

## Public Feedback from Smart Regs Comment Cards

### Written on Comment Cards

#### 1) Brookie Gallagher

Why are requirements for rental unit energy efficiencies different from any other property energy efficiency requirements? They should not be. All should be addressed. It appears that the requirement for a rental license is being used as a way to target one group of property owners. If the city chooses to enact energy efficiency requirements, they should apply to all property owners, and all should be equally incentivized and/or punished. I am not opposed to energy efficiency upgrades, I am making them on my own, but to target this group (low hanging fruit?) does not seem to be the fairest approach. Requiring additional expenditures through additional inspections would also be punitive. Perhaps if the city chooses to have requirements, the city can pay for the inspections. Not having a mechanism for enforcing owner-occupied housing upgrades while having the rental license mechanism for enforcing upgrades for rental properties is NOT a sound basis for choosing a program, just easy. Don't all property owners pay property taxes every year? Perhaps that should be the "mechanism". As you consider rental license changes, please consider revisiting the requirements for the number of occupants allowed in a property. A legal 4 bedroom house, for example, that can only house 3 unrelated individuals legally does not seem to be a sound (let alone fair) regulation. And, this is another aspect of rental licensing. Perhaps the city should take a different approach with landlords owning multiple properties vs. those only owning one or two. I don't have an exact idea/suggestion of where number cutoffs should be, but there may be a real difference in landlord "groups". It may be worth considering. Please don't assume that a rental property owner has the money to spend on upgrades any more than an owner-occupied homeowner does.

#### 2) Pedro Gonzalez

None of the options are acceptable until the scope includes all constituents in Boulder (single family, rentals, commercial).

#### 3) Unknown

Tenant education is important. Idea: Require landlords to show tenants a video when they sign a lease and have the tenants sign a form confirming that they watched the video. Video would provide information on both conservation behavior and typical energy bill amounts so they will know whether other bills are relatively low or high or average.

#### 4) Carolyn Carlat

Please leave owner-occupied properties out of these regulations. Re: owner-occupied homes – my home may not have perfect insulation, but as I live primarily in one room, I keep my thermostat between 59-61 degrees, do not use A/C in the summer and just wear sweaters in the winter. So even if my home may not be terribly energy efficient – I am! I have quite low energy bills (and water usage, too). How would you factor in my very low energy usage even if my house is older and may not be thoroughly energy efficient?

My usage is low for personal financial reasons and because I do care about energy conservation. I could not afford to spend more money on my already over expensive home. I won't recoup what I've spent on it (bought spring '05 at the top of the market) in the foreseeable future. I can't afford to sell or remodel. I own rental condos in Boulder and managed by the HOA – under a joint roof – what do I do about insulation in the attic space roof which covers 3 floors of units? – common roofs, common windows, common doors, etc.? Will you factor in one's age in your financial requirements? (I'm a senior.)  
Re: the Rent Smart program and your Smart Regs- ratings should be based on historic averages of utility bill costs vs. specific energy improvements/parameters. Even though my rental buildings (and my home) are “older” – built in the 60's – they function well – utility costs are low over 17 years of owning as reported to me by about 75 sets of tenants.

5) Ligita Balodis

This program sounds too complicated to be easily implemented. There should be a simpler solution.

6) Unknown

City should address energy efficiency for all dwelling units when they are sold. The city should pursue better energy efficiency for all residential units and especially commercial buildings, which account for a much higher amount of greenhouse gas emissions. Rental units should not be singled out simply because there's already an easy mechanism for enforcement - seems predatory. Consider time of sale for all residential units instead – would be more equitable. You need to address the huge percentage of rental units that are unlicensed. This is not only an equity issue for those that are licensed. It also makes it more difficult for licensed owners to recoup the cost of the energy improvements by raising rents, since unlicensed owners won't have the same expenses to recover and therefore won't need to raise the rent. Can the city find grant funds or tax revenues to subsidize the cost of the required improvements?

7) Kim Pugh

This plan is unaffordable to a landlord. Why are landlords being singled-out instead of anyone who lives in a home being asked to comply?

8) Unknown

Options 2, 3, and 4 may need to all be available in consideration that many may be struggling financially even during a phased upgrade. This would give the flexibility much like the compliance options.

9) Unknown

I live in a rental. I have for the past decade, since moving to Boulder. The cost of rentals is high and I would not want to pay substantially more if energy efficiency costs were passed to me as a renter – unless they were similar to what I already pay in electric/gas bills. My house (the apt. is in an old house) was built well over 50 years ago. The windows leak air, it's drafty, there is no insulation – I mean NONE. It's inefficient to say the least. I don't pay horribly high rent, but it's not cheap. Coupled with energy bills, it

gets extremely costly in the winter, not to mention COLD. My meter won't allow me to turn the heat to a level that would sufficiently heat the tiny apartment. Even if I did there is no way the house, because of improper insulation, would ever get warm. In the summer it's equally hot to match the cold of winter. Weatherizing, making it energy efficient would be fantastic. I feel unable to live according to my beliefs in terms of energy efficiency and renewable energy resources. I feel wasteful and unable to do anything about it as a renter, not the home owner. Not to mention, I'm freezing!

10) D. Henderson

Improvements already done must be counted. Allowing costs to be spread over time is important. We often have other more urgent repairs that use up our budget for a given year. Right now I am upgrading my electric service (a safety issue), but this doesn't count toward energy efficiency. We need to budget all these things over time.

11) Unknown

Do the outreach and education approach instead of compelling owners by force of law. It's about freedom vs. tyranny. Given the green culture of Boulder – tenants would likely rent the updated/energy efficient properties long before the old/not efficient properties (motivation to spend money to update). I have already done this – all my houses have insulation added and windows have been replaced with double pane windows and replaced an old furnace with a 90% efficient furnace on a house.

12) GPH

This is a completely bogus and fraudulent money pit (purchasing carbon offsets). This can't be viable! I am completely opposed to this proposed legislation. My choice for options is NONE OF THE ABOVE. This proposal unfairly taxes rental property owners and may in effect drive them out of business. If Boulder is going to initiate any such legislation, it should be applied to all properties within the city limits and NOT solely to rental properties. It is a lazy excuse to say that rental properties are the guinea pigs simply because they have already complied with Boulder laws voluntarily and provided money, names, and property locations via the Boulder rental licensing program. Purchasing carbon offsets is not a realistic "option" and is a tax. Who regulates those "carbon offsets"?

13) Lindsay Meeks

Any effort to improve energy efficiency of rental property needs to be a part of a complete incentive strategy. Compelling landlords is unfair if owner-occupied properties are not also part of the program. Prior to regulation these methods should be used: rebates and incentives, tax incentives, discounts on material (bulk), energy rating on rentals (this can be used to determine where we are now, if there is a true need, and as a marketing tool for landlords). Apply this to all property owners. Ensure all rentals are registered for universal enforcement. Only after these initial steps are taken should unnecessary and restrictive regulations be implemented. Many landlords are just as impacted by the economy as everyone else. This additional cost will be a burden – an unfair burden. There should be consideration to removing the maximum unrelated renters so that rents can be raised to pay for it. This should be looked at by landlord type.

Those with a single rental home should be exempt or given a small change. Those with multiple units should be asked to do more.

14) Unknown

Differentiate between older/historic buildings and more modern buildings. Plan ahead to also target owner-occupied homes so as not to single out landlords – perhaps at sale/new ownership. I think the gentleman’s comment that dropping the “no more than 3 unrelated” rule will help fund improvements is bunk. Market based “rent smart” rating for renters to view – GREAT IDEA. Work to address non-licensed rental properties. Complaint-based compliance is a start but aren’t there other ways to ferret out non-compliant/non-licensed rentals in order to hold them responsible?

15) Jody Dickson

The Date Certain option unfairly impacts older properties which will require greater updates. I like the 1<sup>st</sup> phase which requires some updates, but don’t like carbon offsets for the rest of the time – false, ineffective environmental benefits. Would prefer a combination of 2 and 3 where phase 1 requires some updates and phase 2 continues updates. Would also like to see a variation of phase-in options for the variety of situations that will be required. My property is a boarding house. How would my “units” count as “units” in this policy? My tenants rent a bedroom and share rest of house (baths, kitchen). I’m concerned that 20 points per unit, if per bedroom, would be difficult and “HERS” would be too difficult to achieve for same reason. I really like the concept of the Two Techs & Truck Program.

16) Unknown

Deal somehow with unlicensed rentals to ensure that all share the burden. Make the regs lenient for historic properties, since energy improvements are more expensive and there are additional restrictions on what changes are allowed. Consider phasing in the requirements (e.g. HERS 140 by 2012, HERS 120 by 2016). Give credit toward compliance for xeriscaping. Work with other local communities so the rules are applied region-wide to avoid pricing Boulder rental housing out of the market (increasing in-commuting and associated CO2 emissions).

17) John Vanderpool

License inspectors: these people need to be better than in the past. I had one from Niwot. He took forever to get back and sign off a discrepancy he found. I complied by fixing the kitchen leaky hot water faucet, but getting him back almost took an act of Congress for him to reply. Please, please help Neil Poulsen in weeding out these people and make a better complaint system and better inspectors system.

18) Joanne Krumel

The city should address rental energy efficiency to a certain extent as many college rentals are in dire need. However, historic homes will have trouble complying.

19) Krista Nordback

Having all of places due on the same day will be pretty crazy for contractors and landlords as the deadline approaches. It's better to phase in with rental license cycle. Carbon offsets don't really meet the spirit of the goal of ClimateSmart. The environment is more important than money right now. But any way the city can reduce costs (like your 2 Techs and a truck) would be most helpful. I don't know if I'll have the money to make the upgrades. Older housing will be more expensive to upgrade especially historic buildings. Also there may be conflicting historic building regulations. Some exemptions may be needed for historic buildings.

20) Clint Heiple

My rental unit is a condo. The only individually billed utility is electric power, last month at \$10.00. There is no conceivable "energy saving" retrofit which would have a payback period of less than 200 years.

21) Tom Deiter

Carbon offsets should be left out. I realize there is much scientific evidence that some global warming has occurred. However, I am not convinced the science is as conclusive or unanimously accepted as the media presents it. I don't recall what government actions were taken to avert the Global Cooling Theory which was so prevalent during the mid-1970's (see National Geographic, Time, and Life magazines). I believe carbon credits are not a legitimate use to pass responsibility. Either have people comply or not. Also, be aware that especially the larger apartment complex owners must pass all these costs on to their consumers i.e. the renters will be footing the bill.

22) Unknown

Carbon offsets are total bullshit! Free market forces will allow renters their own choice. If energy efficiency is important they will seek that out. Council will never apply these standards to SFR (single family residents?). If you want to prove to me that you are serious about this start with private residences and then expand this to rental. You are all too chicken to even think about that. There is not "universal" acceptance of global warming caused by human activity (despite what Clay Evans says). Many scientists think it is voodoo science and just a reason to give government more control of our lives. If it is so damn important for Boulder to do this YOU PAY FOR IT!

23) Unknown

I cannot tell from the literature the approximate cost of the Two Techs and a Truck visit before repairs, the third party audit cost, and the ICC Certified Energy Inspector.

24) James Weingardt

I believe additional regulations not included in energy efficiency but concerning health and building structure should be considered in the rating system. Combustion Appliance Zone tests and radon may prevent possible hazards that to my knowledge may not be considered to residents from multifamily buildings. An optional combustion appliance zone test should be made available to tenants (even if it is at the tenant's expense).

25) Miles King

The city should rely on positive incentives and education instead of mandatory legislation and more layers of regulations and red tape. Perhaps low or no interest rate financing or grants would be inspiring. Has the city forecast the costs to the city to put this additional regulation in place and the administrative costs to keep track of the points, process, and continued enforcement? Why not use those costs above as incentive dollars for voluntary energy improvements by owners? Or why not consider real estate tax deductions for any owner willingly making energy saving improvements to their properties instead of requiring mandatory renovations? Since energy savings are at least 50% or more determined by the user (occupants) perhaps the occupant's usage should be curtailed as well.

26) Louise Padden

I disagree with all of the proposed options. Until the city decides to have all rentals be legal, this is unfair to those who are already complying. On the IBC (International Building Code?) new rules – they are not available online and will increase rents. Rental vacancies are already too high!

27) Mary Lee

None! This is an abuse of government power. So called green additions have nothing to do with the listed purpose of protecting “life and property through cost-effective safety measures”. The International Property Maintenance Code is very vague. You are abusing the rental licensing program to force a political agenda on property owners – stop it, it's not right! Enacting these onerous new regulations on the basis of unproven science that will eventually be proved to be nothing more than a social trend ala Charles McCay's book “Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds” will bankrupt small apartment owners like me that are struggling to build something for their families while operating on very thin margins. Remember those of us that are invested in Boulder through property ownership pay a huge amount of taxes to support the city. Please take our concerns seriously!! Thank you for your time and consideration.

28) Unknown

Please consider adding something around air conditioning units to the prescriptive list. Not having an AC unit should count for lots of points! Perhaps not having a hot tub should also count for additional points. The point being that houses that are cooled naturally are already conserving energy.

29) George Peters

Have a qualified city employee do the following: A) Educate the owner and managers. B) Offer a free audit with priority items listed first. C) Provide incentives for action and then D) Let the market take care of the other market items. The audit could be connected with the license process.

30) Unknown

I understand the city of Boulder concern on greenhouse gases. I feel the selection of only rental properties at this time is an unfair approach to property owners. I think that the

city of Boulder should pursue an approach that would require all residential properties both rental and owner-occupied properties to comply with the regulations.

31) Kyung-ja Kim Park

I manage 1632 Grove & 2233 Goss. I sign up for 6 day review each year. My garbage bill for 2233 Goss was \$1200 in 8/08 and about \$800 in 8/2009 - for 1632 around \$500-600 for August for past several years. Things are put next to my garbage area and they are all billed to my bill. These things are not all from my tenants but anyone who needs to throw away things would leave their things. I have met an officer from the City of Boulder Env. Control Office and a representative from the Western Disposal in 2008. I still pay higher than normal garbage bill this year again. I heard that one other landlord on the Hill paid \$500 or so garbage bill in 2008. I did not get any help for my bill from Western Disposal. I need help from City of Boulder regarding this kind of dumping for future, maybe come up with a plan to distribute excess garbage bill among Goss-Grove area garbage customers. And educate CU students that others suffer if things are dumped at someone else's property. Thank you for your better solution on this particular issue.

32) Steven Moreland

Increase occupancy to 4 per unit which reduces carbon footprint per unit. Any program should be owner-occupied as well. What about unlicensed rental units?

33) Dan Estey

Focus on market based incentives to owner-occupied not onerous mandates on rentals.

34) Wendy Weil

All Boulder housing should be targeted. Although I am an advocate of being green and saving energy I think the proposed timeframe is too short. The entire city of Boulder could comply to some of the regulations and have the same overall effect. Condominiums and townhouses have covenants. It would be unfair to have one that would have to comply and the one next door is owner-occupied and does not have to comply although they share a common wall. There are alternative forms of energy such as geothermal and solar and wind that have yet to be perfected. The time constraints put into this proposal could force people to put in a system that could be obsolete within a few years. The result of the proposal is that rents will go up and tenants will be inconvenienced while improvements are being made. I think there are many modifications that need to be made. These changes need to be made over a longer period of time. This is a tough economy to force these expensive improvements. Many landlords are retired, some are young people who are almost upside down on their mortgage and would have a hard time getting a loan to do the improvements. The other problem is the tremendous amount of waste created with old furnaces, windows being put into landfills. It is actually more energy efficient to keep these things until it is time to replace them. I think Smart Regs could use some modifications. The main thing is to include all of Boulder. The second thing is to have a realistic timeframe to accomplish our carbon footprint.

35) Michael Russell

I am very concerned on cost on owners- particularly those that just may not or do not have the money to complete this by 2012. We have many elderly widowed ladies that really are concerned as well as others. I am just concerned that with Baseline Inspection Changes, Backflow Prevention, and this that some owners are just not going to be able to comply in this timeframe or at all.

36) Unknown

Mandatory changes/fees for landlords should be based on landlords' income on the property, e.g. less demands on landlords with limited income (based on tax filings).

37) Megan Roemer

I am a property manager for a living (7 years now). I own a house that is a rental, and I am a renter (and have been since 1993, when I moved here as a CU student). I am frustrated with federal incentives available for making homes more efficient because they are only available for "primary homes". Homeowners already have an incentive to improve their homes, because they live there. Since landlords have no incentive (to improve rentals), it is renters (usually poorer people), who suffer by paying high utilities and living in drafty apartments. I don't oppose the city's proposal to require rental properties to become more efficient, I think it is a good idea. I do not want to see landlords that have been responsible and already made their properties more efficient punished (or held to the same standard) as "slumlords" or greedy landlords who have neglected the efficiency of their properties. From what I can tell, the proposal seems reasonable (although I can see some landlords are very upset about it). Another issue, especially with renters in Boulder that are college students, is when renters practice inefficient behaviors. I am glad to provide more input regarding my experiences from various perspectives. Thanks.

38) Tim Ryan

1) Based on my experience of the past two years, in which I participated in multiple focus groups, workshops and feedback sessions on both the city and county level, I do not believe that any feedback which is contrary to city council thinking will be taken into consideration. I look forward to this being the exception. 2) The time table for improving energy efficiency in rental housing looks much too tight. Forcing these measures through during a depressed economy will only exacerbate the woes of the housing market. 3) Because of the new "pops and scrapes" regulation, most of the incentive to improve Boulder's aging rental stock has been removed. Great progress has been made over the past ten years that has vastly improved the energy efficiency of older homes. Instead of killing development, let's encourage it. This will help us to reach our climate action goals. 4) I agree with improving the energy efficiency of both new housing and existing housing. However, the City of Boulder is reaching too far too fast. Excessive regulation is killing the housing market. Let's set goals that REALISTICALLY consider the overall economic consequences. By maintaining a healthy economic environment we will have the money to achieve environmental goals.

39) Tedd Harshaw

Don't target rental properties, but apply rules across all residential properties regardless of them being a rental or owner-occupied. Carbon offsets are the best of 4 bad options. It is discriminatory to single out rental property owners and not apply rules across all residential properties (owner & non-owner occupied). The comment that there is no financial incentive for the rental owner has nothing to do with what is fair, equitable, or ethical. You are just pushing this on rental owners because you have a club (regulation). You should do what is right regardless of your power. If you really want to have more affordable housing and reduce the carbon footprint per home occupant, then increase density and allow a minimum of 1 person per bedroom. Repeal the 3 or 4 unrelated renters per house.

#### 40) Ken Foelske

Date certain option is too short of timeframe. Hard to evaluate carbon offsets with unknown figures on costs. Landlords face regulations backed by enforcement in this proposal. The proposal, as outlined on the display boards notes tenants would have no regulations on behavior. Environmental enforcement currently regulates tenant behavior – regulations- this is possible.

#### 41) Unknown

Please consider eliminating the maximum of 3 people per house. This would result in an immediate footprint reduction of at least 25% per household (4 people sharing the heat rather than 3 is 25% efficiency improvement). These regs would require me to spend more than \$5000-10,000 to upgrade windows, boiler and in-wall insulation. Then the city requires me to leave 25% of my house empty. I am expected to pay money to upgrade space that I am not allowed to use! You could make the occupancy based on number of bedrooms, not some random number. I had to pay Boulder real estate rates for a 4 bedroom house. I am assessed and pay taxes on 4 bedrooms. I carry insurance on 4 bedrooms. I have to now make energy improvements based on a 4 bedroom house. But I am not allowed to collect rent to recover my costs on 25% of my house. Please consider using some CAP funding to subsidize or offer free HERS or energy audits so we know where we stand. Forcing homeowners to change out windows, appliances, furnaces, etc. does not necessarily make the gains that you expect. Some of these items are very expensive and have only small gains (maybe the appliances are only a few years old and are only slightly less efficient than a new one). We also need to be aware of the amount of trash that these programs produce as well. Doesn't that impact the environment, too?

#### 42) Greg Sherwin (?)

1) Two years of effort by many people went into creating the existing rental license code. It works. Don't change it. 2) The current Baseline & Safety drafts are too vague and open to interpretation. They are too long. They will result in higher inspection costs. 3) You are trying to accomplish too much by both changing the existing Baseline & Safety regulations AND discussing environmental code requirements in the same conversation. Suggestion: Treat them separately (i.e. 2 public discussions). 4) It is unreasonable to use the IPMC as source material when it is not readily available to the public on the web to examine. 5) What incentives are you willing to offer to mitigate this legislation, legal club that you are proposing to impose on landlords, e.g. tax incentives, lower license fees

for high green points standards, tax rebates, etc.? Suggestion: Increase the tax on utility consumption that exceeds a certain formula for houses and condos. Use the added income to reduce the carbon impact elsewhere. Suggestion: 1) Create a consumer (i.e. renter) demand “green points” form for prospective renters to ask landlords to complete and sign and date as a condition of renting. 2) If the renters rent that property, the “green points” form would, by city mandate, become part of the lease. If the renter later finds out that the landlord misrepresented themselves on this green points form there would be legal grounds for the renter to terminate the lease. The city could also legislate financial penalties on landlords who misrepresent their green points checklist. 3) Work with CU to give out these green points forms and how to ask every potential landlord to show or give the renters a copy of their completed and signed green points form as part of the initial rental interview. 4) The city could set a minimum number of points for properties that the owner is acknowledging by signing, handing out to renters and making a part of their lease. Benefits: 1) This process helps educate renters and landlords about both the green points reality and possibility for each rental property. In this conversation, renters will be educating landlords about the green points accomplishments of competitor rental properties. This competitive pressure will be a large natural incentive for landlords to improve the green points standards for their property. 2) The green points form allows the city to establish a minimum green points requirement that is enforced by renter demand and education. 3) Educated renters are more likely to cooperate in participating with all of us to reduce utility costs. Please respond to my suggestion.

43) Kaye Brundage (?)

Due to cost involved, landlords should have a time period or strategic plan for improvements in order to be able to budget and pay for energy improvements. I feel this is a good program and will start to improve now.

44) Mary Long

Two Techs phase-in approach is not clear. How does carbon offsets improve health issues? 1) The city needs to apply rules to all residential properties evenly – not target rentals first. Too invasive – violates property owner rights. Contradicts health goals – all should be moving together. 2) Each housing unit (rental or owner-occupied) needs to have flexibility for its unique characteristics – size/age/HOA controlled condos, etc. 3) The technology of high efficiency appliances and heaters does not accommodate smaller units, i.e. for a 1500 or less square footage the existing high efficiency furnaces are too big – cost \$4000 and where an appropriate size unit is half that cost – the largest unit will not even fit into some small apartments. Smallest model refrigerators do not come in high efficiency/ ecostar rating. Someone for city council should have been here, too!! 4) Purchasing carbon offsets: How does this improve the healthy situation? Where does the money go? 5) Where are the independent studies of true numbers on health impacts in Boulder (the supposed legal basis for this). 6) If offering incentives to owner-occupied homes, why are the measures for rental owners punishments? Make funding/bond options available to all. 7) The city must consider that many property owners are elderly on fixed incomes. Rents have not been increasing enough to cover these costs and such owners have no where else to increase income.

45) Francoise Poinsatte

Prefer date certain option of the sooner the better. Don't think carbon offsets is a great idea given federal tax credits, rebates, and especially we need the energy savings now. My husband and I strongly support this measure as it will greatly upgrade rental housing and bring us closer to our Climate Action Plan Goal. The timeline is very generous, especially given the launch of the 2 Techs program. It also will make housing operations more affordable for tenants – another city goal. Some important things to consider: 1) All possible tax credits/rebates should be mentioned up front so property owners understand advantages of acting now. 2) Compliance of existing rental licensing is necessary for this to work. City needs to do property checks via county database to determine which units are not licensed – otherwise compliant owners will feel unfairly treated. We need compliance to be as broad as possible. 3) How to materials should be developed for the “do it yourself” property owners. I know several property owners who fall in that category, ourselves included, who could use proper guidance. When we did it with the help of our teenage son, a set of instructions would have been useful. 4) Info about general energy use, “high impact” appliances, hot tubs, air conditioners should be made available for both property owners and tenants. A set of home/apartment operating instructions for maximum energy conservation should be standardized with the lease.

46) Tom Volckhausen

Permanent envelope improvements like insulation and efficient windows should be prioritized over more temporary improvements like showerheads and faucets. As a landlord and property owner I very strongly support Boulder's effort to improve rental property energy efficiency.

47) Daniel Bridge

Hopefully, carbon offsets are temporary – could become confusing. Two techs is a great idea! Efficiency is easy and the best economic choice for reducing not only your energy bill but your carbon footprint. As an energy auditor and renewable scientist, I must state that efficiency is the first step. Personally, I think 20 points would be much easier to achieve and should definitely be mandated. In addition I strongly think this should only be a stepping stone and further efficiency steps should be made! Suggestions: Show more data. Give survey examples. Release your studies on the rental units. Get a survey about what the renters think! I think that you are not asking for that much from rental property owners. Keep up the good work and thank you.

48) O. Alan Rice

Why not create a max required investment like the car emissions pass/fail. Perhaps different max amount required for each (HERS) level. Make sure owners are given HERS scores in each category and requirements for improving that score. Shouldn't the year of construction be considered in the HERS requirement?

49) Liz Wolfert

Date certain option is very tight time limit. Having read the materials associated with these proposed changes I have the following general responses which are informed by my experience as a Boulder renter. I feel as though most Boulder renters will select a unit to

rent based first on its rent amount, number of bedrooms, and location and only nominally based on the property's energy performance. Therefore, I question the effectiveness of this type of positive marketing as an incentive to landlords. However, if a property's energy improvements significantly reduce the monthly utility costs to renters, I believe this is information that will motivate a renter to "rent green" and positive marketing should perhaps focus on a reduction in cost to the renter. I am concerned that the high cost (plus vacancy loss) associated with upper level improvements like sealing and insulation (the fundamental improvements that effect real energy reduction) will drive landlords to a) not renew rental licenses, b) pay out as much as possible to avoid these up front costs. I feel like many of the changes suggested here are positive and should be encouraged to be actually implemented. Are there incentives besides carbon offsets credits and/or existing rebates and/or positive marketing to encourage landlords to comply? -Property tax reduction? Tax credits good within the City? Bulk discounts if landlords install insulation through a large scale City contract for insulation installment? Or window contract? Something else? Thanks.

#### 50) Unknown

City should address energy efficiency only on multiple unit buildings or multiple rental licenses. It would be good if the Two Techs program was a public service. Carbon offsets could include PV or thermal solar systems installed by owner elsewhere. Right now this program seems overly cumbersome or expensive to landlords who own just a single unit. Another option should be considered: Free energy efficient audits to rental property owners (and advertised to them – most of us didn't realize that the existing program was applicable to rental properties). Provide free or subsidized weatherization for rental properties who seek to make improvements. For expenditures beyond \$ \_\_\_\_ (perhaps \$2,000), a reduction in taxes to help incentivize such an investment. The suggestions on the other side may apply as well, e.g. making this mandate applicable to multi-unit buildings or to landlords who own more than one rental unit, etc. Ultimately, before implementing a mandate such as the current program, please consider other available options to change behavior and incentives for homeowners/landlords.

#### 51) Gene Peterson

Date certain option is too soon. Carbon offsets are a scam. Are you kidding me? Two Techs (#3) – What is the question? Very poorly worded! Too broad. The whole proposal is flawed. More government control is going to destroy the rental market in Boulder and force landlords to sell and leave. There is too little profit in rental when the cost of real estate in Boulder is measured against the amount of rent the market will bear. I would propose a bottom to top approach. Develop a rating system for energy efficiency which can be made available to renters and let them decide if the rent, location, amenities and energy efficiency meets their needs. Poor properties will be encouraged by market forces to make improvements. Let a free market bring the changes. Regulation and heavy-handed control are counter-productive. Boulder has proven to be the enemy of business and this proposal is another example.

#### 52) Chris Jones

The city should not do anything. No action should be taken. Last year we had a resident smoking in his apartment so he would leave the windows open year round. We could have had the most efficient furnace, windows, etc., but it would have been futile. In addition, by making people pay the costs of utilities, you get use-conscious people. We must first change our actions before we change our buildings. The city is putting an unfair economical burden on property owners. As demonstrated by recent surveys by the city of Boulder and the recent election of city council members, the environment is no longer a high priority. Insuring viable businesses in the city of Boulder will insure the sustainability of Boulder for years to come. While the environment is important, placing the burden strictly on rental properties is unfair. By requiring efficiency upgrades, rents will increase! Thus, it will be more expensive for renters or they will choose to live outside of Boulder. Small time owners will be economically forced out by the new rules or will choose to no longer be in compliance. Non-compliance is highly detrimental because many of the codes in place were good! Carbon monoxide/smoke detectors save lives! With the reduction of business in Boulder, the city will face increasing debt with reduced income. Environmentally, a year ago I was attending a class at CU and the professor of the class detailed that Boulder's air had recently declined radically because CU could no longer afford to run natural gas and had switched to coal as a cheaper alternative. If Boulder really cares about the environment, an appropriate first step would be to collaborate with CU. In addition, if state institutions cannot afford environmental upgrades as simple as natural gas instead of coal, how will small family property owners/operators, such as myself, survive massive mandatory upgrades? Perhaps, greener pastures lay outside of Boulder. While I am in support of environmental policy, this places an unfair burden on the hard working property owners of Boulder. There are other ways to achieve an improvement in environmental quality without undue hardships of rental housing code updates.

53) B.J. Jones

We believe this to be well-intentioned, but ineffective. City should stay out of setting date certain requirements. City should not have eco-goals for rental licensing and should not regulate efficiency. Rental Housing Licensing was intended to protect health and safety only, not an "eco" agenda. "Eco" goals are well-intentioned, but fail to make real change globally. The cost for this project would cost my small family business thousands of dollars. This is an unfair burden that government would be placing upon us. The benefits may be less than intended. Residents would experience rent hikes which could push them to Louisville, Longmont, or Broomfield. More commuting=more carbon. Let's be smarter. Instead of costly mandates, council should consider more fair and community-friendly solutions: 1) Simplify Home Remodel Process – encourage property improvements which would then allow the city to require modern energy upgrades. Make "Site Plan Review" faster, easier, and less costly. A new house will use less energy, and this is a market-based solution. Big Brother should not mandate, but rather encourage. 2) Incentives for energy upgrades: City should encourage property owners through education, small water bill rebates, and other incentives to improve property on the owner's own accord. 3) Leave existing units alone: Mandates increase costs and hurt affordable housing options. Higher rents could lead to more commuting to cheaper locations. City "affordable" options can not keep up. Let's improve Boulder.

Government has imposed so many restrictions that it is not profitable to renovate a house. Few homes remain affordable enough for middle-class families. Eco-mandates on rental housing will further push out middle class residents. Boulder is on a track to being a community of rich, eco-conscious people only. We should respect property rights and encourage redevelopment of dilapidated neighborhoods by profit incentive. As a native of Boulder (my grandpa moved here in 1953), we should reconsider this destructive path we are on. NO ECO-GOALS should be added to rental licensing.

54) Julia Wrapp

Try and regulate tenant behavior. Any landlord could tell their own stories. There is a better way to come into compliance with the Climate Action Plan which would provide incentives as opposed to regulation.

55) Stan Lanzano

Rental efficiency is largely a product of tenant behavior.

56) Unknown

Encourage everyone to make changes, do not require everyone to. The city should stay out of private property. There are enough problems that the city should be focused on. You are going to cause panic among all of the property owners. The city as a whole will suffer when property values drop.

57) Tom Wilson

I strongly disagree with a plan that targets only rental housing. If these proposed regulations are such a good idea, then why not apply to all housing? (Obvious reason is no one would ever get away with that!) I propose uniform rules for rental and non-rental residential property. When you can get a community-wide consensus, then it will get support. This “Smart Regs” is just a way to push it down the throats of rental property owners and managers because it can be done through rental licensing. Would anyone be pushing this if a majority of voters would personally be affected and would have to comply with their own residences??

58) Cathy Lee

1) My tenants can't figure out the recycling versus the trash – how can they be expected to figure out set back thermostats, etc.? 2) Even building designed to LEEDs and for energy efficiency are not performing to expectations. While retrofitting expensive “fixes” for the Climate Action Plan may (probably not, though!) help the Climate Action Plan, I feel extremely confident stating that the results will not be as good as hoped. 3) Rental licenses are for safety. How on earth does the Climate Action Plan (RECO) retrofit help my tenant's safety? 4) Smacks of buying indulgences from the Catholic Church in the Middle Ages (carbon offsets?) 5) I'm a small property owner. How on earth can I afford these “upgrades”? How on earth does the city NOT expect those costs to be passed on to the tenants? 6) I certainly do not mind replacing appliances with energy efficient models at the natural END of LIFE. Throwing away a perfectly usable appliance before its natural death is a waste of resources. 7) Will these standards be applied to Boulder's subsidized public housing? Have the taxpayers approved that

outlay? 8) Seems with the latest election (defeat of Climate Smart Loan Program) that people are not as interested in supporting the costliness of going green. We need to look to fixing the basic system before going for programs meant to make us look good but don't perform when you get down to the brass tacks.

59) Vahe Derovnian

Carbon offsets – speculative, predatory market, artificially kept. Education to tenant behavior is way more efficient. I don't know how I can in rental units with all the lights on and the thermostat set to 75 degrees. Increasing density of rentals would be a more effective way of reducing personal carbon consumption. Simply increase the number of persons dwelling/per unit. Make accessory dwelling units easier to do. Change regulations again to increase density. I would need 10 years or 3 cycles to update my building. It is a 1960's era with no improvements. I would be forced to increase rents by 10-20% to raise \$4,000 by 12/2012. I have a 5 bedroom rental house. I only can have 3 unrelated people living there. I cannot find a family to rent. Next door there is an accessory unit so I cannot have one. Increase density would go a long way to carbon reduction, make me happy, and keep rents affordable in Boulder.

60) Not signed in fear of reprisal

First – Perhaps one of the most irritating things the City of Boulder does is fail to ever consider or provide for tenant responsibility for their actions that the property owner or manager has no control over. Here is an example of what I would like to see happen: If a group of tenants in a unit, say 3 for example, exceed the prior year's utility bill, THEY would have to contribute to the cost through some form of punitive method. Payment could be for carbon offsets. **AT ANY RATE – FOR GOD'S SAKE PUT THAT FACTOR INTO THE DISCUSSION!** Second – This is being proposed right when the university is going to build another “Bear Creek” housing facility. Not a dorm, normally hated by students, but what amounts to a “state of the art facility”. In 1961 when the Kittredge dorm complex was built, the Hill was 30-40% vacant and many student houses and apartments were foreclosed on. It happened again in 1964 when the Williams Village was built and again in 2001 when the first Bear Creek was built. **MARKET** conditions must be factored in! This proposal, if passed, will come when the University creates extreme stress in the market place with their development.

61) I have chosen not to offer my name because I am fearful of YOUR perceived power. I have too many hours and too many years to have anyone jeopardize my property.

62) Audrey Marquardt

Government over control of personal property.

63) Jim Healy

Let free market efficiency work. The concept of “buying” carbon offsets is illogical. Quit trying to micro-manage life in Boulder. It appears from this questionnaire that the decision to implement the changes has already been made. All you are asking is how to do it with the least amount of problems from the public.

64) Jeremy Speckhals

If the houses are energy efficient it will benefit the renter. If the landlord can purchase carbon offsets then it does not benefit the renter. Most student houses are pieces of crap that have terrible insulation. Rent is already through the roof and having hundred dollar utility bills sucks!

65) Robert Phillips

Need to consider age of property to use a longer phased in approach. Need to consider increased cost to owners to higher rental costs. Need to educate contractors and get vendors to participate first before launching program. Carbon offsets are a waste of time. Suggest focus on different areas for different zip codes, that way all of your contractors are not tied up. Ex: 80301 Insulation, 80303 Heating, 80302 Air Sealing for a given year. While the impact of these programs can be a great improvement across a broad spectrum, much planning should take place first.

66) Todd Siegel

I don't completely believe that compulsory energy regulations are necessary. Perhaps the city can set up an incentive system to encourage landlords to upgrade apartments. If the city were able to obtain the utility data for rental units (perhaps through the new franchise agreement with Xcel), it could publish some like the Energy Guide on appliances where the Rent Smart system could tell prospective renters the estimated energy cost of an apartment. The energy data along with data about energy efficiency upgrades can be fed into a rating system, e.g. bronze, silver, gold.

67) Dan Omasta

Please provide more data to support benefits and impacts (more than 9 homes, assessment of homes that already meet standards, potential packages, split-pay/revenue sharing). This policy needs to happen! The values of this community are intent on the City Council's ratification of Kyoto and delegation to Copenhagen. As a community, we need to force landlords and businesses to meet our values in order to do business in our community. There must be a way to offset the split-incentive between landlords/tenants for the costs and benefits associated with these investments. There are a few options: increase occupancy standards (this will also increase load demand). Work with utility provider to supply baseline (5 year data) numbers for resource use. Estimate reductions based on certain investments in efficiency projects. Savings below baseline number are split between renter and landlord. Expenses above estimated savings are taxed and placed into fund that subsidizes energy efficiency improvements. (This fund could also provide "positive revenue" to be dispensed to landlords/tenants with savings). Establish a lease tax that will go to a fund for subsidizing energy packages available to landlords (2 Techs and a Truck). Offsets are not the answer. Do not let landlords buy their way out of this community problem/effort. Students want and need these regulations and CU will continue to do its part to educate responsible tenants.

68) Deirdre Damron

A HERS score of 120 is too easy! I would strongly suggest a stronger measure.

69) Clint Folsom

Programmable thermostats work well for owner-occupants but not in rentals. Even when provided an instruction manual there is still confusion and service calls for help requests that turn out to be operator error. I have done Climate Smart improvements on my personal home and know my rental properties could benefit from similar work, however the costs are significant and would be a huge burden.

70) Collin Tomb

Afraid people won't make the date certain option. I am very encouraged that the City is undertaking this in the full knowledge of certain pushback. I would encourage the City to hold its ground, and continue with the knowledge that they are supporting an underrepresented population in doing so.

71) Carrie Jackson

This looks great. Thank you so much for all of your work to make this happen! Could the carbon offset fines be used to help others in the community to improve energy efficiency? Incentive programs may help ease this program into effect.

72) Unknown

Energy efficiency is important.

73) Unknown

Creation of a renter group could only help in benefiting this cause.

74) Scot Woolley

You need to present data in your proposals (i.e. case studies & economic analysis, etc.) Would like to see a program dedicated to telling renters how energy efficient units are (market driven demand).

75) Unknown

Not efficient use of staff, landlord and tenant resources – focus on transportation. Retroactive modification of rental units for energy efficiency should only be driven by the cost of energy and the concurrent implementation with other improvements. And the decisions should be left to the property owners. This is a waste of city staff time at a time when budgets are hurting. Put staff to productive work on street cleaning and social control (less threatening intervention than the police). The big carbon footprint of the city is the high transport of people, mostly in and out of town. One of the big reasons is the cost of housing. This effort will increase the cost of housing.

76) Jeff Wheeler

The yearly cap of expenditure should be reinstated. Improvements over 10 year period would be best.

77) Jean-Pierre Bressieux

Some cities, Sacramento, CA and Olympia, WA have provided low interest rate loans with no monthly payments until the property is sold for energy improvements. Grant

writing directed at these kinds of programs would get landlord's support, in my opinion. Why not make these proposals apply to all properties, not just landlords?

78) Tom Haud

The City energy efficiency for all housing: rental & non-rental (owner-occupied). It should be on a fairly equal basis. There should be options for trade-offs to opt to make "life safety" type of code improvements vs. energy improvements. There are many safety type code issues in our older housing stock that should be addressed and not necessarily put second to energy issues.

79) Rebecca Herr

I am here tonight as a tenant because I believe that 95% (or more) of people who will show up about these regulations are landlords who oppose the "extra costs". I have lived in Boulder since 1973. I am now living on disability/social security because my disability has progressed too much for me to be employable. So I am LOW income. I LOVE the idea of this program. I have lived in SO MANY rentals in Boulder (3 years of home ownership in 36 years, the rest rentals that are VERY energy inefficient. And since I always pay the utility bills, I am always paying for that inefficiency. It is never my landlord who pays higher energy bills, because of his/her unit's inefficiency. And we as tenants will probably not show up at hearings/events like this, because it means we have to stand up and announce ourselves as POOR, as people who CAN'T AFFORD high energy bills in addition to our HIGH BOULDER RENTS. We will not expose ourselves to this public embarrassment. ("I am so ashamed that I have failed to produce enough income.") So you will not hear from many of us. But you will hear from PLENTY of Boulder landlords, I'm sure. I got an email at 7:00 this morning from my landlord telling me my rent will increase if this program is implemented. I signed a 1 year lease in September so I have been warned... Please, please, please do this program anyway!! We all know it is the RIGHT THING to do (except landlords?)

80) Julia Wrapp (also wrote comment #54)

Pursue energy reduction in city-owned lighting/street lights/commercial lighting. Why limit this to "rental" properties? Hold everyone accountable- all property owners countywide. I recently attempted to pursue the Climate Smart offering and had contractors reply saying my 2 properties were "not suitable". I am unable to afford much renovation and all costs will be passed on to tenants. Then the problem becomes will tenants pay increased rental fees? Plus there is a larger/broader picture, i.e. travel time. I purchased the properties I hold because they are urban thereby alleviating cars on the road. Please do not tax property owners more than is currently being done.

81) Libby Brown

I have a very old house (pre 1900) that is heated with gas space heaters. I have looked into putting in regular furnaces (it is a legal duplex) but it would be prohibitively expensive. There is no crawl space in the house, and no duct work. You can't put programmable thermostats on these old heaters (maybe they have them on the new ones, I don't know.) If I had to buy new ones (whole heaters), that would be very expensive. Would you make allowances for homes that are heated with gas space heaters? Also,

would you make allowances for historic houses that would have to change their look to comply?

82) Maggie Laubuch

Require store owners on 29<sup>th</sup> St. to close doors while heat or air conditioning is in use. Require all motel, restaurant and professional buildings to upgrade their appliance and heating units. Discriminatory? YOU BET! But so is requiring rental unit owners to do just that. The condo I own is one of almost 300 units. Why should the 200 or so non-rental owners be assessed a thousand dollars to replace boilers because the city requires landlords to upgrade?

83) I am already registered and on email list

As discussed with other landlords at the “open house”, we are going to have to raise rents again. This makes it increasingly difficult for the average renter who will be feeling the “squeeze”. My husband and I own 4 rental properties and were in the “shopping phase” to buy 2 additional units. Now with this new layer of rules, we’re reconsidering investing any more dollars in Boulder and will look towards Louisville/Broomfield and Longmont. P.S. Found the open house to be very uninformative – still don’t know exactly what you plan to do. The video was a complete waste of my time and the city’s money.

84) Unknown

Attached the following letter to their comment card:

UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS APARTMENTS

1310 & 1320 Folsom St. & 2425 University Heights Ave.  
Boulder, CO 80302

November 18, 2009

To Whom It May Concern:

As the owner and property manager of University Heights Apartments in Boulder, we want to briefly express our views regarding the Energy Efficiency Proposal. University Heights Apartments were built over three years, from 1958 – 1961 and consists of 64 units. We are a family owned and operated small business and have been for over 30 years. We pride ourselves on providing clean, safe, comfortable, and affordable apartments to the CU student population and well as other professional Boulder citizens.

We are strongly against the proposal and feel that it is very unreasonable, especially for small, local business owners. According to the case studies provided to us, a building built in the 1950’s or 1960’s could easily cost up to \$5,000 per unit to bring up to the proposed new energy conservation requirements. At this rate, it could cost us \$320,000 or more to be in compliance. This would, quite simply, put us out of business as well as many other small business property owners in the city of Boulder. It would also force landlords to greatly raise their rents to recoup costs, causing many people, especially

students on a tight budget, to move out of the city of Boulder in order to find an affordable place to reside. The proposal would also discourage any potential new investors from buying rental property in the city.

Thank you for taking our views into consideration. Please feel free to contact either one of us for any further information or discussion. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

John A. Landblom  
Owner, University Heights Apartments  
303-378-9692

J.B. Sanchez  
Property Manager, University Heights Apartments  
720-205-9678  
[manager@universityheightsapartments.com](mailto:manager@universityheightsapartments.com)

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS APARTMENTS  
OWNER AND MANAGER**

- The Estimated savings DO NOT justify the estimated cost.
- For something this significant actual data MUST be used for the Council's decision. A pilot program needs to be conducted with actual costs and actual / audited savings.
- The "Two Tech and a Truck" approach should review the Boulder rental stock first in order to define the opportunity before Council mandates expenses.
- This proposal should require ALL rental units to comply, NO EXCEPTIONS such as public housing, assisted housing, University of Colorado housing etc.
- Rental checklists must be easy accessible via the Internet and written in plain and straight forward English.
- **UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS APARTMENTS WILL ADD A LINE ITEM TO OUR PRICE LIST CLEARLY STATING WHAT OUR RESIDENTS ARE PAYING FOR: "BOULDER CITY COUNCIL'S RENTSMART PROGRAM FEE".**

Thank you for reviewing our comments.

85) J.B. Sanchez

Attached the same University Heights letter and is the property manager.

86) Gordon Derber

Attached the same University Heights letter to his comment card and wrote in to cut taxes for better energy savings and provide tax incentives.

87) Harry Grass

If rental units are to be required to make energy efficiency changes, then ALL dwelling units should be required to make energy efficiency changes – only way to be equitable and non-discriminatory. Stop the name SMART REGS. Who is saying this is smart? Boulder residents? Call it Energy Regs of similar.

Also attached the following letter:

November 18, 2009

Dear City of Boulder Representative:

I am a property owner in Boulder, Colorado. I own six rental units in the city. I lived in Boulder for over 7 years as well before I moved to a more rural location.

I am attending the open house on residential energy conservation ordinances (RECO) – proposed. I would like to leave my written comments for the city to consider along with all the other comments it receives on this topic.

While there is no doubt that energy conservation and reduction of green house gases is a good thing for society, I find it amazing that a CITY is making reduction of greenhouse gases its top priority! A city has so many other unique concerns to deal with such as providing quality schools for children (Boulder has a long way to go in that department which is hard to understand in such a well educated community). Other primary concerns should be crime suppression, proper development planning, providing for the poor who coexist with so many very well off Boulderites. I think reduction of green house gases as the number one priority is warped and wrong and off target. Boulder has critical problems with crime, and a planning scenario gone mad. Just look at the densification of Boulder that has occurred in the last ten years. Talk about generating green house gases!!

Also:

Why should landlords be saddled with all the costs of upgrades to mitigate green house gases?? Who assigned that task to landlords?? Do they get to vote on this expense being assigned to them??

At least limit such green house gas mitigation laws to new buildings, not as a “retrofit law”.

Landlords don't use energy. Tenants do. Have a law that incentivizes THEM to lower green house gases.

Inspection programs of rental units were intended to protect the health and safety of tenants. Inspections (as proposed) to reduce green house gases are a bastardization of that process and unfair use of the ordinance. Seems almost police state.

I just read that the residential sector uses approximately 18% of all energy used and rentals represent about half that. Thus, 9% for rentals. If the super expensive changes proposed and on the back of landlords get a 15% improvement, which is unlikely, then you are looking at a 1%-2% improvement in green house gas reduction from the rental sector. All this for hundreds of thousands spent by a very small segment of landlords. Seems like a terrible return on the money. Private money that landlords will never benefit from.

Why is this not just part of a public vote?? Seems like it should be.

To my knowledge, Boulder is proposing to be the only USA city to do this. Why not have other cities show if it works or not? Why us?

If Boulder does somehow pull this law off, it better accompany the effort with making sure everyone, everyone who has rentals for lease is held responsible!! We all know of many landlords who are not licensed and skate from the responsibilities that law abiding landlords adhere to. It must be fair and equitable and even handed. Good luck with a major enforcement nightmare.

Most of all, in truth: Eventually the poorer tenants will suffer for this. The costs have to be passed on to tenants who will find ever higher rents in an already expensive market driven by high property taxes and other city requirements.

I am against the so-called RECO law proposed by the City of Boulder.

Harry Grass

88) Unknown

Typed letter: An apartment community does not have endless pockets. Using the limited financial recourses in a way that provides no payback would then eliminate the funds for necessary capital projects. I think that given a financial payback communities would be willing to go green and have a more sustainable future, the key is a payback. In this proposal all the financial responsibility is placed on the owner, who will not be occupying the unit, and no responsibility is given to the actual resident who is the one utilizing the services and recouping the energy savings if there are any. They would have no personal accountability to conserve the resources, because they have limited financial commitment.

89) Louise Padden

Typed letter: I own a licensed rental in the city of Boulder and am very concerned about the large number of illegally rented units in the city. My main concerns are:

- 1) Zoning violations: many of the advertised units are in single-family homes in low residential neighborhoods. They have illegally created separate second living quarters. They are not only stressing services, they are effectively changing the zoning of these areas, and skewing discussions on density.
- 2) Length of rentals: most of the illegal units are being offered for rent for just several days. A legal rental license only allows for a 30 day rental, and then under specific circumstances. These short term illegal rentals are taking big bites out of the income of licensed motel and hotel businesses, and the tax base.
- 3) Green abuses: having many short term visitors increases the use of water, heat, gas and electricity. These units: a) escape the new carbon reduction rules for licensed rentals, and b) increase carbon footprints. Since the new green regulations will only apply to licensed rentals, economically it will be much cheaper to stay illegal and pay a possible fine, than to upgrade to the new rules. How much energy is used in just washing and drying all the sheets, towels, etc.? The new rules will encourage rentals to stay illegal, the opposite of their intent. It is certainly not fair to add more requirements on currently licensed rentals, who are already complying.
- 4) Legal action against the city: If someone is injured in one of the illegal units couldn't they sue the city for non-enforcement?

I'm confused by the inaction of the city to deal with these abuses. I was told by Environmental Enforcement that "they are not even taking complaints right now, because it's too hard to manage". I think pretty much every situation facing the city right now falls into that category. Let's see if we can identify steps to proceed. There is staff to fine people with expired license plates, so I don't think that's a concern. But if the issue is one of staffing I will volunteer, along with others, to email these owners from the city website, to at least alert them to zoning and license requirements.

This is an important issue. At a time when the city is in economic stress, and dealing with density and green issues, this impacts both. Please at least look at [collegeweekends.com](http://collegeweekends.com), [VRBO.com](http://VRBO.com), and [Craigslist](http://Craigslist) (sub lease and vacation listings). It's very broad. These are not just homeowners casually renting rooms, these are whole separate units in full business mode. Please consider allowing more legal ADU's enforcing the law, eliminating the rental licenses, or any fair action.

Sincerely,  
Louise Padden

90) Unknown  
Typed letter:

Tenants Side of issues: Proposing only “education” programs for tenants while we are subjected to regulatory requirements. There needs to be more of the “burden” placed on tenants so that they feel the economic impact of this decision by council. Existing education programs are not enough. Something stronger, like CU’s mandatory alcohol class freshman must take is needed.

We proposed some kind of tax or fund be established that tenants will have to pay for landlords to use to retrofit their properties, perhaps property owners will be required to match the monies.

For example last winter one unit left for Christmas break with their windows open. We discovered the problem and then found out our heat pump had broken due to its overuse from the windows being left open. Repairs were needed on Dec. 24<sup>th</sup>. How would these new rules impact tenants? Will they remember to leave the new windows closed? Will they remember to close that refrigerator door? Often times, they sadly do not.

How about adding a database of tenants that are not energy efficient for property owners to use? It feels only FAIR if we are going to be subjected to “RENT SMART” database. How about a “SMART TENANT” database for us so that if we make these investments, they won’t go to waste.

The pure fact of homeownership is that once you are spending your own hard earned money, you want the benefit of utility savings, etc. and make changes in your living habits. Let’s face it, for students, MOST just do not have it in their consciousness to be energy efficient. To make those types of choices.

Old Houses: In looking at the spreadsheet, the house that was built in 1905 required a STAGGERING \$20,000 in improvements. This is incredibly prohibitive for most property owners. People who can afford to do that type of improvement would most likely want to live in the house and it would most likely be on Mapleton Hill! How can we expect the houses on the “hill” (built in early 1900’s) to reach same levels as Mapleton Hill and be even remotely cost effective for students?

What other city in the country/world does this? Has it worked? Have we studied it?

Water conservation: Why is zeroscapping not included as point for water reduction? We have “zeroscaped” several lawns so that they do not need to be watered. That should count for points. It certainly does count in terms of water usage, perhaps more than showers/faucets/water closets (what is that?)!

**CITY PAY FOR ALL INSPECTIONS RELATED TO HERS  
RATINGS/COMPLIANCE**

The city should pay for the initial inspection of our properties to determine their existing HERS rating. We have recently had several of our properties inspected and shouldn't have to bear additional cost for reinspection to determine ratings. City should also pay for final inspection.

Train current inspectors in HERS and incorporate in license program. Scope is too narrow, must include commercial/industrial, and single-family. The narrow scope is discriminatory in nature.

91) Frances Dahlberg (responded online as #103)

I think EXISTING homes need to be given the same requirements as rental housing. Landlords have often already insulated, installed new windows, etc. These measures enable higher rents. You are painting landlords in an unfair light.

92) Jane Zander

I feel the city shouldn't even have rental licenses. I think that when furnaces, dishwashers, etc. are replaced, they should be mandated to be energy star efficient. Any new homes should be upgraded to new standards but any existing ones should not have to be. I think that mandating the regulations to rentals is a mistake because it forces one to comply or sell the property. The economic times are tough enough without more rules and regs. Present time isn't great for selling the property either. I think that some people would let a rental deteriorate, but feel that the majority of landlords want to do right for the renters. I moved to Boulder in 1967 and became a landlord in the 90's. Any rules and regulations that Boulder has imposed on me during that time has not improved my lifestyle. It continues to make it more difficult to rent property. I now live in Niwot. People who do not like the rules and regulations build and add on and no one seems to notice. The people who do try to comply just get more rules and regulations imposed on them. I wish that I had never gotten a rental license initially and rented under the table. In the last 2 years I replaced the furnace and roof on my rental and I can't tell you about the furnace but the roof doesn't have light colored shingles because I didn't know about it at the time. I would have gladly complied, but I hate mandates and regulations that force compliance. Truthfully, I think this is a nice ideal to strive for, but disagree with being forced to comply. I think that once a house has been built, leave the codes alone. Also, how can you force one part of the population to different rules than the rest of the population?

## **Online Comments**

1) C. Mathews

email: ctmath70@gmail.com

phone: 720 244 9820

Address efficiency ideas: This is an unneeded city government intrusion into the now proven bogus "human-caused" global warming hysteria. It will eliminate low-income rental units, like mine, because I cannot get enough rent from my 480 sq ft, concrete

block cabin to pay for what you are looking for. I will simply sell the property, and you will have another homeless person on the street. I've worked with my tenant for 15 years when he couldn't pay. The cost of heating should be between the landlord and tenant and not have the city in the middle. The city is so interested in low-income housing, but it does everything it can to drive the cost of rental units higher and higher. This whole thing will accomplish nothing, but if the city must "do something" just to "feel better" about the climate, then exempt low-income rental units. This is really silly and ill-advised. Have some more hearings and get some more input before fostering this on your low-income folks.

Comments: What more can I say? I oppose this whole effort. I was not able to attend the last meetings but would do my best to get to future ones. PLEASE don't do this. Smart Regs is certainly a terrible name for this whole issue. It is just not a smart thing to do.

2) Arleen Miller

email: arleen.m@gmail.com

phone: 303 442-6656

The City and the energy companies should provide cash subsidies and rebates to the landlords who are paying for the energy efficiency upgrades not the tenants who would otherwise benefit from reduced utility costs. The landlords have to be reimbursed for the amortized upgrade costs. An idea perhaps the tenants would still pay the previous price for utilities but the landlord would pay less for the utilities and thus receive economic benefit for their investment. Otherwise landlords will receive no return on their investment for energy efficiency upgrades. Rental properties are a business to make money. The city will be decreasing the bottom line of landlords and could put some out of business. Landlords need money to do this type of retrofit. We are in the middle of the worst recession since the depression. It is unreasonable to expect landlords to pay for these upgrades.

3) Daniel Murphy

email: daniel.j.murphy-1@colorado.edu

category: Renter

It is of utmost importance to make some of these relatively small investments. 1. Over the long haul money and energy will be saved. Projects like these have positive value no doubt about it. 2. Pairing energy initiatives with renter and landlord education is a very powerful tool that could have more widespread effects than can be measured within city limits. Over time these projects drive very real social change.

4) Patrick Bachmann

email: patrick.bachmann@colorado.edu

phone:

It is time Boulder lived up to its greenwashed title of greenest city in Colorado. These are only the low hanging fruit as well these efficiency measures must be passed as so greater accomplishments can be made in the future.

5) Eric

email: eric.jh.wilson@colorado.edu

A video where I could skip around would be nice (hosted by youtube or vimeo or something like that)

6) John Koval

email: jkoval@coburndev.com

phone: 303-442-3351

Address efficiency ideas: I think the City should support landlords in educating the users/tenants in their buildings to help save energy. I don't think that the City should impose this on landlords. It will drive up the cost of rental housing and the Landlords have little over the occupant's energy use of the rental property.

7) Nick Robles (2<sup>nd</sup> response is #98)

email: nrobles@bouldercounty.org

phone: 303-413-7540

I also feel strongly that the city should address tobacco smoking in multi-unit housing. Secondhand smoke is a true health hazard and infiltrates the units of non-smokers. It is a public health issue that can be addressed during this energy efficiency initiative because the guiding principle of this energy efficiency effort is to protect the long-term health of the community. Thanks for your consideration!

8) Nick Robles

email: nrobles@bouldercounty.org

category: Interested Resident

One of the guiding principles in the proposal states to protect the long-term public health and safety of the community. I agree that efforts should be focused on protecting the long-term public health and safety of the community. I have a request that when dealing with multi-unit housing this initiative consider an issue that both in the short-term and long-term impacts the public health of the community. I am referring to tobacco smoke especially since in 2006 the Surgeon General stated that there is no safe-level of exposure to secondhand smoke. Tobacco smoke infiltrates the units surrounding the smoking unit and also requires more money and energy to turnover a unit that previously had a smoker. For that reason I think the issue of smoke-free housing should be considered as one of the ways property owners can protect the health of the community both in the short-term and long-term.

9) Beth Beckel

email: elizabeth.beckel@colorado.edu

category: Renter

Though I will not be able to attend the public forum I want to voice my support for updating rental efficiency codes. I think the most important measures would focus on building shell: insulation air sealing and windows. I would strongly support increases to building shell requirements as soon as possible - including these additions in the licensing process seems logical and minimally invasive for landlords. A second tier of projects should focus on the appliances/water use: - refrigerator updates (replacing any pre-1993 refrigerators with energy star models for instance) - low-flow faucets and showerheads,

- standards for filter replacements. Thank you for your work to make the huge number of rental homes in Boulder more energy efficient - for the benefit of the community the renters and the environment.

10) Donna Schaefer  
email: schaefer.robert@comcast.net  
category: Landlord

Let's do some simple math. The rent covers the building's mortgage with \$400 left over. With that I the landlord pays for the HEAT GAS WATER TRASH and all maintenance repairs and upgrades to the building. Water and gas/heat hits \$300 in the summer and runs \$600 in the winter. That puts me in the red by \$200 for several months. Worse if there's a vacancy. Double worse when the tenants set the heat to 80 and then open the windows while it's only 22 degrees outside. The City seems to think that all landlords are scum who take advantage of the poor renters. This is not true. I have a wish-list a mile long to improve and upgrade the property we rent. I would love to make it air tight super-efficient and filled with the latest fashion statements in decorating. But I cannot. It's simple math. It comes in as a trickle and goes out in a gusher. I pick up pennies in the parking lot because that's more than I earn in interest on my bank account in a month. This new proposal is fine for landlords who have money to spare. But what about us struggling landlords who haven't owned our buildings long enough to start showing a profit? Who haven't built up a savings yet? Who care about our tenants deeply (I've attended funerals and visited hospital beds of former tenants and we host picnics for current tenants to meet incoming tenants). I'm not a scummy landlord. I'm trying to be one of the good ones. A good one who hasn't the financial ability to do what the City thinks is best for my situation. Where does it stop? Are you going to force homeowners to replace curtains visible from the street to avoid offending passerby? The intent is admirable but the forced implementation sucks. Not all landlords are greedy jerks. Some of us are paying the mortgage the heat the gas the water and the trash FOR our tenants. The City is way out of line on this and needs to take into consideration that some of us are NOT scum and NOT greedy and NOT taking advantage of our tenants. I deeply resent being penalized because of someone else's greed.

11) Jon Silver  
email: skisherpa7@aol.com  
category: Landlord

Before you consider any new Regulations during the worst recession in history please read the following.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/copenhagen-climate-change-confe/6672875/Whos-to-blame-for-Climategate.html>

Sincerely

Jon Silver

12) Laila A Amerman

email: [amerman@colorado.edu](mailto:amerman@colorado.edu)

Unfortunately I won't be able to attend Bridging Broadway: Rental Housing and Energy Efficiency on Tuesday December 1. So here are my comments: I'd like to see water conservation showerheads and toilets as this can save money for either renters or rentees on water bills. Also water is one of our most precious resources and so long as we insist on using clean drinking water to flush away our wastes we should use as little of it as possible. Further in any future installations of windows landlords should be required to put in airtight and double pane windows. This will decrease heat loss and conserve energy bills. Lastly it should be required that insulation in Boulder should be updated on a regular basis. This way if a heater breaks or the thermostat doesn't want to work (as mine frequently doesn't) the inhabitants of a property will not freeze in the bitter cold of winter.

13) Frances Dahlberg (also submitted written comments #91)

email: [frances959@yahoo.com](mailto:frances959@yahoo.com)

phone: 303 447 2893

It is fine to address rental unit energy efficiency but not without also addressing owner occupied energy efficiency. If rental units need insulation, don't owner occupied units also need insulation. Without requirements for all housing, I think this is discriminatory and intrusive. I have already added insulation purchased new furnaces etc in my own rental units and many of those which I manage (Aurora Properties). I am concerned that those of us who have already made improvements will be required to do more than those who have done nothing at all. The HERS grading is very expensive and not something I would do for my own personal residence let alone a rental. Excessive requirements lead to a real absence of affordable housing in Boulder. These energy efficiency requirements are just another intrusion.

14) Krista Nordback

email: [kristanordback@yahoo.com](mailto:kristanordback@yahoo.com)

phone: 303 543-0211

Though it will cost me a lot to make energy efficiency improvements to my property it should be done. Just make sure we landlords can afford it. I already lose \$3000 every year on my rental property in the hopes that one day its value will increase. I'm not alone. Many of us can't sell and can't raise the rent because of the market so please help us make these changes by getting the bulk benefits like the 2 techs & truck idea and low interest loans for larger improvements. Also the goal should be to reduce energy per person not energy per square foot. Larger units shouldn't get away with being energy efficient if only one person lives in 2000 square feet. When we push folks out of Boulder they just live elsewhere and consume more gas and other fossil fuels. Let's support low income housing by allowing more people to live in Boulder. If we really want energy efficiency let's GET RID OF THE NO MORE THAN 3 UNRELATED PEOPLE RULE! It's bad for the environment tenants and landlords.

15) MYOB

16) Dan Guesman

email: [ccmconst@qwestoffice.net](mailto:ccmconst@qwestoffice.net)

category: Landlord

Every few years the City of Boulder proposes new regulations for rental units that do nothing but increase the costs to landlords while council tries to promote affordable housing. Do you not understand the connection between increased costs to landlords and their ability to keep rentals affordable? Additionally if the goal is energy efficient units why would you permit purchasing carbon offsets? This is a terrible idea!

17) Michael Wilson

email: [M18@comcast.net](mailto:M18@comcast.net)

category: Landlord

I attended the open house last week and am hesitant to fill out the comment card. Basically I am against the fundamental approach that is being taken to force rental property owners to finance changes to their properties that they may or may not themselves want. I believe that if the city of Boulder would like rental properties to be more energy efficient in order to meet certain community goals then it is up to the community as a whole to finance such changes. A proposed sales tax presented to the voters with the proceeds going towards energy efficiency upgrades in the city's rentals would better represent such a community commitment. If such a tax proposal fails at the polls then we have our answer to the question of true community commitment to this process.

Also I am adamantly against the city using the license inspection program to collect energy data on specific rental properties and disseminating this information publicly. It is inappropriate for the city to interject itself in the marketing of specific rental properties. While the city has been given permission to access rental properties for the purpose of ensuring the safety of the tenants it is an abuse of this process to collect data and disseminate it in a way that may be detrimental to the marketing of that particular property. I am not a lawyer but I would imagine that such an infringement upon the privacy and property of the landlord would have 4th and 5th amendment implications.

18) Peter Stainton

email: [peterstainton@gmail.com](mailto:peterstainton@gmail.com)

category: Interested Resident

The city should address the energy efficiency of homes in the city by raising funds via sales tax revenue which is used to increase efficiency of all homes instead of choosing only to levy fees/taxes on rental housing. Although it may be easier to levy new fees on rental housing because many owners are out of town the city should take the harder but more fair route of involving all citizens that live here not just property owners.

19) Joel Miller

email: [joel.miller@colorado.edu](mailto:joel.miller@colorado.edu)

category: Renter

The lack of care put into my residence makes it difficult for me and my fellow tenants to take proper care of our home. Despite this we have taken many precautions to attempt

and make our home more energy efficient and yet daily we find new problems that must be confronted. A little help from our landlords would go a long way in helping us and inspiring other tenants to take further steps as well.

20) Jon Silver (same person as comment #101)

email: [skisherpa7@aol.com](mailto:skisherpa7@aol.com)

category: Landlord

I will not install programmable thermostats. They break and unless you are going to pay for all the damage I would suggest that you don't even go there. I actually have been looking into installing new windows in both of my rentals. (Average cost \$4500 each.) While we are on the subject of outdated laws from 1965, let's get rid of the no more than 3 non-related family members law. The law should state that if you have a legal 4 bedroom unit then 4 people regardless of their family orientation should be allowed to live there. This will make housing more affordable in Boulder. It will also enable landlords to charge just a little more to help offset the costs of this GREEN program that you are about to shove down our throats while my owner occupied neighbor's homes lose just as much energy.

21) Mark Emery

email: [mark.emery@comcast.net](mailto:mark.emery@comcast.net)

category: Landlord

After attending an informational meeting and learning that the city is not successfully licensing all rental units and has no plan to retool enforcement of rental unit licensing I find it very difficult to accept the idea of imposing additional regulations on current licenses. Addressing rental licensing failures on a complaint basis is ridiculous - who would possibly complain? To address the inequity of this plan I suggest the city take its efforts to enforce existing regulations before moving forward.

Then address the SmartRegs over fixed longer period of time to allow landlords adequate time to grow resources to comply. Raising rents is not likely to cover the investment and likely will negatively affect growing resources due to increase in vacancy periods. A fixed period is important to give equal time frames to all landlords to comply. Some having as few as four years while others have as many as eight years is terribly inequitable. I would suggest a minimum of 10 years to meet new city SmartReg standards. Following this suggestion would make the whole process easier as it would do away with unnecessary phased in approach or carbon offset management that uses city resources. And finally I have a difficult time with the long term policing and compliance. Expecting independent contractors to add licensure to measure compliance of energy efficiency is difficult to accept. If the variable judgement already in place for licensure of rental units is an example of what is to follow I suggest the city re-think its plan.

22) Jon Rush

email: [jonrush@hotmail.com](mailto:jonrush@hotmail.com)

category: Landlord

I own one rental house which is licensed and maintained. I've received your mysterious green postcards and tried to follow this. What is now available on the web is impenetrable. After reviewing it I have no idea of what you want to require me to do.

The 5-page pdf purporting to tell us what you are proposing provides no information that I can find.

23) Susan Balint

email: [sebalint@comcast.net](mailto:sebalint@comcast.net)

category: Interested Resident

You are approaching this issue of legislating landlord mandated expenditures with tunnel vision. Looking at the cumulative impacts of imposing this type of mandatory landlord expensing would lead to a truer cost benefit analysis which I believe would change the Staff and City's perspective on outcome. Mandating the retrofitting of already existing rental housing or multi-unit housing will not bring about the end goal you are seeking because it is the user not the structural unit that will determine energy efficiency. I saw this first hand when I was a general manager for a ski resort motel. Open doors open windows and personal preferences for heating and cooling determine usage and consumption. If you are going to do anything you should be structuring a win-win voluntary incentive program where landlords receive some cost benefit from the City to upgrade specific category's of improvements and tenants should receive city benefits if they can show over time that they have reduced their energy consumption through reduced usage of water and power. It is the end user that will make the difference. Mandating owner retrofits or appliance replacements will have negligible impacts on what you are trying to accomplish. Instead if you mandate these types of improvements rental costs will go higher and Boulder will lose even more of its rental clientele than it already has lost and those traveling to and from the city for work or school will be causing more air pollution more traffic congestion which will more than defeat what you are trying to accomplish. Sales tax revenue for Boulder will be impacted because renters will be renting and spending elsewhere. Louisville Longmont and Lafayette should be very happy if you continue down this ill-thought-out regulation path. Cumulative impacts.....you should be looking at the bigger picture when attempting to make what you think are meaningful regulation changes. The path you are choosing to pursue is a City Staff 'feel-good' plan that in reality is paper perfect and practically poor.

24) Ellen Vineski

email: [ellen@rudoff.com](mailto:ellen@rudoff.com)

category: Interested Resident

What's to keep the landlords from passing on the cost to the renters? You would probably see rents rise en masse in the city.

25) B Sien

email: [hiddendragonfly@hotmail.com](mailto:hiddendragonfly@hotmail.com)

category: Interested Resident

Dear Smart Regs

I am writing because I can't attend the meeting on Wednesday though the topic concerns me greatly. I've been interested and involved in green issues since the 1970s. While I would love it if every house in Boulder could be as green as possible I fear that these proposed regulations could impose severe financial difficulties for landlords like myself who own one or two homes that we rent out for little or no profit [in my case the rental

income doesn't begin to cover my costs]. I live on a very tight budget/income [many Boulder landlords like me are retired teachers and other good community citizens living on very limited incomes]. While I wish I could green up my rentals the costs [in addition to historical restrictions that forbid changing out windows and making structural changes] make it really difficult.

I hope that you will consider how the costs of this program could negatively impact the many landlords like myself who own a house or two [often inherited from a parent]--- these costs will either have to be passed on to the tenants raising already high Boulder rental costs or be highly subsidized [in my case that subsidy would have to be almost 100% because I just don't have any more money to put into my home] or poorer landlords would be forced to sell homes in an already glutted housing market.

Perhaps the requirements could be applied only to landlords owning more than 5 rentals [or some number that doesn't hurt the Mom and Pop landlord] or to those who earn a certain amount of rental profit per year [although remember for some senior landlords rental income is their only retirement income].

I believe that the carrot is always more powerful than the stick why not hold out some very significant rewards for making green improvements [though I know this would benefit the wealthier landlords who own many units and not those of us who really can't afford any outlay] which would help you accomplish your goals of greening up the rental market. Please consider the financial implications of these regulations. Thank you for considering my ideas.

Sincerely

Bettianne Sien

[LETTER NOT FOR PUBLICATION THANK YOU]

26) Jennifer Bohn

email: [soaringgrace@hotmail.com](mailto:soaringgrace@hotmail.com)

category: Renter

I would like to hear the minutes of these meetings if possible as I am engaged both Monday and Wednesday evenings. Can you email me any information you may have. I have perused the website thank you. Thank you for the important work that you are doing! Jennifer Bohn [Note: Info to link was sent on 12/21/09.]

27) Bill Reynolds

email: [bill\\_reynolds\\_co@yahoo.com](mailto:bill_reynolds_co@yahoo.com)

category: Landlord

I own just two rental houses in Boulder. Both are well maintained and priced below market in order to avoid having them sit empty two months out of the year. I actually lose money on both houses but I hope it will be a good investment for the long term (which looks more and more doubtful). If any regulations are imposed that will increase my costs I will sell the houses and get out of the Boulder rental business. If that's any kind of indicator you might want to carefully think of the consequences of any action you

take. Reducing rental units will only increase rents which is what I think Boulder wants to avoid.

28) Dana Donahue Sparling

email: [choicelighting@earthlink.net](mailto:choicelighting@earthlink.net)

category: Landlord

To the Boulder City Council:

I have been a professional in the energy conservation field for 18 years. I believe in it and do my best to practice this in both my business and personal life.

Since the early 1990's when energy conservation measures really came to the forefront in our country there is one critical element that has ALWAYS existed: INCENTIVES for making the retrofits / upgrades. These have come in many different forms but have always benefited the customer who has funded the improvements. This is common sense. With this in mind how can the Council propose that landlords pay up to \$2000 per unit for upgrades that will not benefit the landlords?? The payback on the upgrades would benefit tenants (in their utility bills) which simply makes no business sense when they didn't pay for the upgrades.

Add to the equation those landlords with student-tenants who have a hard-enough time keeping glass and utensils out of garbage disposals...and the Council expects that they will properly manage a programmable thermostat?? The long-term maintenance costs will no doubt rise.

Having said all of this I do believe there is a way to makes this proposal work but it must include tangible and substantial financial benefit to landlords. It's just the right thing to do and it's how business is done in America. The premise is simple and one that is integral to doing business: when one pays for something one gets something in return.

The proposed ordinance must guarantee two things:

1)immediate financial benefit to those paying for the upgrades and

2) this benefit should equal 100% of the cost outlayed by the payor

As already contained in the proposal this benefit should absolutely come in the form /combination of rebates and/or tax deductions.

Thank you for your consideration. Dana Donahue Sparling The JDJ Group LLC

29) Bill Seith

Thank you for your response.

While I realize that this proposed ordinance is still a work in progress and that the full implications have yet to be fully understood, I must protest that immediate imposition of the full requirements of any new energy efficiency code or ordinance is a financial hardship on existing landlords.

As you are well aware rental stock in the areas serving the University of Colorado student population are very restricted. Commitments for the school year 2010-2011 will be made beginning in December and for the most part finalized in the 1st quarter. If your proposed ordinance effectively removes units from the rental pool even for the short term you will

severely impact the rental population. What you outline below requires that an International Code Council Energy Inspector inspect every unit for compliance. There is no other way to determine the current state of each unit. This of course implies some level of cost. The necessity to comply or to get existing UPGRADES verified also imposes a significant cost burden which as you can well appreciate is proposed to be imposed during one of the deepest recessions/depressions experienced during the lifetime of almost everyone alive today. The housing stock in Boulder exhibits a high degree of architectural character. I strongly urge you to consider the effects upon these units from any ordinances or codes that you approve. In closing, a well thought out plan that is phased in over a reasonable time period is a benefit to us all. A Draconian plan implemented immediately will only lead to unnecessary conflict and hardship.

Thank you  
Bill Seith

30) Gordon Bickford  
email: [gbick3@gmail.com](mailto:gbick3@gmail.com)  
category: Interested Resident

If you have not actually considered the opposing ideas about man made global warming (i.e. DVD - 'The Great Global Warming Swindle' but Martin Durkin and the book 'Unstoppable Global Warming - Every 1500 Years by Singer and Avery) and thought about the research grant funding process which fundamentally biases results and conclusions then please do. The un-necessary impact to the US economy is huge. We can not afford to waste our resources eliminating something that does not need to be reduced or eliminated - carbon emissions. It appears that politicians have no principles other than the attainment of power and that leadership is dead. The hoax of man made global warming takes a little thinking to understand but it is not 'rocket science.' Please stop study think and then lead.

4.0% 4% of green house gases are CO2

4.0% 4% of CO2 is human generated

Multiplied

0.16%

25.0% 25% USA contribution to human generated CO2

Multiplied

0.04%

10.0% 10% USA CO2 reduction goal

Multiplied

0.004% Target USA green house gas reduction goal to turn around Earth's eather.

Plot this on a one foot diameter pie chart and think for yourself.

31) Kerranne Biley  
email: [k.biley@comcast.net](mailto:k.biley@comcast.net)  
category: Landlord

This may seem like a naive question but if the City is interested in truly achieving energy efficiency and reducing carbon emissions why just focus on rental properties? Why won't the City require all homeowners to abide by the new regulations for existing housing?

32) Valerie Berg  
email: [gulfy@comcast.net](mailto:gulfy@comcast.net)  
category: Landlord

I'm concerned that I will be required to spend money on upgrades that my tenant may or may not use properly. When I went into the apartment last week I noticed that the carbon monoxide detector that I bought and plugged in had been removed from the socket and was on the floor. What will the requirements be for a condo landlord in an HOA governed complex? If the HOA doesn't want to make upgrades then what? What about the problems with CFLs? I called the county Hazardous Household Waste about disposing them and was directed to an EPA website  
<http://epa.gov/mercury/spills/index.htm#fluorescent>

If I instruct my tenant to follow the guidelines they don't and are injured who is liable?

33) William Seith (could be same person as #119)  
email: [bseith@brookfieldhomes.com](mailto:bseith@brookfieldhomes.com)  
category: Landlord

Do you intend to grandfather in existing rental properties?

34) Sean Casey  
email: [casey.j.sean@gmail.com](mailto:casey.j.sean@gmail.com)  
phone: 7039651001

How are you dealing with owner/renter shares of the incurred cost of upgrades?

35) Laurence Budd, EPA Watersense Partner  
email: [LBBUDD@yahoo.com](mailto:LBBUDD@yahoo.com)  
category: Interested Resident

Will indoor/outdoor water use be part of this? Will the city be offering a list of recommended efficient devices? Such as smart controllers dual flush toilets etc.

36) **From:** [jbjeremykatie@aol.com](mailto:jbjeremykatie@aol.com)  
**Sent:** Friday, November 20, 2009 1:32 PM  
**To:** Gichon, Yael  
**Subject:** Letter from University Heights Apartments  
**Attachments:** energy efficiency views.doc

Ms. Gichon,

I am the property manager of University Heights Apartments here in Boulder. The property owner, Jack Landblom and I met you on Wednesday at the open house regarding the Smart Regs proposal. I have attached a letter with our views pertaining to this. We appreciate you taking our views into consideration. Thank you for your time. Please feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss this issue further.

Have a nice weekend.

J.B. Sanchez  
Property Manager  
University Heights Apartments

37) **From:** Laurence Budd [lbudd@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 04, 2009 4:04 PM  
**To:** Gichon, Yael  
**Subject:** RE: SmartsRegs Web Comment Form Submission

Thanks- I would like to submit that the dual flush conversion kits be included. there are several brands, very affordable, save a lot of water. See Hydroright at [www.gomjsi.com](http://www.gomjsi.com), select-a-flush, one2flush. I am very impressed at what these do for the price, and yes I have been testing one. If you want I will come show you one. You do not know me, I did a lot of irrigation upgrades for Boulder under Paul Lander, in the now extinct conservation dept.

38) Lesley Herrmann  
email: [lesleyherrmann@comcast.net](mailto:lesleyherrmann@comcast.net)  
phone: 406-546-1996  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas: promote zero-scaping and water conservation  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 2  
carbon\_purchases: 1

As a building systems engineering student and renter I believe energy efficiency is the cheapest way to cut carbon emissions. Allowing for the purchase of carbon offsets does not improve the quality of the rental property (thus making it more comfortable for the people living there) and shows poor leadership from rental property owners. If carbon offsets are to be an option they should come at a considerable cost (equivalent to or great than the cost of home energy efficiency upgrades). Feel free to contact me with questions.

39) Steve Fenberg  
email: [Fenberg@gmail.com](mailto:Fenberg@gmail.com)  
phone: 720-244-2062  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 1

40) Julie Zielinski

email: [julie.zielinski@gmail.com](mailto:julie.zielinski@gmail.com)  
phone: 720-979-5493  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 2  
carbon\_purchases: 1

I want a comfortable energy affordable place to live in, not carbon offsets.

41) Julie Hayes  
email: [julie.hayes@gmail.com](mailto:julie.hayes@gmail.com)  
phone: 970-443-2247  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 2  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 1

Please do not allow the purchase of offsets! City of Boulder is the only organization that can improve the housing stock in the City of Boulder. Offsets somewhere else mean we're not really saving here where we as a community have pledged to reduce our emissions. No offsets!

42) Cole Sigmon  
email: [colesigmon@gmail.com](mailto:colesigmon@gmail.com)  
phone: 910-785-1085  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 1  
phased\_in: 1  
carbon\_purchases: 1

I like the two techs option but I strongly disagree because of the property owner's right to purchase carbon offsets in place of investing in energy efficiency. Carbon offsets do not benefit the City of Boulder in fact I feel that they would act as a sort of scapegoat for property owners who are trying to avoid energy efficiency improvements.

43) Kumar Thurimella  
email: [Kiran.Thurimella@colorado.edu](mailto:Kiran.Thurimella@colorado.edu)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5

two\_rental\_license: 5  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 2

Love the idea!

44) Unknown  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 3  
carbon\_purchases: 1

45) Ted Galanthay  
email: [tgalanth@comcast.net](mailto:tgalanth@comcast.net)  
phone: 303 955-0934  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 5  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 3

46) Unknown  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 1  
phased\_in: 2  
carbon\_purchases: 1

47) Jamie Pfahl  
email: [jamie.pfahl@colorado.edu](mailto:jamie.pfahl@colorado.edu)  
category: Renter

Please hold campus and community workshops/panels to get more discussion rolling on this proposal. Student renters (especially) deserve to know what they can do to conserve energy and reduce their bills. I live in a complex with shared utils so if other people take long showers leave lights on or crank the heat then I have to pay for it. In such units there's little incentive for renters to conserve because no one is really personally responsible. This needs to change. I think this is a much needed proposal as rental units are notoriously poorly maintained. Especially now that it's so cold there should be incentives for renters and landlords to find and stop drafts - this is a huge problem in my apartment as we lose a great deal of heat to our very large single pane windows (which are right above the heaters of course). I also think it's important to be proactive and

direct about getting this information out. We need lots helpful and creative tips on conservation (ie. turn the stove burner off a minute or two before your food is done and let residual heat cook it slowly and efficiently to perfection use craigslist or freecycle to get rid of unwanted stuff instead of just throwing it away etc). Students are busy jaded tired apathetic poor etc. and most need information like this presented clearly and directly to them (few are likely to seek this information out themselves unless pressed by someone else to do so). If it weren't for the Student Buff Bulletin I wouldn't have found this information and many students don't read the Buff Bulletin or just don't really care.... so be LOUD and get heard! (Offering free food at workshops helps!)

48) Luke Ragland  
email: [iamluke20@hotmail.com](mailto:iamluke20@hotmail.com)  
category: Renter

This is a horrible idea. I agree that energy efficiency is a laudable goal but this is going to price even more people out of town. This is the case with so many Boulder policies a lofty goal that does one of two things:

- 1.) Force people of modest income out of town or
- 2.) Further contribute to the concentration of wealth in Boulder.

The line must be drawn somewhere unless your goal is to make Boulder a town for people making over 100K a year.

Shame on you.

49) Hannah Cassard  
email: [hannah.cassard@colorado.edu](mailto:hannah.cassard@colorado.edu)  
phone: 503-816-8118  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 5

I believe that energy efficiency is a large issue in college towns and other locations with a large number of renters. I study environmental engineering and would love to make our home more energy efficient however I do not have the funds and am only going to be living here for another year. I'm pretty sure our landlord is currently not willing to invest in these improvements a) because he does not own the house and b) he is not paying the utility bills. I strongly support a plan to improve rental unit energy efficiency.

50) Uriah Beauchamp  
email: [bukowski.was.wrong@gmail.com](mailto:bukowski.was.wrong@gmail.com)  
category: Renter

I wholeheartedly support mandatory minimum energy efficiency standards in Boulder. These improvements can be done relatively inexpensively and pay off in many ways (including financially) in a short time. As a renter I am unable to make these energy efficient improvements myself though I would very much like to for many reasons. This sort of housing code change would reflect the progressive reform minded city that is Boulder and would be a welcomed addition by the majority of the community especially with the college students who make up the majority of renters in Boulder anyways. Energy efficiency in our homes is perhaps the most important starting point in reducing one's ecological impact and there needs to be legislation to allow renters access to efficient housing. Just about the only opposition to such legislation comes from landlords more concerned with profit than their renters or certainly the environment. As landlords these people already have a sweet set up going and they should be required to take on this small extra expense for the greater good of all. As landlords they control any changes to the property and they should in turn be required to make improvements towards energy efficiency on that property.

51) Christie Sickinger  
email: [3MoarCookies@gmail.com](mailto:3MoarCookies@gmail.com)  
category: Renter

This is a great idea. Energy efficiency is better for the renter's budget the impact on the community and will keep Boulder at the cutting edge of low-impact environmentally friendly living. A performance approach to energy efficiency requirements is the better option.

52) Sheena Murray  
email: [Sheena.Murray@colorado.edu](mailto:Sheena.Murray@colorado.edu)  
category: Renter

I think this proposal is a much needed step in the right direction. My building is incredibly inefficient and my energy bills can be well over \$120 a month in the winter to keep my small one bedroom apartment at a temperature of only 68 degrees. I live in family housing from the university in a unit that is required to pay their own utilities. Our windows are so outdated and thin that inches of ice forms all over the INSIDE of my windows during the winter. These inefficient units are using up way too much of our communities electric and gas resources.

53) Cassie Finer  
email: [cassiereyna@yahoo.com](mailto:cassiereyna@yahoo.com)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 3

54) Holly Stevenson  
email: [holly.stevenson@colorado.edu](mailto:holly.stevenson@colorado.edu)  
phone: 7192487243  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 4  
two\_rental\_license: 2  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 1

Most of the rental properties I've lived in and seen in Boulder are very inefficient. This is a waste of energy and money for the tenants. By doing simple things like weatherstripping and lighting upgrades a lot of energy can be saved. Through this program landlords would also be encouraged to promote energy efficiency to their residents (like turning lights off when they are gone).

55) Alana Bereck Portaro  
email: [abereck@gmail.com](mailto:abereck@gmail.com)  
phone: 702-610-1764  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 4  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 2

I've lived in 2 different rental properties in Boulder over the past 2 years and for the most part have no complaints. But the issue of energy efficiency is one that I would like to see addressed. As a renter I take steps to conserve energy such programming the thermostat and turning off lights and conserving water usage. Namely I do the things that I have control over. However as a renter I don't have control over which appliances are in the unit or how well sealed the doors and windows are. There are what seem to me fairly simple steps that can be taken to improve efficiency which I would greatly appreciate.

56) Benjamin Stuhl  
email: [benjamin.stuhl@colorado.edu](mailto:benjamin.stuhl@colorado.edu)  
phone: 607-435-4838  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 2  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 1

As a renter whose landlord has refused for years to install a programmable thermostat I strongly support a program to mandate such low-cost high-benefit improvements.

57) Jared M Urchek  
email: [jurchek@students.naropa.edu](mailto:jurchek@students.naropa.edu)  
phone: 330-606-6376  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 2

This is a great initiative! I give my full support and cooperation with any initiative to tighten up the energy efficiency of our cities rental properties.

This is a wonderful and necessary step to a climate friendly city. Many more steps exist but this is great. Thank you~

58) Jeff Woodward  
email: [jeffrey.b.woodward@gmail.com](mailto:jeffrey.b.woodward@gmail.com)  
phone: 603-995-6345  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 3  
carbon\_purchases: 1

I am strongly in favor of the city pursuing this initiative!

59) Unknown  
date\_certain: 1  
two\_rental\_license: 5  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 1

My concern with a short time frame (2012) is

a) the potential impact on rents - if all landlords have to comply in a short time frame rents may rise in unison.

b) the assumption that all property owners have sufficient cash flow to afford all improvements at once. Not all landlords are greedy slum lords. Not all properties are profitable. With the recession some homeowners have turned to renting to retain their home and may actually be taking a loss.

c) The punitive approach no license if you don't comply may drive more unlicensed rentals.

While I support the goals of the program I feel a longer time frame is warranted. I also feel the program should be structured with more incentives clear understanding of how the IRS will treat improvements for tax purposes and that finding the money for upgrades may not be easy for all property owners.

60) Jess Brown

email: [jessica.e.brown@colorado.edu](mailto:jessica.e.brown@colorado.edu)

address\_efficiency: yes

address\_efficiency\_ideas:

date\_certain: 5

two\_rental\_license: 3

phased\_in: 4

carbon\_purchases: 2

Our home is unreasonably energy inefficient our house is only warm when the heat is on. Once we turn the heat off our house becomes freezing in a short 10 minutes. As a result our excel bill is through the roof which is extremely taxing on my roommate and I as we try to pay rent and tuition at the same time.

61) Michael Christoph

email: [Michael.Christoph@colorado.edu](mailto:Michael.Christoph@colorado.edu)

phone: (423)341-3411

address\_efficiency: yes

address\_efficiency\_ideas:

date\_certain: 4

two\_rental\_license: 3

phased\_in: 5

carbon\_purchases: 1

I've rented in Boulder since 2005 and the energy efficiency available in each of the properties has been atrocious. Insulation has been poor windows have often not actually closed completely door jams have had significant gaps.

I strongly support mandating increased efficiency standards in rental properties as soon as reasonably possible. I tend to be skeptical of carbon offsets purchases as I'm uncertain where exactly this investment would be spent. I support efforts to increase the local availability of weatherization contractors and I support efforts to make Boulder a leader in the development of green technologies.

A compliance date of Dec. 31 2021 for all of Boulder may put unreasonable burden on \*a minority\* of Boulder's landlords but I strongly feel that this policy should phase in as soon as possible. This is why I support the Two Rental License Cycles to Comply plan and it is the only reason I am skeptical of the Phased-in Approach 'Two Techs' plan.

This is an incredibly important and visionary strategy and it is one that will aid Boulder's less affluent population. I hope it succeeds.

62) Jeanne Schamel  
email: [jschamel@myqci.com](mailto:jschamel@myqci.com)  
phone: 303-929-6842  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 1

63) Alyssa Bamonti  
email: [alyssa.bamonti@colorado.edu](mailto:alyssa.bamonti@colorado.edu)  
phone: 720-207-1588  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 4  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 2

Anything to lower utility costs in the long run!

64) Unknown  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas: But you're doing it wrong.  
date\_certain: 1  
two\_rental\_license: 1  
phased\_in: 1  
carbon\_purchases:

65) Carol Carbon  
email: [Carolcarbon@aol.com](mailto:Carolcarbon@aol.com)  
phone: 303-499-4292  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas: how about incentives to increase efficiency rather than mandating costly requirements?  
date\_certain: 1  
two\_rental\_license: 1  
phased\_in: 1  
carbon\_purchases: 1

I am a landlady of one single family home and while I try to keep it up my rent doesn't yet cover my monthly mortgage payment so any additional improvements and repairs which are of course necessary put me in the red which has been the case for the almost 10 years I have been renting. I don't look forward to more costs especially in a short time period. I have a license and have had the house inspected routinely which already keeps our rental in Boulder at a higher maintenance level than surrounding areas. why would the city want to add to the small landlord burden?

66) Barbara McGregor

email: [barbara\\_don\\_mcgregor@msn.com](mailto:barbara_don_mcgregor@msn.com)

phone: 303-499-9341

address\_efficiency: no

address\_efficiency\_ideas: Make downtown shops close their doors in the winter.

Make office buildings turn off their lights at night.

Incentives for swamp coolers in rentals instead of airconditioners.

Give credit for clothes lines.

Give points for no-dog policies (dogs=huge carbon footprint).

Give points for no-smoking policies (cigarettes=bad for soil).

date\_certain: 1

two\_rental\_license: 1

phased\_in: 1

carbon\_purchases: 1

Most student rentals have a very low carbon footprint compared to home owners. Examples: small square footage students use the bus because there is no parking on campus and they have free bus passes they usually don't have pets students often have used furniture and even used clothes. I put fluorescent light bulbs in our rental house and I pay for garbage and water. They pay for electricity because they can do so much to lower the bill themselves by unplugging things not in use and turning off computers at night.

67) Britney Canfield

email: [britneycanfield@gmail.com](mailto:britneycanfield@gmail.com)

phone: 317 440-5568

address\_efficiency: yes

address\_efficiency\_ideas:

date\_certain: 5

two\_rental\_license: 3

phased\_in: 5

carbon\_purchases: 2

68) Austin Rand

email: [randat@colorado.edu](mailto:randat@colorado.edu)

phone: 978 6601304

address\_efficiency: yes

address\_efficiency\_ideas:

date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 3  
carbon\_purchases: 1

I am a renter here in Boulder. I think this program will continue this cities long legacy of cutting edge environmental program. It will also create more awareness and accountability for personal home energy usage. Not to mention the added revenue for local businesses when renters aren't spending all there money on high energy bills.

69) Clark Becker  
email: [cabecker222@aol.com](mailto:cabecker222@aol.com)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 2

70) Sarah Mass  
email: [sarah.mass@colorado.edu](mailto:sarah.mass@colorado.edu)  
phone: 303-895-6760  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 1  
phased\_in: 1  
carbon\_purchases: 1

Carbon offsets are the laziest way of addressing climate change. Everyone should have to improve energy efficiency and sooner than later would be better because it is seriously cold in my apartment which hemorrhages heat through the cheap windows and poorly installed doors. For the amount of rent I pay my property management company should be required by law to at least keep me warm in the winter. Carbon offsets aren't going to help me.

71) Andrea Patterson  
email: [patpallone@hotmail.com](mailto:patpallone@hotmail.com)  
phone: 3038159869  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 4  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 3

This is a great idea. It would be very cool to get students involved in doing the audits and possibly some of the weatherization (provided they are trained).

72) Laura Biles  
email: [laura.biles@colorado.edu](mailto:laura.biles@colorado.edu)  
category: Renter

My door and windows are so drafty and the exterior walls of my apartment leech heat making my heater need to run almost constantly. Addressing these problems will not only lower my energy bill but allow me to use the draftier parts of my apartment and improve my quality of living. And my landlord will NOT address this on his own - I'm already paying to live there why pull more money out of his pocket right?

73) Jarrod Weaton  
email: [email@jweaton.com](mailto:email@jweaton.com)  
category: Interested Resident

I support the climate action plan as a past renter in Boulder for about 6 years I appreciate the action to provide energy efficient housing.

74) Jeff Malin  
email: [jeff.malin@gmail.com](mailto:jeff.malin@gmail.com)  
phone: 303-579-2218  
address\_efficiency: no  
address\_efficiency\_ideas: Look at the whole picture regarding CO2 emissions and energy savings - for example, replacing a furnace with one which is ten years old will result in less energy consumed by the new furnace. However, how much energy did it take to build the new furnace and install it? Those are significant energy costs which are not taken into account by simply replacing things.  
date\_certain: 1  
two\_rental\_license: 1  
phased\_in: 1  
carbon\_purchases: 1

The city should consider relaxing the rules for the 3-unrelated-persons ordinance for rental properties which reach a certain level of energy-efficiency.

75) Unknown  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 1

76) Sue

email: [mokeysmom@hotmail.com](mailto:mokeysmom@hotmail.com)

address\_efficiency: no

address\_efficiency\_ideas:

date\_certain: 1

two\_rental\_license: 1

phased\_in: 1

carbon\_purchases: 1

77) Unknown

address\_efficiency: yes

address\_efficiency\_ideas: no more single pane windows! and just because a property ends up having some energy efficiency features it should have reasonable rent.

date\_certain: 2

two\_rental\_license: 1

phased\_in: 1

carbon\_purchases: 1

78) Eric Patterson

email: [eric.m.patterson@gmail.com](mailto:eric.m.patterson@gmail.com)

phone: 303-913-2755

address\_efficiency:

address\_efficiency\_ideas:

date\_certain: 5

two\_rental\_license: 2

phased\_in: 3

carbon\_purchases: 1

79) Blake Langdon

email: [blake.langdon@colorado.edu](mailto:blake.langdon@colorado.edu)

phone: 2242136771

address\_efficiency: yes

address\_efficiency\_ideas:

date\_certain: 4

two\_rental\_license: 4

phased\_in: 4

carbon\_purchases: 2

My largest fear is having rental costs go up because of these new requirements. I think energy audits would be useful information for the property owner to know and could be done for a low cost to them. Also in this vein I think the property owner should get more time to add these improvements such that they are financially feasible and that the city should help provide resources (monetary as well) for these updates.

This does require an investment by the property owner but it is an investment that I think necessary to make (as I sit in my room with my space heater on and heat siphoning out of my window). I fear that if the cost burden is too high it will be passed on to the renter as well. Finally I think there should be more city awareness about energy efficient things

homeowners and renters can do that are fairly low cost and immediate that can improve the energy efficiency of their home. Thank you for your time!

80) Philip May

email: [philipmay11@yahoo.com](mailto:philipmay11@yahoo.com)

phone: 303-499-1741

address\_efficiency: no

address\_efficiency\_ideas: Let people decide on their own. If a landlord wants to attract better tenants they can offer a more energy efficient home/ unit. This is something that market forces should decide, and renters should start asking for better energy efficiency. As a homeowner, not a landlord, I would love a more energy efficient house, but cannot afford to upgrade at this time. It may be many, many years before I am able to. I also think it is not the city's place to regulate energy efficiency of private property when many public buildings are using more energy than these homes would save.

date\_certain: 1

two\_rental\_license: 1

phased\_in: 1

carbon\_purchases: 1

This was a very one sided survey. There should be some questions that address affordability from the perspective of the renter. Are renters willing to pay more per month to get this energy efficiency? Have they thought that some rental properties could be pulled from the marketplace if it is too costly for a landlord to comply and if that happens rents will also increase due to limited rentals.

81) Reuben

email: reubenrr1

address\_efficiency: yes

address\_efficiency\_ideas:

date\_certain: 4

two\_rental\_license: 2

phased\_in: 3

carbon\_purchases: 2

82) Sandra Chervenak

email: [sandychrv@aol.com](mailto:sandychrv@aol.com)

address\_efficiency: yes

address\_efficiency\_ideas:

date\_certain: 5

two\_rental\_license: 3

phased\_in: 3

carbon\_purchases: 1

I am in complete support of required energy efficiency measures in Boulder. However it is unclear how effective carbon offsets are and providing that alternative may leave the

majority of Boulder rentals energy inefficient. I believe that efficiency measures should be required and no alternative should be provided.

83) Nicole Sauvageau  
email: [nicolereenee21@yahoo.com](mailto:nicolereenee21@yahoo.com)  
phone: 7203897238  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 3

84) Alan Butler  
email: [r.alan.butler@gmail.com](mailto:r.alan.butler@gmail.com)  
phone: 7195881387  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 3  
carbon\_purchases: 1

As a renter I think this measure would be great. In the last place I lived in no doors sealed nor did many of the windows. Even with the thermostat set at 60 the heating in the winter was very expensive. I believe that the property management companies and landlords have a responsibility to provide energy efficient homes without raising rent much. While I understand that they will pass some of the cost on to the renters I would hope that the increase in rent would offset with the decrease in my energy bill.

Also while the city probably needs property taxes to help with the budget some sort of tax credit could be used to help landlords. Alternatively if possible the city could pay for some of the upfront costs and allow the landlords to pay higher property taxes over a long period to repay the city (even with added interest).

Finally if the properties are going to be 'air tight' the addition of radon detesters might be considered. While I am not sure if this is a huge problem within Boulder I know it is in some areas of Colorado. While sealing up all cracks helps with energy efficiency it could impede the necessary ventilation required to dispel radon from houses.

85) Robert Sean Allen  
email: [kidntherain@gmail.com](mailto:kidntherain@gmail.com)  
phone: 720-275-1579  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5

two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 1

This is very important and Boulder stands at the forefront to lead the way for others. Please stay strong in doing this and don't be swayed by the few if they do not represent the majority.

86) Joe Gibbons  
email: [josef.gibbons@colorado.edu](mailto:josef.gibbons@colorado.edu)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 2  
carbon\_purchases: 1

87) Erin Mathre  
email: [erin.mathre@colorado.edu](mailto:erin.mathre@colorado.edu)  
phone: 970-217-6859  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 5  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 3

I believe that it is very important to address rental properties especially low-income rental properties in the future environmental goals. In my opinion some rental property owners may overlook the importance of reducing energy use in their properties since they don't pay the energy bill and they are not receiving huge rent checks to make changes with. I think it is a good idea to implement semi-stringent goals for property-owners but at the same time offer deferment plans such as the carbon offset for those owners with less resources to fully comply. I also believe that easy-to-read and condensed information regarding the city of Boulder's climate change actions as well as information about the importance of energy conservation should be provided to property owners along with the information of the pending change. Many people still do not realize the impact of our seemingly small actions on the environment and do not realize that buildings are a large source of green house gas emissions. Boulder city residents however probably have more of a grip on these issues than other city residents.

88) Ann Reynoso  
email: [ann.reynoso@colorado.edu](mailto:ann.reynoso@colorado.edu)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5

two\_rental\_license: 1  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 1

I'm a student renter and it would really be great to cut down our energy bill especially during the winter season. Our house holds no heat so lots of energy is wasted trying to keep it warm and our bill is huge! I would love to see these changes be put into effect.

89) Natha Espeland

email: [nathae@juno.com](mailto:nathae@juno.com)

category: Interested Resident

I absolutely agree that renters should be encouraged (or even forced) to make their rentals more energy efficient. This sounds like a great program.

90) Unknown

address\_efficiency: yes

address\_efficiency\_ideas:

date\_certain: 5

two\_rental\_license: 1

phased\_in: 3

carbon\_purchases: 1

91) Knud Hermansen

email: [knud\\_hermansen@yahoo.com](mailto:knud_hermansen@yahoo.com)

phone: 931-217-8546

address\_efficiency: yes

address\_efficiency\_ideas:

date\_certain: 5

two\_rental\_license: 5

phased\_in: 5

carbon\_purchases: 5

As a renter I look forward to having lower energy bills and I guess that might be part of the issue here. There needs to be some way for the renter to recoup the costs of these improvements which will be difficult since the renters pay the bills.

92) Valerie Mitchell

email: [tundrapig@earthlink.net](mailto:tundrapig@earthlink.net)

phone: 3034432018

address\_efficiency: yes

address\_efficiency\_ideas:

date\_certain: 5

two\_rental\_license: 5

phased\_in: 5

carbon\_purchases: 1

Get rid of the carbon offsets option! What good does that do Boulder?? What good does that do the family living in the crappy rental? This option defeats the plan as a whole.

93) Laurence Budd, EPA Watersense Partner (maybe same person as #127)  
email: [LBBUDD@yahoo.com](mailto:LBBUDD@yahoo.com)  
category: Interested Resident

Will indoor/outdoor water use be part of this? Will the city be offering a list of recommended efficient devices? Such as smart controllers dual flush toilets etc.

94) Vishal Verma  
1838, 23rd St, Apt 1, Boulder CO 80302  
phone: 3039561647  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 4  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 3

95) Jack Pevey  
email: [jackie.pevey@colorado.edu](mailto:jackie.pevey@colorado.edu)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 2  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 2

96) Eric Tu  
email: [eric2@greenRetrofitGuru.com](mailto:eric2@greenRetrofitGuru.com)  
phone: 303 884 3943  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 5  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 3

97) Morgan Hill  
email: [hill\\_morgan88@yahoo.com](mailto:hill_morgan88@yahoo.com)  
phone: (970) 379-3826  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 4  
two\_rental\_license: 5

phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 2

This is a great idea. It would be best if the rental property owners were provided with inexpensive methods of retrofitting and remodeling so that they are not excessively burdened by the new regulations; and so that rents do not go up any more than they already have been.

98) Michele Ostrander  
email: [waitingforthesun64@hotmail.com](mailto:waitingforthesun64@hotmail.com)  
phone: 303 518 6668  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 2  
phased\_in: 3  
carbon\_purchases: 2

Carbon offsets do not really reduce the amount of energy used as far as I know and the CO2 is still being emitted into the air. However these are all good steps to take and as a student renter I am very happy with these ideas.

99) David Summers  
email: [David.Summers@colorado.edu](mailto:David.Summers@colorado.edu)  
category: Renter

I need to say I really hate Sunnyside Property Management company. We rented a house on the Hill and all they did was screw us. There were repair issues that were never fixed even after repeated phone calls. And then when we moved out they charged us thousands of extra dollars for repairs paint job (which was not needed) and countless other very questionable charges. We wrote many appeals and in the end (7 months later) we got \$800 back. They were extremely difficult to work with charged us constantly for everything and I would really like to see their company close down and leave Boulder. Thank you. Please help rid this wonderful place of such evil company's

100) Krista  
email: [Krista.kelly@colorado.edu](mailto:Krista.kelly@colorado.edu)  
category: Renter

I think that changing the codes of rental homes is a great idea. My roommates and I live in a house in Boulder that is about 100 years old and our landlord just had to replace our furnace and water heater. It was awesome that he replaced them with some of the most efficient that he could get. But the rest of our house is not very efficient making it not too useful. Two of the rooms in our house aren't even connected to the vent heating so we still need space heaters to stay warm during the winter. Our windows walls and doors also let in so much draft that even if the heater is on the cold air blows on you. Causing

our energy costs and use to still be very high. Changing the codes to make houses more efficient definitely has my vote.

101) John Hallett

email: [john.hallett@colorado.edu](mailto:john.hallett@colorado.edu)

address\_efficiency: yes

address\_efficiency\_ideas: motion sensing lights for large houses (fraternities and sororities), energy audits for renat

date\_certain: 5

two\_rental\_license: 1

phased\_in: 3

carbon\_purchases: 1

I think that the City should be careful not to lay the burden upon rentees (students). I think that as a landlord one must take responsibility for the energy efficiency of rental properties and I don't think that landlords should be able to simply pass the cost onto the rentee. There is so much that can be done to improve energy efficiency on the Hill and with rental properties in general. While I don't think costs should be passed to the student I strongly feel that students and rentees need to take responsibility for the efficient use of (more) efficient rental properties.

102) James Bright

email: [james.j.bright@colorado.edu](mailto:james.j.bright@colorado.edu)

phone: 5082598507

address\_efficiency: yes

address\_efficiency\_ideas:

date\_certain: 4

two\_rental\_license: 2

phased\_in: 5

carbon\_purchases: 3

I think this is a great program that will be an example for the rest of the country.

103) Tyson

email: [Tyson.Wolach@Colorado.EDU](mailto:Tyson.Wolach@Colorado.EDU)

category: Renter

I rent through Family Housing and the unit has barely insulated single pane glass and very inefficient draft guards on the doors. In the winter my heating bills are in excess of \$200 which is not included in my rent. I would love to see this ordinance pass so my heating bill would be lowered.

104) Patrick Decker

email: [patrick.decker@colorado.edu](mailto:patrick.decker@colorado.edu)

phone: 303 9026030

address\_efficiency: yes

address\_efficiency\_ideas:

date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 1

It is literally 49 degrees inside of my home right now. The thermostat is at 60 and the furnace is running near constantly. Yet due to the single pain window and probably complete lack of insulation in this old home the house simply cannot be kept warm in these extremely cold conditions. Admittedly it has been abnormally cold this last week and I am terrified to see how much our gas bill is for this month. Nevertheless even if the month had been the warmer average temperature our heating bill would sill have been incredibly high simply because the house we live in has not been updated to meet any type of energy efficiency requirement.

105) Laila Amerman  
email: [amerman@colorado.edu](mailto:amerman@colorado.edu)  
phone: 4697444255  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 2  
carbon\_purchases: 1

While carbon offsets are great we need landlords to CHANGE the way that they insulate and renovate their properties. Offsets are a tricky way to decrease your carbon footprint and making properties more efficient lowers the energy bill of renters and therefore should make them happier.

106) Laura Holt  
email: [holtlaura27@hotmail.com](mailto:holtlaura27@hotmail.com)  
phone: 720 984-3689  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 1  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 1

107) I refuse to give my contact information for privacy reasons.  
address\_efficiency: no  
address\_efficiency\_ideas: None. Anything like this is an additional tax on the landlord. As someone who has owned two properties since the 70's, this will cause me to raise rents. The city should look at other avenues then rental properties.  
date\_certain: 1  
two\_rental\_license: 1

phased\_in: 1  
carbon\_purchases: 1

108) Samuel Dorsi  
email: [dorsi@colorado.edu](mailto:dorsi@colorado.edu)  
phone: 406-461-5298  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 1  
phased\_in: 1  
carbon\_purchases: 1

Currently property owners (rental landlords) have no incentive to make improvements to energy efficiency of properties. I have lived in three different rental units in Boulder and found terrible conditions in all three--leaky windows torn weatherstripping antiquated appliances minimal attic insulation. The rental market in Boulder favors landlords because of high demand for rentals; even houses with poor efficiency will always get rented.

I don't believe carbon offsets accomplishes many of the goals of the project--the offset is a single finite measure while energy efficiency improvements persist for years. Carbon offsets do nothing to change the amount of coal burned in Front Range power plants and the local pollution we experience.

109) Tanya Phillips  
email: [phillitr@colorado.edu](mailto:phillitr@colorado.edu)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 3  
two\_rental\_license: 5  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 1

110) Justin  
email: [justin21112@hotmail.com](mailto:justin21112@hotmail.com)  
phone: 702.277.9470  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 2

111) Daniel Shneyer  
email: [daniel.shneyer@gmail.com](mailto:daniel.shneyer@gmail.com)

phone: 301 452 1765  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 2  
phased\_in: 2  
carbon\_purchases: 1

Thank you I think the faster we become efficient the better for all of us.

112) Ryan R. Neely III  
email: [rrniii@gmail.com](mailto:rrniii@gmail.com)  
phone: 336-302-4244  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 5  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 5

113) Alice  
email: [alikat821@yahoo.com](mailto:alikat821@yahoo.com)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 2  
phased\_in: 1  
carbon\_purchases: 1

114) Peter Grant  
email: [peter.grant@colorado.edu](mailto:peter.grant@colorado.edu)  
phone: 952-807-7527  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 4  
two\_rental\_license: 1  
phased\_in: 2  
carbon\_purchases: 1

I would like to see this change occur as both a renter in Boulder and a graduate student studying building energy efficiency. From the point of view of a renter these technologies would simply make my apartment more comfortable while at the same time (depending on what is installed) making it cheaper to live here. It's a no brainer. From the point of view of an architectural engineering student this proposal would create local jobs. I know I want to be employed after school and I suspect that Boulder wants to keep masters degree carrying engineers around. Again making this change to the rental licence regulations will only be good for both myself and the community.

115) Unknown

address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 3  
carbon\_purchases: 2

116) Kelly Baustian

email: [kellybaustian@gmail.com](mailto:kellybaustian@gmail.com)  
phone: 319-360-0509  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 1

I strongly support this initiative. I'm a Boulderite that has lived in three different rental properties in the last four years and I have looked at dozens more while house searching. The state of affordable rental properties in this town is appalling. Most of the rental properties I've seen were built cheaply with essentially no insulation in 1970's and have not been updated since. There is simply ZERO incentive for landlords to put ANY money into their properties because the demand for rentals in this town is so high. They are making tons of money but putting almost nothing back into their properties. This is especially true when large property management agencies are concerned (AKA: Boulder property management).

I have also had the unique opportunity to live in rental property in which a large energy efficiency overhaul was done at almost no cost to the owners. They pumped the walls full of insulation added insulation to the attic and sealed all of the leaks in the air duct system etc. The difference was astounding. Our heating bill became comparable to that of an average apartment and outside noise did not penetrate into the house as readily.

Unfortunately the landlords decided to move back into our rental shortly after the overhaul and we got kicked out.

As far as your initiative is concerned my only concerns are regarding the implementation and enforcement. We are dealing with rental agencies and landlords that will not fix leaking roofs defunct appliances and have gas leaks in their properties. They are not going to like this. I'm worried that the landlords will transfer this monetary burden to the renters by raising already high rental prices. Is there some sort of incentive we could offer them? A tax break maybe? Thank you!

117) Unknown

address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5

two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 5

118) Samuel LeBlanc  
email: [leblancs2008@hotmail.com](mailto:leblancs2008@hotmail.com)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 2  
phased\_in: 3  
carbon\_purchases: 1

119) Unknown  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 1  
two\_rental\_license: 1  
phased\_in: 1  
carbon\_purchases: 1

120) Jason English  
email: [jason.english@colorado.edu](mailto:jason.english@colorado.edu)  
phone: 920-915-6255  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 4  
two\_rental\_license: 5  
phased\_in: 2  
carbon\_purchases: 1

Energy efficiency will not only help save money for renters it will help Boulder achieve its carbon emissions goals.

121) Unknown  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 3  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 3  
carbon\_purchases: 3

122) Michelle Turco  
email: [mmturco@gmail.com](mailto:mmturco@gmail.com)  
category: Renter

I live in a bottom corner unit of an old 2 story 8 unit building. I am concerned about having to pay more to heat my unit than tenants above and next to me because of the positioning of the building. Having an ordinance that requires all tenants to pay a portion of the heating bill or having it built into the rent seems more fair. The units are also heated with one centrally located gas heater and the heat is not transmitted very well through the rest of the apt. Insulation is minimal as the exterior walls are made of cinder block. The windows are also fairly leaky and could use upgrading to prevent heat loss.

123) Carlynn Spring  
email: [carlynn.spring@gmail.com](mailto:carlynn.spring@gmail.com)  
phone: 3039172947  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 2  
two\_rental\_license: 2  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 1

I think that rental housing should become more environmentally friendly but I think that making them all do it by 2012 might be a bit too soon. If they are given a couple of more years I think that would work.

124) Boston Nyer  
email: [bostonnyer@gmail.com](mailto:bostonnyer@gmail.com)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 5  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 5

125) Candice Serran  
email: [dice824@hotmail.com](mailto:dice824@hotmail.com)  
category: Renter

This is a fantastic project objective! The positive outcomes that would result from such a project would be greatly advantageous for the future of our beautiful city. I am a huge supporter of this!

126) Jeffrey Troutman  
email: [jeffrey.troutman@gmail.com](mailto:jeffrey.troutman@gmail.com)  
phone: 847 3708499  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 3

phased\_in: 3  
carbon\_purchases: 1

Energy efficiency is a must the rental properties I have visited as well as mine are terribly insulated and there is never any incentive for the renters to increase the efficiency.

127) Ian Carter  
email: [carter.ian@gmail.com](mailto:carter.ian@gmail.com)  
phone: 4085057059  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 3

128) Sarah Budinger  
email: [sarah.budinger@colorado.edu](mailto:sarah.budinger@colorado.edu)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 2  
phased\_in: 2  
carbon\_purchases: 1

129) Jim Hauswirth  
email: [jimhauswirth@yahoo.com](mailto:jimhauswirth@yahoo.com)  
phone: 917.232.7042  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 5  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 1

I think this is a great idea. I live in a rental property that has extremely high utility bills. For the last several days I've had frozen pipes and the landlords solution has been to install electric heaters- at great cost to us- instead of simply fixing the problem.

130) Margaret Mitter  
email: [margaret.mitter@colorado.edu](mailto:margaret.mitter@colorado.edu)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 4

carbon\_purchases: 1

I realize this may be a financial burden to some landlords with only one or a few properties but in the long run energy efficiency is a smart investment for everyone. It can be frustrating as a renter to be stuck with poor efficiency weatherproofing windows etc in a rental property: the only choices are to increase one's energy bill considerably or live with the cold.

131) Ashley Steele  
email: [ashley.steele@colorado.edu](mailto:ashley.steele@colorado.edu)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 3  
carbon\_purchases: 1

I have been a renter in Boulder for three years now and all of my three years have been spent in apartments that were built in the 1960s. Many of the features of the apartments have not been updated since the '60s either. In my current residence the sliding glass door would not close all the way. The landlord was hesitant to fix this problem. I was amazed that in a city as progressive as Boulder easy-to-fix problems like these that will save energy and money do not get fixed. I believe this is due to the overwhelming number of student renters in the city and the persisting need for affordable rental properties. Landlords have not been forced to update appliances bad windows and doors insulation or take any other measures because there will always be renters who will settle without. It is up to students especially to demand energy efficiency in our rental properties.

132) Jeanne Schamel  
email: [jschamel@myqci.com](mailto:jschamel@myqci.com)  
phone: 303-929-6842  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 1

133) Noah Fulton-Beale  
email: [noah.fulton-beale@colorado.edu](mailto:noah.fulton-beale@colorado.edu)  
category: Renter

I support the proposed energy efficiency requirements. I currently live in a rental unit that is poorly insulated and has old inefficient appliances. Our landlord has no incentive to upgrade our apartment because all energy costs are passed along to us. As someone who

is concerned about reducing my carbon footprint it is frustrating to have to crank up the thermostat only to feel the heat escaping through the single-pained windows. I can only imagine how inefficient our 70s-era refrigerator and stove are. Landlords must take responsibility for making their properties energy efficient.

134) Kerstin Johansson  
email: [kerstin.johansson@colorado.edu](mailto:kerstin.johansson@colorado.edu)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 3

The apartment I live in now in Boulder has horrible energy efficiency. It is not appropriately weatherized at all!

135) Unknown  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 4  
phased\_in: 4  
carbon\_purchases: 2

136) Emily Rader  
email: [emily.rader@colorado.edu](mailto:emily.rader@colorado.edu)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 4  
two\_rental\_license: 2  
phased\_in: 3  
carbon\_purchases: 1

137) Unknown  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 5  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 3

138) Christopher  
email: [the\\_laminater@yahoo.com](mailto:the_laminater@yahoo.com)  
category: Interested Resident  
We need to have harsh regulations on landlords.

139) Elias Nogueira  
email: [elias.Nogueira@Colorado.edu](mailto:elias.Nogueira@Colorado.edu)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 1  
phased\_in: 1  
carbon\_purchases: 1

The most important and cheapest thing for property owners to do is make sure they have proper insulation. Many of the BPM houses are constantly losing heat and it is a horrible waste. Efficiency does not have to be expensive and does not have to be implemented over the course of years educating people about how to cut down on usage is the best way to get people to change. Also some properties have fixed utility rates which is horrible for this cause. most of the renters in boulder are rich out of staters who don't care if they are wasting energy if they aren't paying for it. Just a few suggestions for now.

140) Sara MacAlpine  
email: [sara.macalpine@colorado.edu](mailto:sara.macalpine@colorado.edu)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 1  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 1

Though I support this program I do understand that there are landlord and renter concerns that should be addressed. I believe that there need to be some sort of incentives for landlords who do comply because otherwise they are being penalized for properly registering their rentals. Also I would hate to see huge increases in rent for energy efficient homes which would unfairly penalize renters.

I believe that some of the more expensive improvements (windows furnaces) should be subsidized somewhat if those meeting a certain energy efficiency standard are purchased. Also it would be great if the city could offer discounted energy efficient refrigerators and perhaps find someone who does insulation at group discounts so that blocks/streets/neighborhoods could get a discount by getting their walls/attics/crawl spaces insulated at the same time.

I am skeptical of the carbon credits buying. Requiring landlords to do actual improvements increases the value of their investments AND has the benefit of making the buildings better for future owners/tenants which seems to be the better option.

141) Hamed Yazdi  
email: [hamedyazd@gmail.com](mailto:hamedyazd@gmail.com)  
category: Interested Resident

I agree with the proposal. Energy efficiency is a big priority and must be tackled the highest (practical) extent possible.

142) Katherine Stuart  
email: [stuart.katherine@yahoo.com](mailto:stuart.katherine@yahoo.com)  
phone: 8326513236  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 5  
two\_rental\_license: 1  
phased\_in: 2  
carbon\_purchases: 1

The idea of buying carbon offsets is good but I believe the purpose of this program should be to make actual improvements in the property to become more energy efficient. I think buying carbon offsets is applying a mere bandaid to the problem instead of attacking the source. If more properties are energy-efficient this will lend to solving the problem. The city should make the improvements a priority over carbon offsets. Besides the obvious environmental issue at hand it is also a social problem. If renters are forced to live in houses and apartments that not even their own landlord would live in there needs to be a change. It is not right to have people freezing in their homes because all of the heat leaks out. It's wrong to have people going broke over high energy bills when there are easy solutions.

143) Patty Patterson  
category: Interested Resident  
I think it is very important for landlords to make their rental properties more energy efficient. I support this proposal.

144) Dave Porter  
email: [gridstorm@gmail.com](mailto:gridstorm@gmail.com)  
phone: (973) 229-9926  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 2  
two\_rental\_license: 3  
phased\_in: 5  
carbon\_purchases: 1  
omments: It is important to let renters be environmental (and thrifty!) too.

145) Connor McAllister  
email: [connor.mcallister@colorado.edu](mailto:connor.mcallister@colorado.edu)  
address\_efficiency: yes  
address\_efficiency\_ideas:  
date\_certain: 4  
two\_rental\_license: 5

phased\_in: 2  
carbon\_purchases: 1