

INITIATIVE 300

The Wrong Solution at the Wrong Time for Denver.



Paid for by Citizens for a Responsible Denver

Citizens for a Responsible Denver



Who We Are and What We Stand For:

Citizens for a Responsible Denver is a coalition of local residents and businesses who oppose a green roofs mandate through Initiative 300 on Denver's November 2017 ballot.

While I-300 is a noble cause, we believe the one-size-fits-all approach and lack of collaboration with impacted stakeholders has led to an initiative that is filled with unanswered questions and unintended consequences.

Our members have been active participants in Denver's 80 x 50 and Energize Denver stakeholder processes. We believe in addressing these issues in collaborative fashion. We cannot support a poorly drafted initiative that has the potential to increase the cost of housing and harm Denver's economy.

Organizations Opposed to I-300





Why should we be concerned?

I-300 is a one-size-fits-all mandate with very few exemptions. The proponents could have crafted more meaningful and strategic off ramps.

The proponents crafted this initiative in a silo. The proponents did not work collaboratively or even speak with those stakeholders (building owners, contractors, schools, hospitals, non-profits) who would be impacted.

I-300 will increase building and maintenance costs. Six+ year paybacks are anything but quick. It's shortsighted to assume that residents and building owners have the upfront funds to pay for installation, maintenance and increased insurance costs.

Tenants will bear the burden of responsibility. Installation and maintenance costs, in addition to increased insurance costs, will be the responsibility of homeowners and are likely to be passed on to residential and commercial renters.

Denver: Environmentally Conscious and Process-Driven



- Denver is already at the forefront of pushing environmental policies and prides itself on inclusive, thoughtful processes when it comes to enacting legislation.
- Energize Denver, a policy requiring every building over 25,000 square feet to benchmark energy usage, convened a Task Force over multiple months to meet and weigh the best policy to move forward.
- Denver's 80x50 Climate Goal, a plan to reduce Denver's greenhouse gas emissions by 80% by 2050, has been engaging hundreds of stakeholders through a Technical Advisory Committee, a Stakeholder Task Force, a widely distributed online survey, and multiple open houses/public events.
- The proponents of the Green Roofs Initiative did not engage impacted stakeholders or potential partners.

Potential Impacts Case Study: Grocery Store



- Average Size = ~42,800 sq. ft.*
- Mandated Green Roofs coverage = 20%
- Mandated roof area = ~8,560 sq. ft.
- Cost of green roof backbone (not including maintenance, etc.) 8,560 x \$35 sq. ft. = ~\$299,600 (\$7 per building sq. ft.)
- Cost of exemption 8,560 x \$25 sq. ft. = ~\$214,000 (\$5 per building sq. ft.)

*Median size of a grocery store on data 2015 data from the Food Marketing Institute



Potential Impacts Case Study: Carla Madison Recreation Center



- Total Project Size = ~62,000 sq. ft.
- Mandated Green Roofs coverage = 30%
- Approximate roof size = ~12,400 sq. ft.
- Mandated roof area = ~3,720 sq. ft.
- Cost of green roof backbone (not including annual maintenance, etc.)
 $3,720 \times \$35 \text{ sq. ft.} = \sim\$130,200$ (\$2.10 per building sq. ft.)
- Cost of exemption $3,720 \times \$25 \text{ sq. ft.} = \sim\$93,000$ (\$1.50 per building sq. ft.)



A Rendering of the Carla Madison Recreation Center

Potential Impacts Case Study: 11th & Ash Affordable Housing



- Total Project Size = ~140,000 sq. ft. (70 units workforce, 40 units senior)
- Mandated Green Roofs coverage = 40%
- Approximate roof size = ~28,000 sq. ft.
- Mandated roof area = ~11,200 sq. ft.
- Cost of green roof backbone (not including maintenance, etc.) 11,200 x \$35 sq. ft. = ~\$392,000 (\$2.89 per building sq. ft.)
- Cost of exemption 11,200 x \$25 sq. ft. = ~\$280,000 (\$2 per building sq. ft.)



A rendering of the newly constructed 11th & Ash Affordable Housing

Potential Impact to City-Owned Buildings



A rendering of the future National Western Center Complex.

A rendering of the proposed Colorado Convention Center expansion.



Say NO to I-300



- **A one-size-fits all mandate is not the right policy.** While green roofs may have benefits, proponents should have considered and included thoughtful offramps within the initiative.
- **The initiative is full of bad assumptions and unintended consequences.** These include increased housing costs, higher commercial rents, increased water-usage, as well as safety and structural issues with buildings.
- **More important priorities for taxpayer dollars.** Taxpayers should not be paying for green roofs on Denver's municipal and school buildings. There are better uses for these dollars.
- **A lack of collaboration.** The process to put this initiative on the ballot was not inclusive or thorough. The proponents should have engaged in conversations with impacted stakeholders and looked at ways to incentive this outcome rather than mandate it.