

House Energy & Environment

03/06/2025 01:30 PM

HB25-1269 Building Decarbonization Measures

Typed Text of Testimony Submitted

Name, Position, Representing	Typed Text of Testimony
<p>Mark Kaiser Against themselves</p>	<p>HB 1269: Building Decarbonization Measures</p> <p>An Overview and Analysis</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>HB 1269 is a legislative bill aimed at promoting building decarbonization measures. It focuses on reducing pollutants and carbon emissions from buildings, which contribute significantly to environmental degradation and climate change. As part of this initiative, the bill proposes the creation of a building decarbonization initiative that encompasses various strategies and regulations to achieve its goals.</p> <p>Key Provisions of HB 1269</p> <p>The bill mandates the integration of energy-efficient systems and the adoption of renewable energy sources in both new and existing buildings. It also introduces a comprehensive framework for monitoring and reporting emissions, ensuring that building owners adhere to the standards set forth by the initiative.</p> <p>Building Decarbonization Initiative</p> <p>The building decarbonization initiative under HB 1269 outlines specific targets and timelines for reducing carbon emissions. It involves collaboration among state agencies, local governments, and the private sector to implement these measures effectively. The initiative aims to achieve a significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by leveraging advanced technologies and innovative practices.</p> <p>Potential Impacts</p> <p>While the bill's objective to reduce pollutants and promote sustainable building practices is commendable, it also introduces several implications for building owners and stakeholders.</p> <p>Bureaucratic Controls and Increased Expenses</p> <p>One of the primary concerns associated with HB 1269 is the potential for additional bureaucratic controls and increased expenses for building owners. The bill requires compliance with new regulations, leading to more extensive reporting and administrative requirements. These additional layers of governmental controls may result in higher operational costs and financial burdens for building owners, especially small businesses and individuals.</p> <p>The Enterprise Fund</p> <p>Another contentious aspect of the bill is the establishment of an enterprise fund, which introduces a fee that is not regulated by the Taxpayer's Bill of Rights (TABOR).</p>

	<p>This fund is intended to support the initiatives outlined in the bill, but it raises concerns about the financial implications for building owners. Critics argue that the fee adds another financial burden without sufficient oversight or accountability.</p> <p>Arguments For and Against HB 1269</p> <p>Arguments For</p> <p>Proponents of HB 1269 emphasize the urgent need to address climate change and reduce carbon emissions. They argue that the bill's measures are essential for achieving long-term sustainability and protecting public health. The building decarbonization initiative is seen as a proactive step towards mitigating environmental impacts and fostering innovation in the construction industry.</p> <p>Arguments Against</p> <p>Opponents, on the other hand, believe that existing laws and procedures are sufficient to achieve the goals of zero pollutants without imposing additional bureaucratic controls and expenses. They argue that the bill could stifle economic growth and place an undue burden on building owners. Furthermore, the lack of regulation under TABOR for the enterprise fund raises concerns about transparency and accountability in the allocation of resources.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>HB 1269 presents a comprehensive approach to building decarbonization, aiming to reduce pollutants and promote sustainable practices. However, it also introduces potential challenges related to bureaucratic controls, increased expenses, and the establishment of an enterprise fund. A balanced consideration of the arguments for and against the bill is essential to determine the most effective path forward in addressing climate change and achieving environmental sustainability.</p>
<p>Jeany Rush Against themselves</p>	<p>TO: House Energy and Environment Committee</p> <p>RE: HB25-69 Building Decarbonization Measures</p> <p>Sponsors: Wilford, Valdez, Ball, Kipp</p> <p>FROM: Jeany Rush, Colorado Springs Constituent</p> <p>VOTE: NO</p> <p>First and again, this bill is based on a FALSE PREMISE of Climate Crisis, Climate Change, CO2 as a problem.</p> <p>Basing anything on these criteria creates mandates that can only be damaging to our uses of energy, and tens of thousands of owners and economies in our communities. The excessive fines, are also beyond the pail. This is not only dangerous to our jobs, our economy, but to our future, based on so many false ideas, not based on true science. Further, I feel it is an abuse of the Safety clause, as many also do, since we the voters should have more input in such important issues.</p> <p>The state of Colorado needs to come CLEAN about energy and climate truths, before enacting one more bill, edict on our energy futures. I totally object to most of these positions.</p>

<p>Jeany Rush Against themselves</p>	<p>TO: House Energy and Environment Committee RE: HB25-69 Building Decarbonization Measures Sponsors: Wilford, Valdez, Ball, Kipp FROM: Jeany Rush, Colorado Springs Constituent VOTE: NO First and again, this bill is based on a FALSE PREMISE of Climate Crisis, Climate Change, CO2 as a problem. Basing anything on these criteria creates mandates that can only be damaging to our uses of energy, and tens of thousands of owners and economies in our communities. The excessive fines, are also beyond the pail. The abuses this imposes on construction, existing structures, and the over – reaching policies of the impossible, globalist green’ deals is actually criminal. This is not only dangerous to our jobs, our economy, but to our future, based on so many false ideas, not based on true science. Further, I feel it is an abuse of the Safety clause, as many also do, since we the voters should have more input in such important issues. The state of Colorado needs to come CLEAN about energy and climate truths, before enacting one more bill, edict on our energy futures. I totally object to most of these positions.</p>
--	---



Written Testimony calling for amendments to HB25-1269

House Energy & Environment Committee

James Burton – james.burton@imt.org
Manager, Policy Engagement and Tracking
The Institute for Market Transformation
March 6, 2025

Thank you, Chair Valdez and members of the Committee, for the opportunity to testify on Colorado's Building Performance Standards and HB25-1269. **We are generally supportive of the bill, but have suggested amendments we believe are critical to its success.**

My name is James Burton. I am Manager of Policy Engagement and Tracking at the Institute for Market Transformation. IMT is a national, non-partisan, nonprofit organization. We partner with government, business, and community to improve the efficiency and performance of the buildings for the people inside them and the communities around them. **IMT advises all 14 states and localities in the United States that have adopted a building performance standard (BPS) as well as 34 others that have committed to do so.**

The Building Performance Standard is a cornerstone of the state of Colorado's strategy to meet its climate goals. Colorado Energy Office has done great work to engage with building owners and other stakeholders to design HB25-1269. It will provide additional flexibility for building owners to comply with BPS and provide much needed resources for BPS implementation. The bill includes many elements sought by both building owners and advocates.

BPS improves energy efficiency and reduces on-site combustion of fossil fuels at the same time. There are tremendous benefits from both the direct pollution reduction and the efficiency gains, and doing both at the same time is important. These investments will benefit building owners by reducing energy bills, and Colorado communities by reducing the need for power plants and creating jobs at every skill level from roofers to engineers.

IMT has catalogued [several academic studies](#) which have all found that higher performing commercial buildings not only save money on their energy bills, but have higher occupancies and sales prices. In short, building improvements typically yield excellent financial returns.

We ask the Committee consider the following amendments:

- 1. Consider adopting interim performance targets every five years between 2030 and 2050**
 - a. This aligns with the capital planning cycles of buildings, as well as the majority of other existing BPS laws across the country
 - b. Not having enforceable five-year interim targets runs the risk of crucial touchpoints between building owners and Colorado Energy Office being missed, and without the targets being mandatory there is no robust manner of ensuring that building owners are more likely to comply with the longer-term targets
- 2. Amend penalties to instead be called "payments"**
 - a. This allows costs to be passed through to commercial tenants when appropriate and aligns with the wording of the majority of commercial leases



- b. Building owners should not be punished if a commercial tenant is the reason they do not meet performance standards

3. Amend wording around local BPS compliance

- a. The current wording is open to interpretation: “reasonably similar”
- b. We recommend replacing with wording such as “at least as stringent as the GHG emissions reductions required by the state BPS”

4. Do not delay benchmarking submission until November

- a. There is no need to push the reporting deadline out until November, as benchmarking is always based on Calendar year and not fiscal year
- b. Reporting needs to happen by June or July to ensure data is collected, cleaned, and enforced prior to the next calendar year
- c. More than 90% of governments have a benchmarking deadline earlier than July

Colorado already has policies in place to incentivize the building of renewable energy. BPS is Colorado's path forward to decarbonizing buildings, and it should stay that way.

We support this bill but believe these amendments are critical to its success. We request the Committee consider these amendments to HB25-1269.