to pay \$20 to \$30
- no
-
- No
- Yes! Like \$10 more
- That's ridiculous. There's no reason they should be more expensive.
- None
- No there should be no additional charge
- Why would I pay extra ? No I would not want to pay anything
- No
- N/A
- No
- None
- No in fact it is the opposite. If neighboring campers are allowed to drink liquor, we should pay less.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. I would not want to pay more just to consume alcohol. Everything has a fee it seems. I would not contribute to more taxes and fees
- No
- NO!
- No. Liquor is already highly taxed and there is no direct cost created by the liquor allowance that warrants an increase in fees.
- Yes but not an extreme price.
- No
- Why should you pay more for liquor? Another socialist tax grab? Thieves.
- Do not allow this
- No.
-
- No
- No
- No. Why would it cost more? All sites should allow liquor.
- No that's a cash grab in my eyes. All picnic sites should allow liquor if any.
- No. I've booked sites previously and everyone has survived without drinking
-
- Not much, maybe five bucks.
- No
- No, it doesn't need to be a money grab by the city. Many cities around the world allow liquor in their parks and they do not charge fees
- Definitely Not
- No
- NO
- No
- No
- No.
- No, picnic sites in Calgary are overpriced already!!!!
- Probably not that much more and it would depend largely on the amount of people that will be coming.
- No
- NO. SEE ABOVE.
- Why would I pay? The current system has me paying a fine if I consume alcohol in a city park and happen to get caught, how is this an improvement? It's not like I would be running a bar from the picnic table.
- Yes. I'm not sure what the going rate is.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Yes. \$10?
- Never
-
- Where do you have to pay for a picnic site?
- No
- No
- No
- Wouldn't be willing to pay
- No
-
-
- I don't think I would pay more because I don't understand why liquor consumption would raise the price. I'm a very responsible park user. I book picnic sites yearly and don't believe much would change if I was able to consume liquor.
-
- Probably up to \$20
- No
- no
- No
- Noa
- 50-100
-
- Yes but no more than 10%. Obviously it will take more to clean more often, and there's potential for more damage.
- Pay to use the park? No thanks
- \$5
- Yeah, probably as long as it's not a significant increase.
- No
-
- No
- Yes
- Yes, 25 dollars
- No
- No
- no. I do not have to have a picnic and drink and asking people to pay will not deter the ones who will book a site without paying and still drink

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No I will not
- No, you should not have to pay. We already pay for too much
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
-
- \$10000000
- Noliq
- n/a
- i WOULD NOT BOOK ONE
- Yes
- No
- No. Parks should be free and safe for everyone.
- No
- No.
- No
- No, I would just continue to drink discretely and pay the regular price.
-
- No
- Yes \$10
- I would pay 5 dollars more
- No
- No. All picnic sites should allow liquor.
- I would not want to be around a site where alcohol is/was served freely... always there are those who push the limits.
- Yes ; its shud be a nominal fee . Main idea is to seggregate the crowd
- Yes - 10%
- Yes but that's silly to pay extra just to consume alcohol beverages
- No
- Yes. \$50
- No shouldn't matter what you consume. Should you pay more for beef instead of chicken
- Yes depends on the kind a small fee for a nice bottle, I dont think it would be a good idea for people to be able to bring unlimited amounts of booze

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No.
- No
- No. I'm not planning to drink there. And would like to use any park any time
- do not make a cash grab
-
- No, should be equal.
- Yes, but the cost of collection would likely make this unpalatable. It would be a big negative to introduce. Why make people pay every single time a new option is introduced?
- No
- Yes. But again, it would be dependent on the type of event. If it was a corporate event or a personal gathering
- None
- You should pay more, to offset potential costs of clean up, disorderly behavior and to ensure the person booking is responsible for group actions - cleaning up, using restrooms, drunk driving. Cost maybe 25% more + refundable deposit to ensure clean up.
- Yes \$5-10
- I wouldn't be willing to pay more.
- No
- No
- Yes. 5 to 10 dollars.
-
- No.
- No
-
- No
- No. We pay enough to enjoy our city
- No.
- Why would it cost more? People should be responsible for taking all their garbage and recycling with them (always), there should be no reason for a difference in price.
- Yes, \$5.00 - \$10.00
- No
- no
- yes, \$20
- yes, \$2000
- I would not book with one that allows consumption.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- No
- No. I will rather cancel my booking
-
- No
- no, no reason to unless increased services are required
- No
- No
- No
- Yes. A premium but not more than a 50% increase. Maybe 20-30%
- No.
- No
- no
- No.
- NO
- No,
- No, I would not be willing to pay either way. I pay enough in taxes that parks should not be an extra charge
- no
-
- No
- No
- Yes, with allowing liquor, I think there would be higher maintenance for many reasons. I would pay an extra few dollars.
- slightly more than waht a regular non alcohol site would cost. Maybe 10-15% more.
- No
- no
- Yes, but not much more (~\$10)
-
- No
- Na
- No
-
- This should not be money grab. Not much more.
- None.
- Yes. A small amount more
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Again if alcohol is allowed so should Canabiss.
- No
- No
- No.
- No !!!
- Yes
- No
- NO
- No. I will not picnic anywhere where liquor is consumed and other peoples bad behavior is not controlled by their own "sober" decisions.
- No - not interested in such a site.
- No
- No
- Absolutely not. Fees should be reasonable for everyone.
- No
- No
- No.
- No.
- Yes. A reasonable increase
- I pay enough thru taxation...so NO!
-
- N/a
- No. Can citizens of Calgary just be allowed to enjoy alcoholic beverages (that we have purchased) outside in public places and not be nickled and dimed for everything. Stop putting price tags on everything!!!!
- No
- No
- No. There should be NO COST FOR A PICNIC SITE! Thats ridiculous
- No. This should not be a tax grab.
-
- No I would not pay more .. why would I have to , it is like paying to drink a pop or water !
- No
- No, ridiculous suggestion, what next tax on dogs?
- No
- No.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, for goodness sake that mkes NO SENSE. The city has to STOP nickle and diming us all the time.
- No, this shouldnt be a way to increase revenue.
- Nothing
- No
-
- No. I do not wish to participate.
- No
-
-
- No.
- No
- N/a
- No
- no
- No
- No, rates should go down and be the same for both.
- N/A
- No
-
- No
- No not a chance
-
- No
-
- No.
- No
-
- Yes
- no I would not pay, as people do now it would probably be put in another container or in a beer coozie and who'd know anyway unless being an idiot, in which case the police can ticket for drunk and disorderly .
- Na
- Hope they pay Lots!!!! Make them pay.
- No
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I would not expect any fees related to booking a table that allows liquor as my taxes already should cover that... in France people would riot, so no, if the city is thinking about half allowing it then don't do it
- I would not be willing to pay more. We already have to pay to bring the food and alcohol as well as renting the site.
- Yes maybe 5% additional of the total picnic site cost
- No
- No
- No
-
- No, why would I? The City needs to STOP gouging citizens at every turn.
-
- Yes, 10-15% more.
- NO
- No
- No
- No
-
- I would pay a premium . Not sure what the baseline cost is, but a premium is reasonable
- Should be no charge
- You should not have to pay as there is nothing being added to the park
- Undecided, if >10%, no, if <10%, possibly
- \$5
-
- Responsible usage should not cost more so no.
- No
-
- No, don't see why that would be necessary
- No
- No
- No
- No! There should be no difference!
- No
- No, do not want to be around that kind of environment.
- Money grab vs social anarchy is a big concern here. We have highest shooting events and criminal events, break ins and police killing people for freak reasons. Our police is not trained/resourced adequately to handle even normal conditions.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
-
- No
- No
-
- No. Parks should be for everyone to enjoy. Drinkers already have too many places to drink, they don't need to do it in our parks.
- Yes. \$1-2 more
- Yes, only slightly more
- Na
- Nope. Not a chance.
- No. Will not drink in the parks
- No, being outside is a free event, that's ridiculous to tax someone who wants a glass of wine, over someone that is drinking a pop. Let Calgarians enjoy the great outdoors. I've been to many festivals, where alcohol is allowed, no issues.
- Yes I would. I like to have the option at least.
-
- No
- No, it should be allowed at all sites
- No
-
-
- No
- Yes. Not by much. Maybe 15% at most. I would hope that would cover the cost of the added maintenance that is required when drinks are present.
- No
-
- Yes, I'd pay 20% more
-
- No
- No
- Yes, not considerably more though. Nobody would be willing to pay it and just illegally drink anyways
- No
- No
- \$10 for half day and \$20 for full day
- Would not go there.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- NOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO
- No
- No unless for a specific event
- Yes, \$20?
- Yes maybe \$10
- No I'm not sure I would. I don't see this discernment in European or US cities that permit public alcohol consumption..
-
- No
- NO?
- No
- No, most people would probably just book a non-alcohol site, and drink liquor anyways
- No, if you clean up everything like you should be, why pay more?
- No
-
- No
- No
- I would not go if you paid me. I'm already paying for it through taxes. Spendthrift and morally bankrupt government so desperate for cash, will prostitute parks to drunks, anything for a buck.
- No
- No
- Nothing
- No
- No
- no
- No
- I would rather not, I think that's silly.
- No, it is not necessary.
-
- No
- I don't think it should cost anything more to drink. As long as responsible adults pick up after themselves.
- No, I would just go somewhere discrete and drink anyways
- +10%
-
- Yes, max \$20
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No more than \$5.
- No as again we are not drinkers.
- No
-
- No
- NO
- I would not book a sight to consume alcohol
- No
-
- No, I will not.
- No, I won't pay more for allowing alcohol consumption. Don't want to see more drunks around, seeing enough on the c-trains, under the trees and in downtown.
-
- No
- No
- Not much more
- Yes.
- NO
- No
- Yes. \$25
- No.
-
- No, I'm not willing to front the cost for something that does not explicitly require more to maintain.
- no amount of money can pay if there are victims of people undernfluence of alcohol
- Probably not, or minimal
- No I don't see why being able to drink at a picnic site or not would warrant different prices.
- No
- No - it should not be allowed
- No, why is additional cost required?
- No.
- No
- No
- 10-20\$
- No .
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, I probably would not pay for it. If I have to pay, I would probably choose to go to a patio instead
- No.
- This seems like a cash grab if all you are essentially paying for is a liquor permit.
-
- No.
-
- Yes, only slightly
- No. They should all be the same.
- I am a no to any drinking in any park and especially combining drinking and not drinking in the same park.
- Sure! It all depends! I would suggest \$25-50.00 depending upon the size of the site!
- Yes 5-10\$
-
- Absolutely not!
- No, unless the liquor is supplied by the park
- No
- 5 \$ more
-
- i don't understand why you would have to pay to lay a blanket down to have a meal.
- Yes, not sure
- No, we would probably bring it anyway.
- No as I don't believe liquor should be limited to picnic sites
- No
- Very little. Maybe a deposit that is refunded if the site is left clean.
- Ah... a new cash grab- at least your honest. So therefore if I don't pay to use a public park I can't attend? You've already reduced 2 lane traffic to one during rush hour and planted a cop to tax motorists, does it ever end?
- Yes. \$25
- If the city can quantify an increase in cost to operate the liquor bearing table. Do they require fortification or re-engineering?
-
- NO LUQUOR alowd
- Is this what is also in play, another chance for the city to make money off this. More hidden taxes. Leave money out of it and leave it to what is good and not so good.
- No
- Depends..

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. Is just a cash grab. And would City then raise fees to cover patrols required to enforce the rules? Not fair to tax payers or non-drinkers.
- No, and I advise against raising the price as people will just book non liquor sites and drink anyways.
- No, I would not visit a site that allow alcohol
- This shouldn't be a pay-for-use idea, it should be allowed for no additional cost.
- No, why. Price should be the same
- \$100. If there is money for booze there is money to pay
- No
- Not a chance.
- No.
- A small fee five dollars
- Yes, but I think it should be +\$25 at least to discourage people from using our parks in this manner.
- No
- No
- no, parks should be free!
-
- No
- no
- Maybe 50% more than a regular site
- No
- \$5
- No
-
- Yes, as long as I am guaranteed that site and open liquor is not frowned upon by others. If I do pay more, I do expect enforcement of no open liquor sites.
- No.
- No
- No, why should there be an additional fee.
- Ah ha - here is why the city is looking at this - more \$\$\$
- 20
-
-
- No, I would not be willing.
-
- I'd prefer not to have to pay more for an alcohol site.
- And here's the reason why the city wants it, more money. Why am I not surprised. No.
- Not really. But if it was more I wouldn't want to spend more than 10% more than no-liquor locations.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, you don't pay extra to go most beer gardens
- Yes. A modest increase only to help cover any cost in extra park maintenance or clean ups
- No.
- Yes
- N/A
-
- I would not pay more.
-
- No
-
- No. Allowing liquor should not increase price. If you're worried about left bottles, they will be picked up by the homeless. Win/win
- No extra fee
- Should be free
- Maybe 10% more.
- No
-
- Yes, \$10-15.00
-
- No
- No
- you should defiantly charge more. this is Calgreedy.. people pay for peace of mind.
- Yes
- No it's not necessary
-
- No
-
- No
-
- No.
- No
- no
- If Liquor consumption is going to permissible at picnic/public place, I will never go to that place for picnic, But I will stay & enjoy time with my friends & family in backyard.
- How much security will be provided? I would pay more if sites were patrolled.
- No. Why? I cannot fathom why sipping a wine or beer would cost money. I
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Absolutely not not
- no. it should be based on how the people behave at the site - if they leave a mess, have the ability to charge more for clean up regardless of whether alcohol was consumed or not
- No i would not pay more plus there shouldn't be liquor at a picnic site due to young children
- No. True is, even if you aren't allowed liquor, most people are bringing liquor anyways
- Yes but only a few dollars more.
- No
- No
- No
- I guess I would but I don't understand why it would need to be more as the same rules would apply for clean up and use.
- no
- no
- Yes. \$10 a visit.
- Yes as long as it was not a significant perfect more.
- I would not be willing to pay more money to tax grubbing bureaucrats who exist to line developers pockets.
- No
- No
- 5
- Yes
-
- No
- No. I could conceal the liquor otherwise- this isn't another City of Calgary cash grab.
- No
- No. This should be an everyday occurrence that does not require special permitting or government revenue extraction. France and other European countries are a healthy example
- No.
- No
- No
- Yes. Probably double.
- Tiered picnic sites are neoliberal crock
- Yes \$5 more
- No. That's a money grab. I paid for that site and I should be permitted to engage in legal activities on it.
- Yes. \$5-\$20
- 100\$

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- Very slightly, for the benefit of others who may choose to drink while there, and to help fund the city budget.
- Yes, 20-30 more.
- No.
-
-
- No
-
- No
- No.
- No, I would continue to hide it
- No
- No
- No, because most people should be responsible to clean up after themselves, city should put more recycling bins for cans and bottles so the city can get the money from that.
- No
-
- No
- No
- No, just have somewhere to collect bottles and return them for money
-
- No
- No
- Not interested
-
- never
- No
- Yes. 10% more
- No
-
-
- No
-
-
- NO. I would not visit parks allowing liquor.
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I wont book that allows liquor
- Make it equal
- I would very much prefer not to. I think all sites should be allowed alcohol.
- No
- no
- No.
- Yes \$10
- No
-
- No
- No
- Yes. Not sure of current pricing so hard to say how much more. I've never booked a picnic site before since we aren't allowed liquor, but definitely would if it were allowed.
- no
-
- No, of course not.
- No.
-
- Maybe, depends on how much more.
-
- No, I would not pay to allow liquor.
- Why pay at all? No need.
- No, they are not paying more money to simply allow it I don't think it's fair.
-
- Yes.
-
-
-
- Yes, somewhere in the range of \$10-20.
-
- Noooo
- No, as I don't see what additional value the city would provide for this extra cost
- No shouldn't be any different
- No
-
- No. But if this goes ahead, I would like to see like \$1000 per hour for the liquor sites

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, maybe \$20 more at the absolute most. Charging too much may encourage people to conceal their alcohol.
- None. This isn't a revenue generator, it's about personal freedom. Don't charge anything.
- No, I would just hang in my backyard if that was the case
- No
- Nope.
- Yes. I would be willing to pay an extra 10 for a site.
- No
- No. I don't want alcohol in public places.
- There shouldn't be a cost associated with liquor in parks. Recycling bins are already available so I see no reason for an increased cost.
- No
- Not willing to pay more
- It seems that soon we would have to pay for our safety in public.
-
- I'm not willing to pay extra. See #1.
- Yes. I don't know the price right now.
- No
-
- No
-
- Unsure
- No - they should not cost more.
- No. it going to be a cash grab
- No
- No, but I would be okay with a small refundable deposit.
-
-
- No, this city is expensive enough, especially with all the forced new taxes the city has implemented
- No
- No
- No. They should be the same, unless they offer more services (coolers, etc.) for the price
- No
- Yes. 20% more.
-
- No. Wouldn't book one.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No . Public Park.
-
- Yes, provided those funds could be used to help maintain the parks and police unsuitable behaviour.
- Yes but only if I have to :) maybe \$10.
- Should be free, blanket allowance.
- No, unless it was nominal
-
-
- No I don't think there should be an extra fee for something that should be legal
- No
- No
-
- No.
- no
-
- No
- No
- \$5-\$10 additional I am okay with.
- Yes but no more than \$5. Having to pay would reduce my use of this.
- Preferably no
- No
- Yes, but not much more.
-
-
-
- No
- Yes- a moderate amount more but ambiance and cleanliness is more important.
- I'd be willing to pay up to \$50 extra.
- Yes and no more than 10\$ more per than regular cost
-
- Yes, but I think an associated price is unnecessary. I am unsure if I would pay, and it would depend on where the picnic sites are located etc. Perhaps a few dollars (for the entire family, no per person)
- No
- No they should be all equal.
- Of course not... what an absurd question.
-
- Not sure - I actually didn't realize that you have to pay to book picnic sites, period.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- No
-
- no
- No liquor please
-
- No. We would continue to use other sites and conceal our liquor as usual.
- No
- No
- No, absolutely not
- No
- Yes. Only enough to combat the added costs for more receptacles to collect empties and to pay more staff to manage them as well as the increase in litter which is inevitable
-
- Not applicable to me
-
- Have never booked a picnic site....may consider doing it if alcohol is allowed
- Enough of a rate increase that would cover any potential costs involved with managing such a site.
-
- No
- No
- Yes. 20 percent more.
- No
-
- No I don't believe there should be an added charge. Maybe a deposit system where you pay and if you leave the site in awful condition you don't get your money back.
- No
-
- No
- No
- No.
- No
- No. Does this question imply that some sites will be designated as allowing liquor and thus they will be more expensive regardless of any liquor consumption at the site?
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Yes, \$5
- No - we pay for enough as it is - I don't see the need for a charge.
-
- No, because I don't see a logical reason why it should cost more to be able to drink at a picnic site
- No. I don't feel it should cost more.
- No
- N/A
- No, that's just silly and taking advantage of freedom.
- No!
- No. There should be no additional cost
-
- Yes. It depends. not hundreds maybe \$20 max?
- No
- Yes, \$10
- Noooo
- No, I don't see why a site allowing liquor consumption would have a different rate.
- no
- Yes but not by a whole lot. 20% higher than normal entry.
- No
- No
-
- No
-
- Is this about the money? I don't agree with the idea of liquor consumption at any public area especially a place where their will be children!
-
- Only if you charge extra for those bringing port and shell fish. Why are you trying to profit on selective ideologies?
- I would be willing to pay more, if the money went towards increased security at parks or a betterment of the park.
- No
- No
- No
- No, that is stupid . Where in the worldve you seen that ?
-
- No alcohol at all

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. It should be free.
- No
- I do not believe that parks should cost money in the first place. Accessibility for all people to our cities parks should be priority. By having people pay (now and in future) marginalizes anyone who's socioeconomic status is at or below poverty.
- probably not
- No
- No
- No, there's enough taxes and premium rates for all the things in life
- no
-
- No, you don't need to nickel and dime us for everything. Alcohol in this province is already absurdly expensive.
- No
-
-
- No
-
- Not really. Why would you need to pay?
-
- yes a moderate fee. This might help screen out those that might abuse this
-
- No. Once the activity is allowed I would tend to treat all park space the same regardless of what the signs say. Don't make this more complicated than it has to be.
- No.
-
- No, I wouldn't pay to book a picnic site at all.
- Yes, \$5-\$10
- No. I am low income and would have trouble paying the base fee
-
- No
- This is a potential new money making scheme?
- No there should be no fee charge to use the park.
- No extra charge. That will promote dishonesty. People will do it anyway.
- No. There should be no changes in service required that would need a fee applied.
- No. That is plain discriminatory!
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
-
- I think this isn't a bad idea, having an enclosed restricted area that can be reserved for a cost that exceeds the resulting damage or security cost of the alcohol consumption.
- No
- No
-
- No.
-
- No! Why would it cost more? I am using the exact same public picnic site.
- Yes.
- No. Money grab.
- Yes. \$20-\$25 more
-
- No
-
- No. I would just book a different site then, and we could go without alcohol. Again, not a big deal
- No. Liquor should be the default.
- No.
- No. Should be allowed at all picnic locations for no extra fee
-
- No.
- No
-
- no
- Yes \$5
- i would only be willing to pay more if i understood what the additional fees would go toward. I generally wouldn't want to pay extra.
- Yes, \$5.00. Make it more and people will resort to hiding it.
- Yes, I'm not sure how much but I would definitely pay more.
- Yes, but not a considerable amount more. The reality is that most patrons consume alcohol at these picnic sites under the radar. If the cost is more substantial, people may just choose to consume secretly.
- No
- No
- No
- No liquor should not be allowed in parks or public places

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- \$5 maybe? It doesn't cost the city more, why should it cost me.
-
- No.... should not be necessary
- Sure, 10\$
- NO
- No
- No.
- No never
-
- No, why?
- No
- Yes. I would be willing to pay \$10 more.
- No, I think this would just be another money grab from the city
- No, it doesn't matter enough to me.
- Not really, why should citizens be required to pay more for something that should be allowed regardless? In fact, why would I pay when I can just consume alcohol secretly?
- Yes. Not much more though
- No
- No
-
- NO
- No
- No
- No
- Charging more for these sites would seem to be a blatant attempt at placating those who have illegitimate concerns. Also charging for certain sites creates a needless economic division in our parks.
-
-
- No
- I don't believe they should cost more. It could create a 2 tiered system where lower income individuals may not be able to afford the licensed sites.
-
-
- Public park is suppose to be free
- No.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- no
- No!
- Yes, but I don't think that it should cost more for liquor.
-
- If I knew the park have liquor I won't book at that park
- No
- No
- No.
-
- 10 dollars
- more
- Yes because it would have potentially more maintenance and a certain amount of understanding that this isn't a standard service
- No liquor should be allow at any park.
- No.
- No
- No
-
- Yes, 50\$ tops.
- No
- No
- No - select sites would be inconvenient. It would be an all or nothing application.
- No
- Yes, but would rather not have to pay to have liquor on site.
- Yes, 50% more
- \$10-30 more. There will always be people that act stupid and destroy public property so the city should be able to pay for the renovations without taxes going up.
- No
- No
- No
- No.
- Yes a little more
- No
- No. There should be no difference in price. Were already paying for our iwn alcohol.
- No. Why are my freedoms being charged a sin tax. I would go elsewhere
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- Yes. \$5
- No, premium should not be charged for allowing someone to bring and consume their own alcohol
- No
- No.
-
- No - would just drink anyways
- No, as there is no justification to charge more for a site other than gouging the public for a single extra perk that does not require any change in the site infrastructure.
- No
- No, I dont want to book a site where kiquor consumption is allowef
-
- No
- No
- No
-
- Not really
- No
- No
- Yes, depending if it is a birthday and possibly 5 dollars per adult
- Yes, \$20-\$30 more
- \$20
- No
- no
- No, because it should be normalized.
- None
- Non
-
- No
- No
- No
- no
- Yes. \$5
-
-
- No
- I dont think that it is fair to charge more - why?

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- Nope!
- No probably not.
-
- For a very special event, perhaps would be willing to pay but for an informal picnic meal, no
- No.
- No
- Yes. Say 25% more
- No.
- No.
- Absolutely not
- No I don't want to pay to have a beer at my own picnic
-
- \$5
- No
-
- No
- Yes, \$10-\$15 more
-
- If there is an explanation for the additional cost, that would be acceptable.
- I don't want to take my child to a park or send them around the corner on their own where there is a gathering of people drinking and acting disorderly. A park is supposed to be a safe place.
- Would book a picnic site that allows booze
- No
- No
- no. NO
-
- No!
- No
-
-
- No, this is not a profit centre. Just allow people to be responsible. Fine those who abuse it, & allow those who comply to simply enjoy it. Don't over think this one, the City is not very good at complex problem solving.
- No
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. The city will not hire more people that leave a mess. If a site was booked and a mess left fine them.
- No I would not
- No. It is people who want to drink who should pay for choosing to impose their choices on the freedoms of others. They also should be responsible for the extra costs associated with the potential problems that would arise such as extra policing.
- Yes - \$20
- Absolutely No
- \$5
-
- No! N I hope govt doesn't decide to permit liquor in any space if the customers are willing to pay higher amount to rent the spot.
- No
- No, that's ridiculous
- No
- No. Unless there is a need for monitoring.
-
- No
- No
- Yes, but not by much. Only \$5 more at most.
- Don't want to pay extra...
- no
-
-
- Yes 15-20\$
-
-
- No. The freedom to enjoy beer, wine etc. responsibly at a picnic site should not be financially exploited.
- No.
- No. This should not be necessary as there is no additional cost to The City
- No.
- Should people have to pay more?
- No
- Won't book if they allow liquor
-
- I would not go to a picnic site with liquor, paying for it definitely not.
- Absolutely not.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- no, it should be free. no one wants to pay for this.
- No
- 5-10 dollara
- No
- No
-
- No, I wouldn't prefer
- No
- No
- No
-
- No
- no way. why would it cost more. i'd just book one that doesn't and bring my booze anyways. no one would know.
- No.
- No! Ridiculous idea. a ridiculous idea. Why make people pay more?
- No. I do not think this is necessary.
-
-
- Yes - \$10-\$20 more
- Yes, CAD2pp
- No
- Yes...not sure how much \$20?
- No
- No but I would be willing to put down a deposit if we leave glass or damage anything..
- No liquor is all ready costly dont charge more for some people who want to have a few beers
- No
- Not personally willing to pay more, but the cost should only be commensurate with any cost the city incurs in order to regulate these sites. Cost should include a liquor licence.
- Do I not pay the city enough already?
- Yes. \$20-30 more
-
- No
-
-
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No.
- I will never choose such site that allows liquor even if it is free.
-
-
- No
-
-
- I do believe that if the City is seriously considering this, a permit should be required at a premium rate, ie, 3-4 times the price of a regular spot.
-
- No
- Yes twice as much
- Yes, like a license that you get in a liquor store
-
- No, out of principle as this doesn't cost the city more. If it justifiable does cost the city more than yes I would be willing to pay the increased costs for maintenance within an allowed liquor consuming picnic site.
- No, consumption of Any food or beverage should not increase or decrease the price
- Nah, I'm cheap.
-
- Yes. \$20.
-
- Yes, approx 20.00 more
-
- No
- ONLY IF A refundable amount if the site is left clean and undisrupted after the visit. Otherwise NO
- None
- N/A
-
- No
- Yes but not by much
- No
- No
-
- Yes, \$25

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
-
-
- No
-
- No
- Not
-
- No. We would bring our own alcohol, which we pay for.
-
-
-
- Yes
-
- No
- no
- No
-
- What price is it worth to ruin a really nice day??
- No
-
- No
-
- No
- No. I dont see any reason to make liquor consuming picnic sites more money.
- No
- Yes, \$5
- I will not book the one that allows drinking because you dont need to drink at a public place
-
-
-
- No
- No
-
- No way
- No
- No that's unreasonable taxation. Taxes already pay for the parks, charging a liquor fee is blatant greediness as it does not require extra service or cost.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No
- No
- No
-
-
- NO.
- No. It should not cost more to have this option.
- No
- Not at all.
- No.
- Yes but only \$25 more or less (it's already quite expensive to book a site).
- No
- Fees should be the same as any group booking a site, a can of pop is the same impact as a can of beer
- No, I would rather not to go to that spot.
- No
-
-
-
- No
- No
-
-
-
- I will not.
- No
-
- No
-
- No
- No
- No, I dont think it should matter. It's all public property so there shouldn't be a charge based on what drink you consume
- No
- Zero and I won't go there with my fam.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Never.
- Would not be paying more unless we can sell liquor & recover the costs
-
- No!
- NO
- There shouldn't be a cost. This is wrong why does one need to drink at a park?
- No, that's ridiculous. A money grab. Let people be and stop taxing us!!
- Yes but only slightly.
- NA
-
-
- N/A
- Again, no.
-
-
- No.
- No!
- Yes. \$20
- No
- No
-
- Unsure.
- Not applicable. I wint book liquor site
- No
- Nomy safety
- If you want, you should have to pay.
- No
- Yes. \$25-50 more.
- No
- Yes 10\$
- No
- No. They all ahold be free anyway. Never lived in a city in europe or latin america were it costs money to use a public park
- No
- No
- Zero.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No liquor
- No
- There should be no addition costs.
- No
-
- No
-
- Bo
- Yes charge more
-
- No, I hope raising more money isn't your main motivation to allow this to happen.
- No
- I think there should be no difference in price between sites with consumption or without consumption
- No
- Yes. 20 % more.
- Yes
-
- No, absolutely not
- We will not book at all
-
- Not willing to pay anything extra
- No. there is no extra cost to the city so why pay more
- Yes \$25
- Yes, maybe \$10-\$20
- Yes, \$20
- No
- Yes, no more then %20 though.
-
- No
- No
-
-
-
- No
- No
-
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No
- Yes, \$50
- Maybe, \$25
-
- No
-
- No of course
- no.
-
- No, I would not be willing to pay more.
- No
-
-
-
- Never
- No, I don't think there should be two tiered park bookings. That isn't fair to the public if all the non-liquor sites are full we would be forced to pay more and book a site where people would be drinking.
-
- No
- Nope
- There should not be an extra charge
- No. It shouldn't cost more to allow liquor.
- [removed] no. Why would you charge more?
- No.
- no
- No
-
- No
-
-
- No I don't
- No, why on Earth should it cost more? Stop trying to nickel and dime us!
- No that's not fair. I'm already paying a ton of taxes on alcohol. Which country does that?? That's just money grabbing!!! You should be ashamed!
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- NA
- No
- No
- No
-
- No
-
- No
-
- Yes.
- No.
- Maybe, as long as it's not more than \$20 or so. More would seem like a cash grab
- No
- Yes, \$15
- No
-
- I will not book a site that allow liqure.
- Yes... \$10
- Nothing.
-
- No I don't pay more for alcohol
-
- NA
- No, I will ne not pay more for liquor.
-
- No, shouldn't be necessary
- No
-
- No
- Yes, but only marginally. Maybe \$5 to \$10 max.
- N/A
- No
- Not at all
-
- That seems shady and in poor spirit
-
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- I would never book in liquor allowed site
- No
- No
- Yes. \$20 more qt least.
-
- Nothing
-
- No
- No
- No
-
- No
- No why should we have to pay more? That is ridiculous.
-
- No, I'd rather avoid such sites
- No
- Probably not
- No
- No
- No. My taxes already go towards city parks, I shouldn't have to pay any fees for booking picnic tables. It puts low income families at a disadvantage.
- No. I would only want to go to picnic tables that are free use. Not the paid for booking sites.
-
- No
-
-
- No
- No I believe this should be free, our social gatherings should not be taxed
- No
- No
- Not at all. I would never even book for such place rather paying extra.
- No
- I don't think there should be any Increased cost. Increased pricing will just encourage people to drink at non-designated picnic sites - like everyone is already doing.
- No there should not be a premium tax.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Sure, extra \$25
- Unsure.
- No
- Pending the function, I would say I would be willing to pay double if there was the opportunity to have more people out that could celebrate or enjoy the space. Similar to camping.
- Yes, not sure as I don't typically rent a picnic site (too expensive, too big for what I need); maybe \$25-\$50 more depending on the size of the group?
-
- No
- No
- No
-
- Yes. Hard to answer the second part as I have no idea what a picnic site costs.
- N/a. No
- Probably not.
- No
- no not at all
- No liquor allowed
- No
-
- Cost per site should be consumerate with other recreational facilities
- No
- I do not think there should be an additional charge
-
- No. this should not be a cash cow for the city. It should be every persons right to enjoy a drink but not to have to pay for it.
- No.
- Yes, but not crazy amounts to cover City tax breaks
-
- No,never
- No
-
-
- I would, maybe 30-40% more.
- No
-
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- nope.
- No because is very dangerous
- Maybe
- No
- Yes, 10\$
-
- Yes, I will pay 50% more
- Yes, \$50
- No
- No
-
-
- No
-
- No. We pay enough for vine/beer in taxes.
- \$5-\$10
- Nothing
- No
- No way.
- NO. NO LIQUOR AT ANY PICNIC SITE
- No
- I will not go to the park where liquor is allowed
- No
- No
- Yes. At least double of what I would normally.
- No, I don't see why it should cost more for the space to be used because of alcohol consumption. If additional charges are needed for clean up this is something everyone should be charged.
- No
- No.
-
- No, don't need alcohol
-
- No
- No
- Not at all
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Probably not, but understand that a deposit against damage may be required.
- no
-
- No
-
-
- No
- NA
- No
- No
- No
- No
-
- I would be willing to pay more for one that allowed liquor consumption. I think that \$10 is a fair price for a better booking.
- Yes, \$20
- No
- No
-
- No, same price
- No. This should be the norm
-
- No
-
- Nope
- no
- No.
- I would not book a picnic site that allows alcohol in general.
- Prefer not... city should save money not enforcing liquor laws in parks
- No
- No
- No
- No I will not pay any thing and planning to do book a liquor site
- No
-
-
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I wouldn't book one, but yes m, there should be an increased rate if this does get passed.
- Yes, within reason.
- No
- No, this penalizes people for doing something which should be perfectly legal and free.
-
-
-
- na
- No.
- No
- I would not pay more
- No
- No
- No
-
- No
- Not a chance
-
- No
- No. Why would I have to pay more?
- Yes, I would say maybe 10-20% more. Although don't see why the city would have to charge more?
Increase security/police presence?
- No
- Is this a money grabbing enterprise? Maybe they could pay by leaving the bottles for refunding.
haha
- No
- Yes, 20% more max
- Yes, \$20
- No
- No
- No
-
-
- No
- I would pay nothing.
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No why ? Parks are free cause if our taxes
- Why would It be more expensive?
- No
- No. I don't think city should allow liquor consumption in parks
- Yes. 10-20% extra
- So the choice is a 5% chance of paying the police a large fine or 100% chance to pay the city a small fine? I'd rather fund the police.
- no
-
- No
- No, I would not. I would likely avoid the sites that allow liquor for fear of the people around me acting disorderly.
- absolutely not
- Ideally no, but would pay 20/group?
- No, why should we. That would just be another tax on law abiding citizens.
- No
-
-
- small amount extra. why would it cost extra. seems to be making it difficult
-
- No - this would decrease the overall number of spaces where the public can experience our parks without being confronted by people indulging in over-consumption.
- No.
- Hard no
- No
- \$5
- No - a booking is a booking
-
- No
- no
-
- No. There should not be any increase in costs.
- No
- No
- Yes. Not much, because why?
- No. I don't see why it should cost more.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No way!
-
- Yes and a lot more
- I wouldn't be willing to pay more.
- Liquor should not be allowed.
- Yes
- No
- No
- Not a liquor site please.
-
- Yes
- No
-
- No. People drink anyway!
- No
- No
- \$5
- No extra payment
-
- 0 dollars. We should not have to pay to sit at a public picnic table in our parks. First come first serve. Clean up after yourself or risk a fine.
- No. Why should I pay to exercise my freedom?
- No, I will not book a liquor
- No. Buying the liquor should be the only cost. Add fines if people leave it messy.
- Yes, I'd be willing to pay \$1 more.
- No, but I never book picnic sites
- No.
- No. Why should we pay to do so. It does NOT cost the city more whether one drinks or not.
-
- No
- No. No different then now just not hidden in a go cup.
- No
- Mo
- No
- No, I would not be willing to pay more
- Yes, but I have never booked a picnic site so I am unsure of the cost.
- Probably not, it would probably be worth the risk of an open liquor fine to just got to a different table.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- No. All should allow liquor.
-
- No alcohol or drug in public area.
- No,
- Yes, I'd be willing to spend an additional \$10 per booking to secure a site that allows liquor.
-
- Absolutely not, but if you're going to allow liquor in public parks, I definitely think there should be a surcharge for people wanting to bring booze in--the money might be put towards upkeep of the park.
- No
-
- No
- No
-
- No, the city already receives too much money via parking tickets, property tax, etc.
- No
-
- No
- Not in support so won't book such facility
- 10
- Maybe. \$10 to \$20 dollars more. but it is a total cash grab. The city would do nothing extra for the money so why charge it expect to take more hard earned money from citizens!
- Yes. \$5-\$10 more
- hell no
- Not applicable
- NO
-
- Yes, \$20.
-
-
- I won't accept to pay any penny from my tax to allow alcohol in parks.
- Opposite. Given a choice I would pay a premium for a guaranteed and enforced DRY picnic area.
-
- There's no reason to charge a fee for allowing what should be a basic right. It does not interfere with anyone else's enjoyment of the area.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Nil.
- Yes, I'm not sure how much it costs now.
- No
-
- No
- Yes.
- No
- No
-
- No
- Not applicable
-
-
- No
- No
- No
- Not at all.
- No
- Yes, \$5 more
- Up to 10% max.
- No
- No
- No
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
- Why would I pay more? Isn't it only group sites that are charged?
-
- No
- No, I don't think I should have to pay more. Not unless the city decided to put more recycling bins nearby, then I would understand an increase in price. I would pay ~\$5 more.
- No
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No
-
- No
-
- Not
-
-
- No. I have never paid to book a picnic site.
- No. If I have a sofa in a park I do not pay more.
-
- No
- Yes
- Never
-
- No, I think all sites should be allowed liquor.
- No god no pls stop this madness
-
- No
- No
- No, that's silly
-
- I wouldn't pay more, I just wouldn't pay for one with no liquor allowed.
- No. Ultimately, a beer or two will be consumed regardless. Change the law so regular citizens aren't breaking it.
-
- Yes
-
- Probably not much more, I don't think that's the right way to go about it.
-
- No, don't want alcohol of any sort being consumed where families can go
- No
- Keep drinking out of public parks. There's risk of impaired driving also and makes the environment not family friendly. Homes, bars other indoor places are better and safer for members to consumer alcohol.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
-
- No. Why would you charge law abiding citizen to use the outdoors? Do you charge for use of safe injection sites?
-
-
- Yes 2-5 bucks
- Yes, 10%
- No
- No
- Yes, up to 25\$ potentially even more if necessary.
- N
- There is no extra cost for the city to allow someone to consume a beer, as such no cost should be charged the picnicher
- No.
- No
-
- No
- 5\$
- Why pay more? It does not make sense.
- Not Applicable to me
-
- Nope.
- Yes
- No
-
- No liquor
-
- No
- No, the city would not incur additional cost so I don't see why the public should have to pay more.
- no
- no
- No but I would be willing to pay a fine should there be litter or damage.
-
- Yes... maybe like \$25
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
-
- Safety has prodigious over money. In any cost, I wouldn't allow liquor in a picnic site.
- Maybe.
- No, i expect this to be a civil liberty question, and not a public cash grab.
- No
- No
- yes
- No
- No
-
- No
-
- No.
- I would not like to pay
- No
-
- No
-
- No
- I won't
- No
- No
-
-
- Depends on the price. \$20.
- No
- No
- No liquor at all should be allowed
-
- N/a cause I dont like liquor in any parks
-
- I thin it depends on the justification for the charge. If it is to help fund extra park security then absolutely yes. If not, I wouldn't. I would pay between ten and twenty dollars.
- Yes, up to 50 percent more
- NO!
- Yes as long as the revenue remains to teach drinking responsibly in the parks

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Maybe \$5
-
-
- Non
- No liquor in parks
- Yes if it was a reasonable rate
- I would not pay at all to use a public park which should be free that's why we pay taxes to support city structures. I would only pay if I was having a large private function and wouldn't pay extra than anyone else booze or no booze
- Never. Not At All.
- Yes. A small amount if it's reinvested into the park infrastructure.
- No.
- No
-
-
- No ,not even for free
- It should not be an option
- 10
-
- No
- Yes, but I don't know how much it costs to book a picnic site. Maybe \$10 more
- No
- Absolutely no.
- No
- I never visit picnic sites where allow liquor
- No
- No, it should be free
- No
- Same price
- No. Liquor should not be allowed
- Yes, \$20
- Yes, \$30
- No, but I might be forced to pay more to get a site that doesn't allow liquor
- No
- Ah it's a cash cow! No I wouldn't be willing to pay more to line your already over reaching pockets
- No
- Nothing

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No to liquor consumption at a park picnic site.
- No
- No
- Yes, if it was minimal. There should be a deposit instead that would only be refunded if the consumption of liquor is not abused
- No
- No
-
- No
- No
- No
- No
- Yes. Up to 25% more.
- Not sure, whatever makes it "budget neutral", ie whatever supply and demand indicates.
-
- Nah...
- Yes, I've never paid for a picnic site, but maybe a few bucks a head.
- No.
- No
-
- Will never use such site.
- No
- None
-
- No
-
- Yes, \$10 per night.
- \$15
- No
-
- N/A
- No
- I would. Pay none
- No
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No.
- No
-
- No
- No, I will not book such a site, nor pay anything extra.
- No. Should be free to all, drinking or not.
- No
-
-
- Not applicable.
- No. The intended use of the site is still the same regardless of whether you have liquor present or not. It would be unreasonable to suggest that those who have alcohol at the site should be required to pay more as a result.
- No
- No.
- No
- No
- No
- No
- Unsure
- No.
-
- I disagree with charging more, but would if that there the only option.
- No.
-
- Yes I would. I would be willing to pay up to 50 dollars.
- NOPE
-
- No
-
- Yes, up to \$50.
- If this goes ahead, yes, I do believe it should cost more to book these sites
- Yes, if necessary. I think is fair to charge the same amount.
-
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
-
- No.
- Yes, I'd be willing to pay an extra \$15-30.
-
- N/A
-
- No
- No I would not.
- No, alcohol should not be mixed with any kind of kids activities.
- No
- No
- No
- Depends on price
-
-
-
- Nope.
- It should be the same price
- No. I don't think it should be restricted to only sites that need to be reserved/booked.
- No
- No
- No.
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No - it should be included the same. There is no reason to raise the price.
- No
- Yes, \$5-\$10 more.
- That's a very good idea.
- I wouldn't take my family near it forget booking and paying for it
-
- No
-
- No. All the sites should be the same price regardless of the liquor.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No
- None
- Nope
- Nope
-
- No
-
-
- Non
-
- no
-
- No, i likely wouldnt pay more. If you did charge it would be like a uncorking fee at restaurants. It would deter me
-
-
-
-
- no
- Yes. 5000.00\$
- No I will not pay.
- Maybe \$5 more
- No
-
- No.
- No
- No
- Yes. \$25 total as currently there is no enforcement on a booked site. If you get there and its occupied, you have no repercussion I wouldnt pay more for that.
- No
- 0,don't want it.
- No
-
- No
- No, but it should cost more to pay for additional cleaning
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes - but would have to be a reasonable amount - maybe 10% more
- No
-
-
-
-
- No
- No
-
- No it should not cost more.
- Nope thats a cash grab
- No. I don't think this would be fair. Public spaces should be equal for all, and doing this would increase the cost exclusively for those of us who would like to have a drink or two.
- No not at all. And I don't expect dry parks would be adhered to anyways.
- No, because I will be supplying my own liquor.
- No.
- No
- No
- No. I don't condone liquor consumption at picnic sites
- no
- No
-
- Never
- No. Would rather use private property then pay to drink in public
- No
- No, it shouldn't be. Because it's just like other beverages.
- I don't think it should have any affect on the price to book.
- Yes - increased enjoyment
- Yes. 30% more
- no payment should be required
- No, I am against having the ability to consume alcohol at picnic places
- No.
- No, it's stupid idea.
- Yes, \$10-\$20 more.
-
- Yes
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Nope. Liquor shouldn't be allowed
- Yes, maybe \$25?
- No ! Never as mention in #2,3&4
- Yes. \$20-50
- No.
- No
-
-
- No.
-
- Not at all,
- It would depend on the price. I would be willing to pay up to \$15
- Yes. \$20.
- No, I would fine people that are being reckless in their consumption
- I will pay more and book a site where only adults allowed to consume liquor.
- No
- No.
- No,I pay nothing
- NA
-
- I would be avoiding such sites which would limit my access to picnic places.
- N/A
- No.
- Not at all , city should choose different options to increase revenue instead ruining public recreation places
-
-
- Yes. 25% more
- I don't think that a fee should apply.
-
- Yes, I don't know how much a site is as-is so it's hard for me to say really.
- No
- No
- No
- No. I wouldn't promote it at all nor I would pay more for that.
- Na
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No. I will not book such sites.
- No
- No
- No
- No, i wouldn't even be interested in going to a park with alchoholic drinks allowed
-
- A fair price that would help cover the cost of running the service
- This question is out of scope.
-
-
-
- No
-
- No
- Yes. Additional 15-30% of base cost
- If I were paying more for maintenance I'd be willing to pay extra. \$20
-
- No
- not willing to pay or to allow liquor consumption at picnic site
-
- No
-
- No
-
- No
- Absolutely not. There better not be some "sin tax" on being a responsible adult.
- Yes. \$20-50
- No thanks.
-
-
-
- No
-
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- No
- n/a
- No
- Yes. Comparable to a reasonable corkage fee at a restaurant. About \$20.
- No and Not even a cent
-
- I really think there should be no extra cost. It would discourage use of spots and encourage drinking in other locations. Better to have no extra fee. An extra \$10 for two beers doesn't seem worth it.
- No
- Yes \$5
- No
- No. That would just be a money grab.
- No
- Not at all
- 0
- No.
- No. The price should be the same. Just because one allows drinking, doesn't justify the city charging more for it. No extra costs for the city to allow drinking.
-
-
- Not really.
- No
- Yes, but only within a few dollars
- No but I'd be willing to pay for more if it allowed to smoke weed.
- I would limit myself to sites that don't allow alcohol consumption thereby limiting my access to all city public places.
- Dont see it necessary to pay for a public park spot.
-
-
-
-
-
- No.
- I would not pay more. In fact, I would not consider taking my kids to that location.
- No
- I would not want to pay.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Not at all
- No. Why would anyone pay more to book a site for drinking. It would sound like government wanting to find excuse to make more money from citizens.
- Not likely
- No.
- No
- No you shouldn't have to pay extra
- no
- \$10
- no. it should be free. why would you have to charge for that.
- Nope. I'd just stay home
- Yes only 10\$ more
- None
- No I would never go to a picnic site that allows liquor i
- Maybe, depending on cost. A few dollars more.
- No
- \$20
- If booking for a party or event, yes, it seems reasonable. Unsure how much I would pay - would depend on the number of people it could hold, location, time, etc.
- No it should all cost the same
-
- Not at all. Against liquor permission at park
- I would not.
- I guess that's why the city want to allow alcohol, it comes down to the financial gain that the city would get!
- Never
- No
-
- Would not book nor pay!
-
- No
- Yes, but I'm not sure how much.
- No not at all, I'd rather pay not too have liquor involved at the picnic site whatsoever.
-
- No
- Never
- None

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- No
-
- yes, unsure
- No
- No because public parks are not the place for liquor consumption
- Yes, up to \$20 more
- No
- No
- Why pay more.
- No, would worry about the safety also
- Yes, cost of liquor license.
- No
-
- No.
- Yes, \$10-20
- No i wouldnt pay a dime to book such a place
-
- Calgary should find healthy ethical ways to collect money for the wellbeing
-
- ABSOLUTELY!!! I'm going to do it any way in reality and so will others do again as evidenced by marijuana legalization allow it but charge extra so we have more revenue off of something that's happening anyway
-
- I will avoid that even with regular price
-
- Yes. 30% more.
-
- No, sites should not have to be book. A "designated area" should be marked for these activities otherwise have the same rules as smoking cannabis in public
- No
- I didn't know there were fees as I have never booked but wouldn't pay more to allow liquor.
- Yes, but not much
- No
- Never
- Abosolutely not.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, should be free.
-
- No
-
- No.
- Yes, but only a little. I understand that it can cost more to maintain a site where drinking can be allowed and monitored. If it's too much I would just stay home.
- None
- definitely not...don't want to see liquor in parks and certainly not willing to pay more to see it happen
- No
- Probably a \$5 fee on top of the booking fee (which I am not aware of amount)
- No
- Yes but not sure of the amount.
- I am not a fool.
- Yes \$10
-
-
- No appropriate
- No
- No
- No, should be equal for all sites
- NEVER
- No
- No
- If it allows for some extra security, I definitely would add \$10 to my booking
- Why should there be a fee? We pay enough in taxes and would be supplying our own alcohol.
- no
- Yes ... not sure
- No, I would just smuggle the liquor if there was a price difference.
- No
- no
-
- No
-
- Yes - \$5 more
- Maybe a bit. Nothing too crazy
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- no, they should all allow it
- Against the idea
- No
- No
- No.
- No.
- No
- Yes, \$5
-
- No I won't pay I I don't like alcohol at picnic areas
-
-
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No I would not
- No, not at all. I'd rather staying home than paying more for unexpected problem.
-
- No
- No
- No
- No
- Yes. It shouldn't have to cost more money. That's silly I already paid taxes
-
- Yes. Except I pay enough taxes already
- No
- No
- I am 100% opposed to this. If people want to drink, do it on their own property. Don't drink around me because 9/10 whenever I am in a public place where drinking is allowed, there is always stupid behaviour.
- No, as they should all allow it. Moreover, why should we pay any more for this? That is like making it more expensive to eat meat at picnic sites - makes no sense.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- No
- No
- Slightly more
- Yes. Perhaps 25% more. I do feel less restrictions are preferable though.
-
- 100 \$
- No should be the same and should be able to drink anywhere in public, there are all ready laws in place to be able to drink in public
-
-
- Never
- No
- No we don't pay.
- No
-
-
- No
- Yes
- I am against allowing liquor in picnic site.
- No.
- I'm assuming it cost to have a license so \$10 more is fair
- no
- Charge way more if you are going to do this.
- No
- I don't feel like there should be an increase in cost for bringing your own liquor
- No
-
- No
- No
- Never
-
- \$10 extra
-
-
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, I'll just go drink at sites that don't allow it out of spite.
- Why would there be a cost?
-
-
- No I think it should just be allowed for free
- Yes. \$10 or so more.
-
-
- 10.00 extra
- No. It's no different than bringing a can of pop to a picnic table.
- No
- No
- No
- Not book
- Liquor should not be allowed openly. Picnic site or the Train Stations
- No
- no. I'd rather have events at home if I have to pay. I'm not the one who needs a license to drink on a park so why would I have to pay just because I'm drinking a glass of wine?
- Not willing to pay more
- No
-
- I
- No.
- No.
- No.
-
- Not applicable
-
- No. I will not book such site which allows liquor consumption.
- No
- no
- no If I wanted to drink I would go to an establishment
- No I wouldn't be willing to pay more as I don't see a need for increased services for responsible alcohol consumption.
- Yes. Multiple times
-
- Yes. 10%

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- \$5
-
- I didn't know had to book a picnic site now. Concept of paying at all is challenging to me to use a park our taxes have already paid for to be maintained. But, if a registration was necessary for security or AGLC permits, yes to extra. But prefer No.
- I would not pay in the first place
- Fees should be the same.
- No thanks
-
- No
-
- No I would never be organized enough to book a sight
- No.
- \$50
-
- No
- No
- I would not be willing to pay anything until it's demonstrated that allowing alcohol consumption at a picnic site actually increases its maintenance costs.
- No extra payment. I've already paid for my wine and feel municipal taxes should cover the rest off.
-
-
- No. Not at all.
- I am not willing to pay. There should be no alcohol in parks.
- No
- No
- No
-
- Not willing to pay more. Why? Do you pay more for a ticket to a hockey game when you have a beer there?
- No
- Never
- Why would it cost more, is the city providing the beer?
-
- No. I strictly against of liquor consumption in park
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No I would not attend
- No way
-
- No. This should be a right and not cost money to do. How ridiculous.
- No
-
- No
- No
- yes, anywhere from \$100-\$250 depending upon gathering. also pay for competent bartenders and security if necessary(for bigger gathering).
-
- No
- No
- Yes. \$20
- No
- No
-
- Not applicable.
- No because the money that must be spent at the expense of the tax payers to repair the damage of irresponsible alcohol consumption would be more.
- No
- No
- No
-
- I would not pay for a picnic site
- No, if this was applied, I would like to see it applied universally. Just as much ch damage can be caused by inappropriate bbq use and littering.
- No
-
- No
- No
- No
-
- That would depend on the function, but yes.
-
-
- Yes. \$10

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes if the fee was small enough say 10\$ max
- No
- No
- No
-
- No, that seems like a trap. People will drink anyways, if they can't get a paid site, resulting in useless tickets
- Maybe, I would want to know the reasons for a cost increase. If it's for additional insurance or something along those lines then yes.
- No - if I am bring my own alcohol, there is no reason I should have to pay to drink it.
-
-
- No
- No
- No why do I have to pay more for that
- I would avoid the site if drinking were allowed
-
- Yes what ever is a reasonable amount to cover any licensing costs
- No it should just be allowed.
- Nope. Unless its eating police to screen every driver at that table before they drive.
- No
-
-
- No
- None
-
- Nope
-
- No
- No
- No
- No
-
- no
- No
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- Yes, \$10
-
- no. They should all be allowed liquor
- A box of liquor cans guards on duty favorite brands, with some food of course because you should see drinkers eating
- I am against drinking and Cannabis.
- Yes, a few dollars.
-
- N/A
- No
-
- NO. In fact it would prevent me from taking myself or children to said sites. Harassment isn't something I go out of my house looking for.
-
- no
-
-
-
- N/A to me
- No , I don't think you should be charging extra to allow liquor ? And if so why would the reason behind it be?
- No
- No
-
- Nope
- No
-
- No, I think they should be the same.
-
-
- No
- No, 0\$
- No
- Yes, double
- NO
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No not really. Either allow it or not
- No
- No
-
- No I should not need to pay.
-
- No
- Yes
- No
- N/A
- No
- No, I don't appreciate the consumption of Liquor
- No Comments
- No
- No
- No, I don't want this
- No
- No
- No
- Absolutely not.
-
-
-
- No
- Yes, up to \$20
- Yes. \$10 more
-
- no
- No
- No, drinking alcohol at a picnic site wouldn't be a necessity for me so I wouldn't pay more
- Yes, don't know.
- No absolutely not!!
- No
- no
- Wouldn't be booking
- NOPE!!!!
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No and money shouldn't allow people to drink
-
- No, I would probably just bring my own alcohol in closed containers to less expensive sites
-
- I'm not willing to pay on one that is not safe
- Yes
- No.
- No
- No .
- No
-
-
-
- No
- Wouldn't even consider staying at an alcohol picnic site.
- There should be no extra charges involved as it does not cost the City anything to allow for liquor consumption at a site.
- No.
-
- No
-
- No
- No.
- No, you should be free to choose picnic site without paying more
- I would pay \$0 ...0 tolerance
- No
- \$15 an hr
-
-
- No. The sites are expensive for short time periods and I'm not sure if you noticed but there are alot of people who can't afford these luxuries anymore.
-
- No
- Yes. \$10 more.
-
- Yes. \$25

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Yes. \$10 extra. No more since I don't see a related expense for the city.
- I would pay not to allow it in public such a horrible place Calgary is becoming
-
- No
- I would pay an extra 20-25%
- I see the catch now...I wouldn't pay extra unless the wine was provided.
- No
- I would not pay more!
- No
- No. Why? Although, perhaps it would be good to have to get a mini-license to be able to have liquor with your picnic so that there needs to be some planning involved.
- I see now it's the usual City money grab,
- NO as it would be offensive for families with children to have to contend with drunk and disorderly idiots who can't control themselves in public.
- No.
- Yes. I don't know what the rates are for oilpicnic sites
- No
-
- No
- Yes, but this a ridiculous concept that would be further (negative) evidence of the municipal government financially raping their citizens.
- No
- No
- No. Because I don't think that I should have to pay extra just to have liquor in a park
- No. There is not reason, it's the same space.
- No. There should be no extra fee. Trying to create two tiers will complicate matters and increase policing requirements.
- No
- No!
- maybe a few dollars a person
- No
- Will not book the site even it is free.
- Why would that be required?
- Probably not. Maybe if it was negligible, like \$5. It would also depend on my intent for booking. I might pay more for a special occasion (wedding etc).
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
-
-
- No
-
- No
- No
- No.
- No.
- No
- No
- Yes. I'm not sure how much.
- No
-
- No.
- None
- No. There should be no charge unless it is paying for more policing/by law enforcement.
- No
- No.
- No.
- No
- No. If it becomes acceptable I don't think it should be conditional to an upsell.
- No
- No, why should I have to?
- No. I don't perceive the ability to drink as a commodity.
- No
- No
- No
- No.
-
- No. Everywhere else in the world allows responsible consumption of alcohol in public. It's time we caught up and didn't try and make some money off it
-
- Absolutely not
- No
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I probably would pay an extra couple bucks, but it's ridiculous to charge for that. What if the only picnic sites available are drinking? I have to pay more, even if I choose not to drink?
- No. Mostly because there is no extra costs associated with this change as refundable bins and infrastructure already exists.
- N/A I don't drink.
-
- No
-
- No
- Yes, but no more than \$20 more.
- No, I don't believe that charging more is ethical.
- No
- Yes \$20 to \$40
- No.
- No. Shouldn't have to pay to use a public park....
- No
- No.
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No.
- N/A
-
- No. all sites should allow for it
- No
- No
- Not applicable
- I have no use for liquor. it is completely unnecessary to have a good life.
- No
- I would not because I wouldn't care about having liquor in the park.
-
-
- Not applicable
- No.
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. You will benefit from the recycling and don't need further capitalization on this venture. Additionally the liquor is already expensive enough.
- No
- \$5 more? There shouldn't be an upcharge in my opinion...
- No
- No
-
-
- No
-
- No, I would not even take free bookings.
- never
- No. That's like asking people that exercise in parks to pay more to do so; or eating in parks to pay more; or taking business meeting in parks to pay more. That's like asking people that use bicycle lanes to pay more to use them. Silly.
- No.
- No, I don't think there should be a price difference, unless the liquor sites were offering something more. Why should an equivalent cost more?
- No
- I will not pay more
- No, what am I paying for????
- No
-
- Never
- no
- No
-
- No
- yes, and up to 20-30% more. But as I said I don't drink.
-
- No.
- No
-
-
- This shouldn't even be a discussion
- No
- No i will not pay more.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Probably not
-
- Won't book a site that allows liquor
- Yes, however charging a fee will limit the increased use a non fee liquor policy would see
- \$10
- I'd rather not but maybe no more than \$50?
- No
-
-
-
- No
- Yes, \$10.00
- N/A
-
- No.
-
- Probably. \$10 - \$15 sounds reasonable to me.
-
- No
- It shouldn't allowed even by paying more money
- ... that's a ridiculous question
-
- No. Don't make this into a [removed] cash grab!
- No.
- No
- No
- No.
- No. I think we should be allowed to drink anywhere and not have to pay to consume alcohol that we are already paying for?
- Yes, about 25\$ extra
- no
- I don't see why it's necessary to charge more. If there's an expectation set on people who book sites to clean up after themselves, it shouldn't be any extra cost to the city.
- In most places around the world, drinking in parks is allowed. Why would we as Calgarians be expected to pay for what should be a free service?
- No
- I don't think there should be a fee

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- WTH please ridiculous nothing I'd pay nothing cause this is just silly!
- \$0
-
- No
-
- No i dont drink
-
- No.
- No, because I think picnic sites are more family oriented, so alcohol is not necessary in these sites.
- No.
- No
- No
- I don't believe you should charge more just for it to allow liquor. There are already laws in place which would cover any potential issues or costs arising from liquor consumption at the park.
- No I would not.
- No
- no
- 10\$
-
- No
- No
-
- No
- No
- I am not sure how much the booking is for a picnic site so it is hard to say.
- No
- No because I would never book a place that allows alcohol consumption.
- No
- Don't want liquor anywhere publicly.
- Never
- No don't need another tax grab and easy target for police
- No. If there was a cost or increased cost associated with those sites I would probably just refrain from bring alcohol and wait to have the beer at home.
-
- It should cost more because the risks are higher.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No.
- No. Especially by the river. People already sneak it in. Having it be allowed would allow people to get carried away. Sadly I, I know too many idiots...
- Not applicable. Yes
- Liquor should not be preferable in public park
-
- Yes - \$10
-
- No
- You can make it money for other resources
- No
-
- Hell no stop taxing people for something that should be a right to have a beverage
- I don't think there should be an extra fee considering it doesn't cost the city any more or less if people choose to drink or not.
- No
- Have never paid to book a site so won't start now
-
- I will not go if there is a liquor
- No
-
- No!
-
- should not be a extra charge
- No
- Yes. Not Much more.
-
- No
- No I would not pay more, even being a drinker myself. Again there is a time and place for everything. I wouldn't pay more just because they allow you to smoke.
- No.. way
- Why make it a cash cow? Do I need to pay if I am drinking coke?
-
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- no- it should not cost more
-
-
- No I will never book it
- I will not book any picnic spot that allow liquor consumption. So there is no question of paying more money.
- NO
-
-
- No
- no.
- No
- No
- Yes, it depends
- No
- No
- None
- No. Parks are a public right.
- No
-
-
- No. I really don't book parties in the parks.
- No
- Making money at the cost of destroying culture n enviro is not good at all.
- No
- No. I don't think you should have to pay extra for that. Seems more like a cash grab then.
-
- Not applicable
- Maybe
- Nothing, you cheap [removed] for asking
- Yes, about \$25.
-
- No
- Yes either per hour or per person
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, it shouldn't be restricted like this. The more planning you make people do, the more it's going to turn into just people looking to get drunk. The end goal should be for everyone to enjoy a drink in a park no matter if there are picnic areas or not.
- No, and zero.
- We have enough "sin tax"; the standard booking fee for all users is appropriate. Unless you also charge extra when users play music to enhance their enjoyment, or extra space taken for bocce.
- No
- No
- yes
- No it's a choice, if you drink have a couple of yiu dobt then don't just cause we want one didn't mean we should have to pay more
- zero, all sites should be the same.
- N/A.
- No
-
- No.
- No
-
-
- No, this should not be a cash grab by the city or province. instead be a conversation about proper consumption
- I wouldn't. It's consumerist bs. If people have a problem with drinks at picnic sites then let them pay more to have an alchohol free park.
- no
- No
- If it's a large site and it's a group booking yes, up to 10-20 bucks, if it's just for a couple of ppl, no.
- No.
-
- No!
- No
- No, wouldn't pay for a picnic site in general.
- No
- Nothing. Read top responses.
- Not Apllicable as I am against the idea of permitting the liquor in parks. Safty of kids should be top priority.
- No
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I'll prefer to stay home rather to go such place where alcohol is allowed
- No I would not. I don't think people who want to enjoy an adult beverage need to be signaled out for no reason. As long as all laws are followed and no garbage or bad behavior occurs, there is zero need to punish people who want to spend time outdoors.
- No. No. No.
- No
- No
-
- No
- No - Don't charge people for the privilege of being an adult and of consuming legal beverages
- Sure, \$50? Isn't the liquor license about \$25. I would say that's fair
-
- No. Payment should not be required for an activity which, as many European cities show, can be done safely in any public space
-
- Probably but I would rather see all picnic sites have allowances for liquor. 10% increase would seem reasonable if it was deemed necessary.
- no,I would not like to pay more.
- No
- No.
- No
- No
-
- No,please
- No. I know full well there's not enough law enforcement to actually make sure people who don't pay don't drink it.
-
- No.
- Alcohol Must be prohibited
- Absolutely not that's ridiculous just because you say I can drink at a picnic site doesn't mean you can charge me more for it. That is rude. And I don't think you should have to pay to book a picnic site unless it's a private site
- No
- No.
-
-
- Yes. Nominal fee would be ok

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, its a public park there should be no difference in price.
- No.
- No
- No
- No
- I didn't know you have to pay for picnic sites. Maybe 5\$?
-
- Sure, like \$10 - \$20 more
- No, you shouldn't have to pay more, you bring your own supplies & liquor is legal
-
- Shouldn't have to pay extra.
- Yes. This would make it your responsibility to clean up after you are finished and also the staff in the area would know who was responsible for any damage done
- No
- Not in favour of liquor consumption in any park
-
- No.
- No liquor
- No liquor
- No
- No, don't grab money unnecessarily here!!
- Pay? Haha nah.
-
-
- Strongly against to pay more to book.
- N/A
- No
-
- none
- No
- No
-
- yes. \$20
- Yes, \$10
- Yes. Double
-
- N/A

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Yes but not a crazy amount more. If that's the case you are better off taking the risk of being caught in a non drinking picnic site.
- Maybe up to \$20 if it was larger?
- Again, disappointed in this question. Sounds as though the city is encouraging this to move forward.
- No
- Yes. Not a ridiculous amount though
- Yes, 10%
- No, I am against the idea of liquor in the parks
- No.
- \$10
- i dont see why the costs should change, maybe a small increase
- No, no price
- Yes and I think 40 is fair
- No
- No
- 1000
- No
-
- Yes, allows more opportunities to do gatherings or parties at cheaper price (not in a restaurant) and bring your own liquor type of thing. The city will also make more profit from its sites - like to pay for licenses or as if you are paying extra for it
- No alcohol should not be allowed in a family setting places. The city should focus on more productive issues
- No
- Perhaps, but I don't think paying more to be allowed to consume liquor makes sense.
-
- Yes a nominal amount
- No.
- No
- I will never book a picnic site which allows liquor.
- No
-
- No
-
- Yes, \$20.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No!
- Triple /Double. People will flock on parks for sure to drink as it is the most cheapest and most unsupervised place to drink , crime will increase for sure & there is no safety for women/children is they are by them selves.all sites elsewhere r supervised
-
- No
- should be free - is there any incremental impact to the city in terms of costs?
- No
- I suppose, but I don't like the idea of a premium. I would argue there are time people book sites in bowness and blast music, which I find annoying, but I understand that family is allowed to book a site and enjoy the parks as I am.
- No
-
- It is not fair to pay more. Simply specify the parks allow for consumption. We will take care of the environment
- Yes.... no idea. But it should not be marketedly more.
- You gotta pay for this [removed]? Lol nah I'll just pick an empty space.
- No
- Not applicable. I am against the idea compt
-
- No
- No
- No
-
- Maybe. Not much more
- There shouldn't be an increase in price
- No
- Yes, 10 dollars
- Yes. Unsure
- Not sure
- Sure. Not too much more but a few dollars to \$10 maybe.
- Sure \$10
-
- No
-
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. They're not serving liquor. Why would I pay to bring my own booze?
- \$10
- Will not ever go to picnic spot if this happens.
- Liquor should not be allowed at any public place specially where kids are primary users.
- No
- Yes, but not too much. Maybe 10\$ more
- NO
- No
-
- No, it should be the same as any. They should all allow it.
- No alcohol.
- Yes. Up to \$100 depending on size and location etc
- no
- No, why would you charge more?
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- I would be willing to be 10% more for a site that allows liquor consumption
- No
- No. I don't think that's fair, especially because sometimes you cannot predict if others you incite will be drinking or not. This doesn't cost the city anymore to allow it, why charge
- Not sure.
- No
- No
- No.
- If it meant not having to worry about getting into trouble for it yeah. I'd pay an extra \$10.
- I feel like this should be included in the price as it doesn't change the service being offered.
- No.. for sure not
- No
- Again no!
- No I would not
- no
-
- No there should not be an increase in price
- Zero

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I would not pay more for the right. It should be available to all for no charge.
- No
- Yes, unsure how much more.
- No, the alcohol is already taxed enough
- No
- No
-
-
- No
- No
-
- Pay four times the cost to cover damages / health hazards / unlawful behavior and abuse etc .
women no longer safe .
- No
- No
-
-
- No
- I don't think it should cost more
- No,
- No
- No
- None
- I do not think so
-
- No
- No
- No, why would I? Where is the extra cost if I'm supplying the alcohol?
- No. I find that to be a cash-grab & unnecessarily punitive.
- No
- No. It doesn't make sense. It comes across as a cash grab.
- No. That's dumb. Why does the city need to make money off it? Provide a recycle bin and collect recyclables instead! City park staff can add that to their day.
- No. All of sudden this has turned into a money grab?
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I would question why it would cost more for the same site just because I want to have a beer instead of a soft drink?
- No
- No, I am against this action
- No
-
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No liquor in public places
- N/a
- do not charge no i would not pay to drink
-
- No
- No
- I strongly disagree on such kind of permission
-
-
- No.
- NA. I'll stay far away from an alcohol park
- Perhaps, but I don't think that the option should cost more.
- 10% more
- I have not booked a picnic site in a while so I'm not sure. If booking regular picnic sites is free and the ones that allow liquor cost money then people will likely continue booking the free ones and just drink concealed alcohol.
-
- Nil
-
- I would be willing to pay more but maybe only by \$10 , Scaling up for larger bookings of course.
-
- No
- No because it shouldn't be an issue. Why are you charging people more for doing what they are going to do anyway.
- Very little extra
- No - I don't believe there should be an increase in cost just because you can have liquor at it.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Depends on how the fee is structured and where the money is going, but if it is allocated correctly then yes
- Yes. Not sure how much more.
- no.
- No
- No
- Always a money grab with the City! Pay to reserve a picnic table, Pay to host a Boot Camp, soon you will have to pay to enter a Park. We are being taxed and fee'ed to death! To be a great City you have to provide a few services for free!
- Yes. Another \$20.
- No
- No
- no
- This seems silly. Why should I have to pay more to do something that is not changing the way I use the site note increasing costs on the city's end. This would simply be a money grab in my opinion.
- depends on how much extra. if there were enough garbage and recycling bins available it could bring in some revenue
- Yes, I dont know
- No, I wouldn't go to one that allows liquor. Think of kids and those(a majority) that don't drink.
- Duck no duck off
- No to all because drinking in parks is gross.
-
- No don't give permission at any cost
- No!
- No
- No
- No.
-
-
- nothing
-
- This does not apply to me.
- No
- No I would not pay
- No...especially if we choose NOT to drink alcohol. Do not restrict my choice of sites which are already quite limited.
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Na
- No; if anything a small fee of \$5 would be acceptable.
- I don't think citizens should have to pay for it.
- Yes, \$5
- No.
- No
- No.
- No, I shouldn't have to pay more
- No. All the same price.
- Not at all
-
- No
- NO!!!!
- 50% more
- No
- CHARGE CHARGE and then CHARGE some more
- No way
-
- Yes, 20-25% more of regular price
- 10%
- Yes \$100.
- No
- How will you ever control that guests are only drinking at certain picnic sites?
- Maybe. Would depend on how much more. But probably not or less than \$10.
-
- This decision should not be a revenue to the City decision. What a lame and pathetic way to generate more revenue to the City.
- Yes, I would pay about \$5 more
- No, this would be ridiculous. And an outright theft by the city
-
- No it should be free to book a picnic if you had to pay for a site there no poin in having a picnic
-
- No, why? It shouldn't boast any more - but there could be fines if people leave a big mess.
- No
- No
- I'd be willing to pay perhaps \$5-\$10 more. Although, I do think that it's a little unreasonable that paying for it is necessary.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Why in the world should I have to pay to book a picnic site?
- NO.
-
- No
- No
-
-
- no. that's ridiculous.
-
- no I would not allow liquor in parks
- Yes - 40 dollars more
- Yes, \$10-\$20 a site/day
-
- Why would someone have to pay more? What value would I get in return for paying more?
- No
- Yes, a minimal dollar amount to offset increased patrol costs.
- No
- No, there should not be another fee associated
- No
- Yes, \$5-\$10.
- No.
- No. As equal residents of Calgary why should I?
- Depends on how much more. I am not familiar with how much it presently is to book a spot but up to \$20 would be acceptable.
- If I can supply my own alcohol, I would be willing to pay maybe a slight fee (no more than 10%).
- No. Decriminalizing behaviors reduces costs to the public. If anything booking a site where alcohol is not allowed should cost more so puritans can pay for the cost of the enforcement they desire.
- Yes, I would be willing to pay an extra fee.
- Maybe? A small fee - extra \$25 maybe?
- No. Asking people to pay MORE just so they can have a drink with their meal is an awful idea and would be counterproductive to getting more people using city parks. What reason exists for adding a fee to something that doesn't cost the city anything?
- No, I don't think it should be treated any different.
- No, it shouldn't matter
- Absolutely not. It's meant for a drink with a meal. It's not cover charge to a bar. I worry Porisky would feel entitled to drink more if they had to pay a charge for the park
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No. I don't see why a fee would be necessary. What extra cost does me providing my own liquor pose to the city?
- I guess, but why would it require an additional fee? Whether I drink 6 cans of coke or six cans of beer, would then recycling not be exactly the same?
- No
- Yes, \$10
- No
- No
-
- No, that's a cash grab.
- I would be willing to pay another \$15
- No
- No. See #4 answer
- No
- no.
- No
- Yes. 15% more.
- Yes. 10\$ more
-
- Yes - 10% more
- N/A
- No
-
-
- No
- No
- hell no
- I will not pay more at all
- No
- No
- Yes, an extra \$2-\$5
- N/A
- No, I don't understand why that would be necessary, having liquor doesn't necessarily make people less responsible to clean up after themselves
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I don't see why it would cost more, unless you are proposing on having security in site.
- No
- No, that's just another reason to make more money off of us! Like we don't pay enough to get out of our house these days as it is!
- I'm strictly opposed to allowing liquor
- I don't intend to drink in City parks, and would be reluctant to book a site at a higher cost.
- Not applicable.
- No
- Nope
- No
- No
-
- Yes, \$5
- I will AVOID these kind of parks. These type of parks could eventually add more complications with drugs, sex etc. PLEASE DO NOT START THIS. Let there be quiet family gatherings with NO ALCOHOL
- No
-
-
- Should not have to pay more
-
- No.
- No.
- no
-
- No.
- No. I could just do as we do now and sneak around about it without paying more.
-
- No why would the city need to charge more? They provide no extra ssrvice
- No Ai
- No
- No.
- No
- yes, like 20 dollars more
- No that's ridiculous people would not pay

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No just because somebody would like to drink at a park does not give the right to impact and ruin the enjoyment of other visitors who also pay taxes for the enjoyment of parks, and charging more for that purpose is just another hidden tax, leave it as is
- Yes. 5-10\$ more.
- The cost should probably be less than a bottle of wine.
- I can't see why I would have to. What would the money be used for that's related to bringing drinks along?
- No
- No, never. As I disagree with allowing liquor in public consumption and especially picnic sites.
-
-
- No
-
- Wouldn't book
-
- No ...not at all why make people pay more for life's simple pleasures
- Yes. Only a little though. There shouldn't be that much difference since nothing is actually being provided other than allowing it.
- No
- No
-
- No.
- Of course! I think there should be a small fee associated. I would say 20\$ more maximum depending on the size of the site and how many people are expected to be consuming.
- Yes, if it could reserve a space, a nominal fee (\$5 maybe?) would be appropriate.
-
- I have not booked one before so I am unsure how much they cost, but I probably would pay a bit more
- Yes! \$5 more/day or something
- No
- I don't drink. I am not happy that my tax dollars will be spent on repairing parks because city leaders foolishly decided to encourage drinking in public spaces. Not thrilled about my taxes paying "leaders" to make such stupid useless choices.
- N/A
- No you shouldn't have to
- No
- I will not book in these sites.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- No...
-
- No.
- No I would not pay more there should be no charge for that
-
- No. Would rather pay more to avoid one.
- No
- No
- Yes- depending on the size of the site....if it was one table I would pay \$10 more.
- No
- No
- NO !! NO! NO! NO!
-
- No
- No. I don't see a reason why more money is required?
- No
-
- NO, not at all. This may restrict us going to such parks.
- no, it shouldn't be about money
- No
-
- No
- No.
- No
- No
- No
- No.
- No.
- Yes, depending on the size of the site and the time of year + size of group. \$10-20 more
- I would not book one.
- No
- No
-
-
-
-
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No way
- No
-
- No.
-
-
-
- Not at all
- No, our family does not drink
- No
- Yes - unsure, depends on other site facilities.
-
- No - I would avoid these.
- No
- Not applicable
- No
- No
- A small up charge would need to be justified. Can't assume this will be more work for the parks department.
- No
- No.
- no
- No.
- No
- No I would expect that picnic sites don't cost money to book. Actually I would expect to not have to book them at all. Is that a thing? It shouldn't be.
- No.
- No, I don't see the need for a money grab.
- No
-
- Depends. If the fees are going towards security personal to monitor the park than yes, but if it's just a user fee than no. My preference is obviously no.
- No
-
- I would not pay more. If I wanted to bring wine, I would bring it whether or not it was officially allowed
- Yes
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Yes, but likely not much. Parks should belong to the citizens that's pay taxes and support the maintenance. If there must be a fee for drinking or non, should be nominal.
- As I said before, I disagree 100% with this new project.
- No
- No. But a \$250-\$500 fee covering extra cleanup and increased security/bylaws enforcement/police presence should be charged for those who wish to drink in a public park.
- No
-
- I oppose
- NO. I'd pay more for a site that does NOT allow alcohol!
- No. You should not have to pay more to book the site.
- No, who will clean up street vomit? Our parks already have empties and vomit during Stampede
-
- No
- No
-
- No
- I am not willing to pay unless it is a large gathering like a family reunion that I want to reserve a site.
-
- not at all, doesn't want a go where alcohol allow
- No. I think the fees should be the same. I've seen children's parties leave a much bigger mess than an event with adults consuming alcohol.
-
- Yes. I don't know how much they cost right now but maybe \$10 more
- No. I dont always want to book a table so I can have a drink with food. We had a winter picnic in Baker and had peppermint schnaps in the cocoa. I think that should be allowed. No one cares anyway.
- na
- NEVER, those corrupt councilors better pay me when they allow their drunkies to waste my tax \$
- no, why would there be a cost increase?
- No. Don't use this as a city money grab.
- No. The city should not be making more money by deregulating something that is already happening regularly.
- No. Of course the city of Calgary wants to turn this into a tax grab. Is this the case for the parks where marijuana is consumed??
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, I would be willing to pay extra. I believe a fair charge would be \$10 extra
- NO
-
- No.
- No.
- No
- No
- No
- No. Not at all. I would never choose the park for any reason that allows liquor.
- Why paying ?
- No i will not be willing to pay more to book a site that allows alcohol
- no
- Yes. Not sure.
-
- No
- No
- No.
- no i will not
- No.
-
-
- I would be willing to pay more, maybe 15% over the current prices.
- No
- No.
- Potentially. Maybe 10-15\$
- Yes - I'd be willing to pay a small extra fee. \$10-\$20.
-
- no
- No
- Not sure why it should cost more so probably not.
-
- No
- No, absolutely not. Establishing a precedent where communities dictate when something is legal based on if a person can afford to pay a premium is a horrible idea.
- No.
- See above

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Likely not, and not more than \$5. If it's expensive people will just book a regular site and drink anyway, knowing the liquor ban is very unlikely to be enforced.
- No because parks are free places for us to gather
- Yes. \$15
- No.
- I would consider if I knew a reason why it would be more expensive? Not sure what the reasoning for that would be. I don't see where the extra costs wouldn't be needed for a family or group that has a few drinks.
- No, as there should not be a difference in cost for a service that doesn't cost the city money. I would not pay and drink anyways like everyone currently does.
-
- No.
- No
- Yes, as there is more enforcement and administrative work needed on Govt. side
- No
- No liquor please
- No. We would just drink at a site that doesn't allow liquor consumption.
- Zero, it's not a club...
- Yes, 20% more than the current price
- No
- Maybe
- No
-
- Yes, i would have no problem paying extra for that. \$10 seems reasonable.
- I would pay more if it allowed alcohol, I don't think I would pay more than an additional \$10
- No
-
- Yes. Maximum \$10 more. Similar to paying a corkage fee at a restaurant
- No
- None
- Don't think you should pay extra !
- No, I would avoid a park that allows alcohol.
- Money grab again. Wooo
- No? Why would you have to pay? That sounds like a money grab.
- No
- No this is not the answer. Is this the City just looking for a way to make more money and to inconvenience other citizens who clearly want our parks protected from this kind of stuff.?

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- no
-
-
- I would probably pay more but I don't see why we should have to. I can't see extra costs for the C of C I'm allowing liquor consumption as the recycles go in the same bin.
- No, we pay enough [removed] tax in this country, I'm not paying extra to a picnic site to drink a beer.
- Booking a picnic site is already a little expensive - I'd say an additional 20-25 dollars for the ability to drink would be reasonable.
- I don't want to pay extra for drinking
- NO
- no
- No
- Yes, not more then a quarter more than the price is the original site
-
- No...
- No
- No
- No, I don't think it's reasonable to charge for that.
- Not much more maybe \$5/\$10
- n/a
- No
- No
-
- \$10-20 more if this was the only option. I think charging more should only be enforced if proven the city has to spend more money on cleanup
- no
-
- Yes I would be willing to pay about 25% more.
-
- No
-
-
- No...see above
-
-
- Yes. A few dollars.
- NO!!!!

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I don't see why there should be any reason to pay more for a site that allows liquor. There should be recycling containers available, but there's no need to charge more.
- No
- Likely, although it would depend on the reason for visiting the park. A group gathering would be more likely to be interested in paying for the liquor license. Rate would depend on number of people attending. No more than \$5/person
- No. People would just continue to drink illegally
- NO
- No. It should be free
- Yes, an extra ?\$10
- Nope.
- \$10, yes
-
-
- No
- Yes the cost of a liquor license \$10
-
- No
- I don't know how much picnic sites cost but maybe an additional \$5-\$10.
-
- NO
-
- No. There should be no extra charge
- No
- No, there should be no additional fee for liquor use. Any attempt at that seems like a money grab by the city.
- No
- No
- No
- Never.
- no wht do we have to pay anyway
- No
-
-
- No
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No way.
- No, because it would create tiers between sites and those that choose not to drink for whatever reason would be affected by higher rates
- no
- No.
- No - in my opinion, a site that allows drinking is less desirable than one that prohibits drinking
- Absolutely not.
- No. I shouldn't have to pay to engage in a legal activity in a public space
- Would not book one that allows drinking
- Yes, may up to 25% extra.
- No
-
- No I wouldn't be willing to pay more.
- Yes, marginally more say 10-20%
- No
-
- Yes, no idea of the current rates so can't answer the actual cost.
- I think there are venues - such as community centers - that people can rent and have liquor licenses built in. there is no need to have liquor licensing spill over into public [family] parks.
- Yes, reasonable amount, 25% more of original cost?
- i would not pay
- I don't think you should have to
- nope.
- No
- Yes. Double.
-
-
- No
- No - I don't think it would be worth it, I would probably stay at home
- A citizen should NOT pay anything for the use of a park that their taxes have already paid for. Charge non Calgarians to use our parks!!
- No
- No, consumption already exists in picnic sites and paying extra discourage public from consuming in the designated areas.
-
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I would pay maybe \$10 to \$15 more to help compensate by-law enforcement.
- Yes, I'm not sure how much it costs to book one now, but i'd be willing to spend 15% more.
- No
- NO
- I would not use them.
-
- No
- I think they should pay a little more. Hopefully they use the bins and not litter after.
- No
- no
- no
- no
- No!
- no
- Not really willing but it does make sense to charge for a picnic spot that allowed liquor.
- No
-
- No.
- No, we have to pay for parks now that should be free to the public,
- Definitely not
- No
- Sure, why not. \$10
- No
- No
- No. Picnic sites should be free as it is a public space.
- No
- No, why would I have to pay more?
-
- N/A
- No
- No
- N/A.
- Marginally more, like \$5.
- Nope.
-
- Yes. \$10
- I will never book a site that allows liquor consumption

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- Yes, \$10
- Yes. \$10 is reasonable providing it goes towards park maintainance and support.
- Yes, \$5
- No – do not understand the reasoning behind the extra charge.
- Yes. Double.
- No
-
- I don't know the current base costs. Maybe \$40 more?
- I will not be booking the site where liquor is allowed
- No, will not pay more
- no
- NO
- No.
- Nope
- No. Alcohol should be in areas where 18+ have access to it. Putting it in an area where children are, is inappropriate and unexceptable.
-
- No. A higher price would just encourage people to drink illegally at parks that don't allow liquor consumption.
- No
- No.
- I don't see why authorities always have to view these things as an opportunity to make money.
- No
-
- Defeats the purpose of drinking for cheap
- no
-
-
- Don't want liquor in our parks
- No
- No not paying more.
- No
- No. Why am I paying to sit in a park?
- No, I would not be willing to pay more. There should be no difference if you having a drink of alcohol or another type of beverage.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, and unknown.
- No, that screams blatant cash grab, that's like charging more for a picnic site for people who want cheese on their burgers.
- no
-
- Like only 10 extra bucks
-
- no
- Yes. \$5-10 more depending on how much the site already cost.
- No, it's not that important
- You shouldn't have to pay, what would you be paying for? This shouldn't be a money grab, you should want to make our outdoor spaces more exciting for those that live here and for tourism
- Yes but only \$10 more
- No
- No.
- No.
-
- No
- Wasn't even aware you had to pay to book a site. Not sure what the current costs are.
- I guess.. if it was a very minimal amount. ~\$5 but make it clear why you have the charge/ where it goes
- Yes, depends
- No
- Yes but minimal (\$20)
- Sure, around \$20 additional cost. No more, I don't see why it's necessary to charge.
- No
-
- \$10
- No
- no
- No
-
- No
- Not at all
- Yes, not more than 10-15 dollars more.
-
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- zero
- Nop
- Yes, \$20
-
- It should not cost more but if the cost increase is marginal I would pay it
-
- Yes- \$5
- I'd be willing to pay about 20\$ more per table.
- No
- No, there's no reason it should cost more
- No
- No
- No, it seems weird to pay extra
-
- No
- No
- No
- Yes. I have no idea how much a picnic site costs but I would pay an additional \$10-15 dollars for a liquor picnic site.
-
- No. Why would the city want me to pay more ? That seems ridiculous and a money grab.
-
- No, drinking is unnecessarily expensive
- Nope
- No
- No
- No
- Don't make it too much expensive³ though
- No.
- No.
- If there was a fee and people want to drink then it should be \$30-50 to allow for that in case there is damage.
- No I don't want liquor in any of the parks.
- Yes. 100\$ and a damage deposit of 500\$
- \$2 - \$5 per picnic site
-
- Not book

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. There are plenty of places to hold events that are licensed. These usually have security on hand if needed and staff to clean up afterward. Public parks should be family areas and not adult drinking party areas.
- No
-
-
-
- Yep, the price would be commensurate with the event size. Small gathering = small fee, large event = large fee.
-
- You shouldn't have to pay - they do this in Europe and civilization didn't crumble there because liquor was allowed in parks.
- No I would not as long as law states we are responsible for cleanup/recycling there shouldn't be a need for more cost
-
- Slightly more but not much it should already be allowed for all
- No.
- No
- Yes
-
- Not applicable
- No. Unless you're getting additional services at the picnic site you shouldn't be expected to pay more. What would that additional money be going to?
- No.
-
-
- No. Picnic sites should be free. Soon they will charge a tax to step outside your home. Oxygen consumption tax. It's ridiculous.
- No, not willing to pay more. If that's the case, I would book a cheaper site and continue to hide liquor.
- Yes, \$20 liquor fee.
- No
- Yes 50\$
- No.
- Not at all as I am not in favour of alcohol consumption.
- Nope. It encourages Drinking and Driving and I am 100% against this.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes I will be able to pay more but it will be unfortunately to be around families and kids as I would not like to show my kids other people behaviours for some who likes to get trash and do public disorder
- No.
-
- Slightly more, maybe 50\$ per booking. Maybe.
- \$0
-
- Maybe. If it meant there was more frequent garbage removal etc.
- No I am not willing. As mentioned before people are already drinking alcohol illegally and a price will just deter them from doing so legally and responsibly.
- yes. \$10/site
- No
- No
- No
- up to 15% more
-
- yes,
- yes. 5\$
- No
- No
- unsure.
-
- No
- No
- No
- Shouldn't have to pay to be able to drink
- No. Bad idea. builds in an exclusion zone and encourages bad behavior.
- Yes 5 dollars
- No, out of principle. This should not be a money grab! Come on Calgary!!
- No. Having alcohol should not change the rates you pay for leisure, just a different sites. If you need more revenue, then increase the fines if found guilty of disorderly conduct, driving/floating under influence etc
- No
-
- Yes, though I'd probably stick to the free picnic sites.
- Should not be allowed

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. It's a park. We shouldn't have to pay to enjoy our city
-
- Yes, \$10-20
- Not really.
- No
- Liquor must not allowed in public park ANF places
- N/A
- \$50
- \$3 to 5\$ more
- Yes. 20%? Granted. It would be a trade off from other venues that allow it without markup.
- No I don't think you should have to pay more to be allowed to have a drink with your picnic.
- I believe that a reasonable fee could be appropriate for being allowed to drink at your picnic area. 10-15% However if the fee is too high people will continue to hide their consumption and are more likely to act irresponsibly.
- Yes.
- No. If this question indicates that the City would charge extra to allow people to drink in picnic sites, it should be enough to cover all the costs of clean-up and enforcement.
-
- No
- I don't think it should cost more to have a site that allows liquor
- No
- No. That would drive consumers away from a picnic.
- all of \$5
- No
- no
- no liquor is already taxed
- No
- n/a
-
- No
- No
- No
-
-
- No.
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Not unless there's a city employee in attendance willing to pour, no.
-
- No
- No
- No.
- No
- No
-
-
- \$5-10
- No
- No, should be the same price
- No - should only pay more if people misuse alcohol m, or fines for damages, improper disposal
- Yes. Unsure amount but if it's reasonable yes.
- No
- No. The purpose of booking a picnic site is that it's a cheap alternative to a dinner out. If it costs more, I would be less likely to book it.
- No. Unnecessary to charge more if you would be bringing your own alcohol
- Only a little more
- No
- I do not support use of liquor in a public place.
-
- No, what makes a picnic site with liquor costing more than one that doesn't? Unless it comes with a fridge or other amenity that justify the cost, I don't see the reason why the same table and seating would cost more just because of a type of drink.
-
- No
- No. Moderate public consumption of alcohol should not be prohibited in the first place. I'm not going to pay more for something that should have always been allowed.
- No.
- No
- No
- No
-
- No, doesn't apply
- no.
- No. They should be the same amount. I'm bringing the liquor, you're not supplying it.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No but if this is allowed, the cost should be a 100 times more.
-
-
- No
- NO
- No
- No!!!
- No
- No
-
- No
- No
- Yes, \$100
- No
- yes
- Mmm...not much more. I like the aspect of people not having to pay to get together for drinks
- I have never paid for a picnic site
-
- No
- no
- Absolutely not. I would consume liquor either way, just like I've been doing in parks my entire life.
- No
- No, I would not expect to have to pay more.
- No I am not will to allow liquor in public
-
- No
- No.
- No
- NO
- \$5
- No
- Probably not, I am not likely to pay for a booking, so adding more \$\$ would not be appealing. Likely we would consume alcohol anyways, even if the site did not allow it.
- Yes, \$10
- No
- Not interested as I won't book
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
-
- I would be unwilling to pay more.
- No. Just because I'm a drinker doesn't mean I should pay more
- No
- 20% more
- Yes but not much and I don't like the idea of it.
- No stop gouging
- No.
-
- Yes. I'm not aware of the current pricing to book a picnic site, so it is difficult to say how much more I would be willing to pay.
-
- Yes, I would be willing to pay up to 10% more. At the same time this should be considered carefully given our city's current economic downturn
- No. I don't think it should be a service to pay more for. Though I am concerned it could lead to more waste or recycling such as extra bottles, as long as the same amenities of waste and recycling stations are available, there is no need to charge extra.
- Only a small percentage more, like 10%.
- No,
- No, none.
- N/A
- Why pay? If forced to pay, i would book the non alcohol one and just conceal my spirits.
- No
- No
- No
-
- No
-
- No
- No
- No.
- Yes but only up to \$5
-
- No
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I don't think it should cost more, but I probably would pay a small amount.
-
- \$5
- Yes, that might be a good idea. \$15 more
- I won't book any site that allows liquor in public
- No.
-
- I don't see why it should cost more to consume your own liquor. Would you have to purchase your own liquor license?
- Yes, yes, yes!
- Yeah I think a cost should be associated because there could be an increased amount of maintenance at the designated sites.
- No way
-
- No
-
-
-
- No. There is no reason to change the fees.
- No. Picnic sites should all carry the same cost, no matter what is being consumed. That would be like saying if you are cooking food, then you have to pay more than if you are not. Or if you are playing games, then you pay more than if you are not.
- No.
-
- Yes but only \$5-10
- No for kids
- I don't think I'd pay much, but maybe around \$5 on top of the booking fee? If we're having to bring all of our own stuff it's hard to think we'd have to spend even more on top of that, but if it was nominal like \$5 I could see the conscience being worth
- No- why do I need to pay more to have a liquor?
- Payment wise, I wouldn't be interested in paying more for something I can't personally benefit from.
- I wouldn't be willing to pay more for liquor consumption site
-
- Yes \$1
- No, but I might have to pay extra for safety.
- I don't want to book any site which have liquor consumption
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No
-
- Absolutely not
-
- NO
-
- No
- No. Price should remain the same when booking.
- No
-
-
- no, what am I paying extra for? Does this cover additional picnic site park security? some other additional service?
- No. Would you tell someone they couldn't bring turkey sandwiches because they cost more than peanut butter? I don't think so....
- Yes. \$10.
- yes
- No. I am against drinking in public picnic areas or parks.
-
- I would be willing to pay more for a site that allows liquor, \$5-10 more.
-
- Most definitely not
-
- Yes, absolutely! People could abuse this and cleanup would require greater staff time and money.
- NO way
- Yes, but not much.
-
- No!
- No
- No, there is no need to increase cost for this.
- Yes, I would pay \$20 more. It is much cheaper than going to the bar.
- \$10
- N/A
- No
- NO

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. That is absurd and is a money grab from no reason. People will just pay the cheaper one and drink on the low down.
- Yes. Maybe \$5 more
- Probably not if we are already paying for the site.
- No.
-
-
-
- No. They should all allow alcohol and it shouldn't cost more.
-
- Yes
- Every user must register for the table and be held responsible for any damages caused by their group.
- I would rather not have to pay more. Adding cost suggests dissuading people from booking the sites. As I see it, people will book it anyway. Why add an unnecessary cost?
-
- No.
-
-
-
-
- yes. \$5
- No
- I will not book such sites
- No, there should not be price difference
- No
- \$5 more. Nothing too crazy as I see it should be a right but I also understand the costs of monitoring this.
- No
- Should not have to pay extra . Sounds like a TAX GRAB again as usual from this council
- no
- no to pay a fee
- No. An extra fee should NOT be levied.
-
- Yes. May be up to 25% more if the City provides some sort of patrolling to heck and make sure people don't misbehave and cause problems and anxiety to others in the Park.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- If allowing liquor creates an extra cost I would pay a small extra fee to go towards that cost. But if it's just a cash grab then absolutely not, you can't rip people off like that.
-
- No
- No
-
- good question. I feel that all major park picnicking sites should allow alcohol, and it would be a challenge to enforce some yes/some not allowed. That being said, I would pay a little more for the ability.
- No
- Yes. Not sure how much as I don't know the going rate.
- Yes. Up to \$15
- Yes, but not a lot
- If the money went towards funding people's concerns about this issue yes. 5-15\$
-
- Why the [removed] would you charge more to allow alcohol that someone paid for already. Give your heads a shake.
- No
- No. Why would there need to be a premium?
- Absolutely no. We do not need liquor in public places
- No
- Not with this idea at all. No alcohol should be allowed in picnic areas
-
- No
- I would not but I can see where people would. ie if liquor sites were limited and a group of alcoholics were having a picnic.
- Yes. The price would have to depend on the location and quality of the campsite. It's hard to estimate a number at this point.
- Yes, because Saturdays are for the boys. I would be willing to pay \$3.50
- No, I think paying for a site would be inappropriate, especially for those who don't earn much.
-
- No
-
-
- Yes , sorry did not know sites required booking
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes
- No, I think that would be an ineffective way of handling it and adherence would be low.
- No
-
-
- I would be ok with paying a small fee like 5 or 10 bucks that would go towards keeping the park cleaner. Or for any extra costs that drinking areas would have.
- No
- \$0
- No
- Yes, 15\$ maximum
- no
- No
- NO
- No
- No
- No, we can just drink at home.
- No. Might as well take the risk and pay a fine.
- no. *stupid* money grab
- No. Will not seek booking at a park where liquor allowed
- no
- Yes, but I don't agree with lining the government pockets more than we already do.
- No, will not even go there.
- Yes, maybe 20% more. It is a greater risk to the city so I understand why they would want to charge more.
- Yes but don't feel that it would be fair -pop -beer ?
-
-
- I shouldnt have to pay a penny more.! Why because the elected decided to give back a little if my freedoms in an area that my tax dollars have already paid for?
- Yes, I think \$20 more for a "drinking license" would be reasonable.
-
- Never
- yes, a 10% maybe?
-
- No and I don't want a table around ppl that are drinking when I'm at a picnic with my family
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
-
- No liquor on any sites
- Yes, depending on the size of the booking I would pay up to \$50 more.
- No
- Yes
- No.
- No
-
- 20\$ charge
-
- Maybe. \$5 is probably the most I would consider. And I would then expect the picnic tables to be very clean and well maintained.
- No
- No
- Yes.
- Yes, I would pay 10\$ more
- No
- Yes, it's hard to say how much though. Maybe up to 25% more.
-
- No because it's a public space
-
- no
- No way
- No
-
- Yes I would but would question why I have to pay more
- I don't even think about going
-
- No, they should be the same price.
- No. Is the city this desperate to bring in extra income?
-
-
- No
- No. I don't think there should be increased cost for liquor consumption. I feel that an increased cost will provoke people to drink outside of the designated areas.
- Yes. \$20

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- Yes and \$5
-
- Yes if it was adults only allowed.
-
- NO
- No
-
- No
-
- No
- Do not have a reference point unfortunately. Not a lot extra.
- No
- n/a
-
-
- Should be free of charge.
- No
- No.
- No don't be like that... Just charge the same price.
- No
-
- Yes, \$25
- n/a
-
- No
- No- should be the same price with all sites. Otherwise, would probably look for a different community space.
- No. Charging to be able to drink at your picnic is ridiculous. People would do it in hiding, there is no extra cost to have liquor at a picnic, its done already.
- No.
- Yes
- No, they should just be allowed to have it by default. Don't be greedy.
- Yes. Up to \$50 more.
- Yes, if the price is reasonable I would pay double.
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Yes - there should be a payment structure and a compulsory alcohol test for drivers pulling out of parkin lot to ensure prevent drink and drive incidents. Cost of service is but necessary.
- no
- No
- yes, 10\$ max
- No, they should all allow it and not cost more. What does increasing the price have to do with liquor consumption? Sounds like a money grab.
- Yes I would. But nothing too unreasonable maybe 10-15\$ more
- No
-
- No. That is a ludicrous suggestion with the appearance a cash grab. If all "prohibited" sites are booked and I have no intent to consume I may be forced to pay more to book an available "allowed" site with no intent to consume. Not fair at all!
- No
- no
-
- Yes
-
- No
- Maybe. Not sure.
- No
- No, this should not create a further charge for families. Parks are already supervised why does this need to incur a cost?
- No
- not allow any parks or picnic point to allow liquor consumption.
-
- No
- No, I would not. I costs no more for the city if I have a can of beer or a can of coke so why would the City charge more. Liquor is taxed enough by the province. I should not be charged by the city just to be able to have one.
- No - I think it should just be deregulated. I don't think it is necessary to ask people to pay extra when there is no service of any sort being offered. That just looks like a money grab. Big turnoff
- No
- Sure, \$5
- No, because drinking alcohol doesn't cost anything to the park
- Yes. To cover clean up fees if needed. Maybe 25\$

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I am willing to pay more to book the sites if it doesn't have liquor
- No Why should it cost more
- Yes, 5-10 \$
- Yes, but not much more.
- Yes! Maybe 5\$ more? To account for potential littering & clean up fees others may leave
- I do not prefer a liquor consumption site and I am not willing to pay a penny for it
- No. Just raise City taxes and be done with this "We have no money in the city thing". Stop be allergic to taxes.
- No. There should be no difference. But if imposed, the maximum would be \$5.00
- No
- No, why pay for something that is allowed ? But if you're looking for a money grab your the one who decides on payment.
- No
- No
-
- No. See above.
- No
- No. Why is that necessary?
- No
- \$200.00
- No
- No
- No. I don't think it's fair to charge someone more money based on their beverage of choice. It doesn't cost extra to sit in a lounge as opposed to a restaurant and the same should apply here.
- No
- Nothing. No liquor at all.
- No and don't turn this into a money grabbing deal
- Yes. 10% more
- will not even use
- Again totally depends on what we are booking it for.
- No
- No. If it is going to be a city bylaw change, we shouldn't have to pay for it
-
- I would not pay to book a picnic site
- To charge more would be an outrageous cash cow.
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, I wouldn't pay more. I would rather BBQ at home or just pour my beer into a cup so people couldn't tell I was drinking in a prohibited area.
- No.
- N/A
-
- No
- Not at all
-
- No I don't think there should be a cost increase
-
-
- No
-
- Yes probably \$20
- I don't see the point of paying more unless I caused disturbance or left garbage behind and police issued me a ticket for that.
-
- No
-
- Yes. Around 15-20 dollars
- No, the same level of service is required from the City for liquor or no liquor.
-
-
- I won't pay or book picnic sites allows liquor.
- Yes, Half the price of the original booking.
-
- They should all allow liquor at no additional cost.
- Yes. Especially in the case of booking a picnic site for a celebration. As it stands, I would not bring alcohol to a larger picnic gathering.
-
- No
- never
- No - That would be an unnecessary cash grab by the city
- No
- I would be willing to pay an extra \$5 or so. Hoping it would go to upkeep of the parks if this proposed law meant more traffic and/or mess. For example if it went towards recycling bins or something like that.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Yes. \$100
- N/A i do not support
- No
- Possible, \$5-\$10 above base rate
- Likely not.
- I don't usually picnic in areas I need to specifically book.
- No, as I don't see any additional costs coming from people responsibly enjoying a drink with their meal.
- Nope
- No. It's the same as bringing pop and water.
- Yes, I would be willing to pay 10 more dollars
- \$25
- No
-
-
- Yes, 25% more sounds reasonable. It would need to pay for increased monitoring and enforcement of unacceptable behaviour.
- No
- No same reason
- Yes, about 5% to 10% or more if forced.
- No
- Not at all
- Maybe
- no
-
- NA
- No, I believe this would just be a way for the city to unfairly capitalize on something that should be free if instituted, at least until there is a clear picture on if/how much it winds up costing the city.
- No
- No.
- No.
-
- I will not book such picnic site
- no
- No
- Yes. \$25

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. I won't be booking one which allow liquor consumption.
- No
- No at all
- \$5
- Yes. Up to \$25 more
- No, I will not pay .
-
- No.
- Yes but not much
- I would but I think it should be free.
- No. I don't think it should be treated like a luxury on top of a picnic space
- no liquor should not be allowed in picnic area and parks
- No.
- Yes, max \$5.
- no
- I'd be ok with a small incremental fee, which should come along with an enforcement mechanism to allow for complaints for non-compliant users.
-
- I don't know how much it's is now. A few bucks more?
- n
- No.
- Depends
-
-
-
- Yes, \$5
- Nope.
- Zero
- Yes, as long as the fee is not significantly different then the base cost.
- No
- NO
- No,
- Yes. But I believe you shouldn't have to pay more for this privilege. It should be no more than a 10% price increase.
- Probably not - it's not important enough to me
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I don't think people should have to pay more to enjoy each other's company/ culture in a very normal way. The money would have towards enhancing the experience GREATLY for it to be justified.
- Maybe I would pay for a license which allows liquor. I worry that raising the rental price would affect those who aren't drinking too.
- Potentially. I guess it would depend on what the money is being used for. If it was for added police regulation then sure but only if it actually increased safety. If it's just got get more money, no.
-
- Nope
- No, we shouldn't need to pay more for this. It's like penalizing people who want to enjoy being outside.
-
- No.
- No
-
- Yes.
- Yes. I would be willing to pay anywhere from \$25-50 more for the site.
- Nothing to be paid
- Yes, anything less than an open liquor ticket is a win!
- No. Not sure what the reasoning for it being more expensive would be. You still have bottles, etc. that you have to clean up if you're bringing non-alcoholic beverages.
-
- Yes, \$5-10 more.
- Yes. Not sure, let's say 50% more?
- No.
- No not at all
- No, it should just be allowed, not taxed.
- N/A
- I don't think there should be a fee, that would defeat the purpose and people would just continue drinking in secret.
- Should not allow. otherwise high penalties
- Yes, \$5-10
- No
- No. I would not pay for to be allowed to consume alcohol at a park
- Yes \$20 more
- Yes. 50% more.
- No. Why would there be an extra charge?
- no

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I don't think that is necessary. It should be priced the same for all sites. When people are allowed to do it, they will do it more responsibly.
-
- No! Why should I pay more for a right. If I'm responsible, there should be no additional cost to the consumer. Go ahead and charge fees for disruptive behaviour though.
- \$15
-
- No, but I think that most people WOULD pay more for liquor.
- Maybe, whatever the set rate.
- Yes - \$10
- No
- probably, i don't think it should cost more but if it does maybe up to \$30.
- Yes I would
-
- No
- No
- No. They should cost the same as non alcohol ones.
- No liquor
-
- Absolutely not.
- No
- No
-
- No, because I wouldn't pay for a picnic site where there wasn't alcohol allowed either.
- no
-
- Not in favour of alcohol consumption in public parks/picnic sites. Is Parks Canada ready to bear cost of additional security? Has any one thought if someone sues Parks Canada because he or she was injured due to unruly behaviour of drunk picniker?
- No. It should be the same as all others.
- No, that would be discriminatory.
- No.
- No
-
- No
- Yes, unknown.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes but probably only \$5-\$10
- No
- No. I am not willing to pay more for the site which allows liquor consumption.
- No. Why?
- no
- No
- No
- I'm not sure.
- Should be the same price as any other site booking.
- No
-
- No
- I don't think there should be a difference.
- Yes, only slightly more.
- No, it's a picnic site not a campground.
- Why would you have to pay for a picnic site?
- No.
- No
- No. It should be free.
- I don't think you should have to is more.
- No
- Yes, but not much. \$20
- yes. I do not know the rate I will say 20 cad.?
- Sure - not sure how much picnic sites cost now but maybe \$2-5 more?
- No
- not at all
-
- Not at all. How does this make any sense at all?
- I will pay more for that site where alcohol is not allowed
- No.
- I don't really see the need for it to be more expensive since the activities would be similar anyway. It would be the same thing that is being booked.
- No
- No
- No
- Yes - 50c per person

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, never. I see the type of questioning as being in the City of Calgary's radar as to increasing their tax grab - a fee for this and a fee for that. Charging a fee does not somehow make drinking in a public place acceptable.
-
-
- Not necessary and shouldn't be an option. Why??
- No, it should be the same price.
-
- no
- Not allowed
- None
- Depends how much more. It would also depend on how the money is being used. If I didn't see it being utilized towards signage and enforcement, I would wonder why I paid extra.
- No
- Yes, if it will help the City to increased the expenses on the security of the site or its maintenance. I would say double is fair
- No- it either needs to be to allowed everywhere or not at all. Charging people would just create a two tiered system and people would drink anyways.
-
- No, it should be accessible to all without additional cost
- No
- I'm not sure why it should cost more to book one that allows liquor.
- Yes, designated areas is a great idea
- None
- I won't be booking a site with liquor permission
-
-
-
-
-
- N/A
-
- No, I don't think you should be required to pay anything.
- No
- No
- No, as this is not fair to users if all the liquor consumption sites are full. People will be consuming liquor in the other sites as well.
- Probably yes, but maybe only \$5 or so more.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No
- No
- I probably wouldn't want to pay more. I certainly wouldn't pay more than \$20 more.
- Yes, 10-15\$
- No.
- Yes - \$20-\$40
- No.
- No
- If the non liquor sites are free and the liquor sites cost a fee I dont see what would stop people from using non liquor sites and bringing liquor. if the fee is within a few \$ of the other sites then that is reasonable, but yes paying more seems fair
- I think that is an overreach on part of government. It either is allowed or it isn't
-
-
- No, that's silly.
- Absolutely no and shouldn't be allowed
- No
- No, it's a park. What kind of question is this?
-
-
- No-- if it's going to be legal, leave it at that. Adding a fee takes away from the experience and need, and to be honest, I wouldn't go out of my way to book or pay that kind of thing. a fee would be an unnecessary barrier, and likely underutilized.
-
- No
- No
- I'm not interested to consume
- \$5-10
- No!
-
- No.
- No
- No - we should simply be progressive. The US has allowed this type of thing for years.
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- Yes. But a nominal amount, say 5% more just to show there is added value in these sites.
- N/A
- I will call myself foolish if I do so.
- No.
- No. People should not have to pay for the ability to consume a beer at a picnic site.
-
-
-
- No
-
-
- No
- Yeah, a bit more.
- Maybe. What's the purpose of the additional cost?
- No.
-
- No
- No, this should already be included.
- Never! Why would you charge extra? This would be nothing but a money grab
- No. I do not support paying more for the privilege of consuming alcohol.
-
-
-
- No, why would it cost more money that's ridiculous.
-
- NO
- No
-
- No
- NO
- No
- No
- No
-
- Yes 10-20 more
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- I would not book such a site.
- Sure. \$10 more.
- Yes \$5
- No
- No
-
- No
- no
- Do you need to pay to book sites now? Maybe \$15.00 towards the city.
-
-
-
- no
- I would not pay.if i have to pay i would rather book a resorts for vacations.
- What?? No! Omg - you are going to try to monetize this?? I'm about ready to leave this city because of stuff like this. Ridiculous
- Maybe if the funds would go towards monitoring, ie) unruly individuals who may act out if under the influence.
- Yes
- No. It should be free.
- No, I think it should be consistent regardless if liquor is allowed.
- no
- No
- Nope
- No
- Yes, not much as there are not many additional costs associated with its use
- I will not book whichas sites allows liquor consumption.
- No
- N/A
- No
- No
- Not willing to Paul
- 10
-
-
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- N/A
- Yes, a couple dollars more.
- No, that's ridiculous to charge more. People will end up booking the cheaper ones and still drink alcohol.
- No
-
- No
- Nope, don't turn this into a cash grab.
-
- No- that would be biased
- No
-
- No
- No
- No
- Liquor should not be allowed at any price.
- No
-
- No. That is absurd.
-
- N/A
- Yes, maybe \$5 for the increased need of trash collection. Or peace officer monitoring.
-
-
- \$10
- Nope
-
-
- No
- Yes, 50%
- No
- NO

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No.
- I believe all public parks and picnic sites should be free
- No.
- No
- No. See my answer to question 3
- No
-
-
-
- No
- no.
- No
-
- no
- No, this is a tax grab on products that are already tax heavily. I have already paid tax to purchase the product and shouldn't be further taxed to consume it.
- No
- No.
-
- No
- No
- No
- No should not charge for this why??
-
-
-
- N/A.
- Absolutely not - but others should. That is, I wouldn't book a site anywhere near other sites with liquor but people booking that type of site should have to pay for the increased cost of maintenance and cleaning - and there would be increased costs.
- No. this does not change the use of the site it just legalizes the activities already occurring there
- no
-
-
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- maybe. \$20 max
- No, this should not become a cash grab!
- No, I don't think I should have to pay more for a liquor picnic unless that increased price comes with complimentary liquor
- no
- No - not interested in paying to picnic in public park
- Yes, 5% -10% more
- Not in favour, so N/A.
- NA
- No.
- I don't see how cost plays into this, I didn't realize booking any picnic site costs anything so don't think allowing responsible consumption should increase that cost. If the pilot identified increase in littering or need for more bylaw maybe?
- No
- Yes within reason. \$10 is what the liquor board charges for bus liquor licenses
- No, I would just book one with out, pay less, put my beer in my yeti cozy and have a few without anyone noticing
- No.
-
- No. This doesn't seem reasonable. Unless there is historical data that shows an increase of clean up at these sites I would not.
-
- N/A
- No, paying more to allow alcohol will only encourage people to book the 'liquor free' tables and then bring alcohol anyway. Allow alcohol for all tables, and for the same price.
- No. Adding a cost would only promote people to try and 'get away with it' at a non-liquor site, which would require more security measures, police involvement.
-
- No
- again - all or none would be my preference and cost would not be a factor to me.
- It would depend on the situation. If I have to pay for a picnic site to enjoy time with my family, I'd rather not go. But if I have a large group getting together, then yes. I have no idea how much I'd pay because I don't know the current rate.
- No
- Yes. Not sure how much more as I don't see the relevancy between a can of coke to a can of beer for cost difference.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No - I already think the price to book a basic picnic site it high.
- Nop
- No
- No
- Yes. \$5
- Not interested in liquor consumption.
- You need to pay for picnic sites!?
-
- No
- No
- No
- Yes but not much - if the site allows it, there shouldn't be extra "penalties" for wanting to make use of it. Probably not more than \$5/site. There's no additional benefit to site or city to cranking up the price. And it may create more of a barrier.
- Really? Get with the times.
-
- No
- No. I would pay less.
- It shouldn't cost more. No I won't pay more!
- This would be a good way to put more money into the parks system however if you make the cost to high or unreasonable people will just disregard having to pay
- No
- nope, that'll go over like a lead balloon - people will simply do it and take their chances on being "caught" - like some do now
- No. It doesn't change how I'm using a park/picnic site, so there should be no additional fees.
- Yes. \$2 more.
- Not likely. Would assume that it wouldn't be unforced at a site that is non-liquor.
- No
- No. I don't think this is something that should be additional. If the space is used for a gathering, consumption of liquor during that gathering shouldn't trigger a fee.
- No, why would it cost more to administer?
- No
- 200\$
- No
- No. It should not cost extra.
- No.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- Yes, \$10, the same price for an aglc special event license. Any more and I think the city is trying to make a fast buck
- I would not book any such site even if offered free
-
- No.
- Yes, I would be willing to pay more, up to and including \$20
- No
-
- No. I would not be willing to pay anything. We do not need to provide our parks with the possibility of creating a "Red Mile" or "Stampede Drinking" venue. Please leave the parks with the current wholesome atmosphere they now have.
- yes.
- No. Maybe I like the site more, or it has emotional value, but I don't want to consume liquor there.
- No. That also would give a reason to skirt the rules, drink in a liquor prohibited section because it's cheaper.
- It's either all allowed or none. Don't screw around with this concept.
- no,
- Ideally no, it shouldn't cost anything more. Most site bookings I've made in the past were free anyway. If I had to pay, maybe \$10?
-
- Yes. It would make it more of a luxury and could possibly keep the unruly people out.
-
- I'm not aware of the baseline cost so it is hard to say
- No
- Not unless it included additional services such as a recycling bin station or a public water fountain as part of the changes
- Why would we have to pay more?
- Yes - \$5
- 10 tops? As it's pretty much a free privilege in many other cities in the world, this seems silly to charge for
- No
-
- Yes. \$1 per adult?
- Parks with liquor should be completely funded by those who use them. Admission should cover all maintenance, cleanup and groundskeeping, as well as security.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
-
- No
- No. That would just be a money grab.
- Sure. Not sure of what a booking generally costs if anything, but I'd be okay to tack on an extra \$20 or so. It should be enough extra cost that it's a "sometimes snack" for people, and not an everyday occurrence. Also good to help pay for the patrols.
-
-
- No.
- No
- no
- no
- N/A
- Yes. Not sure.
- No
-
-
- No
- No.
- no
-
- No.
- For some reason you people don't want to listen to the ordinary family with kids that don't want to have liquor involved in every thing they do !
- no, should be same price, it feels like penalizing people
- NA
- No
- No liquor
- Yes... not sure how much
- No.
- No, The price of these sites already have me limiting the use I have on the sites. That is a conversation for a different questionnaire though.
- No. If smokers are allowed to smoke in public without having to pay people should be able to enjoy a drink while in a public park as well.
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No. I'm not sure why the city would try to monetize this. How is it different from drinking bottled water?
- No, there is no reason why the city would need to collect money for this.
- yes 5%
- See above
- No alcohol at all
- A maximum of \$20 but that would only be for a large picnic site like they have at Bowness park not for just a single family picnic table
-
- Not at all
- No, why should it cost more?
-
- no, that seems unreasonable
- No, why does an extra cost have to be tacked onto everything. I take my recycling home for my own refund.
- No not at all
- Yes. Say \$10 more.
- NO
- Yes
- NO, I won't use park that allows liquor.
- No. Why would it cost more? There are no increases to costs as I am sure that there are already patrols or staff minding these parks on occasion. Treat people as adults and they will generally behave.
-
- NO!!!! I don't want to pay for public space!
- No, cause it should all be the same.
- No
- No way
- No
- Nope.
- Some will pay more but I believe most will get a non alcohol site that's probably more available anyways. If you are charging more a significant increase will cause this. Defeating the whole idea
- No, I would be willing to pay more for one that bans liquor consumption
- Yes, 10%
- No, having alcohol should make no difference.
- Yes, 20% more

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Yes, \$10.
- No
- no
-
- Yes, 20%
- Yes
- no
- I'm not interested in using a site that allows liquor consumption
- No. It should be free.
-
- No
- no liquor
- No
-
- No. Why should it cost more to book these sites? Nothing about the site itself physically will change.
- We shouldn't have to pay to use a public park and parks should not be profited from. This is capitalism slipping into and disfiguring civic affairs.
- No
- None what's so ever!
- no
- I don't drink
- No.
- No, this sounds like another money grab
- It should not cost more, but if that is the only way to facilitate then yes.
- Yes if it's the cost of a liquor license for the day I would pay \$20
- Likely, simply because it would separate the people who approve from those who don't. Thereby decreasing tensions between the groups. I'd say \$5-15 extra.
- Yes - 15% more
- No
-
- No
- No.
- No
- No
- No
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes. Difficult to give an exact amount but would have to be less than the equivalent of going out to a bar/restaurant.
- Yes. 5%
- No. People should not be charged a fee to partake in a legal activity (if made legal). That is ridiculous, as is the conversation about what amount would be appropriate.
- Would never book one of these sites.
- No. Zero.
- A bit more.
- No
- I do not and will not pay for the use of the parks facilities, alcohol or not.
- There should only be added charge if enforcement becomes costly issue. Start without added charge.
- No. I wouldn't want to pay more.
- No
- No, it should be allowable across the board without a fee.
- No
- No
-
- no, unless the payment is for personal alcohol liability insurance.
- no
-
- No, this should not be a revenue generator for the city. If allowing alcohol the site should cover the cost of a security guard to monitor
- no wouldn't pay for it though
- No
- No. Should be considered just a normal process.
- No
- This is a wonderful idea to generate government taxes and income... Please who can buy alcohol they should extra money to pay government
- No, should not be at a higher rate.
- \$5
- Don't want it in parks
- No. If the city decides to allow alcohol consumption it should be available to everyone not just people who can afford it.
- No, I think that is ridiculous as drinking is a personal choice and shouldn't have to pay more.
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No
- No
-
- No
-
-
- Yes. \$5 more.
- No
- No, they should all be the same price, liquor allowed or not.
- A little more, emphasis on little.
-
- No
- If there was a licensing requirement cost involved, that would be fair - but otherwise, no.
-
- No
- No
- No
- No, it isn't for me.
- I don't think we should be charged more for this, if at all.
- Not sure
- No. If I am not going to consume alcohol, why pay more to use the same site in case non-alcohol sites are empty.
- Yes, about \$3.50.
- Should not be allowed
- No
- No. It should be free.
- Because picnics are usually with small children and they should not be exposed to alcohol consumption. One way we want to treat the adults who are addicted to alcohol but we do not watch the children who see is consuming the alcohol.
- No.
- No
-
- 5
- No
- No. I do not opt to book picnic sites that need to be payed for currently. I typically have small picnics (my self and a couple of friends).

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. I hope this is not the main angle here by the city. Ie trying to find another revenue stream.
-
- Yes. 10% more.
-
- No. Because I believe that we should be able to picnic anywhere in any city park and enjoy a beer or glass of wine
-
- No.
- yes, \$10
- No.
- Yes, we would be willing to pay more. Whatever seemed reasonable.
- No I would not- maybe \$5 max?
- Yes, but I don't know how much a site costs. Say \$5 extra.
- No. Liquor should not be allowed in parks!!
- A bit more, maybe 25% more.
-
- no
-
- No
- No
- yes
- I would not pay more to consume liquor outdoors.
-
- N/A
- Yes. Depends on the size of the site. \$20 perhaps.
- No. The sites are expensive as is.
- In some cases
-
- No.
- Why should I pay more. Picnic sites are for families and people who want to drink should have to pay more for that "privilege". But totally against its legalization in picnic areas!
- No.
- no
- The cost should cover the extra work for bylaw officers, at least
- \$0
- no

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes but I'm unaware of the current fees. I would pay more though because parks will need more recycling containers
- No
- Yes, if the fee was nominal and there was a guaranteed receptacle nearby to dispose of empties.
- NO
- No.
- I don't think you should have to pay more if your going to drink or not.
- No
- I am against allowing liquor - so this question is irrelevant
- No, I'm already taxed to death!
- yes, depends on price
- No
- No
- Yes
-
- No
-
- no
-
- No
- No. This should be irrelevant. Look up UK laws.
- Noooooooo
-
- No
- No.
- no I pay too many taxes already
- Yes, a small fee (such as \$20) would be the maximum I would pay. Others who have less funds at their disposal may not be able to afford any such amount.
-
- No.
- \$5
- No
- No, I would drink at one that doesn't allow it anyways and just conceal it more
- Yes - 10\$
-
- No. Why would it cost more?

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I would like to not have to pay more, but I would understand the extra charge. I would not pay more than 15% of the current/non alcohol sites.
- No
- No willing
- Yes
- No, I do not feel this should be a cash grab. I feel that everyone should be able to enjoy a glass of wine in the park and not have to book or pay to do it
- No, I don't believe it should cost any more to book a site that allows alcohol consumption.
- No
- Sure, 5.00?
- No. Not sure why. What about the revenue from recyclables??
- No
- yes; 25% more
- No
- \$20
- No
- No
- No
- No.
- No
- No, it shouldn't cost anything, and you shouldn't have to book anything. Let people be free to do what they want.
- Yes however I would think that they shouldn't need to pay in order to have liquor.
- I would not unless it involved some added security or police presence. \$20 would be reasonable.
-
- Yes I would, but only for a nominal fee.
- No it shouldn't increase any costs
- Probably not.
- No, I don't feel as though allowing people to consume alcohol is making it cost more for maintenance of parks so should not increase the price to do so.
- no. why do you need more money for me to bring my own beverages? there shouldn't be any restrictions on drinking now as it is... really very dark age
- All sites should allow liquor consumption, again if a pilot program were to roll out it shouldn't be restricting some sites in the same park. It shouldn't make a difference if you drink or not.
- no
- No, get your hand out of my pocket.
- No, I would not, it should be free same as the non alcoholic.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, more than 100
- No.
- Yes I would be willing to pay 10\$
- Yes, but I don't believe we should be charged to book a picnic site that allows for liquor. Install some locked recycling containers so people can't steal them & then collect the money from all of the cans/bottles & put those towards maintenance of the site
- No
- Yes. \$5-25
- No.
- no
-
-
-
-
- I wouldn't book a site that allows liquor.
-
- No, I will not
- What possible rationale could there be to charge more for a site that you can drink on.
- No
- N/A
- Probably not a lot. Maybe an extra \$10.00
- I wouldn't be willing to pay anything. The reason for going to a park would be to save money.
- I would be against paying more to book a site that allows consumption of liquor.
- all picnic sites should allow liquor
- Yes, 20% more
- No. Liquor is not illegal, there should be no extra charge to have a beer or glass of wine.
- Yes, if the money went towards the betterment of the park or security. But otherwise no.
- No, it doesn't bother me too much not being able to drink
- No
- Of course not.
- Yes, but not a lot
-
- You shouldn't have to pay for a site to drink alcohol
- Yes. \$50
- no
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
-
- No. Why, how would allowing alcohol to be consumed increase the cost to maintain the site.
- NA
- No. The city does not need to collect money on this initiative.
- I will not book a site that allowed liquor
- No
-
- Um, does it come with security? Then no.
- no
- A very small fee, what would be the reason to increase the fee?
- No. There shouldn't be a charge.
-
- Na
- No, I do not believe there should be an added fee, unless extra clean up is required
-
- No- prefer there to be no extra cost.
- No. I didn't think you had to pay to reserve sites to begin with.
- No.
- I wouldn't pay extra and try to consume alcohol anyways. Most people will take their chances and getting fined.
-
- Yes. How much would depend on the group. I could see a \$5 charge. Though it may be a challenge to enforce.
- Yes - for potential clean up/waste and recycling \$5-10 more
- \$5-\$10.
-
- No
- yes
- No. Liquor is taxed enough in Alberta. One more cash grab isn't appropriate. It is a tax unfairly born by lower income people.
- No, we should be allowed to have an alcoholic beverage in a park.
- Yes. 20%
- No. I would prefer no to go to the place where liquor is allowed rather would love to go a place where no alcohol is allowed even by paying money
- Yes but not much. 10% more.
- Yes. \$100

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No. I don't believe the city would invest in additional services to justify a "sin tax"
- I would only be willing to pay a very small fee. I do not like the idea of the fee
-
- No.
- No
- No
- Yes, a small premium (but i believe all picnic sites should allow consumption)
- I don't believe we should be paying for this. In this case i'm sure most people won't pay but still sneak in booze.
- Yes. \$10
- No
- Yes -\$5
- I believe all picnic sites should have the same rules I would not pay to drink at a picnic site
- No.
- dont use them
- Yes. Probably 5-7% more, if enforcement comes along with the changed bylaw.
- No.
- No
-
-
- I would be willing to pay a very small amount more because I understand not everyone picks up their litter especially after consumption so you might have to do a bit more maintenance.
-
- Yes. \$10.
- No
- No
- No
- Depends on the occasion. If I were hosting a wedding, maybe \$100 fee. If my family wanted to have a casual Sunday lunch together in the park where one or two members of the family might want to crack a beer. None.
- I would, but I think it would be kind of grifty to charge more just for the ability to drink. But I also understand the potential for users to give back to the parks dept
- No
- Only \$10
- Yes but to be honest it is a legal activity I do not see why we should pay more.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- there should be no consumption of alcohol in public sites, and why should the city benefit from charging a fee for a free public space, this is not a fee for use
- Yes. \$10.
- No
- Yes. I think the standard \$10 that aglc already charges for people to purchase licences in businesses in the city
- Booking a picnic spot is ridiculous. I would not want to pay absurd amounts of money just to have drinks with friends outdoors. Parks should be free. And free to drink in, provided people are buying their own alcohol to drink in parks. This should be BYOB
-
- No.
- No. There is no reason to charge for the consumption of alcohol, food or some other activity.
- Not sure. I think we need to normalize people having a beer or a glass of wine. Why pay more?
- Maybe, not sure how much? If it was expensive, we would probably just stay home on our deck.
- No.
- No, I am against having liquor in the parks. The parks are for enjoying nature not altering your mind.
- No
- NO
-
- Yes. If I was planning on allowing alcohol
- I dont support Liquir in parks
-
- Yes; within reason. As stated above, if it costs more than an evening out at the pub, it's not worth it to a consumer.
- no; there is no reason to pay more unless it is a money grab on the part of the city
- No
- I think the point of public parks is not having to pay so would not pay much. Maybe up to \$5.
- No. Why should it cost more. There are no additional costs to the city.
- No
- Yes, I believe so, probably in the \$25 range
- No
- \$5 more. That seems fair.
- No
- Yes. \$10
- No.
- No, I think it should be included in the fee.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, that seems like a cash grab opportunity; no common sense involved in charging money to allow liquor consumption.
- No
- No.
- No, this shouldn't be something that the City can profit from.
- No
- No.
- No, I would just go back to drinking illegally.
- No
- No.
- Yes. Unfortunately some people may leave bottles and unwanted garbage at picnic site. A small fee to clean it up is not unreasonable
- No. No need for any increase in price. Unless, of course, you are providing the alcohol.
- No
-
- No. They should all allow liquor and they should all cost the same.
-
- No.
- Yes. \$10 max
- No, that's a silly notion. Should we have to pay more if we are using the table/site to cook...or eat too? That is just an unfair cash grab.
-
- Yes
- No
- No.
- No. It shouldn't cost more as you are using the same space as if it wasn't a designated area. This should be an added benefit, not an extra expense on top of the benefits.
- Nope
-
- Yes, if that provides security and safety against the aggressive behavior of some
- No, there shouldn't be a charge for sitting at a public picnic table. That's like charging to go to the park! Ridiculous!!
- Why would I pay more? The whole idea is to normalize reasonable consumption, not to treat it differently. Smells of a cash grab.
- No.
- No. It shouldn't cost more.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. Why would it cost more to book. What people bring to a picnic shouldn't define how much they pay
- I would not be willing to pay more. The sites need to be all or none (all allow or not) because it is too confusing to keep track of otherwise and people shouldn't be penalized for having a glass of wine.
-
- No, I do not think there should be a charge for this!!!
- Not more, we pay enough for everything already.
- No, because we all do it already if I had to pay to do what I already do I may as well keep sneaking it to risk a ticket.
- Absolutely not, that makes this a cash cow conversation which I am completely against
-
-
- No
- Shouldnt be charged for any
- No,
- No. That seems ridiculous .
- Yes, perhaps \$5 more.
- Maybe, but not much. However, the price should depend on the length/footage of the site and available amenities.
- No
- no
- yes
- No liquor period.
- No. I'd just bring liquor like I already do.
-
- No, same price for everything.
-
-
- I would be willing to pay extra to consume liquor, but I would hope that the rules are enforced for people who consume alcohol at picnic sites, but haven't paid the fee.
- No
- No
- yes
- Yes. As long as the cost was reasonable, I'd pay.
- No, because that'd be difficult to enforce. There will be people that just pay for the lower cost option and still consume
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- No, I don't think an extra fee should apply, this should apply to all sites.
- [removed] no! I see you trying to charge me for a public space I already pay into the tax pool to help maintain. You can piss right off with that one.
- No. There should be no extra charge for this.
- Yes
-
- No
-
- I should not pay more for the picnic site, I am already paying for the booze
- I don't see the logic behind this question. If you're going to allow it at them then it should already be included - why would I have to pay more to do something legally???
-
- No.
- No, if the parks are open to liquor then another tax or fee should not be applied.
- I would pay more to not have it.
-
- In the instances I would be considering having a drink at a park I likely wouldn't pre-book.
- no
- No
- no. I would not pay an extra cent for this basic civic right, which is not criminalised in most of the world.
- Perhaps, but I would not be willing to pay much more. Perhaps 25% more.
- Absolutely not.
- Please continue to ban it and enforce it with heavy fines.
- \$5 to help with cleanup
- no
- Pay who for what exactly? If anything the liquor-free parks should cost more for requiring more bylaw officers.
- No. Please do not make this a cash grab for the city, it makes us all look bad. Taxes are continually going up and you want to increase fees to use parks for something a large group disagrees with. I don't feel that is right.
- see no reason why there would be a charge to sit at a table to have liquor. What if I want to sit on a picnic blanket?
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- There's no point of a charge, simply have recycling bins for all those beverage containers and the city can get their money from those containers. No need to tax citizens for having fun.
- No, Albertan's are hurting already - no need to charge unnecessary fees.
- Yes
- I would not pay to go to to such a site
- Yes - whatever the additional fee would be
- No
- See #1
- No
-
- No
- Yes, but why does it need to cost more? I'd be willing to pay \$5.
- Yes, if this had been an option for my wedding I would have loved to pay and book a picnic site.
- Yes.
- No. You have your hands in my pocket enough
-
- No.
- Definitely not.
-
- No, you tax us enough already. Liquor is already taxed enough in this country
- NO WAY
- I will not go there at all ever
-
- No
-
- No. I don't think there needs to be a sin tax applied.
- No
- No
-
- I think all sites should allow liquor consumption. If I had to pay more I would, but I don't think that would really be fair.
-
- No
- No
- No
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
-
- No. I wont pay more.
- No
- Most likely yes I would have to see the difference in prices
-
- I would if the group wanted it, and yes they should be charged more to cover possible clean up costs.
- Not willing
- 25% more
- No
- Not interested.
- No
- yes, \$10 more
- no
-
- No
- No. That's ridiculous.
- hell naw
- No. That sounds like the city is just money hungry.
-
- Yes
- No
- No
- I don't think there should be a charge at all for the use of public spaces. Charging for it will push people to do it anyways in other non regulated areas
-
- Not initially. If over time costs were incurred due to irresponsible park patrons, I would be willing to pay a \$5 maintenance fee.
-
- No
-
- No because if you can have a drink why pay extra. Why make up more rules. Just relax existing laws
-
- No, that is an absolutely idiotic and baseless notion.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Why would you have to pay more for a campsite that allows liquor ?
- Yes, an extra 5 dollar charge would be reasonable
-
-
- Yes \$10
- Absolutely not. City Council squanders our hard earned money on stupid stuff and tax us to death.
- I don't want to pay more
- No. Why should you need to pay more to be able to do something everyone should already be able to do in public.
- NO
-
- This should be a free service. And all parks should allow the safe consumption of alcohol.
-
- No
- I won't go to that park.
- No.
- No
- No
- No.
- No. Allowing liquor consumption shouldn't require a higher pay wall, people will be encouraged to follow the same rules of conduct and clean up.
- Yes and 10-20\$ more
- Yes, 5-10\$ more
- No
- No
-
- No
- No, I would use my own yard if I had to pay.
- Yes, Not sure how much more, it would depend on if there were going to be additional resources in place for enforcement.
- Why would it cost more? Our parks are already kept rather clean.
- No
- 20 dollars more. Don't want it becoming overly expensive
- 20\$
- Not at all.
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No i don't think i should be taxed (charged) for something that actually will reduce enforcement costs
- Crown land is crown land, there should NOT be a booking fee as it is already taken care of via taxes
-
- Yes
-
- No that's silly. People that would drink anyways would drink regardless, such as youths or people rafting on the bow.
- Under \$100
- No. Why should consuming alcohol result in having to pay more money?
- No.
- NO
- Probably not. I don't understand why it should cost more. If cleanup is a concern, it's no different from food cleanup. People need to be responsible regardless of whether it's food or liquor packaging. I would support littering fines, though.
- Yes, I would be willing to pay around \$20 for a liquor site
- No, it shouldn't be more. Calgarians are responsible, we can clean up after ourselves the same way we would without or without booze.
- 5%
-
- Yes - \$5
-
- no. It's not right for the city to discriminate between its citizens personal choices.
- Yes, I will be willing to pay maybe \$50 more
- Why would it cost more? That's stupid.
- I will be paying less for the ones that allows liquor consumption.
- Slightly more, if you must charge extra.
- Yes, but not more than one drink would cost. So less than \$10 I suppose.
- no. why would i pay more when i already have to pay for the beer? if i want to pay more for my beer i will go to the bar
- Why does there have to be monetary increase?
- I don't see a reason why one should have to pay more, unless the cost to maintain it is higher
- No, drinking should be personal choice, so it should not be allowed in public places where non drinking people's comfort will be compromised
- Yes. No additional cost should be applied to such a site.
- Yes. \$50
- Money is not every thing safety is every thing if some one million after their function some think happens who is responsible city ha ha

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No
- No should cost the same
- No
- Yes.
- No
- They should all allow liquor and there should not be any additional charges
-
- You'll be a long time waiting for me to pay for any plan that erodes healthy family values.
-
- I don't pay for picnic sites... not sure.
- Yes, \$50 dollars
- No. I am not interested in consuming alcohol outside
- No
- Not sure
- Paying is silly. Disguised drinking can/will occur at any picnic site.
- I wouldn't pay more, as I personally don't drink alcohol that often, but it would be nice to have the choice
- Yes \$5-10
- No.
- No.
- Maybe like ten dollars more
- No I would not.
- No
- The nice thing about picnic sites is they aren't expensive. I would be willing to pay slightly more, but if the price goes up too much, people will just drink illegally at a non-liquor site.
- No
- None
-
- Uhhh not a lot... do you understand how high the cost of living is already? Do you get that we already have to pay for so many things including sometimes access to a park in itself... why does there have to be a price on EVERYTHING
- No
- I don't think there should be any charge
- See my response below. The only way I think this could work is if you made people pay a fairly large fee and sign a form indicating they would be responsible. Then you could revoke their permit if there is misbehaviour.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes
-
- It's just like the proposed cannabis parks. If that legislation passed, my family would simply never go to those places because of risk, which would be a shame, b/c they're lovely spaces. The same's true of alcohol. Even floating the idea is short-sighted
-
- No. \$0
- no
- No
- No I would not.
- why should it cost more?
- —
- No. I don't think consuming liquor at a picnic site warrants a user fee. I wouldn't pay to book a "liquor allowed" picnic site.
- yeah fair idea
- No. No. No.
-
- Oh, I didn't realise this was a cash grab. I'd probably begrudgingly pay it, but I'd rather support the notion that all sites allow it. Then we are not artificially making some more desirable than others.
- No
- I wouldn't pay extra for a picnic site that allows liquor. I will pay whatever the right picnic area entails me to pay for our enjoyment. We don't do picnic everyday. Its worth spending money when we have the opportunity to do so.
-
- No I am not willing to pay more money
- Yes, but all sites should allow beer & wine
- No
- No. It's still illegal to infringe on bylaw noise rules, and being drunk in public is also still illegal. To simply have open alcohol that I paid for in a park seems such a simple liberty that I wouldn't feel right paying a dime extra for it.
-
- No
-
- no
- No i shouldn't have to pay to be a responsible adult.
-
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, I think that it should be free for all if they choose
- Never book a site which allows liquor
- no
- No - I think people will just hide liquor and book in one that "does not allow" consumption.
- No, ridiculous suggestion
- Yes. \$10.
- No
- \$5
- No I would not.
- N/A
- No
- no, not willing to pay more.
- no
- No. Why pay anything, drink at a bar or drink at home. Why do people need to make fools of themselves in more public spaces?!
- NO
- No I would not like to pay more for one that allows liquor consumption. I also believe that people will "hide" it if they are at a site in the same park that does not allow liquor consumption. And who is going to police that?
-
- No
- No - only support implementing this if parks/assets see degradation due to alcohol use
- No
- No
- Not unless i am paying for a bar service. If we bring the liquor there should be no extra cost.
-
-
-
- No
- Never
- I've never paid for a Picnic site so I'm not sure
- Yes, within reason.
-
-
- Yes, not more than \$5
- no Tax grab by city hall NO NO NO!!!!
- Maybe, perhaps a nominal 5 to 10\$ more.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. Consumption of liquor should not be allowed in public parks.
- only if \$ was used to fund a on-site bylaw presence. \$10-20 per booking
- Depends how much more. Not a huge amount
-
- No
- No
-
-
- Do not allow
-
- No
- No I would not.
- No. I'm occupying the same space as I was before. I don't see why I should pay more.
- No
- No.
-
-
- If you are charging more for allowing liquor consumption, this makes sense because it will help limit anyone and everyone from drinking. More likely the more responsible drinkers.
- Yes, probably twice as much
- Yes but shouldn't have to. Liquor should be fine to consume in parks
-
- Yes \$10
- Yes. It would depend on what I was doing, but maybe \$25-\$50 for personal events and more for company events.
-
- No, sites should be the same price whether or not alcohol is consumed. Unless the city notices that the sites that allow alcohol require more resources to upkeep.
- No.
- No
-
- No. I pay enough in taxes.
- Nope
- Not sure.
- no
- yes, maybe \$20?
- no

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No
- No.
- Would not be willing to pay more. Standard picnic practice includes hiding liquor and wine in non transparent bottles.
- No
- no
- No.
-
- No.
- No,
- Yes. \$10
- No
- I have personally seen the devastation that alcoholism causes and have had a family member killed by a drunk driver. So no, when I go for a picnic it's about being outdoors and enjoying nature in clear state. Not with rowdy revellers all around.
- No you shouldn't have to pay
- No
- No.
- No
- I wasn't aware that there was a charge to have a picnic in Calgary. I would not be interested in paying for a picnic site period, whether or not it allowed liquor.
- No
- NO!
- No. Stop trying to monetize something that's legal in many other parts of Europe without any issue.
- No
- I would not
- No
- No, alcoholic beverages are already overtaxed by the government. We all have paid equally for common use areas already.
- No
- No
- Yes, I would be willing to pay the standard alcohol licensing fee of \$25
- No. This is a ludicrous concept and whomever thought of it should be fired. Simply allowing a very normal part of life should not come at a higher cost
- no, I would not go if liquor is allowed

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. It won't cost anything to legalize consuming alcohol in public parks. Charging admission seems completely unnecessary.
-
- No , unless it can be demonstrated that there are truly increased costs to operate the sites.
- I will never book or pay for a site that allows liquor
- No And how many people would still bring liquor by hiding it i a water bottle container, etc.,
- No, nice try, but since I'm already recycling my bottles/cans and pay my taxes, I don't think you need to take any more of my money.
- Not applicable
- No
- Yes but not too much, maybe \$5-10
- Yes.
- Yes, \$10
- I don't think you should have to pay more for an alcohol consumption site.
- No, there is no valid reason to charge more money. There is no material difference in site usage with or without liquor that would justify any price difference
-
- yes! \$20
- I would not be willing to pay more as it seems in appropriate, I could drink at home for free.
- No!
- Yes, \$5 per hour or \$30 for the day
- no
- No, see above.
- No. It should be standard.
- Parks are for kids and families and not for drinking liquor.i will never use a park with liquor
- I would not book a site where liquor would be consumed. As an individual I would not want any responsibility for the unexpected poor behaviour of anyone in a group.
- no.
- sure
- No, there should be no difference in cost. People would book a picnic site that allows liquor, even if they don't consume alcohol themselves, due to availability. Difference in cost would create discrepancies in how this law is enforced.
- I see no reason to charge more for such booking.
- No, there should be no increased cost.
- No
- NO. this seems like you want to allow liquor consumption to make money!!?! public parks should not be turned into beer gardens.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Pay for a picnic site? Is this all about the money?
- No, do you have to pay for sites currently? I did not know..
- No
- N/A
-
- No more than 10\$
- No
- Same price
- Preferably no, if so I'd pay a minimum of \$15 extra.
- Absolutely not. There shouldn't be any difference picnic tables bookings where or not they allow alcohol
-
-
- Yes I would pay more to be able to drink, but it does not compare to how much I would pay to be able to consume weed.
- N/A
- no
- No
- Yes, I'd be willing to pay, say \$5 or \$10 more.
- No
- No
- I won't ever book a site for liquor use. I would not be willing to pay for reserving a site.
- no
- No. I will just not pay for one and hide the alcohol like in the past. It will cause the same problem as prohibiting alcohol
- No comment - I don't know how much it normally costs
- No
- Possibly, depends on how much extra this would cost. I've never personally booked a site, but would be more likely to if this was an option.
-
- Yes I would pay more because it would be an enhanced experience. I would be willing to pay no more than \$15-20 more
- Would prefer not to, but would pay a small increase.
- Perhaps a couple of dollars per person more.
- No, it's a public park, fully funded by tax dollars and perhaps private donations. The City needs to keep their hands out of our pockets whenever they come up with some new idea.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Really? I would pay more for a site with a working grill/bbq
- Yes. 50% more.
- N/a
- Don't think so
- No
-
- Yes but only marginally. I believe this is something that should already be allowed.
- Potentially but not much more. I would be willing to pay around \$5 more.
- Yes, assuming that the additional funds go towards managing the premise. An percentage of the overall cost (e.g 5 - 15%)
- No
- Can't see a reason for higher rates outside of bottle bins for recycling and paying city employees to pickup
-
- No.
- no
- No
- Maybe, not significantly more though
- N/a
- No
- No
- No, because I'd just go drink in one that doesn't allow it, like I do now.
- No
- No. Sick of getting nickel and dined for everything vocab
- No, would not pay more.
- no
- Yes. 20%
- No - Why?
- No, there shouldn't be a cost associated with it.
- No why should we be charged for this makes no sense
- Yes, a small amount more
- Don't support drinking in public
- Probably not. I don't see why someone would have to pay more depending on what they drink, as long as they are picking up after themselves and causing no damage.
- 5\$
- yes \$10
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. I will just enjoy a drink or two at home. I have had enough beer poured on my clothes at hockey games.
-
- If there was a chance I did, then yes. I'd see to it that I would pay maximum forty dollars.
- No and never
- No, because it should not be an extra tax
- No
- No
- No.
- No
- No, why should we have to pay more? For what service? Maybe the city can take the bottles back for a refund if they need more money for parks that allow drinking!
- Maybe a small fee (\$5) but I don't think there should be a fee.
- No, I should not have to pay more for setting that isn't costing the city anything
- No
-
- I don't think you should pay more.
- 5 dollars
- No, should not be allowed liquor in picnics areas and parks
-
-
-
- No, that seems unfair.
-
- Absolutely not. There should be no price difference for wanting to consume liquor - liquor or not the space is being used for the same purpose and likely would result in the same waste/recycling output. Allow it for free or don't at all.
- if they have money for the liquor should be double of the amount bringing in liquor
-
- Yes
- No - why should I?
- No
- No that is ridiculous, maybe a deposit to cover any clean up costs, but the same goes for any sight whether booze is a loud or not!@
- Never. I don't drink.
-
- Yes \$25

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No...get real.
- No
- No.
- No, why charge more for the same site?
- no it should be free
- Yes . Double i can pay
- No. Why bill more? This sounds like just a way to get more money from people.
- Perhaps, have never paid to rent a picnic site, so not sure.
-
- Yes, any amount.
- No
- Yes
- no-- why would we need to pay more, unless they had an outdoor bar there
- no
- Yes \$10
- A principle amount. Just for extra respect and maintenance.
- No as it's not like the city would be supplying the alcohol. What would the money be going towards?
- Yes. Depending on purpose, up to 20% more.
- N/A
- No. It's not about money it's about societal values and family norms
- I will never book a picnic site / park that will allow liquor use
- No. It devalues the park as a whole.
- No
-
- No, why would we be charged a different rate to be able to drink alcohol?
- No.
-
- No
- No. Liquor should be permitted in all park areas, charging to have it merely encourages drinking in currently unapproved areas.
- Slightly. Maybe \$20 max.
- No. Now that would just be a cash cow for the city.
- Should be a first come first served program.
- No
- No
- No never

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- N/a
- Begrudgingly, maybe. It would seem odd to have to pay more for this.
- Not sure on the price they are now but yes I suppose I would but not significantly more
-
- Yes.
- A bit more.
-
-
-
-
- No
-
- Yes. \$10 more. No more than \$20
-
- NO
- I would be willing because I can afford it, but I think that making it more expensive would only negatively affect the poorer portion of the population with no real benefit to it. It just makes low income families feel like they can't participate.
- Yes \$5
- I'm unsure about this.
- No liquor
- No
- no
- Would not pay
-
- \$5
- No. Having an extra cost adds barriers and gives the impression that alcohol consumption is high risk and associated with damage to the public space
-
- TThere should be no charges. Public dollars were used to create parks.
- No, why should it cost more?
- Yes, 10\$
- 5-10% more
-
-
- I don't think it would cost more just because alcohol is involved so I would not pay more.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. What stops individuals from taking a hamburger and a 24 of beer. Who is going to and how is it going to be monitored
- No
- No
- No
- Not at all
- No
- No
-
-
- Yes. \$10-30
- No
- no
- with a group organized in advance, for an occasion. But the opportunity to have a picnic should be spontaneous.
- No
- Yes, but not much. Maybe an extra \$15
- I am totally against allowing it
- Cost should just be cost recovery.
- No
- No.
- not interested in these sites
- Yes. I don't know how much the fees are but \$10-20 more would be fine.
- Yes. Slightly more. \$5?
-
-
-
- No
- No
-
- No.
- No
-
- No , no drinking should be allowed
- No
- No
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- Yes, but only a small amount more. If the cost was too high, I would just book an indoor facility or have people over to my house.
- No
-
- yes, probably 5-10 dollars.
- Yes
- Absolutely not. Having a drink will not put any additional strain on the park area or staff that maintain it. Cigaret butts are more of a problem
-
- \$5-\$10 per day
- No
- No - it's public space, if I wanted to pay cover I'd go to a bar
- NA
- no
-
-
- yes
- Yes, \$40
-
- No not at all
-
- No, I'd get the cheapest and drink beer regardless of whether it's allowed or not.
- It should be a pay system, and it should be more expensive
- Yes, in order to have those sites equipped with proper disposal bins
- No
- It depends, if paying goes toward paying for clean up- I feel like that could be remedied by a bylaw infraction. Otherwise I feel it's just another road block to keep people who are not in favour happy
- No
- yes, probably around a 15 % increase
- no
- Yes. \$50 more
-
- No I would not be willing to pay
- No
- Probably yes, \$5

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I'm sure I would, but I'm curious as to what the extra costs are for? If it's for clean up costs, receptacles for deposit bottles/cans will be collecting money for city parks.
- Yes and 5\$
- Yes I would. Depending on price. But 10 to 15% higher
- Unsure, it depends on where the money was being allocated afterwards.
- Not sure.
- \$10.00 more
- No. Shouldn't have to pay for that. I'd be more likely drink illegally and hide the booze if bylaw or officers come by.
-
- No. I will not go to a park where Alcohol is allowed.
- I would pay, any where between \$10-\$30 dollars.
- No, I'm not paying to drink outside. I'd either stay home or do it anyways on a non pay site.
- NO
- No
-
- No
- No
- Possibly; I don't know what the current rates are so I can't answer the second question.
- No
- No, I believe taxes should cover the increase in liability
- Yes, few bucks.
- Yes. No idea.
- No
-
- No.
-
- No. I won't go there.
- Never, not willing to pay anything for this way
- No
-
- Why would it/should it cost more?!
- No.
- No
- No, I already pay enough taxes on liquor.
- No
- No. Not that important to us.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No.
-
-
- No.
- No.
- Yes
- No
- No
- No
- why would a person have to pay more for a picnic site which allow liquor ? Would we pay more if we were 'allowed' to drink soda? Energy drinks? Smoke a cigarette? etc.
- It should not cost more, because me having a beer is not costing you money. That doesn't make any sense for an added cost
- Never
- No. This should not be profitable.
- No
- No and I wouldn't go to a park or picking site that allows alcohol in the first place because it's unsafe
- No
- No that's absurd. Pay for what service? Nothing.
- Guys c'mon. Really?
- Yes. \$10
- Like I said I didn't know you had to book sites.
- No. That's just a cash grab. And if they put a price on it people will just break the law and drink on unassigned sites.
- Yes. Standard liquor license fees
- No, I guess I have to bring my own liquor anyways
- Who pays
- No
- No.
- How would this be enforced?
- No. Why paying more? As long people respect the environment. If they trash a place, they should pay a fine. If there is a payment, it should be refunded if the site is not damaged or the site is not cleaned. Should be the same state as booking time
- No.
- Yes, 15
- Yes. Should be free

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I don't think there should be a fee, that is an unfair barrier to people with limited economic power
- I will not book a site where alcohol is consumed. There should a difference between a pub/bar and a public picnic site
-
-
- If I was booking for a larger group of people, I would. I think there should be a \$10-15 surcharge for liquor consumption sites/whatever is needed to cover corresponding increases in littering by negligent users.
-
- No.
- No. This is an abuse of government to even suggest charging more for a basic freedom.
- No.
- No. I feel that the increase in bookings that the site will likely see is more than enough to compensate.
- Nope. That's a slippery slope.
- No
-
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No. I understand there is the potential for increased garbage services - but i do not believe this will drastically increase to the point that increases park budgets.
- Yes, but not much. I would argue that if they are more expensive, people will continue to drink at both and those who can't afford the fee would be unfairly penalized for drinking at non-drinking sites.
- Under 25\$
- Shouldn't be allowed
- I would prefer not to have to pay
- I don't picnic, but I wouldn't pay for a site.
- No
- I would not go to it at all even if it were free
- No. Charging money for the priviledge to use a drug in a park, is not the issue.
- No. That's discrimination.
- No.
- Not at all, And I will try to avoid that picnic spot.
- Absolutey NOT!

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, I think that makes it feel like a penalty for wanting to drink. But I do think that there should be a fine for those who abuse the privilege and cause a nuisance, damage property, or leave garbage behind.
- No
- no, because that should be normal. Why would I pay for that?
- Not willing to pay more just to have liquor.
- No
- No
- No
-
- I don't know how much it currently costs to book a site, but if it's \$50 then no more than \$25. Like 50% of booking cost extra max.
-
- No
- No
- It costs money to use these sites? No wonder I haven't used them.
- Yes. 50% more than current costs.
- Yes. I'm not sure how much it costs. 10% more maybe.
- No, I do not book sites that have fees. I would rather drive out of town.
- Not applicable. I would rather not book the site.
- No.
- No.
- No.
- No. Unless or until it can be shown there is an increase in COST to have a liquor positive site, there should be no difference in fee.
- Yes, 10% more
- Of course not. And I shouldn't have to pay to be in a non-alcohol site either.
- No, charging people more to have permission to drink at a picnic site would make people just choose non drinking sites and do it anyways.
-
- Sure but that seems like a cash grab. Are there higher costs to the city as a result?
- No
-
- No.
- i wouldn't pay to book one
- No, it should not cost more.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, I don't see why I should pay more to drink. Maybe ask for a deposit so that if the site is damaged/misused there is a fee.
- No
- No I would not
- No
- Why in God's name would we have to book and pay to have a picnic . Are blanket picnics not going to be allowed liquor consumption ! Seriously!
- Donot want alcohol should be allowed
-
- NO
- No
- No.
- No
- No, because what is the extra money for??
- No, i would preferred to drink at the time of payment and walk away. I have seen people doing this at my 3 friends hotels at three different areas and cities. And police said we are not responsible for it, go to small court.
- Yes, maybe \$20-30 more.
- Yes 25
-
- Paying for it may be seen as an entitlement to over imbibing. Now we are getting into dangerous territory. What defines too much? And how much does the non drinking/smoking up public tolerate?
- yes 10 dollars
- No
-
-
-
-
-
- no I would be more likely to pay for a picnic spot with NO drinking, smoking, marijuana
- N/A
- No
-
- No, I would not want to pay extra. But if it ensures no glass or empty bottle and cans being an eyesore or dangerous to kids, pets then sure 10\$ per site visit.
- Most likely not.
- No we have the right to consume alcohol
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No, I would not go to a park that allows alcohol consumption.
- Yes. \$5
-
-
- Yes but not sure how much the going rate would be
- Yes, although I don't think that is necessary since the facility is not changing in any way (as long as there are ample recycling bins for the increased beverage containers). Such a fee should be zero or minimal.
- no
- No I would not. Anything that would cost would only reflect a money grab from the city.
-
-
-
- No.
- No
- Yes - 25% more
- No
-
- Maybe, but only if it's marginally more expensive.
-
-
-
- No
- No
- No
-
- No
- No
- No, for the reasons above
-
- No
- No
- No
- No.
- No
- NO

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. Why would costs increase?
- No
- No.
-
- Depends on the booking of it was for a large party than yes. But not just of its me and my wife..
- This should not be an option. No liquor in parks
-
- Minimal increase
- No that's a cash grab
- would not pay.
-
- No I won't book the picnic sites which allows liquor consumption.
- Ideally not but if it is a must yes because it would allow us to enjoy ourselves with our young family members while enjoying alcohol responsibly.
-
- Yes, but a very small percentage more
- No
- No, you should have to pay more for it. Just penalties if you can't clean up.
-
- yes, \$40
- No why should it cost more?
-
- This does not apply to me at all.
-
-
-
-
-
- No.
- No...why would I have to pay more?
- No
- Would not apply; although I enjoy my beer and wine; I am not in support of allowing liquor at camp sites.
-
- Probably not. Though if a small fee was the barrier to having this opportunity, I might consider it occasionally. Up to \$20 or \$30, perhaps.
- No. I believe it should be allowed everywhere.
- Yes

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- No, I wouldn't be willing to pay anything
- No liquor.
- No!!! Why should we have to pay?????
- Same rate as a typical liquor license for events
- No
- No.
- Not really but 5 dollars more
- Don't want to pay more
- No.
-
- Money is not everything
- Yes. \$5-\$10 for a small group, \$20 for a larger group.
- No
- Yes, 25% more
- Maybe
- No , dont see the need for another tax grab etc. Like really why would it cost more other than the city can make more money.
- No
- no
- I won't book a site where liquor is allowed
- Yes I'd be willing to pay up to \$50
-
-
- Not interested in public picnic site allowing alcohol.
- no
- No
- No
-
- No
- No
- No
- No
-
- Yes, less than a liquor license
- No, we will just hide the fact we are drinking in public then like we already do.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Shouldn't have to pay for picnic sites at all. But if that is the standard - yes, alcohol friendly could be slightly more, no more than 10% higher.
- Yes 10-25% more
-
- No
- No.
- No, they should all be allowed
- nope. should be the same price \$0.... its a park... it's a public good. who will enforce this?
- No.
- This is not right question, what's about liabilities if City has to pay from public money.
-
- No.
- \$1
- No
- No payment
- No
- No. I don't think this should be a money grab for the city. I think Calgary needs to have perks encourage people to stay in the city and animate the area
-
- No
- No
- no
-
- No, people are already drinking in parks and I don't believe putting a price on these areas would help segregate these people.
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
-
- Yes, as there is greater risk for littering
-
- No extra cost
- No
- no
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- No! This is typical of Calgary- always thinking of how to fleece the public!
- I shouldn't have to pay more.
- No. Never.
-
- No. That's BS. And you know it.
-
- No
-
-
- no i feel the cost for a site costs enough
- No.
-
- No
- No, increased booking fees should not be required.
- I would, but that would be discriminatory
- No
-
- no, no ,no
- Should be a zero charge or extra charge let's not make a good thing come with a punishment
- No
- Yes
- Yes because it would allow funding for any extra clean up or security required to monitor usage. 10-15% more.
- No.
-
- No
-
- No.
-
- Yes. \$20.
- no. don't be so gougy!
- No, I wouldn't be. What extra cost to the city is being incurred? If a mess is the concern, people are capable of leaving one whether there is alcohol or not. Plus, people don't go to parks to throw raging parties. The use will be more intimate than that.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Interesting question. Is there is more revenue in it for the city for liquor sites will that then allow the city to approve liquor consumption. I sure hope not. Simply put. Why
- Yes
- No
- No, it's not a pub. Adding a cost makes it a business venture instead of a community building initiative, like it should be.
- No. I don't drink but I would happily pay to rent a safe space to consume marijuana.
-
- no
- No, I don't think it is fair to request extra for a liquor approved site. It unfairly burdens the people who want to have a drink casually and responsibly.
-
-
- No
- Yes
- No
- Yes, \$10
-
- Why you guys insisting for reasons already explained above and why some one pay more or less . Equality for everyone .
- Sure , \$20
- Yes - maybe 20% more? I'm not sure what it costs now to book sites, but I imagine costs of monitoring by park personnel would need to be covered in general for this to work.
- Nothing. I wouldn't pay for a picnic site either.
- No
- No
- No
- Not much more, it should be equitable and affordable for all.
- No
- No they should all be available for responsible consumption.
-
- No.
- So...you're basically charging "corkage"? No.
- No
-
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- \$5
- Maybe \$3. Not much
- Maybe. Should it cost more to enjoy alcohol instead of soda though?
- No
- No, that seems unnecessary. Why would I need to pay more? Unless there is an added cost to the city, I don't think there should be an added cost to the taxpayer.
-
- No
-
- No
- No why should you pay more. This will further promote people hiding it
- Yes. Double
- No
- No
- No. It should not make a difference to rental rates
- No. It is inappropriate to pretend that alcohol is only for the elite. I would prefer not to have to pay or book to enjoy our parks in this way.
-
- Yes
- No - in fact, charge more for liquor-free sites.
- No, why should I have to pay extra? The city isn't offering me any additional services.
- No. We are bringing the liquor so it shouldn't cost more.
- No
-
- Yes, I'm not sure how much a picnic site costs currently, so unable to make a proper decision.
- No. I will stop using city parks if liquor allowed.
-
- Not at all
- Of course yes! We would be willing to pay more depending on the number of people allowed in the picnic spot. I wouldn't say more than \$20
- I don't think it should be more money. I think having it more will increase the risk of over consumption.
- No.
- No. I would rather pay more to go where liquor is banned.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. Why should I? Do you charge more for kids? How about about charging for Soda? Or for using disposable plates?
- \$10
-
- So this is what this is about - cash grab. Social costs are not worth the increase in municipal coffers
- No.
- No
-
-
- No
- No. I dont think that should be a rule unless the city is trying to get cash for some reason because then we might get more picnic sites left empty when we want people outdoors and the law would be unfairly applied to poor people in my opinion.
-
- No.
- Yes, 15% more
- No
- No
- No
- No.
- No
- Sure. That might weed out the people who can't afford it. \$25
- NO! Why would that be considered?
- No, I don't think it's necessary. I think that makes it into a bigger issue than it is.
- No - they should be the same price. Definitely.
- Today I wouldn't pay to use a picnic site - that's what taxes are for.
- No
- no
- No
- No
- Yes, \$250 for an hour with Liquor picnic Sites
- No
- I would pay the same for a site with or without liquor.
- I am not sure
-
-
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No. I would say experiment with free and fine/ding groups who aren't responsible
- No, I do not understand why we should have to pay more.
- No
- Sure, 5% more.
-
- No
- No
- No, it should be allowed in all parks and picnic sites without becoming a new form of consumption tax
- no
- No
-
-
- No.
- No, we are hosed on the current system of sales of liquor. Will continue illegally, if I pay more. Thanks.
- No
- I think this is a cynical question and refrain from answering
-
- Yes but not much. \$20
- No, there should be no extra charge.
-
- No
- No
- No
- Not at all
- No
-
- 15%
- I would be willing to pay, but I don't think paying should be contingent upon drinking. Either charge for the booking, or don't.
-
- No it would be better to not have to book, it would be better to just allow it in parks in general
- no
- Yes

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No.
- Yes although begrudgingly, I don't think you should have to pay extra for something that should just be allowed
- Yes; \$20-40 more
- No
- No
- NO!
- No cover fees please!
- No
-
- No
- Yes
- Yes, probably upwards of \$50
- No
- No
- No.
- We will never book a site that allows liquor consumption.
- This should be treated as a private and isolated park
-
- No
- No
- Of course! A fair amount.
- Yes \$5
-
- No
- Yes, \$20
- No
- No.
- No
- Haha I'd rather drink illegally then pay more
- No
- No
- Yes. I'm not sure how much a site fee is so I have no point of reference.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes. Unsure on price increase. I would need to better understand the allocation of funds and the justifications behind the increased prices. If it's simply a money grab, that's unacceptable. If there are true associated costs, be opaque about them.
- Yes. \$25.
- No
- Five dollars
-
- Don't know
- Yes
-
- I don't think they should charge extra
- Sure, so long as the expense provides added service, such as security or cleanup.
- No
- Yes
- I do not believe there should be payment required for a casual drink at a picnic site in a Calgary park.
- \$20 but I don't think it should be reservation only sites. It should be open to calgarians who don't have backyards and likely not higher income.
- Yes, but only a small fee like \$5.00
- No
- No. I would want to be able to enjoy the space, but I would rather have a picnic in my yard for free if I had to pay more.
-
-
- No
- Yes, not sure how much it costs now so I cannot say.
- Should be more money to hire security for the park to protect city assets and public safety.
- No
- No, this seems unreasonable. How would this possibly be enforced? If liquor consumption is allowed I think it should be implemented broadly, not segregating areas/tables.
- No!! So this is a money making scheme?? Geez.
-
-
- For groups only.
- no
- No
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- Not at all
- No, you should not have to pay to use the space.
- No
- No, in this economy the city already overcharges for most services
-
- Yes. I'd be willing to pay double the regular rate
- No
- No
-
- No
- No
- No
-
- Same
- Na
- Yes, \$25-\$35 extra
-
- No, what is the justification to charge more?
-
- Never
- Not at all.
- No
-
-
-
-
-
- No.
-
- Never
- No
- No
-
- No
- No, allowing alcohol should not affect cost of booking a picnic site.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No and none
- Yes. 20% more
-
-
- N/A
- Yes, as much as you ask
- Nil
- No, I would not pay more for it.
-
- Yes, 10-20\$
- No.
- No. I can spend my money on better things. And for people that like their liquor, again there are bars. Honestly, Calgary has way too many liquor shops to begin with.
- Yes
- No. That would be discriminatory. The proposed changes main effect is to get rid of the discriminatory practice in place. Imposing a fee for choice would be regressive in this regard.
- No. I don't see why an extra fee should be charged.
-
- No. There should not be an additional fee.
- No
- NA
-
-
- No
- No
- No
-
- 0 to 5 more.
- No
- I personally don't think that there should be price difference between liquor and no-liquor allowed sites. It should all be up to guests' preference
-
- No. It should not cost more.
-
- No
-
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I would be willing to pay more, but I don't believe people should pay extra.
- No, they should all be the same amount.
- I would not book in a liquor consumption park. Because it is not safe.
- No I see no reason to pay extra. If the fee needs to go up it needs to go up for all bookings.
- I'd be willing to pay a bit more, but it would have to be apparent why there is an extra charge. I'd pay 20 or 25\$ more.
- No!
-
- No
- N/A wouldn't go to a site that allowed liquor.
- No
- No.
-
-
-
- No
- NO.
- no. n/a. not interested in having a picnic with alcohol
- No. I do not believe alcohol should be considered to be consumed in a picnic site
- No
- No
-
-
- No.
- No
-
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No.
-
- No
-
-
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes
-
- Yes
- No
- No
- No, that's a cash grab. I'm getting far to used to that. We'll just keep hiding it like always.
- Not sure it would be necessary since we wouldn't require a liquor license unless we were selling liquor.
- Should blacks' have had to pay for the privilege of using the whites' drinking fountain? If yes, how much should they have had to pay?
- n/a
- No
- Nothing
-
-
-
- No
-
- No. Why would I be charged for consuming my own liquor?
-
- Absolutely not. There's more to this than \$\$
-
- Yes, \$5.
- No
- No, I would just put my beer in a water bottle and drink elsewhere.
-
- No
- No
-
- No I would not
-
-
- Yes depending on size 15- 25\$
-
-
- Safety is much more important.
-
- No. Because it's the same concept as bringing food. It's just a beverage.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No.
- Consumption of liquor should not be site specific. The city should not tax people for consuming liquor in a park. There are already more than enough taxes on alcohol.
- No.
-
- no
- No. Why should we?
- No
- Not really. If it cost me money to consume a bottle of wine/beer at a picnic I would probably just stay home to eat.
- No, I am not going to book any park which will allow any liquor.
- no
- No
-
- N/A
- Not even a little bit.
- No
- I don't like liquor in parks.
-
- No
- No
- No, liquor shouldn't change the price of a picnic site
-
- No
-
- No, I don't see the reason why allowing alcohol would increase the cost.
- No
-
- No. I don't feel you should have to pay to consume liquor. It gives the message that there is something at risk when people drink. I would like to see the consumption of liquor normalized.
-
- I would never go to a picnic area that would allow drinking. If picnic areas, usually designed to gather Families, are to allow drinking, I would never ever again take my family to any one of those.
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes 10% more
- Maybe-depending in the cost difference
- No, I don't believe there should be an additional fee for this.
- Yes. Nominal increase
-
-
- I think it should be free, wouldn't go if I had to pay.
- Yes. And I'm not sure we have only been to parks that you can book for free.
- Shouldn't need to have cost assigned. Impact will be nominal.
- No
-
-
-
- No drinking in public shouldn't cost money, it doesn't right now, it would be like charging a fee for women to vote, it shouldn't cost money nor should it be prohibited
-
- \$15
- No. Most people do it already and are just sneaky about it. Charging more will most likely only deter responsible people.
- Yes but just a marginal fee not a dramatic overage from other picnic sites.
-
-
- No
- No
- Yes, a minor fee for upkeep of the public space. If the fee is too much I'll drink in the park for free like I already do.
- why to I have to pay to drink a beer (over and above the federal tax already on the beer) ridiculous!!
- No
-
- Not willing to pay more.
- No
- 10\$
- Yes, assuming I was planning on drinking. Not sure how much more.
- yes, \$5. But it would create inequalities in society, why does there need to be any charge at all?
-
- No.
- No, I would not pay more. We already have officers that enforce public drinking bylaws.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, I'm not sure the current rates but I would pay 15% -20% more
-
-
-
- Didn't realize it cost anything to book a site. I likely wouldn't pay to book any site.
- Yea.
- I don't think an extra charge shouldn't be necessary
- no
- The extra I'd be willing to pay wouldn't be significant enough to even bother mentioning.
- Probably not... Don't care that much, maybe \$5??
- No, I shouldn't have to pay more just to have a beverage
-
- Never.
-
- No.
- I wouldn't pay to book a picnic site
-
- No, I do not drink
- Possibly, though I suspect that if the fee is high, it'll feel more like 'permission' to party. No fee or a very low one would normalize things more. Probably no need to cash grab unless additional clean up is anticipated.
- 5\$
- No- oh so you put women and children at more risk in public places for a money grab?
- No, I think this is a terrible idea. We as citizens of Calgary pay too many fees and taxes
- No
- No
- NA
- Not applicable for me answer is no
-
- Absolutely not.
- 2\$
- Yes. \$20 more.
- No. I would avoid a picnic site which allows liquor consumption.
- No. I would just choose a non alcoholic site and drink discreetly.
- Seems silly to pay more... But yes.
- No, not unless the city can demonstrate that they incur a higher cost to maintain the sites
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, because I will never consume liquor on picnic site, I'd go to a pub
- I'll pay for convenience if its justafiable
-
-
-
- No
- Yes
- Unsure of costs to book site
-
- No! Dont do this!!
- No. I think that excludes people who can't afford it. Often a picnic is a way to have an economical outing.
- Nil
- No.
-
- No I think it should be no charge
- No.
- I don't think that adding an additional fee is fair. You're already paying for your food, alcohol and a picnic site... all to just enjoy an afternoon outside? That should be free.
- No. Alcohol is not that important to me.
-
-
- \$5 more
- \$20
- No
- No way
- Noit
- No
- no
- No
-
- No
- No
-
- yes, up to \$10 more/site
- Maybe. I'm unsure.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Not more than the liquor itself. There really shouldn't be a fee. Unless the city is providing an extra service.
- yes, depending on the amount of people at the site. Charging more for the ability to consume alcohol is unnecessary though
- No
- No
- To some extent
-
- no
- no, we already pay enough tax on liquor in the store
- Judging by current oil and gas economic issues I think I will not pay for my personal leisure
-
- Nope.
- No
-
- No
- Yes, I would be willing to pay up to \$20 more
-
- Nothing. [removed] off with making money and give us free access and try things out like that first before you out a pay. Make a little lesson like you are with cannabis
- Noal the ones allready check
-
- No!
- nope
- Not applicable
-
-
- I wouldn't book one, so I wouldn't pay. What concerns me though is it costing more for a site because you can drink, but if you choose not to drink, the cost would still be the same
-
- N/A
- N/A
-
- No.
-
- no....it should be free....get your heads out of your ass....look at Europe and USA...geeezzzzzz
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- I do not believe people should have to pay for the right to enjoy a beverage outside. In many parts of world alcohol is enjoyed on beaches, in parks, etc.
- No
- No
- No, I strongly disagree with drinking liquor in public parks.
- Not at all.
- Any cost no allow
- No
- No
-
- you must be joking
- No
- No
- None
- yes....I would be willing to pay for a liquor license, for an event...\$50
- no
- No
- Probably 10\$ more
- No
-
- Hell no. Why? Cause its dumb.
-
- Noneno
-
- Yes. As I am unaware what the present cost is to book a picnic site, I'm kind of guessing. I'd say \$20 - \$30
- Nothing
- No
- No. Should be available to everyone not just those with more money
- Yes
- I think to pay is better, since people can leave mess behind them, hm... maybe 10-30\$
- No
-
- No . Because I dont feel paying more in necessary as it takes no extra space and requires no extra work. Your posting signs not building structures. So iam not willing to pay nothing to use a public park. That's why we already pay taxes.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- Personally no, because I'd prefer to go to a park not influenced by alcohol.
- Nope
- Yes. Anything reasonable.
-
-
-
- Yes. I would pay a small bit more
- No
-
- No! Reserved picnic spaces are limited so I would take what is available. I don't want to pay for a site that allows drinking if no one in my group drinks.
- No
- Yes. Maybe \$5-10 more
- No
- no why should i , another rip off
- no
- No
- N/A
- Yes. \$10.
- Yes within a reasonable limit I.e. 15% more
- no
- Yes. \$5.
- Not a chance. Most people will book cheap and drink there anyway. If you want to separate the drinkers from non-drinkers you'll have to charge the same. The only people who'd pay more are the ones who don't want liquor nearby.
- No, the sites should be equal use for all, income level aside.
- no
- Yes \$20
- No
- No, this isn't something you should have to pay more for. In places like Montreal you can drink liquor in the parks as long as you have food along with it. We need to be more easy going in Alberta. We have too many rules about everything
-
- No. Why would the price be any different?
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Yes. Up to \$5 per adult. Though, I feel an increased fee is unwarranted if the goal of allowing liquor consumption is responsible use. Responsible use not result in any increased work demands for city Parks employees
- I think so, even though I don't see why it should cost more. Maybe \$20 more
- Did not know it cost money to book a site now but yes, I would be willing to pay a small amount more. Not sure how much.
-
-
-
-
- No.
- No
- Yes. \$2-5person
- No. Possibly encourages drinking in excess. Plus it's already expensive to just treat yourself to some wine/beer. Don't make it a cash cow. I wouldn't pay for it. It should be a right. Not another tax!
- No.
- No
- No!!!
- Yes
-
- Yes. Whatever is decided is fair.
- I was not aware that there was a charge for booking a picnic table.
- no
- No
-
- Yes. I'd be willing to pay 50% more.
- No
- No
- Yes. Perhaps 25% more
- Nope
- No
- No
- No
- Rental of site needs to cover cost of clean up and protection of site area. I think at least 300-400 dollars for 4 hour use.
- Yes, not sure, I don't know the non liquor booking fee

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Maybe. Understand there may be more work to clean up ??
- I don't see why the cost should go up.
- No I am not willing to pay more nor to visit that park.
- No, I will book such park where liquor is allowed due to potential safety concern for children
- I don't think it would need to cost more but I'd be willing to pay a small fee
- Not at all
-
- I wouldn't book one, even if it was free. I don't want my picnic disturbed by out of control drinkers at the nearby picnic site that allows liquor consumption.
- No. I would not book a picnic site that allows liquor.
-
- Should be the same price as a normal site. There's no added cost to parks.
-
- No
-
- No
- I don't want liquor on the family parks
- Not really I didn't know you would have to pay currently. But if needs to be marginally. Feeding people is expensive.
- I don't think it's needed to pay money to be put in nature enjoying themselves
-
- No
- No
- I mentioned that I avoid the picnic site that have liquor consumption
- No; this approach would not be part of normalizing moderate and responsible consumption of alcohol - akin to European countries.
- No
- No absolutely not
- No
- Yes. \$10-\$20
- No.
- I would need more information before I could respond to this question, but in theory, I would be willing to pay a slight premium for this type of picnic site.
- I guess, but it's not important to me to drink alcohol at a picnic, lol. Why is this even a thing?!
- No.
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Shouldn't be an extra price to book a site that allows consumption. Why must everything come at an extra cost. Stop being so greedy stop trying to turn this into an opportunity to create revenue. This is to create a responsible relationship with consumption
- Probably not, I probably would rather just BBQ/eat at the convenience of my own home
- Nope
-
- Zero dollars.
- I do not know what is charged now but if reasonable I would pay a little more to cover additional cost of maintenance.
- No absolutely not
-
- N/A
- Yes, not a lot.
- No
- Yes
- I would hope they would charge more for those sites because I'm sure they'll be a cost in cleaning up or taking care due to over consumption because we don't have enough police to patrol and I'll be come a nightmare I think .
- No
- Possibly if those sites required additional costs, but I can't imagine what those would be. A can of pop or a can of beer, it should make no difference.
- no
-
- No.
- No.
- No
- No I would not
- yes. 25%, with the understanding that it would be cleaned and monitored more and consistently.
- No
- Not really. While I do understand due to the risks, increased enforcement patrols would be required in which these resources cost money. However, the cost should be shared and a increased across all sites, otherwise people will continue 'hidden' drinking
-
- Yes
-
- NO. Liquor consumption in parks must be ban.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- No, people already consume liquor in parks. This will just let them do it in the open.
- NO
-
- nominally more, if we can show that there was a required increase in parks resources to provide the service. if there is no increase need to budgets I wouldn't support the increase.
-
- Yes, I would pay \$5 or less for this.
-
- No. Its not like its a club. We are having a picnic and already paid taxes at the liquor store.
- No
- No
- Yes
- No, you would not be upgrading the facility or providing anything different than before.
- Yes
-
-
- No. Any revenue generated will not offset costs likely incurred by drinking in parks.
- Absolutely not.
- No
- NO
- No
-
- Unsure of current booking rates, but I could understand a reasonable increase.
- Absolutely not
- No, that's discriminatory.
- No.
- No, you don't need to in Europe. It works there....
- No. There should not be an increase in price to have a site that allows alcohol. I also think having to pay for a picnic site in general is asinine.
- No. I have already paid taxes on the purchase of alcohol. Why am I paying again?
- I would be willing to pay more for the site to cover any licensing costs (ie. event liquor license fees).
- No
- Fee would make me less likely to book it
- N/A
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Other picnic site to be developed at remote areas where no residentials are affected. Police to be present 24 hours at park and check before they leave the site.
- 10
-
- Yes. I would pay an additional \$15 to be allowed liquor consumption.
- Paying more makes no sense.
- No because that's unfair for what you want to do at your own picnic site
- No
- No, that would be discriminatory.
-
- No. If there is an increase in cost, there better be better facilities to justify an increase in cost.
- No
- No
- No
-
- No
- No
- No. Never.
- No
- Drinking in public shouldn't have a cost, so disagree on additional cost measures.
- Yes, \$100
- Only if additional facilities were provided such as recycling bins.
-
-
- \$20
- Yes - from my knowledge I believe liquor licenses aren't all that expensive. My assumption is that the increased cost is due to this so I'd be willing to pay around \$20/\$30 more depending on the site of the site.
-
- No, I would expect to pay less to go to a park with drinking because you will need to deal with all the potential drunks.
- Maybe only \$2 more. Most people will clean up the empties and most people don't get disorderly when drinking at a public park so increased police enforcement shouldn't be necessary
- No
-
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- No tax grab please
- Please don't charge
- Yes, up to \$50 for site rental.
- No
- No. It should just be an option if you'd like to.
-
-
- N/A
- No
- Yes, I would pay a few dollars more for the option. Nothing exorbitant, though.
- Yes \$5
- Yes, I'm not sure how much it costs as it is right now. Maybe \$25?
- No, at that point I would put my alcoholic beverages in non-alcoholic containers to avoid paying more.
- I would pay more if that increase went directly to additional resources/enforcement for that park to ensure that the rowdy minority doesn't ruin the fun for everyone else.
- Yes
- No. Paying for a public picnic site is against equity principles, as it would exclude potential free outdoor activities for low income families.
- An extra 5 or 10 dollars, but not much more than that.
- I would I am not go to site where liquor is allowed
- No not at all
- Probably not since I think most people have sorted out ways to drink at picnics anyway.
- Why pay more? Responsible picnickers (drinks or no drinks) should clean up after themselves.
- No because if I am consuming liquor I am already paying for a taxi or uber there and back
- No
-
- I would maybe be willing to pay a 5-10% increase, but not more
- No
- Yes. \$15
- Yes nominal fee
-
- No
- Yes, maybe \$5
-
- It should be the same cost

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No, should be the default situation
-
- No.
-
- Yes, \$150.00
- No
- 5
- No
- I suppose if it can host 25 people for a party. I think only for the party sites. Not just a table. If booking a party site I'd pay 50% more for the availability to have beer. If they are currently free, I'd pay \$25 for the party site.
- No, it should be free
- No
- I am not in favour
- No. Use of picnic sites should not cost money.
- NO!!! - you can not charge for a right; and don't confuse this with similar cases like drivers licenses which is an admin fee to manage a standard of skill and competency
- No
- How much is it now? I'd pay. I need more context to give a price though.
- No, I don't want to pay for it.
- Recycling of bottles should recover costs; I would pay a 20% surcharge.
- No, rental fee should be the same. You're booking the space, being able to drink alcohol that you brought should not change the price. I think most people would just lie about bringing alcohol if that were the case.
- No
-
- No
- no
- No, that would be a cash grab, anyone should be able to use it, not just those who pay for the privilege.
- Yes but not that much more
- No. I don't think the cost should increase. There would be no additional maintenance required to drink at the site. So why charge more. I think having that option would increase use by the public alone.
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No.
- Would not book site with liquor .Yese
- NO
- No.
- no
- No
- No. It is ridiculous to charge extra.
-
- No.
- No
-
- No, I won't spend my money on something like that.
-
- Yes. 5\$
-
- Lot more
- No. That wouldn't be fair and unless there were real reasons for why the picnic site requires a higher fee, a fee system may create inequitable access to a recreational activity. The requirements and rules for both types of sites should be the same.
- Yes. 20% more.
- I will not book that spot
- NA
- Yes. 5 dollars.
- Yes, about 20% more.
- No. I do not like places wiyh people drinking liquor
- No. What is the need to pay more? We're already overtaxed in this city. I would just go to any picnic site where there's no fee and have my drink(s) from a thermos or mock non-alcoholic container. People tend to ignore rules that are silly / overbearing.
-
- \$2
- A little more. Say 25% more
- NO
- I'm not familiar with the rates. Would need to know the justification for the extra fee. Would be open to paying more dependent upon price. Some poorer people have no place to drink and won't be able to afford the fees though (i.e. discriminates)
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- The only reason I think a few would be necessary is for extra recycling services. It should only be enough to cover that.
- No, I would not want to pay any more, I think certain areas should just be selected for based on activity.
- No
- No
- No
- Pay more simply to do what I can in my backyard for free? No thanks.
- There should not be a price difference....just a cash grab
-
- Yes. But only a small amount more.
- Don't make it a cash grab
- No.
-
- No
- No
- Yes, minimally more. Maybe \$5-10
- NA based on previous answers.
- This a pretty loaded question. Price is reasonable and people will use, if you price gouge people will continue to drink and hide it.
- No
-
-
- No. Why would there be an increased cost? This makes no sense. You will create worse issues if you charge people for this ability - it will go back to being hidden, etc. Also it is regressive and impacts people who have a lower income. This idea = 0 sense
- No
-
- I would not pay more nor do I think this is a freedom that should be taxed.
- No. I believe that it should be allowed, and there is no need for there to be a higher cost.
- No
-
-
- I would not pay for a site that is typically free. If the site had a cost associated with it I would pay more.
- NO!
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
-
- no
-
- No
-
- No!
-
-
- No. Same as above.
- No, this should be allow everywhere without additional fees
- No
- No
- Yes. Just a couple more dollars
- No it should be just allowed and not a money grab.
- first of all how dare you
- No
- Absolutely not. To pay so you can consume your own alcohol in a public space is ridiculous. That would create more issues and defeat the purpose.
-
- No
- no
- No
- No
- N/A
- No. I see no reason why I would have to pay to bring my own drinks. No additional facilities or support are needed from the government so charging for this would be a pure cash grab. That doesn't seem to be what Calgary is about, thankfully.
- No liquor should not be allowed in any park
- No I would pay a deposit fee though to prevent damage and vandalism
- No. If i was booking a site and they allowed liquor I would not book at that site.
- No
- Yes, \$10.00
-
- No.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No, why up charge when people nowadays drink at picnic sites anyhow
- 50\$
- Not a chance, sounds like a cash grab
- N/A
- No
-
- I don't think there should be an additional charge.
- Yes
- zero
- No I would not pay more.
- No, if fees increase, I would go somewhere else or stay home
- No
- No
- Maybe like \$20 more
- No
- No
- No.
- Possibly probably not a lot more depending on the occasion
- What is the extra money going towards? Increased rates for no reason should be what's illegal.
- &Yes. \$100 more
- no
- No.
- No
- Nope not paying
- I would be willing to pay more if that park has proper disposal units and park rangers to ensure that drinking is done safely and clean for the environment.
- Yes. \$20
- No.
-
- No
- a marginal amount
- There shouldn't be any cost difference, if you don't want to drink you have the option to rent a spot. And if non drinking spots are unavailable they will just rent the drinking ones and not drink. Public space shouldn't be more money
- Yes. \$5.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- I am against liquor consumption in public parks.
- Maybe \$5 more.
- Yes, 10 dollars
- No
- No
- I don't feel you should have to pay more. You already paid tax on the liquor
- No but I wouldn't be opposed to a fee if the City's costs and cleanup increase because of alcohol use.
- No
- No.
- Yes, in reasonable price. Let's say around 50% more
- No
- No.
-
-
- No
-
- Not applicable
- It would depend on the event. I likely wouldn't pay much more than 10-15% for a big occasion at absolute most, depending on additional costs/permits required by the AGLC.
- Maybe, but not a lot more than current fees
- Maybe, a slightly higher fee.
- Yes, not much, this is not a tax grab proposal. \$5.00
- Yes, \$10 cad
- I'm not sure how much it costs to book a site currently. But I would be willing to pay more, given its reasonable.
- Yes, only up to \$15.
- Didn't know it cost money. Parks should be free for use
- Liquor consumption should NOT add to cost. Parks should not be "for profit". Taxes already pay for these parks, and cost should not be decided by what park goes bring on their own.
-
- No.
- No
- No
- No! Why? The service hasn't changed
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, personally because i dont drink alcohol.
- No
- Yes, perhaps a small premium of 15-20% more
- Oh god, let's not turn this into a tax. There are already penalties for littering. Just enforce them.
-
- No, should be the same
- No
- No
- No. \$0.
- No
-
- Yes
-
-
- no
- Hmm. Half the cost of a liquor licence? Boo on costs.
- No.
- No.
- Yes; I would pay \$5 per site for an unlimited amount of time and people. It's enough to make some revenue without it becoming prohibitive for families and friends.
- Maybe city need more money that's why city think like liquor but it is not good.
- No because It would help me out, if the good picnic areas increased in price because of something I don't agree with that would irritate me
-
- No
- No
- No
- No
-
- Probably not.
- No
- No
- no
- Yes, not significantly more, though. I wouldn't see why a higher cost should be assigned as there can be garbage left or destruction to property regardless of alcohol consumption or not.
- 10 dollars more.
- Yes - \$10.00

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- I would not prefer to book liquor consumption at picnic site.
- A small cleaning fee? \$25 per booking
- Probably not. I don't think there should be a premium for something that should be allowed anyway. All the fee increase serves is to generate money for the city, but booking picnic sites serves that purpose already. A price hike would be pretty shady.
- Yes, between \$2.00 to \$5.00.
- No, that's absurd
- No, I don't think one should have to pay extra.
-
- Yes, and I am not sure of the specific fee
- I think it would be ridiculous to charge more.
- No, I don't think it should cost more to book a site that allows liquor consumption. In Europe, you can freely drink liquor anywhere in parks at no cost, without booking a site: this should be the City of Calgary's goal.
- I don't believe charging for more for a site that allows liquor consumption is fair.
- \$25?
- I've never paid for a site.
- Don't support this idea to allow consumption of alcohol in open public areas.
- No need of this actions
- No. It should not be a cash grab for the government to make more money.
- No. It shouldn't cost more to book a site to drink.
- No
- I never book sites just go to the free public ones so can't say I'd pay in general
-
- No
- No, I don't think you should have to pay more to book a site that allows liquor consumption.
- Sure, as long as it was only \$5-10 more
- Yes, not much more. Maybe \$5 more.
- Possibly, not by much though. I don't see why it would need to be more.
- No
-
- No
- I'm not sure.
- No, taxed enough for the liquor. Put in recycling containers maybe.
- No, they are not providing any added service
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. I would just conceal alcohol and drink it anyways.
- I am not in favour of liquor Allowed in parks.
- No way!
- No
- Yes, up to twenty dollars
- No
- Yes, depends on participants
- No
-
-
- Yes for the ability to enjoy
- I don't see why that would be necessary, so no.
-
-
- NO. Ban liquor and marijuana from all public spaces.
- Yes \$25
- It shouldn't be any extra charges for that from the city the reason for that is we trying to save and protect everything around
- No. I don't believe it would be fair to penalize people with higher costs that may want to have a beer during an outing.
- None
- No.
- No
- No
- NO
- No
-
- No cause more money less fun times. Need the money for booze
- \$10
-
- Yes. It would depend.
- Yes. \$50
- I don't see why it should cost extra to allow people to drink
- No
- No I don't
- Yes but only willing to pay up to the amount a liquor license would cost. No more than that. (E.g. if liquor license is \$15, I'd only pay that much for picnic site)

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I do not believe that sites should pay more for drinking sites. This seems as though it will become obviously predatory. There is no incurred cost for the sites to allow this. So why ought we pay more
- No
- No
- Yes. \$5-\$10
- No, all outdoor spaces should be accessible to the public or they truly aren't public.
- Yes, make it so you have to pay for a daily license rental, like you would at a wedding venue etc.
- No
- Yes. \$10 more
-
- No. Where would this money go? It's just a form of unnecessary taxing
-
- No
-
-
- No. This is not a perk I would pay more for.
- no. fees to allow liquor must be very large. double normal fee.
- I expect to pay less as it wouldn't be safe for my children.
- Nope
- No
-
-
- No
- Yes. I don't know how much it is to book a regular site.
- N/a not willing to pay
- Ignorant question.
- No
- No, I think they should all cost the same. Alcohol is more expensive than non Alcoholic drinks.
- I would not be willing to pay more.
-
- I would pay \$10.
- No
- No
- No
- No & I wouldn't book any picnic site if liquor is permitted in parks due to concerns for my family's safety & enjoyment as others will disregard the rules & be drunk and disorderly.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. Are you kidding! Another ill-conceived money grab! This puts a two-tier system in our parks with "richer" people feeling they have paid for the right to booze it up. This is an affront to equal public access!
- \$5 extra for liquor consumption, max.
- Slightly
-
- There should be no extra charge if someone decides to consume alcohol at a picnic site.
- Not sure
- No, not a penny. In fact, I wouldn't book ANY picnic site if there's even a chance of liquor consumption nearby.
- I think there should be an increase in the price. I would pay 50-100% more
- Yes, \$10 more per site.
- No.
- No, I will not be willing to pay more for one that allows liquor consumption.
- No it should be equally accessible.
- \$5
- No I don't think that is something I'd pay for.
- No
- No, that seems unnecessary.
- No. Seems totally inappropriate to make access to public parks subject to what you're willing to pay.
-
- No
- No.
- No. It shouldn't cost anymore.
- No.
- No.
- Yes about 10 cad
- No - Should not have to pay to use a public site that I already pay for with my taxes, to consume a drink that I purchased myself.
- No. You're using the picnic sight regardless if alcohol is consumed or not. Why should there be a premium when the city has no additional costs.
- Don't agree with alcohol at picnic park
-
- No
- Yes however only a marginal difference. Really there should be no cost difference.
- Yes, less than an overnight campsite but more than a regular picnic site
- No. People do it anyways.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Sure, maybe \$50
- No
- I don't believe it should be required to pay extra
- I think they should be the same price
- No. I will not book at a park that allows alcohol consumption.
-
- No
- Not sure
- Yes to pay for additional staff to ensure public safety
- No
- Up to 25\$
- no. fine me or arrest me if I leave a mess or am unruly. it shouldn't be illegal to begin with.
-
- Yes. Can't be more then what a liquor licence would cost.
- N/A
-
- No
- No
- Will never book
- Not at all
- I won't book there.
- No
-
- No
- Yes. Tbd
- No
- I would pay maximum of 10\$ additional to booking a site.
- No
- No
-
- Yes. Price unknown.
- Not willing to pay for this as my taxes pay for the park
- Would be willing to pay more at a location that does not allow drinking anywhere on site
- No
-
- Yes \$10
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- Yes. \$50-\$100 depending on the site and what the event was.
- No I won't be booking any site that offer liquire
- No
- No
- Nope. Please find another way to steal my money! Pic ic sites should already be equipt with recycling bins. I cant see a reason to charge more for the same services.
-
- No. That would suggest a money grab. Unless the parks needed to staff up more.
-
- No
-
- No.
- Nope. Not interested.
- No
- No
- No.
- Yes, \$20.
- I don't agree with having to pay more for this.
- \$5 or less
-
- No
- I would not book a park site if there is alcohol.
-
-
-
-
- What would be the added benefit to me with a more expensive site. Security/police, fencing?
-
-
-
- I would pay more. But I would also like to know what the jjusrification would be for paying more. Nominal amount \$5.00. Or else people will cheat the system.
-
- No
-
- Yes but not by much

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes if necessary. A fee would help aid responsible use too, rather than younger kids taking advantage to get loaded away from the watchful eye of parents. (I may have been one of these young kids years back
- No
-
- No, that should be the same cost.
- No.
- n/a
- No
- Yes. 20% more.
- No
- No
-
- Yes. Much more.
- No
- No. It shouldn't cost more to have the choice to drink at a site.
- Yes, 10.00cad
- No
- 100 percent more
- No
- Yes
- I don't think it should cost more.
-
- . Maybe \$10/ adult. Good question
- Yes, probably about 10-15% more would seem reasonable to me.
-
- No, I would prefer to pay more for one that doesn't
- No
- No. Stop trying to make money off this.
- No
- No
- No
- no, plus did not know there was a fee to book picnic sites -- guessing this is Bowness sites
- Yes. I don't know how much they cost currently
- Why would it be necessary to pay more? How would this be managed efficiently? Believe costs would outpace revenue.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. I don't think it is far to charge
- Yes, \$5 more.
- No. Taxation is theft
- No
- Yes, \$15
- No
- I would not pay more for a picnic site to drink liquor. The parks I choose are the closet to my home and work.
- Yes
- No
- Absolutely not
- If someone wishes to do this, there should be a designated park, with shuttle bus to public transport, or taxis. Bowness park is beautiful , paths are near water, is on a road that is currently busy and will be busier with new developments planned.
- Yes. I'm not sure.
- No.
- 5\$
- No
- Yes - \$100 a night
-
- Drinking in a park shouldn't be taxed.
- Yes - but only if the city could show that that money was being used to enable to law. Aka: recycling bins in the park.
-
- I would not enjoy paying more to book a site; however, if the city was transparent with what they would be spending the extra money on (enforcement to handle over-intoxication in parks, additional clean up, etc.) then I would be okay paying a bit more.
- Sure, maybe \$5?
- No, I wouldn't pay more for it.
- No. What an absurd suggestion. A cash grab for the city to "allow consumption of liquor"? Ridiculous. Shameful question.
- Yes - \$5 more
-
-
- no
- Charge people a hefty fee if they want to drink. People drinking will not be as caring in the area for clean up etc. Then the risk of driving while drunk!

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes I would pay more
- No
- Yes I would but I don't believe it should cost more. As long as everyone is responsible and clean after themselves then there should be no extra cost.
- no no NO
- \$20
-
-
-
- No, you shouldn't have to pay for a picnic site
- No
- I would not, but if it would be allowed, I agree with charging more for those sites, as they may imply additional costs to the city for monitoring, cleaning, etc.
- Ridiculous question. Another pathetic way Calgary is trying to profit.
- No. The city already has containers for refuse and bottles- having liquor allowed doesnt increase the citys cost so why should we pay more? Cash grab as usual by council
- Yes
- No
-
-
- No
- Yes but it shouldn't cost more.
- Clty can better mamange their work with the tax we pay and this is a depolarable intenstion to make moeny from this that will go agiant most of the general public, I donot think people with families will use this
- No
- Nope
-
-
- No. An increased cost seems arbitrary and draconian unless there is a bonafide reason that cost is offsetting and that said reason is clearly communicated.
-
-
- No.
- Yes. I don't know how much it costs to rent a picnic site now.
- No. This will encourage people not to book them. People will most likely still consume alcohol but maybe covertly. If you're of legal age you're within your rights to have a drink.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No
- Not really
-
-
- No
- A nominal amount I guess, \$5 more max
- No
- i won't even book a site which allows liquor
- No
- No
- No, I feel asking people to pay for being allowed to consume liquor in a public park is simply a money grab. There is no reason to charge money.
- No
- Nope.
- I don't pay for them
- No
-
- NA
-
- I would be willing to pay \$30 more
-
- Yes
- No.
- No
- No
- No
- Yes
- No. Why should I have to pay more for no additional service?
-
- Not at all
- No
- Never
- No.
- No, waste of money
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No
- No
- Yes, likely, but only if it was a small fee difference/increase. Uncertain at this time exactly how much more I'd be willing to pay.
-
- Yes. Minimal amount (\$10 more)
- No.
- No
-
- No
- NO!
-
- No.
- No
- Why would you pay more for a picnic site? Are you offering bottle service or clean up service?
- I would not pick a picnic site with liquor, if you want to bring liquor to the park you should have to pay 150
- No
- No.
- No
- Why does it have to be a money grab?
- No, it should be the same across the board. Why should there be a surcharge? Use of the store doesn't change
- No, never & we will not book the site allowing alcohol consumption.
- Yes
-
- I would prefer there was no cost
- No
-
- No
-
- I am against liquor consumption in public parks.
- No I wouldn't be willing to pay more.
- None
- No
- no.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No
- No. Come on. There's no reason it should cost anything. Literally no reason.
- Would not be willing to pay more.
-
- NO!
-
- NO! I would pay to be far away from any alcohol or cannabis or tobacco smoking.
- A small amount, I think that is just a cash grab though.
- No.
- No
- Yes. \$10 dollars more as that is usually the going rate for a liquor license anyways.
- No, I will not pay. I would just bring the liquor anyways. Charging a fee will push it under the table.
- No
- No
- No
- Yes, like an extra \$20 to cover license and insurance
-
-
- Never
-
- No
- I do not want to pay more
- No
- No
-
- NO.
- No.
- Not sure why I would need to pay for freedom from unnecessary regulations of civil behaviour. Fine disorderly conduct, not civic responsible citizens.
- No as above.
- Yes ten percent
-
- Why?
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No
- I would refrain from going to a picnic site that allows it
- Yes. I'd pay up to 30% higher for a site that allows liquor consumption.
-
- No
- No
- Probably not.
- Even if it's A deposit to make sure litter and damage wasn't done. 25.00 fee
-
- I wouldn't rent a picnic spot that allowed liquor consumption.
- Yes, \$5
- I I DO NOT WANT ONE THAT HAS LIQUOR CONSUMPTION
-
- Yes. But not much
-
- No
-
- Uh, no. Why on earth would it cost more? I expect people to clean up after themselves when they use a public space, including food and beverage garbage and recycling.
- NO, THAT IS DISCRIMINATION AND MONEY GRABBING
- Yes
- No
- No this defeats the purpose of having open access for all income levels
- No
-
- No
- Is this another plan to get more money out of Canadians?
-
-
- Not chance. I wouldn't even book one that allows.
- No
- There shouldn't be any difference for booking public sites! It should be equal for everyone!
- No
- Never and I would not even book one that allows.
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. There should not be any fee for consuming liquor unless the City is providing the liquor and full service.
- No
- No.
- No
-
-
- No oooo
- No I think it should be the same price
- No
- Definitely not
- No
-
- I would not
- no
- Yes. Small amount. \$5
- I don't think there should be a charge to use a public picnic site that is already funded by taxes. Parks should be available to everyone regardless of income.
- No.
- No. This seems unfair. Why should it cost more?
- No
-
- Maybe, depending on the cost. I wouldn't be willing to pay more than \$20
- No
- No. They should be the same price. Unless there is another service being provided for the extra cost, the prices should be the same.
- No
- No.
- No
-
-
- If anyone wants to book it, ask him/her to pay \$1,000,000. Not a penny less.
- I would not be willing to pay to book a park that allows liquor
- No, no penalty, we would book a non liquor site and drink anyway if you did that.
- no
- No
- No I don't want to more

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- you already pay lots for the site for what is supplied to you
- Yes, probably 10-20\$
-
- Yes. \$10-15 more.
- No
-
- No. Charging a fee could result in inequity for lower income individuals or families
- Yes
- N/A
- I would expect to pay the same as any other site. Unless more recycling bins and a bartender is provided at all liquor approved sites.
- No
- No. People will not pay a fee. People will hide their liquor in water bottles. As they already do.
-
- No
-
- No I don't think there should be a surcharge if the bylaws against the act goes away
- Yes, up to CAD 5 more
- Not at all.
-
-
- I don't think tat is necessary.
- No, I would just book a normal one and drink there. The laws against it a meaningless
- No
- No, there should be no extra charge.
- No.
-
- I am strongly against of allowing liquor consumption on the picnic sites.
- No
- I'll not book that park
- no
- no
- Yes, if the fee is nominal - \$5-10 dollar additional.
- No - I don't want liquor in the city parks.
- No, the cost should not be higher just because an individual chooses to consume alcohol.
- I m not in favour of liquor in public parks.
- I thought it was currently free to book, however a nominal fee of \$10-\$25 would be well worth it.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No, there is no added value. Responsible adults should be left alone to behave in a responsible manner
- No. That is unnecessary
- Yes. \$10 more.
-
- Probably, but I don't see a good reason to discriminate between parks or specific sites. This should simply be an approved activity at a public location intended for dining.
- It shouldn't cost extra.
- Yes. 50-100 more
- No
- 5\$
- Not a chance.
- No
-
- No, I would not pay more.
-
- No comments
- No
- Yes
- No. I think this shouldn't be a "cash grab" and instead just allow for people to live outside more in public spaces.
- No. That's ridiculous. Money grab.
- No
-
- Absolutely not. Why should i have to pay more to consume alcohol...do parents have to pay to have children there?
- No
- No
- Idk
-
- Yes and \$10-\$20
- No
-
- Sure. Maybe another \$5-10.
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
-
-
-
- No
- No, liquor should not be limited to picnic sites, and should not require a fee
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
- Yes. Maybe \$10.
-
- No
- No I don't think I would pay to be able to drink
- Yes. \$10.
-
-
-
- No
- No
- No, it has very little cost to parks to get a liquor license and it comes from tax money anyways so why should be already pay more on top of the taxes we already pay
- No
- It should not cost more. More [removed] taxes. Enough already
-
- No.
- No
-
- No it should be free. (Like any other non-American country)
- I'm not sure.
- No
- Yes, but not a lot. Maybe \$10 more.
- No. All sites should be equal.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No more
- I am against any liquor consumption in public especially around children
- No
- Yes nothing more
- No
- No
-
- No, will not pay extra
- I do not like to have liquors at picnic site. So if it is allowed it should very expensive so people can not have liquors over there like 1000 \$ extra for each site
- No, I wouldn't.
- No
- NO
- No
- No it should not cost anything extra. Do people pay more to consume canibis? Or smoke? Then why should this?
- NO
- No
- No way
- No. I hardly have enough money to pay for a picnic site as is... enough with price increases. Charging more seems like a punishment... you should be encouraging moderation with alcohol.. and one to two drinks is not worth paying extra
- No
-
- No
- No
-
- No.
- No. I think this would cause more administrative work, confusion in parks, enforcement issues and the number that permit alcohol may not meet demand, causing problems in sites in the parks.
- No
-
- No
- At first I would have not charge, but if during the pilot you find it is taking more man power to clean the site afterwards, then a cost need to be associated.
- yes.
- Probably not, people are drinking in all the sites as it is.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- yes \$10
- No, but if required I'd like to know what the fee goes toward.
- No
- No
- NO
- Not really. I'd just do it illegally like I already do if I had to pay.
- Yes I would 10%
-
-
- No
- Yes. \$5
- Yes but only a few extra dollars.
- I would, if only the price increase wasn't too drastic.
-
-
- Yes. \$10-15 more
- No.
-
- Not much more, could be viewed as serious price gouging....
- No. If so, I would choose those without the "license" to drink; seems silly. Like drawing an imaginary line between the "smoking and non smoking" sections; you still get exposed. Who would enforce this anyway; City is already running lean...
- no.
- No
- No
- No
- No.
- Depends on the event. \$15-20 per site may be reasonable.
- No and I would be mad if the only ones remaining were liquor sites that I had to pay extra for , knowing that I won't be consuming it.
- No way
- No, I would not pay extra
- No.
- No. Why would I pay to book a picnic table in a park that my property taxes are already paying to maintain
- Yes - high fees to discourage it

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- no. Not sure what the additional cost would be to the City if there was drinking or not but I do not suspect there is any. This should not be a money making initiative.
- no
- Yes, not a whole lot more. You cannot charge that much more for a site that is being used for the same purpose, just with some alcohol. That's punishing the people who would like a glass of wine with lunch...
-
- Yes, don't know how much it costs to book one
- No. It should be a right to do so. Paying more may encourage people not to clean up after themselves.
- No
- no and this shouldn't be used to raise money.
- I think people should pay at least \$50 for the benefit.
- yes, maybe \$25
- No
- No,, for safety of my family I would not choose site allows Liquor
- No.
- Yes. \$2
- No
-
-
- No
- No need for an increase in price.
- No
- NA
- Yes, \$25
- Yes. But only if the fees go towards patrols and enforcement. \$10 more.
- Yes. Don't know.
- No
- Yes. I am not sure how much it costs to book a picnic site. But a small "corkage" fee based on amount of people seems reasonable. Like some venues due for weddings
- Unsure - I didn't know they cost money now to book
- No
- No
- Yes, but minimal
- Yes. 10% more at most.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No
- NO
- No. It's the admin process that would stop me from booking a site, if there were permits required for using a picnic site requiring liquor
- I got it. This is all about money and corruption to sell peace of mind, safety and healthy life style of people for benefit of roughneck liquor producer and dealers. I rather pay more for alcohol prohibited areas.
- I would not pay any additional fee for any picnic site. I just find a quiet spot.
- No as most of th elite I have seen have people drinking at them
- No
-
-
- \$500
- \$10
- No
- No
- No.
- I dont agree that the fees should be higher for sites where alcohol is allowed. Thats not fair. And i dont see a reason why? Everyone should leave the sites clean after themselves anyways.
-
- Yes. \$5
- Again, no
- No
-
- No
- No, that seems ridiculous!!
- Why would we do this and enable .05 driving offences. People drive like fools on spruce drive to Edworthy park already. Add alcohol and this will endanger families, cyclists and pedestrians. Fire pits/bbq with alchohol are not a good idea.
- No
- Nothing
- NO WAY!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Yes, 20-30 dollars
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, I would not pay more. It's ridiculous to imply charging more for liquor. Kids and patrons not drinking could cause more damage to the site.
-
- No means, no
- Yes. About 10\$ more
-
- No I would not be willing to pay more.
- Yes 20 % more
- No
-
- Yes, \$10
- No
- No
- no
- No.
- No
-
- No
- No, the fact that you allow liquor doesn't cost the city more money so why citizens should pay more for that
- Maybe but why? what additional costs does the city need to collect additional money for?
- No. Pay \$1000 extra
- Yes, I would be willing to pay enough to cover the costs of implementing such bylaws.
- Yes I would pay up to 20% more if having an event or get together and wanted to use a public space
- No
- N/A
-
- No
- Yes, \$5
- No
- No because I'm going to bring alcohol regardless
-
-
- Yes. Probably at least \$15
-
- Yes, maybe 10 dollars more. I'm not why there should be any extra charge however.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No I will not be willing to pay more for a picnic area that allows Liquor consumption as it isn't a healthy practice.
- please stop this....money doesn't justify
-
- I don't think I'd be willing to pay more per sé, and I think charging more might come across negatively to some consumers with the potential perception that it's a money grab.
- No, I would stop using city picnic sites.
- I thought the sites were free but \$20 more
-
- No. I think the price should be the same for all sites and all sites should allow drinking if the policy changes.
- No, I don't feel like I should pay more for using the exact same facility just because I have a different type of liquid in the cup I'm holding and taking with me when I leave.
- No
- No, there is no reason to charge for this
- Perhaps.
- NA
- You shouldnt have to pay at all.
- Yes, perhaps \$10-20 extra.
- Would definitely not book one with liquor consumption
- No. I don't understand why I should have to pay more to consume the alcohol that I purchase myself and bring to the campsite. This is about having the freedom to do so in a responsible manner.
-
- get real, charging for the pleasure of getting drunk? what a stupid question
-
- No
- Yes, but in my point of view there is no need to pay more to have this benefit, but I would pay 10% more if necessary
- No. If people need to bring their own alcohol and are still required to clean up after themselves, I'm not sure why an extra fee would be necessary.
- Yes, \$50
- no
- No
- Yes, but not much more. Perhaps 5% extra is fair.
- no
- Maybe, if the cost was under \$10/person attending (approx.)

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- NA
- Yes, I am not aware of how much it costs to book.
- dont know
- No.
- No
- Why, should I pay more. Does it cost more to allow? God damint. The province already taxes liquor very highly and insists on a crazy centralized distribution model. Do people really need to pay a third or fourth layer of tax just to drink outside in sun?
- Yes, not by much though.
-
- No. Parks should be free.
- They should all allow liquor, and it shouldn't be more expensive
- N/A
- No
- No.
-
- No
- No. It shouldn't cost more. It doesn't require any extra time or money to allow liquor so why would I pay more for a site?
- No
-
- No.
-
- No
-
- Yes. \$5
- No.
-
- Yes. \$10
- Possibly, if its a reasonable amount
- No. Unless the park will supply my liquor
- No. I would not pay more for a site to allow me to bring my own liquor.
- I am not in favor of such picnic site.
- No
- yes, the cost added to the city

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- 500% more.
- No
- No. It'll just encourage me to drink at sites that don't allow it.
- No because I wouldn't need the alcohol permit. But yes. If others need the alcohol then they should pay more.
- No, it shouldn't cost more.
- No I don't think the parks need liquor in them.
- \$10-\$20
- Not at all
- ☹️☹️☹️☹️☹️
- No
- No
- No, I don't think the addition of alcohol would increase the cost to the city.
- Yes, but again, only if the sites are kept clean. I'd pay a \$5-\$10 "liquor permit" fee
- No
-
- No
- NA
- No
- Yes. \$10-15.
- No
- No
-
- No
- no
-
-
- It depends on how much it would cost, and what that money is going towards.
- No
-
-
-
- No
- No.
-
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes. And extra \$20
- Yes, \$5
- No
- No
- Yes. Great revenue idea.
- Yes but not much more
- No never
- No.
- No, I wouldn't. I would rather hang out in a park for free, so I am not the sort to pay for public space.
- Never willing to pay
- I would not pay more
- No
- no there should be no charge
-
- If I wanted a site that allowed liquor, I'd pay up to \$20 extra
-
-
- No
- N/A
-
- Unsure.
- No
- Yes. The taxes I already pay should cover it.
- Yes, I don't know how much it costs to reserve a site now, so I would suggest charging 20% more
- no
- No, it should be free, liquor consumption is up to the individual
- No
- I will not to the park where liquor is allowed and specially with family and kids
-
- there should not be a price difference
- I do not think liquor should be allowed.
-
- Yes - \$20
- No. It's not safe. Children will be exposed to it. Behavioral issues
- No. I believe it's a public park, therefor all costs should be the same
- No
- Money should not be alternative

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No.
- No
- No
-
-
-
- No
- No. Why should it be more money? It should actually cost less money as it could be a source of revenue as people could be heavily fined for public drunkenness.
- no
- No, I would not be willing to pay for a picnic site that allows liquor consumption.
- No.
- N/A
- Would be willing to pay \$5 more for a site (less than 10% of total booking fee, if I recall the fees correctly).
- no
- No
- Yes but only a minimal fee of \$5 or less.
- Nope
- No. I don't see the need to have an up charge to have a beer or two. That's a money grab.
- No. It should cost the same
- What would the revenue from liquor sites?
- No, the price should be the same liquor or no liquor
- Yes 5-10% more
- Yes I would but same thing everyone already v in and drinks liquor at parks
-
- No
- No
- No
-
- No it should be allowed and free
- No
- If this were to be allowed, the cost should be high enough to cover something similar to the supervision and responsibility that would be part of a licensed business. There would need to be hired supervisors with authority to tell people to leave any time
- No, I don't think it should be an additional charge, just an option for Calgarians to choose.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No - just continue to drink illegally at parks...
- I guess. I don't know. Why would it cost more?
- No. Why should there be an additional cost??
- Yes - \$10 more.
-
- Yes, I think having a get together where people could feel like they are at home in the park would be worth it.
- No
- No
- No.
-
- Sure
-
-
-
- If I had to then sure. \$25 max for entire group.
- no fee should be charged
- \$20
- No I won't
- No
- Yes i would pay 10-20 more
-
-
-
- No
- yes, \$15 more.
- Yes 20% more than regular price.
- I don't think you should have to pay more. How does allowing liquor increase maintenance costs? I don't think it does.
- No I don't see why there would be a price difference.
- No
- It should be the same since you're bringing your own liquor and food. There shouldn't be an additional cost
- Why would you have to pay more ?
- N/A
- Yes. Five to ten dollars more.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No
- Yes, \$20...to cover the requirement for added patrol to make sure people are respecting the rules and drinking responsibly
- No. I have never booked a picnic site and I would not pay to be able to consume alcohol
-
- No, this should not be a fee. It will just encourage people to pick the less expensive one and drink sneakily
- no
- Yes I would be willing to pay more however there shouldn't have to be a fee for consuming liquor unless there is damage or trash left behind. There should be a larger emphasis on picking up after your use so we don't need extra resources to do so!
-
- No
- No, if it is extra I wouldn't use it.
- Nothing u [removed] always think to get money regardless of the source where & how u get
- This is wrong... no extra money should allow drinking to occur in a public park. Not everyone is as well behaved and noble as councillor Carra. Canadians tend to be yahoo's (ie Red Mile) and not civilized enough
-
- Yes, up to \$20 more at a 25 person site
- Would not be willing to pay more. Would just drink illegally if there were a price difference.
- No
- No.
- Yes- additional \$25
- No should not have to pay to consume something I've already bought
-
-
- No
- I don't want any picnic site with alcohol consumption
- Yes, maybe a \$20 fee.
- No, I don't see a reason why the charge should be higher.
- No.
-
- Yes, potentially up to an additional \$15-\$20 depending on the park.
- Why should it cost more? That's ridiculous discrimination.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- \$5
- Should have no difference, unless the city encounters legitimate increased costs
- No.
- No. I don't understand why there would be need for additional overhead.
- Yes. I would pay 10-20% more.
- There should be no difference. drinking tables should be available for all families.
- No more then \$25 as that is what a liquor license would cost.
-
- No
-
- No
- Yes- 10\$ more than a non-alcoholic site
- no
- I wouldn't pay more.
- No. I don't want to pay more because we will take care of our surrounding some
- No
- Yes 5\$
- No. I would not.
- No
- No. It shouldn't make a difference!!
- No. It should be just generally allowed.
- No. Prices shouldnt increase if alcohol is allowed
-
-
- no
-
- N/A
- Yes - \$5 more max
-
- NO
- \$10.00 more
- No
- No
- Yes, maybe \$5 or \$10 more.
- No
- Yes. 20% more.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No.
- I would pay a little more since there's potential for more recycling after. Maybe \$5 more.
- No
-
-
- No,
-
- No
- No
- Should not have to pay more.
- No it should be allowed anyways
- Yes. I would be willing to pay what ever it costs to clean up and ensure that when I use it the space it is clean, but also that the space is cannabis free.
- no
-
- \$5/10
- yes i would \$25
- No
- No, because it is not fair to have to pay to use a outdoor location to enjoy activities
-
- No. It shouldn't cost more.
- Yes
- No
- No. Again, a bad idea. Someone can pay more to drink in a park? How about paying more to speed or to park illegally? Silly idea, yet why should those with more \$\$\$ to spend get special priviledges? The City should not be considering increased \$\$\$!
-
- No.
- No
-
- Noooo
- No.
-
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- yes, maybe a 20% premium.
-
- No, monetizing picnic sites which allow liquor consumption would discourage parks from being used. Only when there are too many reports of disorderly conduct that needs security, then charging to subsidize security costs should be administered.
- If Liquor consumption is allowed in Parks, I will never ever go to Park for picnic. But I will stay at home.
- NA
- No
-
-
- No.
- No
-
- As long as its under 20 bucks its worth it otherwise i would rather prefer drinking on my couch and watch netflix.
- No
- No
-
- No
- No.
- Yes. Not much.
- Yes I'd be ok...unsure of what it currently costs so cant comment on that re how much I'd pay
- no
-
- Yes, \$20-\$50
-
-
-
- No. And this should not be a consideration for the city.
-
- No
- No
- Yes, perhaps 20% more.
- No.
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- N/A
- Not at all.
- No
-
- nope.
- Yes, maybe \$5 or so. Not too much or you may rather goto a bar.
- Yes 20 dollars.
- I actually don't believe you should pay anything to book a site.
- No
- No
-
- You should not have to pay
- I don't mind a surcharge since there will be additional costs for the city- perhaps increased park supervision etc. 20% more seems reasonable.
-
- No.
-
- Yes but only about 10% more
- Yes I would pay \$5 more.
-
- No
- Yes \$5
-
- Hmm... no I think it should be free
- No
- \$15-20
-
- no
-
- I don't typically go to parks that I have to. But I would be willing to pay but no more than \$5.
-
- 10-20\$ morw
- N/a but if this bad idea goes ahead the city should make money on it and more than cover all the new costs
- I don't like the idea of fees for parks. If increased mess becomes an issue then institute fees.
- no

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No.
- No
-
- nope
- No!
- No
-
- No
- Of course not
- No. If so, at the very highest \$5
-
- no
- No, as impact (cleanup, etc) should be roughly the same as a picnic without.
- No
- No.
- Yes
- No
- Why should someone have to pay more to book a site that allows liquor. Liquor consumption sites should be the same as any other regular site. There should be no premium associated with a picnic site which allows liquor consumption.
-
- No
-
- No
-
- Yes, \$50
- No, I would likely just go to a regular one and have liquor anyway
-
- No
- Yes, 10-20% more maybe?
-
-
- No.
-
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No
- No I won't book that site
-
- No. Paying for my liquor is enough
- No. Whether it's a can of pop or beer, people should be cleaning up afterwards and should make no difference. Fine those who cause damage or leave a mess.
- No
-
-
- No
- No
- Yes if I was going to pay. 2x more
- Yes, but not even twice the amount of regular cost.
- No!
- no
-
- Not supportive of this at all
- no
- I wouldn't pay more. Any increase in fees should be equal for all sites.
- Why would one cost more? What features would you add that would justify it costing more? So no, getting people to pay would just be a greedy cash grab.
-
- Yes. Double.
- no
- No
- No...as long as we are being respectful of the property and cleaning up after, should not have to pay extra. If you want to charge, charge for booking in the first place. Not for allowing alcohol.
-
- Free
- no
- Occasionally. I would have for my child's birthday party, or a family get together. No more than \$5-\$10
- No. Enforcement costs shouldn't be higher than not allowing any so I don't see why it should cost more to have wine with dinner.
- No
- No I would not be willing to pay more

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.. I am not in favour of allowing liquor on picnic sites
- Never
-
- Yes, but at the same time let's not get too carried away with trying to monetize this. Europeans and Australians allow liquor in parks and don't charge people for it.
-
- We want no liquor at all. The idea is lunatic.
- 20\$ per trip out max, but 10 is reasonably priced.
- Really, those who can pay more get to book it to destroy the ambiance of those who do not. Really? Sacrifice the peace and family values of outdoor fun, nature, and wholesome, bowing down to the few? Stop this ridiculous idea - SCRAP THE PILOT
-
- No
-
-
- Yes I think about 25 is reasonable
- No
- No
- Yes, \$20 more
- \$10 more but preferably no fee.
- No
- Yes, \$25
-
- No.
- NONE
- Yes
-
-
- No comment.
- Yes, 25 dollars
-
- No.
- No
- No, I would not pay more for allowing liquor consumption. I believed if it is to be allowed it should be part of the taxes and fees we already pay to support the parks
- I do not think that sites that allow liquor should cost more.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No
- No as I believe that liquor should not be consumed at public places
- City have to think more about safety instead of slight more income by allowing liquor at park.
-
- Possibly, it depends on how much. I would be worried about the availability as sites that allow liquor would probably be booked up quickly.
- no
-
-
- That seems unfair/ like a cash grab. If anything, you could charge a higher REFUNDABLE deposit
- why would i pay more? we already pay too many taxes
-
- No
- Yes, but only marginally. If it was too much more, it's really easy to find other places to spend time while drinking.
-
- No, why it should cost more in first place?!
- No sorry
- never
- No
- Don't charge for alcohol consumption at your park. If you need additional funding charge elsewhere, like admissions. If you charge people, they won't use the sites and will sneak in alcohol, like they do already!
-
- No. See previous.
- Yes. I would expect to pay more if there's a booking charge. I didn't know calgarians have to pay or book picnic spots! I guess I haven't used a city park for picnics recently enough! Better make that clear to everyone in Calgary!
- No should be same price.
- I am not willing to pay more
- No
- That's ridiculous more \$ for xity
- No. It has no affect on the booking so why would the price increase?
- No. Liquor is already taxed at high rates in Alberta so there is no need for various governments to gain from it twice. People who want to enjoy a beverage in the hot weather legally shouldn't be penalized for doing so.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Not at all
- Definitely not.
-
-
- No.
- Yes up to 50% more
-
- No
- No
- Yes, but not sure how much it costs now.
- I could see paying an extra \$5-\$10.
- No.
- No. This is a public space.
- No wouldn't want to book one
- Yes but I don't think it should be necessary.
- NA
- Yes, \$5 per individual.
- No
-
-
- No
- not sure
- No I would rather stay at home and will not pay visit to the park at all knowing that there will be liquor being consumed at the park.
- No
-
- 10-20 dollars
- Yes, \$10 more.
- No.
- No, you don't charge people now no matter what they bring to their site, that is discriminatory.
- No
- no
- No
-
- No.
-
- I don't think you should have to pay more, but would be willing to buy a permit if needed.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- NOOOO.
- Not necessarily. Depends on the event. I don't think this should come at a premium.
- Possibly, however, how does this get enforced? Is the cost of patrolling it going to outweigh the income generated by liquor-specific sites? I'd say \$25 extra would be reasonable.
- No, it should already be allowed in general
- No
- I live in the beltline. This conversation really seems to be about those with families living in the suburbs. I do have a family and would appreciate this conversation to be broadened to places like the beltline/innercity.
- No, I think that's dumb making it more expensive. If it was I would just book a regular one and do what people do anyways.
- Yes. 5-10 dollars
-
- No, I will not pay. Public spaces should be open and fees shouldn't be charged.
- Potentially. Up to 50% more of the booking fee.
- I am not willing to pay extra fees at all
-
- I would be willing to pay \$5-\$10 more
- No - people are doing this anyway when they book a site, but they try to hide it
- No
- Nope. There are plenty of other places to drink if one wants to.
- I don't book picnic sites. Example: just allow drinks in green spaces and parks. Sitting along river on a picnic blanket.
- No, we should be able to enjoy liquor at any public park
- No, will not book so no question of paying more.
- no
- no
- No
- Depending on the cost, I would pay more for a site that allows liquor. I believe the price increase would justify additional cleanup, maintenance, and policing.
- No. I really think that it should be allowed but it shouldn't be a cash grab from the city either. This is a very leading question.
- No
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I don't think anything more than maybe \$5
- I don't think the fee should change. Liquor is already taxed and expensive enough in our Province
- no
- No
-
-
- Yes I would but I don't really think that is fair or needed.
- Yes. Up to double
- No.
-
- No
- Yes but I would rather not to
- no, not at all
- I will never go that picnic site where liquor allows
- No, I would book a non liquor park
- No
-
- Yes, perhaps 10-20% more to cover incremental costs.
- Maybe
- Maybe. Depends on whether I explicitly want to drink (in which I'd maybe pay an extra \$5) or if I just want to have the option (in which case I wouldn't pay extra)
-
-
- A minimal fee directly associated with offsetting the cost of damage to park areas. Maybe \$5-\$10
-
- No
-
-
- No
- I don't think this should be seen as a cash grab so I don't support having to pay more. If the argument is more funding is required to support increased monitoring I would argue that casual consumption of liquor is already occurring now.
- No
- No, this allowance should not be fee based.
- Sure just a booking fee? \$20-40
- No
- NA

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, booking picnic sites should be free to begin with
- No. I likely would continue the current practice of bringing non-obvious liquor containers or use a back yard.
-
- Not unless the alcohol is provided by The City.
- No. The fee should be the same across the board. It's unfair to charge just because people are choosing to drink alcohol.
-
- No
- NO
- No Liquor Consumption in Parks
- No
- You have to pay to book a picnic site?! No I wouldn't be willing to pay, liquor or not.
- Yes. Not sure, I don't know how much a site costs normally.
- No. No liquor at picnic place at any cost.
- Liquor should not be allowed in public places
-
- I would not be willing to pay more to book one that allows alcohol consumption. Instead of enjoying Calgary parks, I would stay at home.
- \$5 more.
-
- If the site had an increased work force or required more maintenance I would be willing to pay up to 25% more
-
- Yes. 25 percent more.
- No. I would rather pay more to go to picnic sites that doesn't allow liquor consumption, which I would pay up to \$10 more
- No
- no
- \$10 to \$20
- Yes, but probably not a lot. If it were to cost much more I would simply use my back yard instead.
-
- No
- Not sure
- Yes. I'd be willing to pay at least \$20 more to book a picnic site that allows liquor consumption
- Yes I would be willing to pay no more than \$10. However I think most people would book non alcohol sites to skip the fee and drink anyways descretly.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- no
-
- No
- One shouldn't have to pay anything to have open liquor at a picnic site!
- No
- No.
-
-
- Yes, 10% extra.
- No, I don't think there should be an additional cost.
- Yes, 10-20 percent more
-
- 15%
- NO. it should be free
- No.
- no
- No - that's a cash grab
- nooo
-
-
- Depending where the picnic was, I would pay due to wanting a good scenery. Only 15-20 more though, but the additional charge would turn me away as a buyer most likely
-
- No.
- No.
- Yes !!
- No
- no
- No
- I don't want liquor to be allowed in the park.
- No
- Yes. A minimal fee for maintaining more recycling bins etc.
- This isn't fair. I wouldn't be able to pay much.
- No
- I had no idea one had to pay to book a picnic site!
- Yes, an additional charge would be acceptable. I think a 10%-20% increase would be appropriate.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- No thanks. Please keep the pricing the same. Why would you consider more if someone was enjoying a beer or wine etc. Just not necessary but thanks for asking.
- No
-
- Yes. Maybe \$20-40 per site.
- No. Don't have liquor consumed at city picnic sites.
- None
- No, I would not pay more. If I need to pay more I will drink in a private space.
-
- No
- no
- Yes - would be willing to pay about \$20-30 more
- No
- I personally probably wouldn't unless it was a special event such as a birthday party. But I can see how it might increase use of the parks.
- No, the city doesn't need another cash grab.
- No, this is absurd
- No.
- No.
- Yes.
- Not applicable
- No
- No, there should be no additional cost to book liquor tables.
-
- No. Nothing. I don't want them.
- No
- No. All should allow liquor consumption.
- no. I would not book such a site. I would more likely attend parks that had no alcohol consumption.
- I would prefer not too but I likely would
- No, the city steals enough of our money. Piss off with your upsells.
- I would be willing to pay a bit more but not something extortionate.
- I would not pay more to be able to drink in a picnic area. Is the city in that much need for money? You raised taxes and are the highest paid mayor and city council in the country. Yet small businesses are closing. The cities focus should be there.
- I think that's fair. I don't know what the cost is right now, but I think 25-50% higher wouldn't be asking too much

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. This is ridiculous. Why should people be penalized for consuming alcohol?
- No
- No. I will continue drinking illegally at the ones that dont allow liquor consumption
- No I would not, because I don't know where the additional money is going. If specified what the additional money is for I would consider paying more
-
- I shouldn't have to pay more, it should be my right as a taxpaying adult to have a drink where I choose, assuming I'm not putting anyone in danger or breaking the law. Having said that, I would be willing to pay slightly more.
- No. It doesn't cost any more to monitor than the current regulations. I'm not paying a "park drinking tax"
- No. Because I will never appreciate people drink alcohol at any public place
-
- No
- No
- Not willing to pay increased fee.
-
- What a stupid question you are asking , tax payer money is not enough already , and tomorrow someone is willing to pay to sleep with your mother or sister or wives and daughter should you allow t hem. Shame on the CITY for putting such a question.
- No. The sites should be the same price, and alcohol should be allowed at all sites. There are garbage and recycling bins readily available so there is no reason I see that these sites should cost additional \$ to book.
- Yes
- I would not pay extra. As it stand people do bring their own alcohol but hide it. If it costs extra I will just enjoy my alcohol in a "discrete" cup.
- No.
- No I would not be because if they allowed some and not others how would we monitor ?
- No
- no
-
- No
- Not necessarily willing to pay more.
- No.
- No. Why would an additional license cost be required
- Yes, \$10
- Yes 5 dollars

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I wouldn't pay anything to drink liquor at a picnic sight.
- No
- No. I see zero reason to charge more other than as a tax (user-fee) grab
- Yes, up to 50% more
- Again, every site should allow it. Charging more seems like a passive aggressive way to Sin tax those who choose to do so. If there is a charge I want to see exactly what it's paying for then. All this does is further discriminate against those who drink.
- no i would not pay more to book site that allows liquor as i think that is ridiculous and discriminatory. do you charge people more to have a place to smoke? if you choose to charge a fee then that is a cash grab
- I would not be willing to pay more as it should be allowed in all parks.
- Yes, \$100.
- No
- Potentially, but not much more. I don't really see the ROI of charging users for this.
- No, all sites should be the same price and have the same rules.
-
- Yes. \$10.
- Not sure.
-
- No.. Should be equal amounts
- No
- Yes, only about \$20 more.
- yes, not sure? 10%-15%?
- No. People already figure out ways to drink in parks when it's illegal. If it costs extra they will book the regular site and then hide their drinking just like they currently are doing.
- No- there shouldnt be restrictions and the city shouldnt be profiting
- Possibly depending on fees, would not pay more than \$10
-
-
- No- it should be the same
- No
- I would not even book
-
- No.
- All the same
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- I would pay \$5 more to book a site where liquor allowed.
- No
- Of course, I imagine participation would go up so to keep the park maintained will cost more
-
- No
- ...maybe don't look at this as another possible source of revenue to generate from the public and instead consider it a freedom that should have been present already... but if you have to further squeeze then 20 bucks.
- Yes. 5-10. Allows more monitoring
- Not really, however if it wasn't all that much more that would be okay.
-
- no
- Yes, up to 10% of the current fees
- Not all all
- No.
- No.
- No
- Yes, perhaps a \$10 liquor licence
- absolutely not, it would have to be less in rent
-
- There should not be an additional fee. It would provide an unnecessary layer of administrative burden and cost within the city administration.
- No, we would not.
- Yes – up to \$10 to \$20 more.
- I will not pay a penny instead I will discourage other too,
- No
-
-
- It shouldn't be right to pay more just the same.
- no
- Yes. \$25 more.
- No.
- No, because it is a public park all fees should be equal and it should be reserved on a first-come first-serves basis.
-
- Why is this even a question? You take enough tax money

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- Yes but a refundable deposit would be more appropriate to cover individuals who cause damage.
- No.
- No
- Absolutely No
-
-
- No. A two-tiered system of payment is overly bureaucratic.
- No
- No
- Yes, \$10 per site
- No but like the idea of adding cost to cover added cost of bylaw enforcement, cleanup, etc.
- Yes, 25% more.
- A liquor site should not cost more. All sites should allow liquor, so then there should not be a cost difference.
-
- Yes. \$5
- No.
- Yes, 10-20 dollars more
- no, i don't feel an additional cost should be necessary.
- I shouldn't have to pay more, but if i did I would. We shouldn't separate it on cost - that defeats the purpose.
- No
- No
- No
- 10\$
- No, all picnic sites should be free.
- No
- No, I would book the non drinking one and drink anyways. It is not reasonable to charge extra for this
- Nope
- Yes, a nominal fee to cover the additional costs for cleanup.
- No
- \$0
- no
-
- no

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes. \$50
- No, come on.
- No
-
- Yes.
- No. There should be no reason for this. All the sites should be alcohol friendly and people can abstain if they wish. People already drink at these sites anyways...
-
- No. That's a sick joke. I paid for beers. That should be enough
- no. they all should allow it. it should not be a tax on one type of group.
- Not applicable for me
- Yes, I would be willing to pay whatever it cost.
- No additional cost should be added.
- I don't think it would be appropriate to have to pay more for a site that allows liquor. The only reason I'd be willing to pay is if there was an increase in city staff required to monitor the alcohol usage.
-
- No- I wouldn't pay to book a picnic site ever
- No liquor in any parks
- No, I don't think being made to pay just to have the option to drink would be fair, especially if some people in the group were driving or not interested in drinking
- Yes, I am not sure how much it costs to book a regular picnic site, but I would think \$10-\$20 would be acceptable.
- No
- Yes
- I think it's ridiculous to upcharge for this. In more places in the world, public consumption is legal. When you put barriers or upcharges I would think people would have a tendency to binge. Make it same everywhere so it's not special and people moderate
- I wouldn't be happy about it. \$5
-
- Not at all
- No
- Yes, perhaps up to \$30 for a group site
- I don't believe there should be an extra cost to drink at a picnic site
- I think so but I would not pay any amount in parks that currently do not charge the public
- Yes - no more than \$25

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I don't want to see this turning into a cash grab by are city. They pratically distroyed the ability for a community , business etc to have a stampede partying outside their business such as during stamede, so I certainly do not want to see that.
- No. It is already very expensive to book park sites.
- No, parks should allow liquor consumption.
-
- No
-
- No, it should not be another tax, but should be accepted and soft acceptable to consume responsibly in any park.
- No
- Yes, 50% more.
- no.
- yes. 50\$ more for a group event.
- No. I don't book picnic sites ever. I show up in a park and hunker down.
- Yes. 10% more.
- Sure, \$25 probably. I would also expect to agree to terms that say I'll be responsible when consuming liquor at this site.
- No, there shouldn't be a fee to book a site that allows liquor. Fees should be equal regardless.
- Absolutely NOT. This should not be a money making scheme. If this is the case i would just go to a park without booking a site, bring my beer and risk getting a ticket.
- No I don't feel why you should have to pay extra just so you can have alcohol at your site. When we go camping, you don't need to pay extra at your site for it. Same idea!
- Not applicable. It is a good idea, however to off-set costs of monitoring and clean-up.
- No
- No
- No
- No.
-
- No
- No
- that seems silly, I would probably just have a glass of wine at either site - whether it allowed liquor or not
- Yes \$10
- No. Regardless of payment, I will clean the picnic site and leave nothing related to alcohol consumption.
- Yes, if it means booking a table at a site then i would pay up to \$20.00.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes. This would still be cheaper for me than going to a bar and having to pay a premium in drinks and food. The booking fee could go directly back to the city to help keep our picnic spaces clean, up to date and have adequate garbage and recycling bins.
-
- no
- No! I won't pay! I told you I don't drink!
- no. I refuse to pay more. I refuse to book a site that allows liquor at all.
- Yes. Double the price.
-
- No I would not be willing to pay for a site whether or not I can drink liquor. That is insane.
- no
- No
- I wouldn't pay more.
- NO. We should not let people with more money pay for special privileges!
- Yes, I would be willing to pay a little extra for any related expenses caused by the change (for example, increased police patrols in the area).
- No, it should not cost more. There are no added costs to the city, therefore no reason why we should pay to use a park sit IF we intend on drinking.
- \$10-\$20
-
- No
- No. This shouldn't be a cash grab.
-
- Depends on how much. If it was just a few dollars, fine.
- no
-
-
- NO. Unnecessary.
- I fail to see why it should be more expensive to allow liquor consumption? I can afford to pay more, so I suppose I would, but that is somewhat elitist, and makes me wonder if it's fair to allow or not allow alcohol based on one's ability to pay?
- No, why would you pay more?
-
- No
- No. paying more does not make sense.
- No , why would I pay more for the same table ? I am responsible enough to clean up garbage therefor I would recycle alcohol related items also

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I would never pay. That said, I'd never been willing to book public space regardless of liquor consumption. It's a park, not a nightclub VIP lounge.
- No
- No - why would I need to pay more?
-
-
- It shouldn't cost more.
- Yes. Depending of the size of the area we would pay \$50/ 4 hours
-
- Yes if someone wants to consume liquor they can do at a separate excluded area, away from the public sight. No comment on the amount
- Yes
- \$100
- No
- I would not pay more unless it was for a large group of people.
- Why would I pay more just because I have liquor? If you say it isn't a problem then there is no problem and I shouldn't have to pay more. If there is a problem then don't do!!! How can you discriminate between drinker and non if you say not a problem
- No, because I don't think that it is necessary to charge for being able to consume alcohol. If I had to pay more, I wouldn't drink in the area.
- I wouldn't book site which allows liquor use
- No
- NO!!
- No
- Yes because I understand the parks would need further licensing and insurance
-
- I would but only \$5-\$10 more for the site
- Definitely not
- No
- Yes \$5 more
- Yes, a nominal amount. 25\$ maybe.
- Maybe. Likely \$5 - \$10.
- No
- 20 bucks
- No
- Yes.
- No. I pay for park with my taxes

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I'm broke so no
-
- No
- No
- Yes. \$20 more
- not at all.
-
-
- Yes I would, I would pay 5-10\$ more for a site.
- \$5
- No
- No
- No. Make it legal but don't penalize people for wanting to capitalize on it.
-
-
- Yes I p\$
- No
- You should have to pay anything to use a public space. Public bbq areas are huge in Australia and everyone waits there turn and is respectful of one another. Again you should have to pay for it at all!
- No
- None
- Yes. \$10
- No - you can have a similar experience in a residential yard. A park would be more fun, but would not be willing to pay anything substantial
-
- No
- None
- no
- No
- no
- No
- Nothing
- No
- Yes, depending on the situation only a small percentage more.
-
- Yes max 20 dollars
- I would not pay more

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No, I'm bringing my own food and liquor and I am not bring served as I would be in a restaurant. A "corking" fee would be unfair.
-
-
- No
- Depends on the quality of the site. Accessibility. A large increase in fees wouldn't be a good idea. \$10, \$20 more.
- No
-
- No. Again, this is a stupid idea put forth by a moronic councilman who we will be voting out in the next election.
- No. Don't think it's a necessary cost.
- No.
- Yes, 20-50
- Small, if any. They're a public service, don't punish its if we're not doing anything wrong.
- no need to charge more
- No, the same. Shouldn't require any more overhead, so why the increase.
- No
- No
-
-
- Yes, probably \$25 more
- No. Why would I pay more for this? I don't pay more to drink a can of Coke, why would I pay more for a can of beer?
- no
- No
- \$5-\$10.
- No.
-
- No
- Yes. \$1
- No, why should I pay more for drinking beer thank pop?
-
- Why. No that's silly.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- yes! up to \$10 more
- Umm, I thought it would be free. Free appeals to me.
- No
- No, I don't believe there is a difference in what it would cost to maintain the site VS non alcoholic sites. In the end the park makes more off the empties.
- I'm not sure what the original cost is, but maybe 20.00 or so
- No
-
- Not necessarily
-
- Yes, not more than \$5 though
- No
- No.
- No. I would pay the same.
-
- No. Should be available at all parks
- Yes I would, I am not sure what the current rates are for booking a picnic site but adding a 25-50\$ fee may be reasonable.
- No.
- Yes, but only 5-10 dollars
-
- No
- No.
- No, I don't see any reason why a site that allows for liquor consumption should cost more.
- No
-
-
- Depending on if there are recycling receptacles around. If not would pay for cleanup. \$15.
- No, I would not be willing to pay because I am not a liquor consumer and neither is my family.
- I will not book that park.
- yes. significantly
- No
- No
- Yes, a reasonable amount. Double or triple the cost would not be appealing, but 5-10% would be acceptable.
- Yes.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes why not, saves sneaking booze in like most people do anyway, but be nice to pay extra to save the haste !!
-
-
- Yes \$20
-
- No.
- NO
- No
- Not in favour of a site that allows Liquor consumption
- No
-
- Yes. \$20.
- Yes, not a significant amount
- No. That seems unfair.
- No
- No
- Yes, about \$10
-
- No - that's dumb. Should I have to pay more to drink sugary drinks? What extra costs does The City incur if I'm recycling a wine bottle instead of a pop can if I have been drinking responsibly? Save the fines for irresponsible people.
- No. This is obviously just a money grab. How about councillors and our useless mayor take a pay cut or stop wasting money on halfassed Olympic bids.
- Yes, about 10 dollars
- No
- \$5
- Yes. Maybe \$25 for a "permit" For that specific site.
-
- No. There is no cost to the city for allowing this, so this should not be a revenue generating opp.
- I think that charging more is BS. It makes me wonder if this is the reason the city is considering legalizing liquor consumption in parks.
- No.
- Yes, but I'm not aware of how much is the booking fee for a picnic site. Perhaps nothing more than \$20?
- Yes, I think I would cap this at \$40 to book a site.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No I wouldn't.
- No, we will never book a park that allows consumption of liquor n alcohol .
- Yes. \$5
- Yes, \$25
- Not much but I suppose.
- No
- No.
- Not really
-
- No
- No
- No
- No
- Come on, there is no reason to charge more. Give fines I'm you leave it a pit.
- No
- No i would not be willing to pay more
- Maybe \$5-10 more. I
- No, I would book the cheapest option and hope I don't get caught with liquor.
- No that's what my taxes pay for. Dont want to drink if it's just gonna be a money grab for the city
- No
- We would no longer book picnic site if liquor will be allowed on picnic sites
- Yes, 10-20 more?
- No
- Yes 5 dollars
- No
- NO
- Yes. \$5
-
- No.
- Yes I would be willing to pay \$20 more as it would be a decent amount that will allow me and my party to enjoy the alcoholic beverages of our choosing.
-
- No.
-
- I would but I don't understand why the City would charge more for that? As far as I know there's no extra cost to the City.
- N/A

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes. \$15
- NO
- No
- I would not pay more to drink at a picnic site
- \$5
-
- No
- No, there is no need to pay for a picnic site where I have to bring my own alcohol
- No
- No
- No.
- No. Parks should be free to use.
- Yes. It should cost more. I will pay upto CAD50.
-
-
- No. Charging will only encourage people to outside of designated areas.
- No
- No
- No it's just an excuse to draw people in too dri k an then ticket them
- Yes I would pay more, depends on place and size of picnic area
- Yes. 25% more.
- No, it should be free. Paying for having alcohol introduces the mind set that you are paying someone else to assume responsibility. Therefore This may lead to dirty picnic areas and parks because "it's peoples job to clean this up"
- No
- I don't know that there has to be an increased cost to the public - as allowing the liquor should reduce the amount of monitoring. Marginal costs - maybe \$5 if have to.
- No
- No
- No.
- Personally I wouldn't expect to leave any trace of liquor consumption behind. So, I'm not sure what there would be a booking fee for. So, no.
-
- Depends
- i don't think it should cost more to book a picnic site that allows alcohol.
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- \$5
- No, why would it cost more to be able to enjoy a beverage. Will people with children pay more for the mess their children make and often leave behind or for the use of the playground facilities?
- No because I don't understand why you would have to pay more for something like that when you are already paying for the liquor
- No. They charge for EVERYTHING already in Can(t)ada.
-
- No
-
- No.
- No, there should be no additional cost. You can place recycling bins there and create revenue through that.
-
- No. I don't drink.
- N/A
-
-
- No
- No.
- Marginally more if absolutely needed. Let's not overdo it.
- No I wouldn't, I don't believe that you should have to pay more to book a site where you can drink.
-
-
- I'd pay 10-15% more
- No, our parks and their picnic spaces should be free for all use. Do not monetize this, people are already paying high taxes on alcohol.
- No. I would personally pay for a regular site and still drink
- No - liquor consumption wouldn't require any special arrangements, so paying more seems unnecessary
- Yes
- no
- No
-
- No
- Nope
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No but there could be some kind of fine in place for left over empties or unsafe intoxication.
- Likely would not pay. Would rather visit a patio at a bar if we had to pay.
- No
- Not much. It's easy to hide alcohol so I don't see a reason to pay to be explicit with it, unless there was an extra service like ice for coolers
- No wth
-
- No that is discrimination
-
- Probably not. I could sit on a patio if I wanted to lay s lot more
- No, a payment would turn crowds away, and people would just hide their liquor as they already do.
- No. I don't think that is fair to charge more because you are still simply using the site to have a picnic.
-
- yes. price is not a factor.
- No that's ridiculous
- No
- No
- Yes \$5
- Yes, 5-10 dollars extra.
- I don't think it makes sense to tax liquor and then tax the consumption. Having an affordable option to have an afternoon out is what makes this idea exciting.
- No
- Yes. I would pay more if I wanted a picnic site that allows liquor.
-
- No
- No. Why would it cost more?????
- No, it's to be a picnic and I'd have to drive there.
- Yes, and not a large few probably 5ish dollars.
-
- Yes
- No
- Yes byba fair amount
- No.
- No. Sounds like a scam by the city to make more money
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Absolutely not acceptable.
- No, it must be the same price
- I didn't know you had to pay to have a picnic...? I would not pay for any site, alcohol or not.
- I don't think any extra fee should be paid. If I don't drink, and someone else does, I don't think either of us should have to pay a different fee for a campsite.
- I would, but really wouldn't see the need to charge more. The alcohol being consumed is already taxed at a high rate, this would seem to be taking advantage of users and discouraging them from booking.
- No. Why would it cost anything?
- You have to pay?!
- No
- None
- Uncertain. Why would we have to pay more when the city is not offering the alcohol products?
- I've never paid to book a site and I never will.
- No
- No
- No
- Yes. \$10
- No.
- yes, \$35-\$75
- Yes, simply because of the economics of the idea, spots will be limited and paying allows more accountability to the people booking it, and allows for the group I book I with to come together to do so.
- No
- Yes. \$10 more.
- Yes, 50% more.
- yes, a little bit more : 5 or 10% more
-
-
- No. I would absolutely not pay extra for a liquor consumption site. I would get a regular site and consume discretely, just like I have done in the past.
- No
- No
- No
- I would not be willing to pay more.
- No, why should I may more for that? Are you aiming for another cash grab? This question has made me decide not to vote for nenshi or the current council, get real guys, we're not idiots.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- I don't think it's necessary
-
- No
- No.
- No. All rules around cleanliness should still apply. Security measures may be more expensive but that's to be seen.
- No
- No, paying a premium for the privilege to consume alcohol at a certain site does not make sense. If there was a situation where there were only liquor consumption-friendly sites left and I wasn't planning to consume, I wouldn't expect to pay extra.
- No, this shouldn't be viewed as a way to generate more revenue for the City.
- No. There is no increase cost to the city as long as users are being reasonable and responsible.
- No
- No
- No, paying will only make people feel like they are entitled to behave however they feel. Regardless the surrounding tables. There are plenty of designated patios & beer gardens for those wishing to indulge.
- No
- No.
- Yes. Not much more. \$50.00 per booking?
- No, I think it should be available at all picnic sites and not be a way to prioritize some sites over others
- no
- No.
- No. I would probably forgo the picnic site in favour of a backyard if there was a cost associated. Also, what if you don't drink but you are "allowed" to? Still having to pay?
- Yes but I don't think I should have to - the reality is that most people are drinking anyways on picnic sites, so actually no.
- No
- no
- Yes - to a maximum of \$5 a person
- No, why should it be more expensive?
- Yes. \$20.
- No, that's ridiculous. It should be allowed at all picnic sites, therefore it would be a flat rate
- No. They should all allow it.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No, the right to drink responsibly should not be capitalized.
- No
- Not applicable.
- No as it should be included.
- It should be free.
-
- No
- No
- \$10
- yes
- Yes, up to \$10 if I was to book a large party , but if it's just me and another I would not pay.
- No, why would I pay more when I can just book a regular site & still have a drink, it is currently not enforced enough to deter
-
- no, I would just book a regular one and drink anyways - like everyone else.
-
- No, there should not be an extra charge.
- Yes. And extra \$5-\$10?
- I don't think you should have to pay, there should be a fine for littering and disrespect for our parks and disorderly behaviour
- No. Unless all the additional revenue is going to drinking and driving awareness. Adding a fee isnt fair when no real additional cost to the city exist. It will disproportionately block less affluent citizens from using parks
- No. Would just book a normal one and drink anyhow.
- Absolutely not. What is the purpose to allow liquor consumption? If its to make Calgary a more socially, and lenient city to visit for tourists, this is not the way to achieve it. Is there a fee to smoke pot in public parks?
- I would not book one that allows liquor consumption.
- I feel as though a \$5 extra charge would be fair
- Yes, \$10
- No.
- Not at all
- Yes \$10
- I would prefer there be no fee. But if paying is the only option, possibly \$10 more per site?
- I'm not sure why we'd have to pay more but if it was a nominal cost I would be okay with it.
- yes

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Why should it cost more? The CoC is always looking for ways to gouge the citizens. Our taxes support the operation of these parks. Stop looking for reasons to charge everyone .
- No
- No - I do not see why it would need to cost more. Liquor is the same as any beverage and it's containers can be put in recycling just like any other drink. It is already illegal to be drunk and disorderly and can be enforced by police as it already is
- There should be no difference. I do think that fines should be strict for littering in all cases as that is inexcusable.
- No
- NO
- NO can't see why that should cost more
- yes, to encourage responsible drinking. I would be happy with a \$20 fee or a 'license' for the day
- I didn't realize you had to pay to book at all. I would say between \$5-10 more to account for any potential problems and so people take drinking in parks seriously.
- Don't open parks up at any cost. It is a Pandora's Box.
- Yes however not a significant amount more. What would amount to covering the incremental amount of potential increased cleanup.
- Yes \$300
- You have to pay for picnic sites? My answer is clearly no.
- No. It already costs more for the liquor.
- Not that much more. Maybe \$5
- No, I don't think it should be an extra fee. If there must be, I only think a \$10 fee would be the max.
- Never!
- Likely but not much more
- Yes, 25% more
- Yes, 10% more I will pay but no more than that
- n/a
- No that's a stupid idea people will go back to covertly drinking at a "non booze" site
- No
-
- Yes
-
- No
- No.
- Yes 10\$
- No, this should just be the default. I'm not that desperate to have a beer with my burger to pay more for the site unless the additional charge was very minor (like \$5)

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- no
-
- No
- Potentially.
-
- no
- Yes, \$10. Fee.
- No
- No I would not be willing to pay more and don't think it is reasonable to charge extra.
- No
- n/a
- yes. I never use picnic sites now but would use them for gatherings and would pay
-
- I think it would be ridiculous to charge more to book a picnic site for the only reason being that you are allowed to consume liquor. The picnic site would be the exact same. Yes I would pay if I had to, but only a couple dollars more.
- I would expect to pay less, if someone wants to book a site at a place where people's rights are restricted then they should pay more.
- I would not want to pay more, no. The park will benefit from our cans and recycling, and more common use.
- Not sure, but I would be willing to pay more
- Yes, a Nominal fee (\$20 or less per booking) that is directly attributable to the costs of administering/monitoring liquor in parks.
- Yes and no. I would be willing to pay up to \$20 more. However, I don't agree with adding a charge. Perhaps taking a deposit is best and then if picnic site is left damaged or dirty from reckless behaviour or empty cans, the charge can be added
- no.
-
- Yes, \$30
-
- Yes, Max \$10, but I really disagree with their being an extra charge for this.
- No
- Yes
- Yes. \$30
- Yes
- no because I think all parks should allow this

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, I don't think you should have to pay more for booking a picnic site just to be able to consume alcohol. Enforcing people to recycle after drinking will eliminate the risk of litter in the parks, same goes with food and non-alcoholic beverage garbage.
-
- No, make the rule change across the board without extra fees
- No, you shouldn't have to pay to drink it should be the same
- No.
- No
- No.
- Yes, \$10
- No - because really how do you police the sites individually. Make it all park spaces or no park spaces.
- Yes. 10 dollars
- Yes. A smaller fee of 10-20 dollars.
- No
- Yes, 5-10 more (to cover AGLC liquor licensing costs)
-
- No
- Not really. Should be free.
- No.
-
- No. Why should it cost more? Is there going to be more services? Like free wood.
- No. This shouldn't be about cost.
- No
- No. If you try to charge people for the right to drink in our parks that would be worse than the current system of prohibition.
- No
-
- No
- No
- Yes, \$20
- No, asking for extra money is unnecessary and a money grab.
- Yes, 25\$
- No
- Maybe

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. There should not be a fee associated other than the regular booking fee. What is this revenue used for? I do not anticipate extra clerical or administrative work involved in allowing liquor consumption at a park.
-
- Yes, but a marginal amount.
-
- No, as I would not attend a picnic site that allowed liquor consumption.
- Yes, 25 \$ more
- Yes, maybe as much as 15% more to book a site
- Yes
- No, picnic sites should be free.
- Yes
-
- No
- Potentially. But I don't think there should be a charge for that.
- Yes. \$5-\$20
- Depending on the amount of people you could have the site, and I don't know how much it costs to rent a site, but for liquor consumption I would pay an extra 25%
- \$15 for 3 hours
- It should cost the same. You're doing the same thing you would have been doing in the park as before only now sometimes you might have liquor so why on earth would there be a need to charge extra for that.
- No I won't pay to drink
- No. I am already paying for the alcohol and the province collects taxes and I see no reason why I should pay extra if we are allowed to drink at a park rather than our own houses.
-
- There is no need for the picnic site to cost anymore than it would if it didn't allow liquor. People don't have to pay to enjoy their backyards so why at a picnic site?
- No: why should you have to pay to drink alcohol you paid for? Might as well just drink on a patio somewhere.
- \$0 - \$20, if a mess is left of empty bottles the person who booked it should be fined afterwards.
- Once again, all sites should allow liquor consumption for shortage reasons. I was also not aware that it cost money to book a site so I cannot answer this question.
- No, I would just consume liquor anyways
- Never. I would avoid places with the use of alcohol.
- No. That doesn't make sense.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No way.
- Liquor or marijuana consumption in public requires more policing and I hope that enough money is charged to offset these costs.
-
- not sure why it should cost more. I would take any empties with me or put them into recycling bins.
- No
- I probably wouldn't pay for one. I'd opt to find one that was free or a very low price.
- Yes. Lots, but I don't understand why I should be charged more to consume liquor.
- Probably not but maybe for a special event I would
-
- No
- NO
- It should be free. Sitting at a table shouldnt cost money.
- No. I would not be willing to pay more to book one that allows liquor consumption.
- No
- Yes, \$20 more seems fair
-
- No
- \$5
- Not my preference.
- No, in principle I don't think that makes sense. I'm assuming the cost of upkeep for the site is the same regardless of what types of beverages are consumed.
- Yes, 5-10 more to cover the cost of the license
- Yes \$20
- No
- No we already pay in taxes. It should be encourage for people to clean after themselves. Money from a bottle recycle could be use pay for an extra container.
- Yes, \$10
- I resent being asked to pay more for something that should not cost the city more.
- No
- A tiered system should be based on use, not the site's status. On busy days, groups with not consuming liquor should not have to pay extra because the only site available allows consumption.
- no
- Yes/the cost of a liquor license for small gatherings. \$10
-
- Yeah I would, maybe 10-15 dollars more.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No...
- No.
- No
- Yes. Less than and not more than \$20.
- I don't think it costs anything to allow liquor so I would not pay more. We get taxed enough on liquor.
- Will not book one that allows liquor consumption
- no
- I actually never book picnic sites. I just don't see why the liquor is not allowed on picnic sites. As long as it stays within the site
- no
- No.
-
-
- No
- Not sure how liability would work, I would pay more if insurance was provided for the permit holder
- I would not pay more for a sight that charges for liquor consumption. There is no additional service being provided.
- Honestly I don't think you should be charged to drink at a picnic site I don't think that would help people will choose to pay less and sneak liquor if prices go up.
- A small amount perhaps.
-
- No. Why would it cost more to allow me to bring alcohol into a park?
- No, that's ridiculous. It's either legal or it isn't.
- Yes
- No
- Yes, I am unsure how much
- Yes. \$25
-
- No! Are you kidding.
- no
- yes, I would be willing to bay 10-15% more.
- no
-
- Yes. \$5
- No. Anti poor to make it inaccessible through payment
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- Yes. 20-30% more
- No, if people can smoke in a City park at no extra cost, they should be allowed to drink at no extra cost
- Nil
- Yes. \$20
- I would be willing to pay 50% more
-
- Sure... \$5
-
- No. Why would it be more? this seems backwards.
- Yes. Probably 10-20% more.
- Yes. I would be willing to pay twenty-five to thirty percent more.
-
- Yes. \$20
- I think all sites should allow liquor, so no, I think they should all be the same cost. Revenue generated from recycled containers at said sites, could offset any additional charges.
- No. All sites should allow consumption. It will create "party" sites if they are segregated.
- No. Make it open. It shouldn't cost. Quit trying to add red tape.
- Yes - 15% more
-
- No
- I would not be willing to pay for a site that allows liquor consumption. Drinking alcohol should not be regulated through further capital payments. The bylaw should simply allow for alcohol consumption with food, similar to what is seen across Québec.
- I think if you designate certain picnic sites , equal amount of alcohol v non alcoholic there shouldn't be extra fee just because you book one with alcohol doesn't mean everyone attending will be drinking it's giving ppl options. No extra fee
- No, I don't think it is nessicary, and it could put it out of reach for some people
- Hard no.
- Yes, but not an exorbitant jump in price. Something along the lines of SEL that exist currently with the AGLC (\$25)
- No
- No
- Not really, I don't see why it should incur an extra cost if I'm supplying the beer or wine. If anything the notion is somewhat insulting.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- The cost should be the same whether or not it allows liquor consumption as some people would pay more for it not to allow liquor consumption!
- No should not cost any more. It will already be hard to get one
- No. I would never book a picnic site, it should be first come first serve.
- No.
- Yes
- Yes we would be willing to pay more. Limit depends...if its significantly higher (like \$50-\$100 over) we may not be willing.
- No
- Probably double
-
- Oh, come on.
- yes I will, up to 40% more.
- \$10 per person.
- Not much more
- No
- maybe, again depends on activity
- Nope
- N/A
-
- No.
-
-
- Of curse, I don't think that is an issue, and that funds will helpThe city to use it in posters to advice about the responsible consumption of liquor
- No that's ridiculous
- No if there was cost associated I would BBQ in my yard. I'm very frugal
-
- No
-
- No
-
- Yes - up to \$50 a day
- No. Seems unreasonable to pay more. However if the concern of littering is the reason for the extra cost and that money is used to buy more disposal units than I think the increase would be justified.
- No.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- no
- no
- No.
-
- Yes. I would pay what it costs per can to clean up. However responsible people should always clean up
- No, I would pay more to book a picnic site at those parks that do not permit drinking.
- No
- Again definely NO.
- Yes, as much as its worth .50%, 100% or 200 or more.
- This would depend on how Calgarians show themselves to be in parks. If there is more work required for cleaning out parks, then there should be fees to pay for more workers.
- No, I don't think there should be an added cost. This should not generate revenue!!
- No
- Yes but minimal no more than 5\$
- I don't mind paying extra. I just don't think we should make it prohibitively expensive for lower income Calgarians.
- No
- yes. no real maximum, but \$50-100 would be fair.
- No. The liquor is taxed enough.
- 10\$
- No. I think the standard rate should apply to all.
- No. Not unless you provide the beer.
- OH...so that's what this is about MONEY ?
-
- Not at all
- No
- No.
- Yes, I'd pay double
- Yes - anything within reason although this shouldn't come at a cost
- No?
- Yes
- No. I'll. Just sneak it in and do it anyways.
- No because what is the difference if the people are drinking soda pops or beers, no one should be surcharged for the type of beverage they chose to drink.
- If I have to pay more I will continue to sneak and act illegally

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, I think they should all allow liquor consumption with the proviso that park maintenance doesn't have an increase in their workload. If there is a direct, measurable, and quantifiable change, there should be an associated cost increase,
- No
- Yes- not much more, under 40 bucks
- no.
- 5%
- No.
- 10\$
- Yes. I am unsure of how much more I would pay.
- No, there shouldn't be extra charge for it.
- NO, I pay same taxes as other, why is the price of admission contingent upon alcohol consumption. Keep costs down for park users, ditch the alcohol.
- No. It should be legal and free.
- No
- No
- Do not allow
- Yes, perhaps 25% more
- Yes \$10
- No why I have to pay more
-
-
- Absolutely no. Alcohol or no alcohol - same price.
- This is a leading question; I don't want to see liquor consumption in any City park picnic sites
- No.
- No
- No
- \$25
- I would be willing to pay a little more for liquor consumption, but only a slight increase
- No
- No, I've already paid for the park with my taxes.
- No. Come on.
-
- Yes I would, however I do not feel this would be the right approach to take as it may encourage people to attempt to secretly consume alcohol on the less expensive, non-alcohol sites.
- Not sure, I have never booked a picnic site. Potentially if the price was reasonable.
- Would prefer not to but if it's a must, then yes.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Definitely not, is this what this is about? The city wanting more money? After people are drunk and start to vandalize all extra money will be needed for the repairs.
- No. Adults should be permitted to consume alcohol in a responsible manner everywhere in our parks.
- No. That is absolutely ridiculous. Why does our city insist on constantly taxing the consumer?!?!? Wake up Nenshi.
- No. Paying for a picnic site in the first place seems an unnecessary fee for enjoying a city park. Set up and enforcement costs need to come from existing budgets.
- I wouldn't book a picnic site with liquor
- No.
- Yes, \$15 or the fee to cover liability costs
- Not sure why you would have to pay more. I'm assuming you have to clean up after yourself.
- no
- Sure. Well, I'm unsure of the cost for a picnic site presently, but I think 10-20% more would be fair.
- No
- NO, alcohol should be allowed period. no extra cost is needed
- No
- Should not have to pay to book picnic sites
- Yes 10\$
- It should not be an extra cost. It's not an extra cost for the city to allow it!
-
- No. I can drink at home in my backyard, in a restaurant, on a public licensed patio, etc. If I was renting a picnic shelter for a large party, I might be willing to pay something.
- No
- yes, I would. The amount would depend on the occasion. If it's a bigger group meeting for a celebration of a rather significant event, I would pay more. For just an afternoon snack in the park with wife and kids I would probably not pay more.
- Yes. \$25
- Not willing to pay more
- No. This is an opportunity for social change; not a money grab for the city.
- Yes. Up to \$50.
- Maybe. But I don't know the current prices of picnic sites.
- No, but I think it's a good idea if this goes ahead.
-
-
- I don't think you should have to pay more. It should be legal everywhere.
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. The government doesn't need to profit off of me having a drink in the park. They aren't profiting off me drinking on my patio at home. They already receive money from sin taxes. This is a quality of life change for Calgarians. Not a \$ opportunity.
- No - this is not about raising taxes - its about personal freedom
- yes, anything within reason
- No
- Yes, I would. I haven't booked any site now, but I'd pay an extra \$10 per site.
- No. The restriction on liquor is ridiculous and shouldn't be there in the first place.
- No
- I'm not actually sure if there is already a charge. But I don't think there should be an extra charge. I don't see any reason to merit charging more, the site is the same regardless and I'd think people would clean up just as any other site.
- Id be willing to pay and extra \$10, which would be similar to the cost gor an event liquor license
- No. I'm not sure why The City would see the need to charge a higher fee if users were going to drink. It should not be as a clean up fee. Alcohol users should clean up after themselves as all park users are expected to.
- Yes, I'm not sure how much it is now though, as long as it's reasonable.
- No I would not be willing to pay more, I would just stop using city parks that allow liquor. If my alderman votes this in the will be losing my vote next election.
- No
- No, if i'm bringing my own food/liquor it should not cost more.
- No - and this should NOT be a question of money!
- NO
- No. It should be free. Why would you charge for allowing people to have a small drink.
- no.
- I don't know how much a regular site costs but I know a liquor license is \$25 so I'd say I'd pay an additional \$10 on top of the site cost.
- I would not be willing toi pay anything to have liquor in a park.
- No, People should not be charged extra
-
-
- Yes. I would pay more. \$20?
- No
- No, it is the same service from the city. Why should it be more expensive?
-
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- NO! I do not believe liquor consumption in public parks is a good idea
- No
- I think an extra \$15 to \$20 would be reasonable, and that they could also sign a waiver accepting full responsibility if they are injured or cause any damage to the park.
- No... That makes no sense. That is a cash grab, without any additional requirement from the City.
- No
- No
-
- Yes, moderate fee.
- perhaps... but with a liquor permit... should be more then a hall liquor permit... and a damage deposit should also be charged for possible damage and cleanup.
- No
- No. (Not unless the city will be serving alcohol like they do on golf carts at golf courses! ... hmm, entrepreneurial idea?! LOL) Allowing this option gives users a choice, it's not an additional service the city provides.
- Possibly but not sure why the city would need to charge money. If the money was going towards keeping the parks safe & tidy due to alcohol consumption then I would pay. I would pay under \$20.
- No liquor please
- Sure, Extra 10-20 bucks?
- A licence costs ten dollars now..that would be enough.
- Yes Perhaps \$25 extra for a small group, but \$50 if booking for a larger group to ensure good behaviour happens and appropriate cleanup.
-
-
- Why would you have to charge. People will be cleaning up after themselves
- no
- No
- No & no
- I don't think there would be additional cost to the city for someone bringing liquor, so there should not be more cost to the picnic site user.
- no
-
- Don't ruin my city for politics. Why this question raised? Don't ruin my city for politics.
- No. This seems like a cash grab to me. I'd rather not pay the premium and drink undercover.
- 5 CAD

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, see answer to question #4. I'd pay to NOT be beside a liquor consumption site to avoid the poor behaviour and to avoid my picnic from being ruined. I expect unruly behaviour at a bar/restaurant and can choose not to go there, unlike a public place
- no
- No...
- Yes, \$10 more
- No
- No
- No
-
- no
- no
- No.
- Yes, a marginal amount
- No.
- No
- no
- No
- No
- I would avoid sites that allow liquor consumption.
- Yes, I'd pay up to 15% more
- No.
- I don't think there should be a huge increase but something modern or as a deposit that you have left the site Clean or pay for some one to come and cleanup.
-
- Yes, but only nominally. No more than \$20.
- no
-
- Yes, a marginal amount. I can't provide a dollar amount as I am uncertain as to the existing cost without allowance for liquor.
- Yes, I would pay an extra \$5.
- No
- I don't believe that you should have to pay more to book a site that allows liquor consumption. What would the extra funds be used for?
- No. Haha, we need to pay for a table?!?
- No. The gouging from city Hall needs to stop.
- Yes, I'd be willing to pay more. Up to \$10 more for allowable liquor consumption.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- yes; same as a liquor license (\$10)
-
- no
-
- No
-
- No.
- No
- No
- No. Why would I pay more?
- No, but I think it's a good idea to change more.
-
- probably not as the drinking is not important although its an interesting idea. people might be willing to pay \$5-10 more.. like a corkage fee in a restaurant
-
- If the supervision and maintenance costs of a site increase as a result of allowing liquor these should be charged to those that set up the potential for the problems.
- N/A
- Yes, \$25
- No.
- No we shouldn't have to pay anything. Our taxes cover enough
- I would prefer not to pay as it will not have a direct cost to implement. If I had to I would pay \$20.
- No
- Yes, \$10
- No.
- No
- No, there should be no charge to book such sites. However, a deposit should be charged, and "will be forfeited" in case the site is left dirty or if there is any disorderly behaviors.
- No.
- No. Why should we?
- Yes. Not sure of current pricing.
- A reasonable increase, perhaps upwards of 25-50%
- no. I refuse to pay more. I refuse to book a site that allows liquor at all.
- No. There should not be Booze in Parks.
- No
- Sure, \$20.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- no no no no no
-
- Yes. \$5-\$10
- Yes \$10
- yes - 10-20%
- No
- It might justify the cost of the booking. \$70 seems like a lot for a picnic site.
- No, it should be free of cost at all parks.
- No, but I might be willing to pay more for one that *doesn't* permit it.
- No. I don't feel this is necessary if it doesn't increase the work to maintain the site.
-
- I don't feel I should have to pay to be allowed to drink a beverage I purchased and brought. As long as I clean up after myself and are respectful to the park, environment and other beings.
- No not willing to pay more
- probably not. There is no extra cost for the city, so why should i pay more? I would consider paying an extra \$20 at most
- yes, maybe up to \$20
- If the bylaw changes to allow alcohol, it should not be associated with fees/permits for the picnic sites. To me , that feels like purchasing a separate of rules and would be unfair to those wanting to use the park but unable to get a picnic site.
- No
- Possibly - but risk is that this becomes something only people with plenty of disposable income can do
- no
-
- no
- Yes to an minimal extend.
- 10\$ more
- No
- No
- Nope
-
- I will stop going and taking kids to parks
- Yes
-
- no
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I think the initial cost should be the same, but would be willing to provide payment details in case a penalty for littering/damage to the site occurred during my stay.
- No
- No
-
- no
-
-
-
- Not sure if I would.
- No.
-
- I didn't know payment was needed
- No we pay enough taxes
- No.
- No. You do not pay extra to consume liquor at a restaurant or indoor venue.
- No
- Yes, depends on overall factors of area, but really, don't gouge, we already have to pay for the liquor.
- Depends on what other options there are. Depends on what the fees would be.
-
- No. Would create a public problem area.
- No. I should not be charged more just because of what I am drinking. All sights should have recycling services, so there should be no increase in cost to the city
- Didn't know there was a fee to book
- No.
- No!
- No
- No
- Yes. I am willing to pay a fee upwards of %10 of the original pricing to ensure that I will be allowed to drink in my designated area without trouble
- No
-
-
-
-
-
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes. 5\$ more per day
- No because I will consume liquor anyways.
-
- No that is a bit silly and not reasonably enforceable.
- no
- No am not willing to pay single penny not for even free
- No
- Absolutely not, I pay enough taxes as it is.
-
- No
- Yes, not sure
- no - and I would not like to be at a picnic site that was near one that allows liquor.
- No.
-
-
- Not at all.
- Probably not
- Undecided.
- If we were to pay to book for each park, what's the point ?. Paying for a picnic date in a park with wine? Be reasonable. Some parks should just be open un'e You're running an event. Using Montreal as reference, tams was free and picnic was 15 each Sunday
- No that defeats the purpose
- No: I think the city should set up recycling bins at these locations and promote park uses to recycle their cans which intern the city can refund and use the proceeds for the cost.
- No
- No, I don't like alcohol that much
- No
- N/A
- Pay? For a public park? Thats Criminal! I'm part owner.
- No
- I think rent should be the same for all sites with or without consumption.
- No. It does not cost anymore to facilitate drinking liquor therefore it should not incur extra costs either.
- No I will not be interested to pay for liquor consumption.
- Yes, \$50 depending of the number of people
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. Nor should i be expected to pay more for being in a park that doesn't allow it. Having some parks that allow drinking decreases the number of parks I would feel good about using. Please don't limit my options.
- No. Having a can of beer instead of pop adds zero cost to the City's infrastructure maintenance budget. This assumes responsible use, of course.
- No
- Maybe a small fee, but I don't think it's needed. Just another fee and reason for the government to take money
- No liquor
- NA.
- N/A
-
- Not at all
- No.
- No.
- No. And I would not book a picnic site near other sites that allow drinking.
- NA
- No.
- No
-
- Maybe, not much more than a non-alcohol site. I think you will find people drinking alcohol in all picnic sites if you try to charge more for certain sites just because it is allowed.
- No, don't need that to be in the public area. Currently public drinking is illegal, why would it be different in a PUBLIC park.
- no. we drink but it's not ESSENTIAL enough to need to put out the extra cash for a specific site.
-
- Yes. Unsure
- Absolutely not!!
-
- I will not pay
- No
-
-
- Never
-
- No.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No I would not pay more as the picnic site is providing no more of a service if I bring my own liquor
- No
- No
- Yes \$25
- Probably not
-
- No, drinking should be allowed at the same price as regular picnic sites
-
- Nope
-
-
- would pay more, up to 20% more.
- No
- No.
- That would be a discrimination!
-
- yes, 10% more
- None
- Yes but not a lot. 10-15% more as there may be more clean up however people have been drinking in parks as it is so i would anticipate little change.
- Yes - 5
-
- No
- wouldnt pay regardless
- Yes \$25 for the site
- Yes, \$10-\$20 more
- No
-
- No
- NO
- Yes I would. \$10/day.
- No, why should there be a monetary cost associated? It costs the city nothing to allow this, and is under provincial purview. Levy fines if sites must be cleaned up to recoup any costs.
- No
- Yes, 10% more

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No I am not willing to pay more. What benefit would extra fees bring to the process? It will not deter undesired actions. Why must any benefit always be linked to extra money. This will not cost the city anything extra except to remove the current signs.
- Yes - up to \$25 for added recycling
- Yes, \$10
- No. If a park were to begin selling and monitoring alcohol/use, then the cost of that should be incorporated into the beverages. However, I realize this is not part of the conversation at this point, so no, I don't think the public should have to pay more
- Yes; up to %100 more.
-
-
-
- I would not book a site that allows liquor consumption.
- NO.
- No
- Yes. 10% more.
- I would pay more for one which does NOT allow liquor in the park.
- I am against paying a user fee in any city picnic area. I feel our taxes are high enough without another layer of taxation disguised as a user fee.
-
-
- Yes, this is scare tactic using to promote liquor
- No. That is stupid. You should just be allowed to have open liquor with food, like other major cities. Who cares?
- No- they should be the same price.
- No
- NO
- No No
- No
- Yes. Not knowing how much it costs to rent a site, I don't have a frame of reference, but I'd pay 25% more for a location that allows alcohol.
- No. I want to enjoy my site, not having drunken people around.
- I dont think people should have to pay extra for this feature
- No. No need to pay more unkes the wine is provided?
- Most definitely not!
- I guess so. \$10/more
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, what's the extra cost for?
- NO! This is wrong. Those with more money should not be able to buy their way into exceptions!
- I will avoid to go where liquor is allowed.
- No why should i pay just because of my beverage choice. You dont make people pay when they want to drink a fanta instead of water.
- No, if I was asked to pay more, I would go to a restaurant.
- No, don't allow right to buy privileges
- No
- No no Hell no
- Not sure
- No
- I would say yes - by allowing liquor we might see an influx of park use which would require more frequent upkeep by parks staff. I would say an additional \$5 fee.
- Maybe if less than \$20
- Maybe - but i'd prefer they all allow liquor as opposed to some do and some don't. That feels confusing and will likely just end up in innocent by-law infringements from folks who meant well and misunderstood.
- Yes - I'm not familiar with the fee structure.
- Yes, but nothing crazy, otherwise we would just keep our picnics and social gatherings in our back yards.
- Don't agree with a "two-tier" system.
- Yes
- No
- No
- No. I do not think there is a good justification for charging extra, for the same service - in this case a table or just space.
-
- No
- No.
- I pay city taxes, why should I have to pay to go to a city park.
- No. There would be no additonal costs to the City of Calgary to allow this in our parks. We are already pay enough taxes to allow this in our parks.
- Maybe? I'm not sure how much they cost now because I've never felt the desire to book one. If I could bring a bottle of wine to my picnic, I might just be more compelled to book a City picnic site.
- \$0. Stop taxing everything.
- NoYes
- yes

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes; 10% more or no more than how much it would cost to be served alcohol at existing establishment, whichever comes first
- Yes, Although I do not see why costs would increase to consume!
- \$5-\$20
- yes, i'd pay the same. Nothing more si being offered, a picnic table is a picnic table nothing more comes with it other than what you are allowed to do while you are there. There should never be an extra price for that!
- Why would a site with liquor allowance be more expensive? Having a beer can is the same amount of garbage than a plastic cup or waterbottle. If the price were different and liquor allowances was needed for a gathering I suppose I would pay it.
- No....I don't see why the public needs to pay more for this allowance.
- No
- Should be the same price.
- no
- Yes, don't know.
- No
- No.
-
- No - the site is already there. Why does it require a further fee.
- No - I think this will create more problems than it solves.
- No
- No!
- Yes twenty dollars more.
- No.
- No. That [removed] should just be [removed] free
- no, i think the economy is bad enough we don't need you nickel and diming us on this
- Yes. \$5-10.
-
- No.
- Again, I'd required I would. But this seems like requiring restaurant patrons to pay to sit in a "drinking" section. Seems like an unfair disadvantage.
- No. This is ridiculous.
- Maybe a little more. But not much.
- no. thats ridiculous.
- No. Why put a surtax on it?
- Yes I would, not sure what it costs to book one already. You could have it be similar to the cost of purchasing a liquor license.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, ~ 50% more.
- no
- No, why on earth would you have to pay to bring liquor? That makes no sense. You're not making any more or less use of the park just because the beverage containers you're bringing contain alcohol vs containers that don't. Absolutely not.
- Yes, an extra \$5 or \$10 would be reasonable in my opinion.
-
-
-
-
- No, maybe a deposit to make sure you clean up your site and everyone around you is safe, and has safe transport. Maybe pay extra for a ride to your next destination could be included
- No more than the AGLC would charge for a liquor license for a private non-selling event - so \$10.
- n/a
- Absolutely not - people should not be able to consume alcohol in public areas just because they pay to.
- No.
- no to paying more. why should it cost more to have alcohol in a public park?
- Yes and definitely a slight premium
- No
-
-
- Seriously?
- Yes, I would pay 10% more.
-
-
- No.
- paying extra seems a shame
-
- Yes \$10
- Yes, about \$10 more.
- No
- No
- No. This should not be a cash grab and makes this a class-based rule.
- N.A
-
- Yes. I don't know how much it costs to book a picnic site. Maybe \$50 more?

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes. \$30-\$40
-
- No, that would be silly.
- No
- There should be no extra fee for booking a site allowing liquor consumption.
- No.
- No unless there was liquor options being provided but also yes if there was special clean ups regularly and such
- Should not have to pay, then people will just book non-liquor ones and drink liquor there.
- No
- I suppose so but I think 10\$ more is as high as I would go just to ensure better clean up.
- Yes only if there's added recycling. And not very much at all.
- No
- I would not be willing to pay more. That seems silly.
- Yes no more than \$50
- No
- No
- No.
- No.
- Yes and I don't know
- No
- Depending. I would need to know the reason why im paying more. Not quite sure on the prices to to know how much more i would be willing to pay
- No. The approach should be more relaxed than that to start out with. If the new regulation leads to higher costs for the City due to vandalism and litter, then maybe. I think most people will behave well if the guidelines are clear and reasonable.
- No. I don't think it should be necessary to charge more money just because you are consuming alcohol. I don't see the reason for that.
- No, it should be mainstream.
- Liquor should not be allowed in picnic spots, safety should be put first rather than revenue generation.
- Yes. \$3-5 more.
- No
- No
- No. I might as well put that money to buying alcohol I can consume after the park at my home
- No
- Nah it shouldn't be treated any differently

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
-
- No, there should be no cost associated with booking a picnic site that allows liquor consumption. I see a fee associated with liquor consumption as a barrier to accessibility. Allowing alcohol consumption should NOT be an exercise in privilege.
- Yes. A nominal fee would be fine. Maybe \$5-10 per booking
- Ya probably...
- No
- No. I don't think you should have to pay to bring your own liquor.
- No
- No, I refuse to pay to picnic anyway.
-
- No! Really?
- I would not book a place where they allow liquor
- No. Because everything is already so expensive and at that point many would rather drink and drive or hide it and it makes it more difficult
- I don't think those sites should cost more than the regular rental rate
- No
-
- Yes and no. No because you're just paying someone to drink somewhere. Kind of what we already do. If the fee was to include a "park drinking permit" then yes I would gladly pay. But not much more than \$5-\$10.
- No
- \$10, which is the cost of a liquor license for a private party in Alberta.
- Like 5 bucks
- Depends on the cost
- Yes.\$10
- No, I wouldn't pay to picnic. I'd go somewhere free.
- no
- Yes as it has added value. Should be all site allowed but with per use permit for extra
- No
- No, they should cost the same
- Yes!
- Yes \$10 more
- No
- Not a chance. 0.
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Not a whole lot, maybe \$10 max
- No it's public it should be free
- Of course you would ask this question because you want people to pay more. There's no reason for anyone to pay more unless the study shows that people are leaving a mess behind.
- No, why should one group of people that want to have a few alcoholic beverages be charged more than someone who does not?
- No. Some people are already consuming liquor and weed in parks, for free.
-
- Are the costs justifiable
- Yeah I guess. I'd prefer for it just to be allowed. If you charge too much people will just sneak it in. Extra \$5-\$10 max.
- I guess it would be a good idea to pay for recycling pick up.
- If it was for a birthday or celebration where people over the age of 18 will want to be drinking then of course I'll pay the extra price.
- No. Even if we have alcohol at our picnic we are still responsible for taking care of the site while we are there and cleaning up after. No one has to pay more to bring certain food items.
- No. I don't know why the city insists on gouging people for simple pleasures plus these picnic sites already cost an arm and a leg.
- Pricing should be the same for wet or dry.
- No
- Absolutely not. You can't charge people more for wanting to enjoy a beer with their picnic! This is just absolutely ridiculous.
- As much more as you charge people who smoke pot in open areas
-
- It shouldn't cost more
- Why should I have to pay more? Screw you.
- No, that should not come with a premium
- No. I don't see the reason as to why it would cost more
- NO! What's the point in charging more? I think we pay enough for the little things in life why add this to the list?
- No. Would not pay.
- No.
- No. Would sooner continue to drink illegally if there is more fees. If more cash needs to be generated, go after the people who break the rules, not the ones that are trying to follow them.
- I don't pay to use public facilities, like parks.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I don't think it's necessary to charge more. People should still be cleaning up after themselves, and not causing damage. If that happens there are already means in place to react. I don't think that would need to be increased.
- No
- Maybe, but not much more
- 0. It should be free.
- Yes, but not a lot more - just enough to differentiate and not encourage excessive drinking
- Would pay \$20-30 more
-
- Yes. \$10.
- No that is silly. Liquor is already heavily taxed.
- No
- No, I would not.
- Yes. \$30 more.
- No
- No
- Yes, but not sure what amount would be reasonable
- No
- I'd rather not pay more.
- Not much more, it should be allowed anyway.
- No, that's ridiculous.
- No
- Yes 20 bux
- No, that's just a money grab.
- No, should be the same price across the board.
- No. Letting people bring liquor to parks shouldnt mean extra costs. Not everyone who goes to the parks will consume liquor.
- No, I would expect to pay the same or less as I would imagine alcohol sites would be less clean and more rowdy.
- No
- no. if liquor consumption at picnic sites is permitted, there should be no bias/deterrent against those wanting to consume liquor.
- Nope
- Yes, but no more than \$10-15 per site for the allowance of liquor. Anything more and it's more cost effective to go to a bar.
- I thought they were free to the public, since we over pay for it.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes- but you should not have to. This should be city wide and in every park. If people are going to break the law they are probably already doing it
- yes. this would help to discourage some of the drunken behaviour
- yes
- \$10
- No.
- Only if it is transparently justified by empirical evidence suggesting that the site would incur more costs from allowing such sites. In which case, I would be willing to pay less than an amount proportional to their increase in cost.
- Yes
- No
- No
- No and nothing
- No. People aren't going to be charged more to consume non alcoholic beverages and food at these sites, which results in the same or similar risk for littering. It doesn't cost more to book a site that allows smoking, where cigarette butts are left.
- I've never booked an outdoor site so this doesn't apply to me
- no more than \$10 than a non liquor site
- Never. Booze already costs way to much.
- Yes, maybe 20 extra dollars
- no I don't think paying more is necessary.
- No. It seems ridiculous to be charged an additional fee when there are no additional costs associated with it.
- No.
- No, because the government should not charge a fee for something that should be free.
- Yes
-
- Yes \$5.
- yea, \$60
- Oh. Of course this question. "How can we profit from this?" Cool.
- No
- Nope, I would not pay more
- No - if you charge though you should make it \$150 to help policing, clean up and compliance issues
- No
- No
-
- Yes. Unsure of amount.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. It doesn't matter if it is not allowed. People that want to drink will do it anyway and just conceal the type of container it is being drunk out of
- Yes. Perhaps \$10-\$20?
- No
- No I wouldn't pay for any picnic site when I could go to a free one
- I'd be willing to pay more for one. I'd want the rate to be based on how many people are there. 50 bucks for 10 people maybe. 25 for 5.
- should be free
- Yes, perhaps \$10-\$20 extra
- No. Why should it cost more?
- No
- No
- No. Perhaps you should charge extra to the curmudgeons who want a non-liquor site. They can pay for the enforcement to keep the booze out.
- Yes. I'm not sure how much I would be willing to pay.
- no
- Yes, 10.00
- yes, an additional 20 dollars
- Yes. Not by much though
-
-
- No ill drink anyways
- No.
- no
- No. Very little. There is no reason for them to cost more
- No. People mostly do it anyways (not me)
- No. I will not book at picnic site. Period.
- No, we already pay enough in taxes, people will just do it anyways whether they pay or not
- Most likely not, unless under specific circumstances. If I were to pay only about 25% more at the max, otherwise I would go for the other sites.
-
- I would be OK with a refundable deposit charged on the space. I would keep the space very tidy and would leave it in good condition, so an additional fee doesn't seem fair to me.
- Absolutely, I would pay up to 20% more
- No. That is restrictive and not inclusive
- I would. However I think that all picnic tables should be booked for the same price
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
-
- Yes. I am unsure how much they cost currently but a slight increase would be ok.
- Unless it offers a fridge to keep the drinks warm I don't see why you would have to pay more
- Yes. About 50 percent more
- No
- No. There isn't anything additional that the city needs to do if people bring their own alcohol. If you ask people to pay more they are just going to book a cheaper site and disobey the no liquor rule.
- Yes.
-
- no, I shouldn't have to pay more to use the sight just because I want to have a beer.
- Nope, I wouldn't pay more. I'd just have the picnic on my living room floor where I can drink.
- 10 dollars
- Nothing more.
- Yes, easily \$15 more.
- Yes of course! Maybe \$10 more?
- NO
- NA
- No
- No... It should not be more expensive because you are allowed to drink alcohol...There is ABSOLUTELY NO REASON that it should be more expensive.
- Pay for public space? Might as well just sit on a patio and pay for over priced drinks
- 25
-
- YeS, I'd be willing to pay up to \$5-10 more.
-
-
- No.
- No. Don't understand why you would?
- Yes. I don't know the cost now, but I don't think another \$5 or \$10 would be unreasonable for the privilege.
- I don't see how more money to drink a beer would be necessary. It's not a restaurant and no one is opening the beer/cork. No service provided no need to increase price. People who litter beer cans/get intoxicated in a park are doing it regardless.
- NA, don't book picnic sites
- No, unless it was less than \$5
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Yes, if it were \$10 or less.
- No
- Nope. Already paying too much for the liquor
- No.
-
- Yes
- no
- No
- Possibly but wouldn't be willing to pay much more. \$15-20 max.
- no. I don't book picnic sites.
- No
- Perhaps a \$5 surcharge. Maximum.
- Yes. Maybe and extra 40-50bucks. It should just be like getting a liquor license. But it doesn't have to be extreme
- Yes, it's just like getting a liquor licence for an event
- Yes, about 5\$?
- I suppose if I was booking a large picnic spot I would pay a few \$ more. Maybe 5?
- no
- I would but probably only \$20 more
- No extra fees.
- No
- i don't think so. Think it should be more just specific places that have it or not.
- No, all sites should allow. Pricing can change if this policy increases costs.
- No.
- Yes. 10%
- Yes
- No- should be the same.
-
- Yes
- Likely not.
- I am not sure why a fee would be required for liquor consumption, when there would be no increased cost for the city. This would discourage people from following the new regulations.
- No I think it would be so unnecessary to make people pay extra to enjoy themselves. Total money grab.
- It should be the same price. You aren't providing anything more.
- N/A

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No
- No
-
- Perhaps
-
- no
- No
- Preferably not, but not more than \$15 I would think.
- \$10
- \$10
- No
- No.
- No
- Yes because I understand this would involve some increased cost to the city but not more than a 20% increase in fees
- No, why should you have to pay more for a site to drink liquor, your paying for your own liquor
- Possibly. and if i did it would not be much.
- No. I don't understand why I would have to pay more.
- No it should be the same as any picnic site.
-
- Yes, I'd pay more...up to \$25 for a permit; or make it \$5-10/person and each person needs to register for the permit
-
- No.
- Sure - that's a great idea. Like \$25 more??
- Yes. Unsure on amount
- no.
- No
- Possibly. Not more than 10 bucks? I actually don't know the current picnic booking rates...
- No
- Yes, not sure how much more... something that is less than the cost of the liquor itself.
- No, we pay enough for everything. "Allowing" consumption is not a reason to pay more.
- Yes I don't mind anything under 5\$ max would be 10
- Not unless there is a proven cost to allowing liquor consumption. A "cash grab" is never good.
- Yes up to \$25
- Yes. \$5

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. Honestly it shouldn't even be based on picnic sites. You should be able to go to any public space and have a drink or two within moderation.
- Yes but only a small amount more.
- No.
- No, why would you need to, Canada is one of very few countries that has such strict alcohol rules, its time for change and there should be no extra cost to the public to be able to enjoy alcohol outdoors. The rules are ridiculously outdated
- I don't understand why there would be a different cost.
- No
- No. That's ridiculous. Penalized for something the city will allow? Fines should you be unruly or messy is acceptable a fee is not.
- Sure, but I generally don't ever book for sites I need to pay for. But if I was organizing a gathering I would up to a 15% increase maybe.
- No
- Yes
- No
- No, increase city budget costs police more
- \$20
- No, the price should be the same as I do not see extra benefit/service required when liquor consumption is allowed.
- No
- No, people will sneak it either way if they really wan to.
- No
- No
- Yes \$25
- No
-
- no, that's ridiculous
- No.
- Sure, temporarily while the situation and costs are analyzed. Maybe \$5 or \$10
- no, why would i pay more, its the same site...don't try and gouge us for more money
- yes - \$10
- No, if I wanted to pay a preimum I'd host it.
- No
- No, I don't understand why you would need to charge more?. Citizens are providing their own alcohol so what need does the city have to charge more unless the strategy is to continue deturing people from consuming alcohol in parks.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Yes, perhaps \$10 more.
- no
- Depends on the location and occasion
- If I have to pay for it, I would not use it.
- No just no
- Yea 10% increase
- Yes, up to \$80 more
- No
- no
- Yes, however much
- No. Paying for such a simple freedom is a slope we should not expose our society to.
- I don't want to pay more, I just want it allowed. I probably wouldn't pay more.
-
- Nothing
- Yes, I don't know what the cost is to book as it stands now but \$20 or under seems reasonable.
-
- Yes, not a considerable amount more. You never used to have to pay for smoking vs non, and I do realize that alcohol alters your state of mind but cigarette smoke or second hand is more detrimental specifically to children and the public than booze
- I'd pay about 100 more on top of the cost.
- no
- No
- No
- No it should not matter as long as all parties involved are safe.
-
- 5 dollars CAD
- I don't know how much it costs to book now, but I'd pay \$10.
- I am totally against liquor consumption in the parks. If people feel that they must drink, then go to a bar.
- Not really
- Yes, \$3-\$5? I don't know.
-
- No extra cost.
- Up to 15% more
- No
- No! Don't be ridiculous.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- \$20
- No.
- No
-
- No
- Yes because then we dont need to just have a backyard picnic
- No. I would just book a normal site and hide the liquor like everyone is already doing.
- No
-
- No, I am definitely NOT WILLING to pay more.
- No. This should not serve as another cash grab. Plus this makes it prohibitive for low income Calgarians.
-
- Yes. I would be willing to pay up to about \$50 for additional insurance and liability for a large gathering, and \$20 for a small one.
- I feel like that would be unfair and prohibitive to lower income folks
- No. I do not think there should be an extra fee. Will there be a fee for people smoking marijuana???
- I wouldn't pay I'm against this! And even if I was ok with it I still wouldn't pay as I already am paying more then enough taxes!
- No. Its the same picnic bench as the other one!
- Yes
- I probably wouldn't book a picnic site regardless, but I can see people being willing to pay a bit more to be able to consume liquor at the site
- No.
- It depends what the extra cost is intended to cover. I'm not sure how much more I'd be willing to pay.
- Yes but I don't think it's fair to charge extra for a drinking picnic site. Parents don't have to pay more for having annoying screaming children sites.
- Possibly? I haven't thought about it.
- yes, 5\$
- No
- No
- Maybe \$5 but no more.
- Yes, however I would only pay more if the same policy applied to people that wanted to smoke, eat, or perform any other activity that was not already present in that park.
-
- No
- I would not be happy to pay more to drink my own liquor. Money grab.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No, for me it would defeat the purpose of the park as a free public space
- No
- Personally i would not be willing to pay more for booking a site that allows liquor.
- no
- No, why should I pay more. The facilities are the same regardless.
- I think charging extra would be unscrupulous. If the people are cleaning up after themselves as per usual, there is no need to take advantage of them by charging extra money. If more people book then the added use of the sites would bring in extra anyway
- I wouldn't want to pay more to book to allow liquor consumption. I think that is taking advantage of honest people, as we all know that many people already drink in park sites.
- Yes, within reason.
- I would be willing to pay a small amount more. Perhaps 10-20% of the original booking cost
- No idea how much picnic sites cost to book, but any nominal fee would be better than trying to get liquor license.
- No, not a drinker
-
- I've never booked a site and didn't know there was a cost at all. Maybe an additional \$5.
- No, I don't think there should be an added charged.
- No.
- Yes but only a nominal fee
- no. paying for something that does not actually add value is [removed]
- Yes, 10\$
- No.
-
- 0\$
- Yes. Maybe \$10-\$20.
- No, I feel they should all be equal.
- No
- No
- No
-
- Depending on what the pricing is
-
- No
- No
- Probably not. Should be allowed throughout.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- I would be willing to pay a minimal fee if I understood that it was going toward things like providing recycling bins in the area, etc.
-
- No
- 20
-
- If necessary. What would the collected fees be spent on? Maybe \$5, although \$0 would be much better.
-
- No
- No.
- No, I am not willing to pay more.
- No
- No. This would miss the point of loosening restrictions and waste bylaw officers time.
- No. No reason for an extra cost.
- Yes \$25
- Absolutely not just didn't cost any more money for one person to be there versus another person strictly on the business that are not drinking sounds a little ridiculous
- Most likely. 5-10 dollars more. However as a matter of principle, it should be free. If I am missing something, please let me know why there should be charge for this.
-
- No, that's ridiculous
- No there's no justification to charge more.
- No, drinking liquor is a choice and you shouldn't have to pay more just because you want to drink alcohol or not. That would be a complete money grab and negative actions would take place.
-
-
- No. I'll just bring my beer elsewhere.
- No, it's the same as any other site. All that's changed is the beverage. I'd be willing to donate the empties.
- No.
- Yes, and appropriate fee to ensure public safety and responsibility through security or law enforcement would be acceptable. As time passes this should become self regulating such as the right or privilege to use cannabis products.
- No
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- No
- Shouldn't have to pay more just let people enjoy them self's friends and family
- Yes. Depending on the event and number of people.
- no
- Depends on how much more. If it was equivalent cost to that of a liquor license, then yes, that's understandable.
- No, I don't think it's fair to make people pay more for the exact same space. Allowing liquor in parks wouldn't cost the City any more money, why increase costs?
- I'd pay 5 dollars per person who will be consuming alcohol
-
- Yes 25% more
- No
- no
- No
-
- Depends if Cannabis is allowed.
- No, and nothing.
-
- Yes, \$about 20 dollars
- No
- I would be will to pay a maximum of \$50
- yes no more then \$20
- No
- No. Free them all
- No. It's a park that I already pay enough city taxes to use! You get enough money from us already!!!
- Nope! Do we have to pay more because alcohol is allowed in restaurants? What about the movie theatres? Campsites? I don't think there should be an extra fee for picnic parks that allow liquor consumption
- No. Why there should be a price difference?
- Yes, I think a fair rate would be an additional \$10, as I believe that is the fee for a temporary liquor license for an event.
- Yes as long as it's reasonable between 10-20\$
- No.
- So i could have a glass of wine
- No. Why would it be more expensive? That's prejudice

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- no, another money grab by government for no reason
- No, please! There no extra costs for the city. Don't make it a cash grab thing.
- Yes. 50% more
- No.
- Yes, it would have to still be affordable
- I don't think that this should be necessary because it creates a tiered system where certain people are perhaps prevented from using the space due to cost; it also doesn't make sense because it shouldn't lead to more maintenance cost. But I'd pay \$5.
- No, that is not relevant, perhaps if a damage deposit was needed, and would be refunded when left in good condition. That would be fine.
- No. A fee should only be implemented if damage is done or waste is left behind.
- no
- Yes. \$20/more
-
-
- Nope.
- This should not be a money making initiative and I wouldn't pay. I would put it in a water bottle.
- \$10
- Yes, if that would be the only way to be able to drink. 5\$?
- No. All sites should allow it
- See above response.
- No
- Yes. I would be willing to pay \$15 more.
- Not really. Already paying money for my own liquor!
- No! That's discrimination
- Yes
- Hahahah. I never will give a dime to city unless required for admission to a facility or legally through legislative means.
- No, unless new services are provided and are clearly outlined (such as regular dedicated clean up crews) I wouldn't be willing to pay more for a picnic site. If the city does decide to charge extra it should be clearly outlined as to the reasoning.
- No
- I don't think the City should charge for this, unless there is a direct correlation between alcohol consumption in public and an increase in services/operation/maintenance costs.
-
-
- I think all of the sites should cost the same.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- Only \$5, or we will just sneak it in!
-
- Na
- No. There's no additional cost to the city - - unless cleanup is required, in which case the users who leave a mess should be fined appropriately.
- While I think it would be unreasonable to hike the price of a site if people are bringing their own drinks, I suppose I would be willing to pay a very slight amount more for this.
-
- Yes, i would be willing to pay a \$5-\$10 fee for a liquor site if needed.
- No
- no
- No
- Perhaps, i would only be willing to pay a small amount more.
- No
- Maybe. Not sure what they currently cost so I cant say what surcharge I'd consider reasonable.
- No
-
- No. Because how about stop adding a price tag to EVERYTHING. How about you take the empties and call it a day?
-
- No, they should all be the same price
- I don't think we need to charge people to drink in a park when it is a simple pleasure that all should be entitled to.
- No
- There should not be an increased price. Unless the city is providing new mini fridges and a local wine cellar.
- No
-
- Sure \$5-\$10
- No
- No
- No. What exactly would we be getting more of?
- Yes, I am unsure of the prices of booking currently.. but I believe an extra 10-15% would be worth it.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, I would be willing to lay up to double for the ability to have alcohol on site, this increase in booking cost would also contribute to park maintenance due to increased traffic and liquor licensing for potential small businesses.
- No
- No, why should you profit from this?
- No
- No, all sites must allow liquor consumption
- Nope
-
- Should not have to pay more. No damage deposit. If damage is incurred the person responsible will have already put forth their personal information and will be liable
-
- Why pay more?
- Yes \$20
-
- No
- No
- Yes, only a token amount.
- Seriously !! Is this about a tax grab ?
- Not too familiar with current rates but yes I would pay a reasonable amount more.
- Yes, not sure how much more. Maybe \$25?
-
- No
- No
- A small amount perhaps to keep degenerates from camping at a picnic site.
- No
- No, liquor is already expensive, don't make this a money making scheme
- No in all honesty. I think charging will end up in more fines as people will just sneak it in anyway.
- Ahhhh there it is . Looking to grab more money
- No
-
-
-
- No
- No - bowness is free now and should be free if liquor is allowed.
-
- No!

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes. \$20
- No. Why would I pay more? Is there an additional service being offered? What would the additional funds be used for?
-
- I would be willing to pay more. I do not know how much more . . . I would like to see a breakdown of additional costs that The City feels would be involved.
- Yes \$20
-
- Not sure that people would abide by this
- No
- Not more than \$5
- No. Liquor should not be in public spaces.
- No
- Sure, \$15-\$25 per site.
- Yes, I'd be willing to pay up to \$5.00 more
- Yes. A small surcharge - whatever it takes to cover clean-up if sites are not left clean.
-
-
- I think it should be free for a regular single picnic table. If it was for a larger group picnic site I would pay \$20 or what it would cost to get a liquor license.
- No.
- No.
- No
- no
- No if somebody wants to buy liquor then have picnic in a banquet hall
- Yes. \$5 to \$20 would be reasonable, depending on seasonal demand and other amenities at the site. I would expect to pay much more on long weekends like Canada day
- \$5 if I had to. I'd prefer not to pay more to responsibly enjoy myself.
- No, this should NOT be another tax grab by the city. The tables are there- do not charge extra.
- If that was the only option yes. Maybe 25 dollars.
- No
-
- No, not if it's going to cost extra.
-
- No.
- Yes, maybe 25% more.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Too hard to limit and police that
- No
-
- No
- I DON'T WANT TO PAY ANYTHING. THIS IS WHAT I PAY TAXES FOR.
- No. All picnic sites should allow responsible liquor consumption.
-
- Yes - maybe \$10 more
- No
- No parks should have alcohol.
- Yes- \$20
-
- Yes. I wouldn't want to pay much more.
- Yes, \$5 more
- No. We would conseal it.
- Yes, but also do not full understand why it needs to be more when the purchase of alcohol is already taxed at point of sale...
-
- Depends on cost
- No, that's unreasonable taxation on a very small difference in sites.
- I would pay 20% more.
- Sure why not as long as it's reasonable
- No
-
- \$350. If you do it charge so much that no one will book the sites
-
- N/A
-
- Yes, up to 30% of the cost of liquor.
- No. I've never paid to have a picnic somewhere
- 1.3 million
- No, I wouldn't pay more, and charging more for liquor consumption sends the wrong message, Canadians already pay enough taxes for alchohol, it would be a bad idea.
- No.
- no
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
-
- Unsure. I didn't know it cost \$ to book the sites at all.
- I guess so. Maybe 10\$ extra at most. It should be easily accessible to everyone who would like this.
- No.
- No, liquor sites and non should be same price.
- Yes,
- Do we pay to book sites now? That doesn't seem very Calgarian.
-
- No
- I'm not willing to pay for a picnic site to begin with.
- No
- It should not be about making a buck off of it make it free like our parks are.
- If Liquor becomes allowed for consumption at picnic areas, a charge 7 times the amount of regular price is a possibility. E.g. # of people 1-25 => $68.24 \times 7 = \$477.68$. Make the price high so that it does not become easily accessible to drink outside.
- Please just NO.
- No
- I think the price should be the same, as there isn't a reason that alcohol consumption needs to be stigmatized
- No
- Yes \$10
- No, why would that be needed?
- No
-
-
-
-
- Sure, I'd pay 5-10 dollars more a site
-
- Yes. \$10
- \$5 dollars more
- No
-
- Yes- a fair amount more
- No
-
- NO

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- no
- No, should be free why take money ?
- No
- Yes, I would pay a \$20 fee
- Yes, but not a huge amount. I am not sure how much the fees are now but I'd say not more than 10% more.
- No.
- No stop charging everyone for every little thing you can think of
- no, this should not cost money
-
- Yes - liquor fee proportional to size of site size possibly \$10
- No.
- Yes, but not a large amount. \$15-\$20
- I sure do NOT pay to go to a dirty picnic table in a public park
-
-
- Yes don't know how much. I don't know how much they are
- Maybe. To account for added clean up's and monitoring potentially. More port o potties needed
- No that's ridiculous. Now you are gouging, this is not a revenue generating opportunity
- Yeah sure, maybe 20-40\$ more.
- No.
- Yes. I think up to \$20-25 more.
- a little bit extra but not too much
- Yes. However, I don't believe that increased costs should be necessary as a picnic site allowing alcohol should not cost more to maintain than a picnic site where alcohol cannot be consumed.
- I have not booked a site in a long time, and do not have a frame for reference
- No. Should be free to consume.
- No
-
- No. Why the need to pay more or at all? Isn't part of the reason going to a park to picnic is that it's less expensive than going to a restaurant patio?
- Yes I would. I don't know how much the currently cost (see answer 4).
- \$5
- \$20
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- All should be allowed to have liquor. Making some legal and some not is more work for everyone and silly.
- Yes, \$5
-
-
- No, this is unnecessary, and should not be on the table
- No. This should not cost people more.
- No - there shouldn't be a penalty for liquor consumption. Particularly when there are no different amenities as those sites
- No. If there are liquor sites, I will NOT book at the same park.
- Nothing.
- Not at all. I will avoid to book such site
- no
- no.
- Yes, I don't have any idea as to why a picnic site costs so I couldn't give you an accurate guess as to how much I'd pay.
- No. Why does the city have to make money off of this. Please be reasonable
-
- I do not think an added fee should be necessary. I am also not aware of the current prices for booking a picnic site. I would pay \$5-\$10 more than whatever the non-alcohol booking is.
- No. I would not be willing to pay to book a picnic site.
- No
- No, I don't like to have picnic place with liquor options
- N/A - would not book a site.
-
- No
- No
- No, a price change would defeat the purpose of increasing traffic to the parks
- You should not have to pay more in order to consume a product you have already purchased. Also the Parks may get more bookings and generate more income as people see it as an actual option for social gatherings
-
- No, because they should all allow alcohol. Also because it won't stop people from drinking at non-open alcohol ones.
-
- It will limit my options to book in a liquor free spot unless the City plans to build many more.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes, but I think a increase in cost will just deter people to booking "liquor" site and drinking in "non-liquor" sites.
-
- No. People are hiding it now. People will still hide it if it means not paying as much to book a site.
- No
- Yes I would pay 30 dollars
- Yes, I suppose I would. I have no idea how much booking a picnic area is currently.
- Yes, probably not a huge deal more. In the range of like 5 additional dollars.
- This doesn't apply to me, because I wouldn't go there if liquor consumption was allowed on the site.
- There shouldn't be a price difference as all pinic sites should allow liquor consumption
- No
- Yes, \$10.
- No
- No - that's lame.
- No
- No I wont
- No
- Minorly- 5\$
- I think I would, only because there will always be people who abuse this privilege and leave costly messes behind that would inevitably cost money to clean up. I might suggest \$5.00-\$10.00
- Yes, if they are going to book a site with liquor then they should pay extra. Kind of like a liquor liscense, they can be held accountable for the liquor consumption of those attending their site.
- No, I would not want to pay more. There shouldn't be any additional costs to this proposed change, so it seems unfair to charge more.
- Yes, I would be willing to pay anything within reason; \$5-\$10 per person.
-
- no
- Yes, \$5-10
- Yes - up to \$5 more.
- I would pay more for use of the amenities that complement social gatherings that I would bring alcohol for. I would be willing to pay to use the barbecues, sheltered tables, gazebos, etc.
- I would not be willing to pay more. Maybe a buck or two more? Anything over that and I would just risk drinking elsewhere in the park and dealing with peace officers if it comes to that.
- No, we should not be penalized for wnating to have a drink with our BBQ/picnic.
- I would strongly prefer not to have to, but if a nominal fee were required, on the order of 10-15% of the cost of the site, then realistically I probably still would pay it.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I don't think it should cost any more
- no i wont
-
- No. What is the difference between the two sites? Seems arbitrary.
- No
- No
- Yes - I would pay \$5 extra.
-
- yes
-
-
- no
- yes, maybe \$5-10? Ideally the cost should be reflective of any social cost (enforcement, cleanup) for having it.
- No
- No
- I'd reverse this question - have people pay more to prohibit the way others can enjoy of a shared facility.
-
- No
- No
- maybe a bit more but we are still bringing said liquor.
- Not much, maybe a few dollars.
- No, I believe picnic sites should be free regardless.
- No. I do not support liquor consumption in public parks, so I will not pay more for the site that allows liquor consumption.
- No, do not want liquor
- Yes, 25-50% more
- Maybe \$25
- No. No need to increase fee unless it becomes apparent that more cleanup or maintenance is involved due to the liquor use.
- I don't agree that one should pay for using a picnic table in a public park.
- No - why should I?
- Yes, 5-10\$ more.
- No
- 1\$ bob
- I don't think what is consumed at the site should determine the price

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No
- I'm unsure. Possibly, but no more than \$5 for liquor vs no liquor.
- no why should the cost be different
- Yes a modest amount. \$5-10
- No. If I have to pay for it I just go to one that doesn't allow it and hide the consumption
- I don't think you should have to pay more. What would be the reason for the extra fee? So I guess my answer is no, I would not pay extra. That would be discriminating against a large group of people.
- No
- Yes
- Yes. I assume there will be a liquor license cost?
- Yes
- I would not be willing due to the fact I've already paid a fair share to get a picnic bench put up in Bowness Park on a late friends behalf but if I had to I would not mind paying upwards to about 20\$
- I don't think it should be more expensive as you are bringing your own alcohol already
- Yes, double.
- Is this really needed? I feel like the city already takes a lot of money.
- No, as I don't drink.
- No heck no should be free to consume
- no, absolutely not.
- Maybe only \$5 more.
- \$5, yes
- N/A
- Yes, a quarter of the price more
- \$5
- Yes, \$10.
- No - this would restrict being able to do this to those who can afford it.
- Not sure about that
- No I think they should all be priced the same because it does not cost the city anything extra to manage the sites that allow drinking.
- No
- No. I do not support public alcohol consumption.
- Yes , this fee would be applied to park maintenance costs
- If there is a marginal environmental charge, I wouldn't mind paying 10% more.
- Nope
- No!

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No if i have to pay to use a park that my tax dolars are paying to maintan then i will go elseware even if I have to go out of the city.
- No. There should be no charge for this.
- Yes
- No
- No
- no
- not applicable
- I wouldn't go to park which allow liquor
-
-
- N/a
- 100
- No.
- No.
- yes. Price can vary. no more than \$30 extra
- No
- No.
- Absolutely not. That's a joke.
-
- No, that is a silly idea.
- n/a
- Only a very small fee extra, if any. 5-10%
- No
- Only if there is logic behind charging more for those sites - where would that additional fee be going? Security?
- Yes
-
- Yes, 10% more
- 5\$
- No
-
-
- No
- Yes - \$25 dollars
- No
- No I would not , rather if some one gives me money to book that oak o wouldn't

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- N/A
- I may not spend more but it would incentivize people like me to book sites at all. As it stands I have never booked a picnic site in the city because unlike with alcohol I can bring a cooler of food anywhere in the park.
- NO. I will likely just conceal the alcohol and chance a fine in a park of my choice. I act responsibly when I drink alcohol. I will not book a site typically and I feel this should be allowed at all sites, even sites that don't require booking.
-
-
-
- No
- No
- No
-
-
- I wouldn't pay to use the outdoors. Typical city of calgary..
- No, because all picnic sites should allow liquor.
- No
- No it should be the same liquor already costs money
-
-
- Hell no, there are spaces for people to drink. It's called their backyard and any restaurant.
- No
-
- If it was forced yes, but I would be very annoyed about that. Restrictions are bad urban planning
-
- Yes. Having the option to consume liquor in parks is a good thing. I am not willing to pay any more for picnic sites. Many countries allow you to drink EVERYWHERE and they don't charge a thing as long as it's conducted safely and respectfully.
- Not at all. Why should we have to pay more just because the liquid we consume has alcohol in it?
- No.
- No
- Yes. \$20.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Nothing, picnic tables and sites should not be charged for in the first place. they are created and maintained by our current tax dollars and it should be part of our parks maintenace. User fees are unacceptable for such a small investment.
- Absolutely not.
-
- No, this should not cost more.
- You have to pay currently? I wouldn't pay for one regardless of liquor laws.
- No
- No
- No
- No.
- Why should it cost more? Unless you can provide a defined benefit, no I wouldn't pay more.
- Would be willing to pay a small amount more.No concerns.
-
- No
- Wouldn't necessarily pay more.
- No
- no
- No, it should not cost more
- Sure
- No. No way to monitor this.
- Yes, only by a few dollars.
-
- Yes 20\$
- no
- No
- Yes, \$10
- Not willing to pay more
- No. Besides creating an additional small revenue stream for the city, paying for a liquor friendly picnic site would serve no clear purpose.
- Yes. Few extra dollars is worth it
- No.
- yes - there is an assumption of possible extra damage - broken glass , etc so it is user pay
-
- no
- \$10 more than the existing fee
- Yes

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No I would not pay more.
-
- No, that seems silly and difficult to enforce
- No.
- Yes probably 200
- No it should not be another City money grab.
- No
- No, should be the same.
-
- If coerced by arbitrary laws to pay more, I would probably do so, but I would want to know why I was expected to pay more for a privilege I enjoy elsewhere.
-
- No. That's unfair. Make them all legal. It costs you nothing more to police it.
- Nope.
- Yes, \$10.
- I would not pay for a picnic site.
- No because that is just a benefit for the rich.
- No
- No, don't nickle and dime people
- No! I pay taxes for that.
- No
- No. Liquor should be allowed everywhere and shouldn't have a cost associated with it
- No
- Not sure how much booking costs but I would pay a bit more
- No, there shouldn't need to be any extra costs associated with people having liquor in parks assuming there are already recycling cans nearby. Enforcement should continue as it has and the additional collected bottles will create some revenue.
- Not a lot, nothing is topping the consumption anyways
- No, why should we have to pay to drink alcohol
- no
- Yes, enough to cover costs if extra clean up is required as a result of people leaving empty's.
-
-
-
-
- No. I think if you're going to segregate drinking and non drinking you should make the non drinking sites more expensive.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- No, I wouldn't.
- Not really, because you either allow it or you don't
- No. Either allow it or don't. Do not use this as an opportunity to fleece calgarian for more, when we are already working with less while you increased fees and taxes on EVERYTHING!
- No.
- No we pay enough in taxes to cover this.
-
- No it shouldn't cost anything. There's no reason or additional cost to the city.
- I don't agree with liquor consumption in public parks so this does not apply to me.
- No ... because I will still have my wine decanted into a swell type bottle to keep it chilled
- No, public liquor consumption should not cost any extra.
- No
-
- No.
- No
- Yes, 5\$
- No - all sites should be the same
- Yes, \$5
- No
-
- 5 dollars
- no
- No
- No, I don't understand why there would be a cost associated with this. I am bringing my own liquor, cleaning up after myself, and quietly minding my own business. I am not costing the City in the doing, so it seems like gouging to charge for this.
- no, the rates should be the same as with or without liquor consumption the service provided by the city does not change
-
- No, this should not cost any extra money
- No
- sure. but not much.
- No. I don't think it's fair to charge more as there is no additional impact of liquor versus non liquor bookings. It's not fair to penalize citizens who want to enjoy responsible liquor consumption with their picnics.
- No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, again you're creating a licensing system for keggers in the park, which will obviously not go well. There simply needs to be the freedom to consume in public, stop turning everything into a cash-grab and let people squeeze a bit of joy from life.
- Yes, \$20-\$30
- No
- The site should have a flat fee, without increase for alcohol. This would reduce people's desire to be deceptive in efforts to save cost. Expectations should be outlined clearly, if there are concerns during the pilot a fee could be considered
- No. Because that's just a money grab. It should be allowed at all parks and sites.
- No.
- If the price isn't substantially higher than a non-liquor site, I would.
- No
- Yes, a small amount more.
- You have no legal mandate to charge me money to engage in a legal behaviour.
- Yes. \$5. Why should there be an extra cost however?
- No, why should a site that allows liquor consumption be more expensive, that is nonsensical.
-
- Yes, rather than drinking it in concealed containers. \$10
- Yes \$10
- no
-
- No. They should all allow it.
- No, I believe liquor should be allowed in all parks, regardless of bookings.
- No.
- No. You shouldn't charge to be able to drink at one. All that will do is cause people to sneak their drinks everywhere else
- This is dumb.
- No
- yes, maybe \$75
-
- No
- Yes. Maybe 15-20%
- No
- No. Don't be stupid. I'll just book a "non-alcoholic" site and drink out of a koozie or something similar
- No.
- Yes
- This would depend on the circumstances of the license

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Nope, city parks should be public spaces without fees
- Not really, they should be equal
- No. Public spaces should be equally accessible by all ratepayers, regardless of income.
- No.
- No
- No. That is a really low cash grab. All other rules apply, so there is no real additional risk to the City. People can always drink illegally and that is the sort of behavior that will cause trouble, not legal consumption.
- Nope. What you want is a campground not a public day use site.
- No. Government shouldn't use liquor in parks as yet another tax grab.
- I probably would pay extra for the site if I wanted to have or serve alcohol at the site. Though I would find it frustrating. I would wonder what this fee is supposed to be paying for. Why would you have to pay for the right to have a beer?
- No, it shouldnt cost more.
- No
- No, I'm not willing to pay for picnic site use with or without alcohol.
- Yes, not sure what the cost is right now.
- No.
- People should pay more to be able to drink alcohol at a picnic site.
- I do not think you should have to pay more for a basic human freedom
- Depends on how much more. An extra \$5 would be fair.
- No
- No
- No! We already pay taxes
- No. All should allow it.
- No
- no - all sites should be the same price
- No
-
- No
-
- No
- Sure. \$10? I have no idea how much/if it costs anything now. That being said, I'd prefer to pay nothing, who wouldn't?
- Who "books" picnic sites?? Seriously?? PAY!!?? WTF kind of picnics does the person writing these questions go to???
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, that is just a money grab for the city coffers
-
- No
-
- no. they should be the same.
-
- i'm not sure why once that allows liquor would be more expensive. If i remove my garbage and recyclables there shouldn't be a difference.
- Yes. \$20
- No fee
- No, parks are paid for by taxes
- No - I don't understand why allowing alcohol would require an increase in a fee.
- No
-
- No - and revenue generation should not be a driver for this
-
- No
- Yes, but probably not a lot. A few dollars.
- no.
- No!
- No
- Let people pay the same.
-
- No, I think you should charge if the group wants to guarantee they don't want to be around legal consumption.
- What ? Why. No.
- No, it should be everywhere the same
- No. I'll drink at the regular sites. I do not litter or get drunk and is no different than drinking g a soda.
-
- No. Shouldn't cost more
-
- No
-
- No
- No, the right to enjoy alcohol safely in public should not have a charge associated.
- No
- Not really, it can be concealed for free, it's more of an convenience than a anything

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, I feel like it's not really important to me if I get to consume liquor there or not. I can always do it at home instead.
-
- No. Why pay when you could go to any normal picnic site and conceal it.
-
- No. This adds no cost to the facility. Why should it cost more?
- A small fee more. Nothing to substantial.
- None
- No. Allowing liquor doesn't make you more or less likely to leave trash everywhere, given we see that now.
- I wouldn't, but that's because I wouldn't book one. I do think that's a good idea to distinguish between the sites, however.
- Maybe, but they should be available at all picnic sites.
- No. I don't want to book a site and pay more. I just want freedom.
- No, but I'll let the city keep the empties.
- Yes
- No, attempting to collect a premium for liquor consumption in parks is counter to any public goodwill generated by loosening restrictions.
- No.
- No
- No.
- No, you are told to clean up after yourself regardless of alcohol or not so there should be no additional charge for something we are bringing and cleaning up after.
-
- No. No added cost to for the City to extend the permit to include alcohol consumption
- No, I don't see why renting the same space should cost more depending on my activity in said space
- I think all sites should allow it, and there shouldn't be a cost.
- No
- No
- No
-
- No I wouldn't be willing to pay more
- No. If you don't have to pay for food which produces a similar amount of waste you shouldn't have to pay for alcohol.
- Yes. \$20-\$50 depending on the location.
-
- No. There should be absolutely no difference in price

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- 10
- No. I believe there should be no extra cost for this.
-
- No
- Why is that even necessary? The only relevant cost with alcohol is the garbage disposal, which already exists with food. Don't try to charge us BS fees.
- Yes. Maybe 30% more
- No, Dont be silly. I already paid too much for the liquor.
- Not at all
-
- No
- No, should be allowed at all sites, so therefore no justification for more fees
- No
- No. Why would I pay more to provide my own liquor?
- yes
- No. Charging more is a ridiculous idea.
- No. Either it's allowed or not
- No
- Yes. 5\$ more
- No
- Probably, but it seems ridiculous. All sites should allow it.
- Sure, maybe 20% more.
- No
- Yes, \$20
-
- I do not want liquor consumption picnic areas.
- No. If it's deemed acceptable why would you charge people more. You don't charge more to smoke or to eat, drinking shouldn't have a charge
- Meh..
- No because I wouldn't drink at a picnic site, I drink around the campground fire when out camping but I am not driving anywhere after.
- No, why penalize drinkers
- \$5-10
- You parasites! Read my answer to question 3
-
- Yes, especially if we're having a bbq or get together.
- No, because every picnic site should allow liquor consumption.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, I don't drink and my family members as well.
- Yes, 20% more
-
- No, adults should be able to responsible consume beverages of their choice anywhere.
- Less than \$5
- No - all or nothing
- Yes, but why should I have to pay extra?
- No
- No, unless it had upgraded facilities. Would you charge more if someone wanted to drink a pop? No. So why more for alcohol?!
- No
- I don't think a site allowing liquor should cost more. Does one that allows smoking cost more?
- I would pay an additional \$10-50
- N/A
- No pay no increase other than to cover increll
- No, I would not pay. I already pay enough in taxes and liquor is over priced as it, realistically those who wouldn't respect the park likely wouldn't book a picnic site anyways.
- No, it should cost the same...
- no
-
- I definitely would NOT be willing to pay more to book a picnic site that allows liquor.
-
- Probably not..
- Yes, \$5 of the duration of the booking.
- No
-
-
- Why do you have to pay to book a picnic site????
-
- No. You can't charge people to use a park.
- I think 50% more than the current charge would be reasonable, possibly using that money to subsidize the non alcohol sites/bookings, or to cover the costs of increase bylaw/CPS presence
- I would as long as its reasonable, personally I don't think we should have to pay extra because either way we have to clean the place the same whether alcohol is involved or not. So it doesn't seem fair
-
- This seems like a money grab for parks/government.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- Yes \$5 maybe !
- No
- No, that's ridiculous.
- I'm not sure how much a regular campsite is to book, however I'd be willing to pay extra if the money is going towards extra security personnel or police presence, not just in the city's pocket for no real reason.
-
- Yes 10 dollars more
- I don't know how much it costs now. And I don't think people should be charged more.
- I've never booked a picnic site, and probably wouldn't in the future, so I can't answer this.
- I don't think I should have to pay more however If a park worker has to spend time to clean up a mess of bottles and cans I think this cost should be past back to the person who booked the picnic site.
- No.
- I don't think there should be additional costs associated with this.
- Absolutely not.
-
- No. Should be the same cost
- No
- Yes.
- No.
- Yes but next to nothing more as I would expect all park spaces to allow alcohol
- Yes, because it would make people think about if they really needed one with liquor. No idea what the cost should be at at tho.
-
- No
- No, because I would just drink there if it was illegal anyways
- No, why would I?
- NO, just get rid of the old laws about public consumption in general. Don't turn this into another tax grab.
- No, there should be no extra cost to booking a site that permits alcohol.
- Yes - same price as liquor license cost.
- No.
- NO
- No
- No people will do it anyway

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Yes but only moderately more \$10
-
- No
- Yes, for a liquor license I would pay \$25 for 4 hours.
- Pay? What the actual [removed]. You're kidding right? In a public park? Get a grip. Seriously.
- we don't book sites, prefer to take our chances, never have a large enough group to worry about booking
-
-
- there should not be a cost difference as all sites should allow it
- No.
- I would be be will to pay more. No idea what I feel is fair but ideally it wouldn't be much.
- I don't think it is necessary. People still should be fined for disorderly behaviour or not cleaning up after themselves.
- I believe charging extra to book for liquor vs not is a mistake as it will encourage people to drink to excess to get the most value out of their booking. If you keep it the same people will probably drink more casually
- Likely yes. I would be willing to pay more so long as that money went back into the parks system. I would estimate my willingness at \$10 per person.
- Yes \$50
- No.
- No.
- No
-
- Shouldn't have to pay more. All sites should be allowed. It would encourage use of outdoor facilities.
- no
- \$25 for the right to consume a drink or two seems fair.
-
- No
- No
- Yes, price I would be willing to pay depends on occasion, location, etc.
-
- No
- Why should we have to? Don't try to gouge.
- No
- Yes

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Paying money does not erase the risks to family, others using the parks, or the danger to the public following the drinking.
- Not sure.
-
- Yes \$30 max
- Only if paying more resulted in additional resources being used to keep the space clean and enforce the behaviour of people drinking.
- No, facilities already exist for recycling, I don't believe any extra costs would be incurred
- No
- Yes. Maybe \$5? It shouldn't be a crazy amount, however I wouldn't be against paying a bit extra for it. Only issue is what's enforcement?
- No I would not
- Shouldn't have to pay.
- Yes as long as it is reasonable and they don't gouge so families can still enjoy a small fee should be sufficient
- No, it should be based off the amount of time booked.
- No
- Is be willing to pay \$3 more
-
- Nope, but have recycling bins near by and reminded sugns to clean up after yourselves (that includes non-alcohol sites too).
- I don't agree with having to pay for a public picnic site and would not pay. If that was my only option I would rather stay at home and not enjoy the beauties of our city, which is quite unfortunate.
- Again - it depends on the guests as I personally don't drink. 25%
- No. Why would it cost more? Stop making everything in this city so expensive by inventing imaginary fees.
- Maybe.
- Sure
- No, why?
- No. If so like \$1.
- No
- No. I don't want this to become a revenue generation item for the government. Want less regulation and taxation, not more.
- No
- Yes a bit
- Yes, moderately though because I think it's unfair to charge in the first place. Provinces like Quebec have been able to successfully accomodate this for free for their residents.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I'm not sure if I would be willing to pay more. Maybe only a couple more dollars
- No. To be honest I'd probably do it anyway. I'm not drinking from a paper bag full of Jack Daniels. I'll have a beer or wine with lunch from a coffee mug if it's illegal.
- Yes I guess so but really?!?! No red tape please.
- Depends. Legalize it everywhere so the communities with parks where it is allowed don't feel an unfair burden.
- No
- No
- Not willing to pay more.
- Yes. But why would citizens pay more for the same site? What are the reasons for charging more money for a site?
- No. There is no reason it should cost more
-
- No. It shouldn't be something used as leverage or seen as something worth more money. Let people choose whether to drink or not.
- I do not want to pay more
-
- This sounds misguided. If the City determines public consumption is acceptable, an added fee or cost would only marginalize the poorest of Calgarians.
- No. They should all allow alcohol.
-
- No
-
-
- No, I'm not going to pay to drink my own beer/wine outside. That's dumb. Don't charge for this.
- No. People are already drinking. This just means it's not hidden and doesn't have the problems that come with it being a hidden activity.
- No.
- Yes
- No.
- No. This should not be a cash grab. Stick to overcharging us on our taxes.
- Yes - but this should be included in the risk management fee. Maybe increase the incorporated fee to \$10-20 for liquor allowed sites.
- No, there's no increased costs with a can of beer rather than a can of Pepsi, so increasing the fees would be absurd.
- \$5
- Yes - I would pay a few dollars more

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- If it's just a small gathering of say 5 or less I would not want to pay more. A large group I could understand.
- No
- No
- Yes, would pay up to double.
- Definately not. It's hard to justify paying for what would normally be a free space just so people could have a beer that they brought. May as well have people over at home where they can drink outside for free.
- No
-
- no
- Yes, approximately \$10 more.
- No
- Yes, I would pay more. I think the additional cost could be a percentage of the current picnic booking price that way it scales based on the amount of people attending.
-
- Yes.
- It shouldn't cost more
- No. Putting a financial penalty on people because liquor is "allowed" is useless. People are going to drink no matter what the law is.
- No, this creates split expectations and makes it way too ambiguous to enforce.
- No
- No.
- None it should be free. It should be a basic right to consume liquor, safely in a park
- No
- No.
- No, I don't understand why there would be an increased cost. Currently the liquor prohibition in city parks has to be enforced, what would the increased cost go towards? There must already be a budget line for park patrols,
-
-
- No
- I would if I really have to, but I don't see a reason why people have to pay in the first place. Fine people if they make a mess, but charging people to drink in parks will only encourage them to hide it like they do now
- No.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

-
- No
- No
- No.
- No there shouldn't be a charge... Calgary will never be a world class city with so many restrictions and costs associated with just living and enjoying life. We already pay an arm and a leg for alcohol in this country.
-
- No
- Yes, perhaps \$10 more.
- Yes, however much
- No, all parks should be completely open to liquor and other alcoholic drinks and there should not be a segregation of people that are able to access liquor sites.
- yes
- No, it should not require an extra cost. There should be no reason for pay more for a site that already exists. What marginal costs would be associated with open liquor?
- No.
- No.
- You shouldn't have to pay more but lost would. Probably \$20
-
- No
- No.
- No, I fail to see the rationale behind charging people for this, when in reality cannabis would never be charged this way.
- No. Don't believe costs sotos change materially. I'd probably bring drinks discretely regardless.
- No. The city already takes too much of my money, and I get nothing in return. Allowing liquor would INCREASE revenue as more people who be using the sites (instead of drinking in their back yards). Why tax people who want to actually use the service?
-
- I would prefer to book one that allows liquor consumption, but I would not want to pay more for that. What would the point of an extra fee be? If there is a clear rationale for an extra fee, then perhaps -- but it is not clear to me why it is necessary.
- Yes - not much more, perhaps 10-15% more
- N/A
- No.
- No
- I don't think it is necessary to charge people to drink in a public park.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, because again not only limited to picnic sites
- No.
- Yes, depends, likely a nominal amount.
- I see no need to pay for a public site
- No.
- No
-
- no
- No
- No.
- Yes. \$10.50 - that is the same price of purchasing a liquor selling/consumption license. I would like to see picnic sites being regulated this way in having someone book a site and paying for a liquor consumption license.
-
- No
-
- No
- no
- No.
-
- No, I already pay taxes for the public parks. Why should I have to pay more just because I want a beer with my meal?
- Yes, 10% more
- No, why should it cost more to drink liquor in a park?
- No keep the price the same.
-
-
- Yes, \$50
- No
- Yes \$10.00
- Yes. \$20
- No
-
- no
-
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- I would be willing to pay a small amount more to be in the form of a license (like a special event liquor license) of no more than \$20 extra
- Absolutely not
- \$10
- No - I already pay enough taxes. Police already police the parks anyway.
- No
-
- No. It should be allowed. Paying a fee doesn't change behaviour.
-
-
-
- No
- No
- No, why turn this into a cash grab? Oh right.
- No I would not. It should just be aloud
- All picnic sites should allow liquor, and it should be the same cost.
- No
- Too me, that sounds like an unreasonable charge. If it was required due to an increase in cleanup costs I could maybe understand. However, that additional revenue of recycling would likey cover the costs associated.
- No.
-
- No.
-
- \$20 or less
- I would pay and I think that \$20-\$30 is fair.
- Yes.
- no
- I do think if liquor is going to be allowed in the parks, there should be a cost associate. It will increase a greater demand on police and first responders.
- I've never paid for a picnic table before...
- No, there isn't a reason for it to cost more, that's just a pointless upcharge for nothing, people will book the cheaper and drink anyways
- NO. It does not cost the city anymore for permit!
- No. Consumption does not require additional fee increase.
- No
- maybe by a few dollars no more the 5-10\$

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- NO
- No, I don't book picnic sites normally
- No
-
- Yes \$5 more
- No
- No
- I would not use this service. Alternative to higher fee: a damage/garbage deposit (with leave it as you found it photos of the picnic site)?
- No. Why would it cost more?
- No. I'm not interested in paying extra for a freedom that is enjoyed without consequence in many places of the world.
- No. Why should you discriminate or create a cash cow situation on the desire to consume alcohol.
-
- No, picnic sites are already expensive enough.
- No
- I would not like picnic sites to cost more if they allow liquor consumption. This will result in people who would already drink responsibly having to pay a premium to do so, and those who would not, feeling entitled to behaving irresponsibly.
- No
- No. That's silly. People need to be responsible and clean up after themselves and not be drunk in public.
- no
- No
- No
- yes \$5
- No because there would be no reason to have an increased price.
- Taxes are taxes. Do collect them.
-
- Shouldn't have to pay to have a picnic.
- No. All sites should be equally allowed liquor
- Paying seems to be a discriminatory practice as well as a waste of city resources
- No
- Yes, I would be willing to pay an extra fee of a reasonable amount or a deposit that would be refunded after leaving if area was left clean and nothing was damaged.
- no, allow consumption at all locations.
- You have to pay to book a picnic site in a city park?

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No.
- No
- Do we pay now to book a site? Should be same price.
- No
- No
- Absolutely not! Punishment before I do anything wrong? No.
- No
-
- Yes. \$10
- n/a
- No because that is just a petty money grab it won't cost more. It is the SmE picnic site it was before.
- I think its should be more to book if you are going to have liquor as this will help off set the cost of any additional maintenance due to the few that may become disorderly and not respect the property.
- No
- Potentially a little bit more.
- No. I don't think so. I don't understand the rational to have an increased cost. People who drink and disturb now, would be the same as the one who disturb now. And I don't think they would pay anything for this service
- Probably not.
- No. This would just encourage individuals to break the law
- No!
-
- Absolutely not.
- Sure, if it's reasonable.
- Yes. Not sure how much more.
- No, All picnic sites should allow responsible consumption.
-
- No
- No.
-
-
- Not really interested in paying more however yes I would pay if that was to allow liquor
- Yes, \$5
- Lol, I wouldn't pay for the privilege of sitting at a table in a park. Is that currently a thing? I've sat and picniced (is that the correct spelling?) and never booked.
- No, wine costs money already, so I won't want the price
- Sure. \$5-10 max.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- not very much more
- Absolutely not and what a silly and money grubbing idea
- No. Money grab
- Yes. \$25
- Yes
- 5\$ per group booking
- No. There should not be a fee associated with it.
- I do not support a fee for that option
- No
- No i would just drink there with out paying.
- Yes, \$20 more to help with additional issue that will arise from those that will abuse it
- Under 10 dollars
- No
- Why would there be an extra cost?
- No. Don't weasel a tax into this you hack fraud.
- No. I would probably secretly drink at the no alcohol ones and play dumb.
-
- You should not have to pay for a picnic site nature is free enjoy it
- No
- No, don't be absurd. It costs no more to manage/maintain such sites, so why punish people for wanting wine with their lunch?
- No
- Yes
- It's unclear to me why it would be more expensive as I would be supplying the liquor myself. I would however be willing to pay more if there was going to be security walking around making sure things are going smoothly within the areas of alcohol consumption
- no, while enforcement is necessary, there should not be separate areas for booze consumption, let the public mix and hold each other accountable. naturally people will behave better if kids are at the next table.
- No
-
- No
- Yes, but I have never paid to book a picnic site so I'm not aware of the costs. A few dollars more per person?
- No
- This isn't the right place to add in a pay service. That is simply gouging people. Please do not consider this option, we have to pay enough fees already.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No. I do not think the cost should increase because of liquor consumption.
-
- No
- Maybe. Not much.
-
- No. I don't believe in taxing alcohol use or requiring a permit for it. If you're going to allow it, just allow it.
- No I wouldn't be willing to pay more, I would likely just book one that doesn't allow liquor and use alcohol quietly.
- No.
- No I would not.
- A little more seems reasonable
-
- Yes
- No. It should be the exact same price.
- 20\$
- Yes up too 10 dollars
- No. Leave a recycling bin at the picnic sites and use the funds recovered from bottle/can recycling. There should be no difference in use or impact to picnic sites whether or not alcohol is permitted.
- No
- I would prefer this priviledge to be free of charge. However,I think \$10 would be a fair price to charge
- No
- Potentially
- Probably not. Like I said, those who want to drink in a park are going to anyway. Charging more is redundant and kind of ridiculous. There's always a way to circumvent silly restrictions like that. Extra fees solve nothing.
- N/A
-
-
- No because I feel that you shouldn't have to pay to drink liquor, other than the cost of the liquor itself
- NO!
- No
- no
- Yes I would. I would be willing to pay up to the price of what I'd get charged for drinks and service at an outdoor patio/ bar writhin the city. After that, there's no point, I'm not saving any money.
- Maybe \$5
- No. It should be the same rate regardless.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Not really. I wouldn't want to pay for something I feel has no extra costs associated on the city's part. If you told me where the money was going (ie.\$3 fee to add more bottle recycling bins in parks) then I would happily pay it.
- No, None
-
- No
- I don't really see why it should cost more, so no I think that would be a weird rule.
- Absolutely not, that's insane
-
- No.
- No
- No
- NO
- NO
- yes. I don't think they should cost more. why would it cost more?
- I would only be willing to pay \$5 more.
- Yes I do not think it should cost any difference.
- 10% more.
- No
- No.
- No.
- Yes
- No.
- Yes. Maybe \$50?
- NO
- Not a chance!
- No.
- No way.
- No, that's a really dumb idea.
- No.
- No I would not
- No more charges, this is very bad
- No
- Yep. 25%
- No I would not
- No
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Yes
- No. If I had to pay more, I would just go to a bar and get a large selection and service.
- not applicable
- No.
- ~ 50% extra
- No
- No. That's ridiculous to charge more for what people bring in their picnic baskets.
- No
- No, as it should be treated equally. No one is charged more or less because of their food choices.
- No. And if this goes through there should be a discount if you are booking a site that does not allow it.
- No.
- i dunno man, maybe. depends on the broads at said park
-
- No. There should not be a reason to charge more.
-
-
-
- No
-
- No
- No. How does the city plan to justify an additional fee when the services provided are the same? Charging for liquor consumption would be a most blatant cash grab and an outrage to citizen empowerment.
- I think having fees for liquor consumption at a picnic site should involve permits and be an exception (such as a wedding reception) rather than a rule.
-
- I don't believe picnic site costs should increase on the bases of whether alcohol is permitted or not. All picnic sites, regardless of whether liquor is allowed or not should be the same price.
- I think it's unfair to charge more. I also think specifically designated areas for liquor consumption is overkill and over complication of a simple situation. Let's follow in Quebec's footsteps.
-
- I don't wanna pay for my right jf drinking what I want to drink
- No
- No.
- No.
- Yes, \$15

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No
- Yes, significantly more. Instead of a \$68.24 fee, I would easily spend \$100.
- \$5
- Yes, \$5 to \$10 per adult
- Yes - undecided on amount - 150?
- Yes, I'd be willing to pay up to around 10% - 15% more.
- Money is not the issue it is the safety and bad behaviour
- Sure, maybe 10% more?
- Not sure there's a need to charge more for a site that allows liquor.
- Yes - It should be a premium as more tax dollars will be needed to monitor the sites
- Yes I would pay a premium if it was reasonable.
- Perhaps. Maybe 10 - 15% more but i do not know how much it costs to book a site. It still needs to be reasonable.
- No.
- No
- It's always about the money....
- No
- Good grief. Now it's a money grab.
- no
- No
- No.
- no
- no
- No.
- No, should be free use
- No.
- Yes, 10 dollars maximum.
- no.
- No
- No. I don't understand why lifting a ban would cost more money. It is unbelievable that an increased cost is even suggested.
-
- No
- No. And we shouldn't have to pay anything to book picnic sites at all. Just another tax grab.
- No
- Yes I would, up to about \$25.
-

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- n/a
- Um, possibly, but if it was more than \$10 I would just picnic in my own backyard.
- No, I don't see why there needs to be a price difference just because someone might have a beer instead of a Coke.
- Yes, 50% more
- I wouldn't but this might be a way to manage it.
- Yes ... probably \$10.00 ... but it would be a huge task to manage all these costs and to ensure that no one has taken someone else's table. I feel really there should be no extra cost. It should be first come first served for the picnic tables.
- No
- No
- No. There should be no difference in cost. That is ridiculous. This shouldn't turn into a scenario where you are allowed to do certain things based on how much you can pay.
- Only a deposit to make sure nothing is damaged or destroyed.
- yes, but not much more
- yes. \$10 more
- no
- Yes, like a liquor license
- No opinion
- Yes, within 50% of the cost of the base price
- No
- yes - an extra fee is reasonable (not sure if it a per-person fee, or a extra group fee is best).
- sure
- No, I don't think it's appropriate to tax activities of any kind. It should be equally accessible to all Citizens
- NO, THE FACT YOU CAN HAVE A DRINK AT THE SITE SHOULD NOT DETERMINE THE COST OF THE SITE.
- Why would you have to pay more? That's just means there a double standard when the law has already granted the permission to do it. What else are you going to want to gain from the taxpayers don't we already pay enough? Now you want to charge more.
- No
- No, this is absurd. Look at Europe and how they do it. Having to pay more is just going to push people away and they will continue to drink in the parks and not pay.
- Yes
- No
-
- Definitely No

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- A small fee. \$10-\$15.00
- No I think there's no need for increased fees
- No
- No I would not pay more - that is a complete rip off.
- No, do you have to pay more for a BBQ site vs. no BBQ?
- Yes, maybe 5010%
- no
- No. Why should I pay? Where would the money charge go?
-
- No.
- No, what a person consumes shouldnt dictate the rate paid.
- Yes, if the participants of my event wanted to have that as an option. Price would depend on the number of people attending. Average small gathering of a couple family would be under 50 people. \$50 to 100 would be fair in my opinion
- No. That's a cash grab. No need for it to cost more there is no corollary increase in cost to City for liquor consumption site vs. Non consumption sites. Absolutely no.
- No
- A nominal additional fee would be acceptable for sites with bbqs and/or tables, to provide for better upkeep and maintenance.
- No.
- No, I don't drink much, so don't care.
- This is not a good idea.
-
- I would, but only if its marginally more.
- No
- Not a chance
- I'm not willing to pay more
- No
- No
- No
- Yes. 5\$
- No
- Absolutely not, that is absurd.
-
- No
- No
- Definitely not.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- Sure. Not a whole lot more - maybe \$10
- Yes, \$25+
- No- should be same price and all sites should allow it.
- No.
-
-
- Slightly more. Approximately \$5 or less
- No. Liquor consumption is already happening in parks in concealing drinking containers. Decriminalizing this behaviour will lead to happier citizens.
- Ugh, I guess so but would like to understand why it'd cost more?
- no
- No I think it's pretty ridiculous to ask me to pay "cover" for the vip service of acting as if I am 18+. I've already paid to be here and paid for all my food and beverage as well as gas to get here and paid tax on that all I, believe me I know I'm 18+.
- No, that's like imposing another tax on an already overtaxed population.
- In my humble opinion, there should be no difference.
- I suppose I would but I don't believe that's necessary or appropriate
- No.
- NO
- place with alcohol
-
-
- I don't know.
- No, I don't believe it is fair or ethical to charge more for the opportunity to drink my own purchased alcohol. I would probably just book the regular site and use a coozie to conceal my beer/wine.
- Yes, this is a good option to minimize possible abuse.
- Yes. \$25 or more ... like a corkage fee in a restaurant. Don't make it too easy.
- Yes for a nominal amount, i.e. \$10. However it would want to understand what the additional money would be used for.
- I would be willing to pay a moderate increase (5%). But all sites should be allowed to consume liquor. No 2 tiered system.
- No
- no
- No
-
- NO not going to pay more to the government that is silly
- Indifferent - I do not consume alcohol

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- dependent on size of site and party size. \$1-\$5 per person seems fair
- No i will drink anyways
- No
- No, I would never encourage or promote consuming liquor in public places.
- No, because right now I could book any picnic site and discreetly consume alcohol in a different container without any way. Picnic sites are a run as a service, and I don't see any additional costs arising from a liquor/no-liquor picnic site.
- No, it shouldn't add an extra cost.
- No. Why on earth would it cost more? I suppose if there were increased liabilities/insurance for the City I would be willing to pay. Seems unnecessarily bureaucratic to have to apply.
-
- no
- No
-
- No
- I don't believe there should be a "charge" . If it is an extra charge, the areas that are supposed to be liquor will will be abused.
- No. Picnic sites should be free.
- Initially, I do not see the need to increase fees unless there is proven increase in park maintenance due to vandalism or clean up.
- No, it shouldn't be subject to yet another tax, we pay plenty of taxes already
- Yes I would. Although I couldn't quantify it.
- No. There is no reason to charge more for allowing liquor.
- No. All picnic sites should allow it and that would alleviate an extra cost.
- No.
- No, in this case I'd just do the same thing as now and paper bag or put it in a discreet container.
- No! Stop cash grabbing Calgary
-
- No I would not be willing to pay.
-
- No
- No, it shouldn't matter. The price of liquor is enough. Let people be people without yet something more to get cash off of.
- No lol
- Yes, 2.00 assuming receptacles for recycling are provided
- NONE.. BLUE GATORADE VODIS WORKS FINE.

Liquor in Parks

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 24, 2019

- No, this could promote bad behavior as people could book a site with no liquor allowed to avoid the fees. I really hope, the city would not make a decision only considering the economic benefits.
-
- Not sure why you should be paying more if booking a site.
- I would want to know why I would pay extra and where the money is going. Why would there be any reason that I should have to pay extra to sit and drink a beer with my family at a picnic.
- No. Most already hide their beverage of choice while they drink and I will continue.
- No
- No
- No
- No.
- Not likely, but if I had to, then maybe \$10
- Never.
- No.
- No
-
- why is the city of calgary thinking of this. if this goes thru whats next have a place as long as one pays to smoke pot ?
- I do think it makes sense to pay extra (like having a liquor license). It sets these sites apart and I think primes people to be willing to be more responsible.
-
- Not in favor. Drinking should be confined in private places or bars or do not drink at all so that the government would not spend money for curing alcoholism and the need for peace keepers and enforcers.
- No, it should be the same cost.
- No, this would be a ridicules cash grab. Another good way to keep people out of our public spaces.
- Would NOT book where liquor is consumption!! They should have to pay at least a \$1000.00
- Yes, but it's unlikely I would be booking such a site.
- No, I do not agree with liquors at the park
- None
- No. Should not be a difference in what people do at their site
- No
- NO - there is no added service here, why would Calgarians need to pay more?