**Appendix**

**A) Current and Past United States Green Rooftop Policies and Programs**

Chicago, Illinois

* 2014: Green Permit Program
  + Expedited building permit program
  + Project which meet sustainability guidelines may qualify for a waiver of consultant codes of $25,000
* 2017: Sustainable Development Policy
  + TIF funds available to multi-family housing project that meet 100 point system à Green roofs will earn 10 points if 50 to 100% of building net area is covered, and 20 points for 100% coverage
    - More than 5 million square feet of green roofs have been installed due to this policy

Denver, Colorado

* 2017: Green Building Ordinance
  + Any new buildings or updates to building roofs over 25,000 sq ft must have a cool roof and comply with one other Green Building Requirement

New York City, New York

* 2011: Green Infrastructure Grant Program
  + For private property owners, Roofs must be between 3500-20,000 square feet. At 1.5-1.99 inches of soil depth, projects receive $10/square foot; at 2-2.99 inches of soil depth projects receive $15/square foot; at 3-3.99 inches of soil depth, projects receive $25/square foot; and at 4+ inches of soil depth, projects receive $30/ square foot
* 2019: Green Factor for New Construction
  + New and existing buildings undergoing major renovations in particular occupancy are required to cover 100% of available roof space with sustainable roofing, is green rooftop

New York, State

* 2008, revised 2019 Green Roof Property Tax Abatement Program
* tax abatement of $5.23/square foot for the installation of a green roof, and in certain high need areas, as much as $15 per square foot. At least 50% of the roof must be covered with a vegetation layer

Onandaga County, New York

* 2018: Green Improvement Fund
  + Facility property owners are eligible for grants for the installation of green infrastructure for stormwater management, such as green roofs. Green roofs on high-priority sites can receive up to 30 cents/ gallon captured, medium-priority sites can receive up to 20 cents/gallon, and captured low-priority sites can receive up to 10 cents/gallon.

Syracuse, New York

* Green Improvement Fund
  + Funds available to project using green infrastructure solutions. Almost $4 millions awarded towards 37 different projects so far

Portland, Oregon

* 2018: EcoRoof Requirement
  + New buildings with areas of 20,000 square feet or more must have an ecoroof that covers 100% of the budling area

San Francisco, California

* 2017: Better Roofs Ordinance
  + New non-residential buildings with an area larger than 2,000 square feet are required to have 15% of roof as solar panels or 30% of the roof as green roofs

Washington, DC

* 2017: Green Area Ratio
  + All new buildings requiring a certificate of occupancy must meet the Green Area Ratio (GAR). The GAR can be meet by incorporating vegetated roofs.
* Green Roof Rebate Program
  + Funding between $7 and $10 per square foot of green rooftop installations

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

* 2019: Green Infrastructure Partnership
  + Receive credit for storm water capture, an eligible method includes green rooftops
* Regional Green Roof Initiative
  + $5 for each square food of approved green roof

Montgomery County, Maryland

* 2018: Raincapes Reward Rebate Program
  + $9 per square foot rebate, up to $7,500 for residential buildings install green rooftop and up to $20,000 for institutional/commercial properties installing green rooftop

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

* Green Roof Tax Credit
  + A credit of up to 25% of all costs incurred to construct a green roof with a maximum of $100,000 per square feet

Nashville, Tennessee

* 2016: Green Roof Rebate Program
  + Property owners can receive a rebate of up to $10/square foot of green roof installed. The credit is applied over 5 years. The vegetation must cover 80% of the roof with hardy, drought resistant plants.

(Source: **Green Rooftops for a Healthy City**, How Your Community Will Benefit From Adopting Green Roof Policy, https://static1.squarespace.com/static/58e3eecf2994ca997dd56381/t/59dfd5db268b96c5a9ea66b1/1507841543362/2015+PolicyBrochure-HowYourCommunityWillBenefitFromGreenRoofPolicy.pdf)

**B) Information presented in survey about *GR Program* Graphical user interface, text, application, email

Description automatically generated**

C) *GR Program WTP* question in survey

Graphical user interface, text, application, email

Description automatically generated

**D) Green Rooftop Information Provided in Survey**

**Please Read**

A green rooftop is a layer of vegetation planted on top of flat roofs. Green rooftops can vary in size and usage, as seen in the images below.

A garden in front of a building

Description automatically generated with low confidenceA picture containing tree, grass, outdoor

Description automatically generated

A high angle view of a building

Description automatically generated with medium confidenceA picture containing grass, outdoor, building, park

Description automatically generated

**Please Read**  
Green rooftops benefit building owners and the surrounding community members. Benefits vary with the type, size, and location of green rooftops. View the tables below to learn about some of the annual average benefits.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Building Benefits** | **Cost Savings** |
| **Reduced energy cost** | $0.23 per sq ft |
| **Reduced storm water run off** | $2 to $30 per sq ft |
| **Increased property values** | $12 to $60 per sq ft |
| **Increased lifespan of roof** | $30 per sq ft |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Community Benefits** | **Quantified Benefits** |
| **Air quality improvements** | 11 square feet of green roof could reduce the pollution of one gasoline-powered car per year |
| **Reduced urban heat island effect** | Reduction of 0.3°F–0.9°F in neighborhood temperatures. |
| **Increased access to healthy food** | 2 lbs of fresh produce per sq foot (for intensive rooftops) |
| **Increased access to recreational space** | Cost savings of $0.50 to $1.30 per sq foot |
| **Habitat creation** | $0.94 to $1.00 per sq foot |
| **Reduced infrastructure improvements cost** | Cost saving of $0.8 to $2.4 per sq foot |
| **Increased economic activity** | For every dollar spent on green roofs $0.75-0.85 goes towards local job creation |

 **Please Read**  
Green roofs have three drawbacks.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Drawbacks** | **Cost Incurred** |
| **Increased installation costs** | $10 to $40 more per sq ft |
| **Increased maintenance** | $0.06 to $1.25 per sq ft |
| **Increased C02 and N02 emissions** | $0.50 to $2.00 per sq ft |

**E) Choice experiment hypothetical bill information**

F) Extended Results Regression Output

For vegetation, the reference group was changed to grass and shrubs/bushes was included directly into the regression, results changed as expected. Compared to grass, shrubs/bushes and produce gardens were negative and significant, while flower gardens were negative and insignificant. When the reference group was altered for amenities from shaded area to small ponds, walking paths and benches remained positive and significant while shaded area was negative and insignificant. When the model of choice was altered to a GMNL, all variables’ coefficients and significance remained consistent, with small variations in magnitude, with the exception of solar 10, which became insignificant. When controlling for heterogeneity differences among demographic groups, demographic controls for income, race, gender, and education were included directly in the regression (Appendix F, table 5). Income, gender, and education were found to be significant and negative, however when other controls were included such as political party affiliation and home ownership there were not significant differences amongst control variables (Appendix F, table 6).

**Table One Mix logit: Choice Experiment Main Model with Vegetation Reference Group Changed**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | Coef. | S.E. | P - value | [95% Conf. | Interval] |
| No GR | -6.880 | 1.003 | 0.000 | -8.846 | -4.914 |
| **Vegetation** (Grass) | | | | | |
| Shrubs/Bushes | -0.422 | 0.096 | 0.000 | -0.611 | -0.233 |
| Produce gardens | -0.499 | 0.106 | 0.000 | -0.706 | -0.292 |
| Flowers gardens | -0.017 | 0.089 | 0.851 | -0.192 | 0.158 |
| **Amenities** (Shaded Area) | | | | | |
| Ponds | -0.014 | 0.084 | 0.871 | -0.178 | 0.151 |
| Walking paths | 0.237 | 0.073 | 0.001 | 0.094 | 0.379 |
| Benches | 0.458 | 0.109 | 0.000 | 0.245 | 0.672 |
| **Solar** (None) | | | | | |
| Solar 10 | 0.117 | 0.075 | 0.118 | -0.030 | 0.263 |
| Solar 20 | 0.362 | 0.082 | 0.000 | 0.201 | 0.523 |
| **Community Access** (Open) | | | | | |
| Mix | -0.069 | 0.062 | 0.268 | -0.190 | 0.053 |
| Limited | -0.263 | 0.078 | 0.001 | -0.416 | -0.110 |
| Price (log) | -7.618 | 0.743 | 0.000 | -9.075 | -6.161 |
| Notes: This table shows regression output when the vegetation reference group is changed from Shrubs/Bushes to Grass. All parameters are model as random parameters. All parameters are normally distributed except price is log-normally distributed. Attributes in the parenthesis are the reference category. All variables are dummy (0/1) except price is continuous. N = 8,472 , Log likelihood = -2325.62, Chi-squared = 86.13 | | | | | |

**Table Two Mix logit: Choice Experiment Main Model with Amenity Reference Group Changed**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | Coef. | S.E. | P - value | [95%Conf. | Interval] |
| No GR | -8.559 | 1.755 | 0.000 | -11.998 | -5.120 |
| **Vegetation** (Shrubs/Bushes) | | | | | |
| Grass | 0.355 | 0.089 | 0.000 | 0.179 | 0.530 |
| Produce gardens | -0.100 | 0.088 | 0.252 | -0.272 | 0.071 |
| Flower gardens | 0.353 | 0.074 | 0.000 | 0.209 | 0.498 |
| **Amenities** (Ponds) | | | | |  |
| Shade | -0.035 | 0.075 | 0.646 | -0.183 | 0.113 |
| Walking paths | 0.194 | 0.082 | 0.017 | 0.034 | 0.354 |
| Benches | 0.408 | 0.104 | 0.000 | 0.204 | 0.612 |
| **Solar** (None) | | | | |  |
| Solar 10 | 0.125 | 0.073 | 0.088 | -0.019 | 0.268 |
| Solar 20 | 0.364 | 0.079 | 0.000 | 0.208 | 0.520 |
| **Community Access** (Open) | | | | |  |
| Mix | -0.067 | 0.060 | 0.263 | -0.185 | 0.051 |
| Limited | -0.241 | 0.076 | 0.002 | -0.390 | -0.092 |
| Price (Log) | -6.687 | 0.492 | 0.000 | -7.651 | -5.723 |
| Notes: This table shows regression output when the amenity reference group is changed from shaded area to ponds. All parameters are model as random parameters. All parameters are normally distributed except price is log-normally distributed. Attributes in the parenthesis are the reference category. All variables are dummy (0/1) except price is continuous. N = 8,472 , Log likelihood = -2326.99, Chi-squared = 83.38 | | | | | |

**Table Three Mix logit: Choice Experiment Main Model with Vegetation and Amenity Reference Group Changed**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | Coef. | S.E. | P – value | [95%Conf. | Interval] |
| No GR | -6.919 | 1.347 | 0.000 | -9.560 | -4.278 |
| **Vegetation** (Grass) | | | | | |
| Bushes | -0.425 | 0.095 | 0.000 | -0.611 | -0.240 |
| Produce gardens | -0.496 | 0.103 | 0.000 | -0.697 | -0.295 |
| Flower gardens | -0.016 | 0.086 | 0.852 | -0.185 | 0.153 |
| **Amenities** (Ponds) | | | | | |
| Shade | -0.038 | 0.077 | 0.622 | -0.190 | 0.114 |
| Walking paths | 0.187 | 0.083 | 0.024 | 0.025 | 0.349 |
| Benches | 0.450 | 0.105 | 0.000 | 0.243 | 0.657 |
| **Solar** (None) | | | | | |
| Solar 10 | 0.101 | 0.073 | 0.166 | -0.042 | 0.244 |
| Solar 20 | 0.340 | 0.080 | 0.000 | 0.182 | 0.497 |
| **Community Access** (Open) | | | | | |
| Mix | -0.065 | 0.061 | 0.287 | -0.185 | 0.055 |
| Limited | -0.254 | 0.076 | 0.001 | -0.403 | -0.105 |
| Price (Log) | -7.831 | 0.766 | 0.000 | -9.332 | -6.329 |
| Notes: This table shows regression output when the amenity and vegetation reference group is changed from shaded area to ponds and from shrubs/bushes to grass respectfully. All parameters are model as random parameters. All parameters are normally distributed except price is log-normally distributed. Attributes in the parenthesis are the reference category. All variables are dummy (0/1) except price is continuous. N = 8,472 , Log likelihood = -2321.83, Chi-squared = 93.70 | | | | | |

**Table Four Mix logit: Choice Experiment Main Model as Generalize Multinomial Logit Model**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | Coef. | S.E. | P – Value | [95%Conf. | Interval] |
| Price (Log) | -0.123 | 0.042 | 0.003 | -0.204 | -0.041 |
| **Vegetation** (Bushes/Shrubs) | | | | | |
| Grass | 0.400 | 0.088 | 0.000 | 0.227 | 0.573 |
| Produce gardens | -0.079 | 0.086 | 0.359 | -0.248 | 0.090 |
| Flower gardens | 0.335 | 0.073 | 0.000 | 0.191 | 0.479 |
| **Amenities** (Shaded Area) | | | | | |
| Ponds | -0.006 | 0.080 | 0.944 | -0.163 | 0.152 |
| Walking paths | 0.260 | 0.071 | 0.000 | 0.120 | 0.400 |
| Benches | 0.451 | 0.102 | 0.000 | 0.250 | 0.651 |
| **Solar** (None) | | | | | |
| Solar 10 | 0.114 | 0.074 | 0.122 | -0.030 | 0.259 |
| Solar 20 | 0.353 | 0.079 | 0.000 | 0.197 | 0.508 |
| **Community Access** (Open) | | | | | |
| Mix | -0.072 | 0.060 | 0.230 | -0.189 | 0.046 |
| Limited | -0.198 | 0.074 | 0.007 | -0.343 | -0.053 |
| Notes: This table shows regression output. All parameters are model as random parameters. All parameters are normally distributed except price is log-normally distributed. Attributes in the parenthesis are the reference category. All variables are dummy (0/1) except price is continuous. N = 6,285 , Log likelihood = -2228.06, Wald Chi-squared = 97.79 | | | | | |

**Table 5 Mix logit: Choice Experiment Main Model with Demographic Controls**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | Coef. | S.E. | P – value | [95%Conf. | Interval] |
| No GR | -13.512 | 4.843 | 0.005 | -23.004 | -4.020 |
| **Vegetation** (Shrubs/Bushes) | | | | | |
| Grass | 0.525 | 0.111 | 0.000 | 0.308 | 0.742 |
| Produce gardens | -0.075 | 0.117 | 0.522 | -0.304 | 0.154 |
| Flower gardens | 0.458 | 0.092 | 0.000 | 0.278 | 0.639 |
| **Amenities** (Shaded Area) | | | | | |
| Ponds | -0.053 | 0.101 | 0.600 | -0.250 | 0.145 |
| Walking Paths | 0.168 | 0.091 | 0.065 | -0.010 | 0.345 |
| Benches | 0.559 | 0.134 | 0.000 | 0.296 | 0.821 |
| **Solar** (None) | | | | | |
| Solar 10 | 0.062 | 0.092 | 0.501 | -0.118 | 0.242 |
| Solar 20 | 0.340 | 0.098 | 0.001 | 0.148 | 0.532 |
| **Community Access** (Open) | | | | | |
| Mix | -0.088 | 0.074 | 0.232 | -0.233 | 0.056 |
| Limited | -0.375 | 0.098 | 0.000 | -0.567 | -0.184 |
| **Demographics** | | | | | |
| Low Income | -6.732 | 3.357 | 0.045 | -13.312 | -0.152 |
| Race | 1.831 | 2.253 | 0.417 | -2.586 | 6.247 |
| Gender | -3.653 | 1.517 | 0.016 | -6.627 | -0.680 |
| Bachelors | -3.439 | 1.708 | 0.044 | -6.787 | -0.090 |
| Price (Log) | -6.533 | 0.514 | 0.000 | -7.540 | -5.525 |
| All parameters are model as random parameters. All parameters are normally distributed except price is log-normally distributed. Attributes in the parenthesis are the reference category. All variables from the choice scenario are dummy (0/1) except price is continuous. Income low (1 = Below $49,000 and 0 = $50,000 or above), Gender (1 = Female, 0 = Male), Race (1 = White, 0 = Nonwhite), Bachelors (1 = Bachelor’s degree, 0 = High school, associates) N = 5,852 , Log likelihood = -1578.42, Chi-squared = 106.0 | | | | | |

**Table 6 Mixed logit: Choice Experiment Main model with Demographic, Political Party Affiliation, and Home ownership controls**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | Coef. | S.E. | P- value | [95%Conf. | Interval] |
| No GR | -14.853 | 10.283 | 0.149 | -35.008 | 5.302 |
| **Vegetation** (Shrubs/Bushes) | | | | | |
| Grass | 0.536 | 0.118 | 0.000 | 0.306 | 0.767 |
| Produce gardens | -0.059 | 0.122 | 0.631 | -0.297 | 0.180 |
| Flower gardens | 0.454 | 0.098 | 0.000 | 0.263 | 0.645 |
| **Amenities** (Shaded Area) | | | | | |
| ponds | -0.066 | 0.107 | 0.536 | -0.276 | 0.143 |
| Walking paths | 0.199 | 0.093 | 0.033 | 0.016 | 0.382 |
| Benches | 0.551 | 0.140 | 0.000 | 0.277 | 0.825 |
| **Solar** (None) | | | | | |
| Solar 10 | 0.052 | 0.095 | 0.582 | -0.134 | 0.239 |
| Solar 20 | 0.350 | 0.104 | 0.001 | 0.147 | 0.553 |
| **Community Access** (Open) | | | | | |
| Mix | -0.118 | 0.078 | 0.128 | -0.270 | 0.034 |
| Limited | -0.372 | 0.100 | 0.000 | -0.568 | -0.175 |
| **Demographics** | | | | | |
| Low Income | -1.048 | 1.784 | 0.557 | -4.545 | 2.449 |
| Race | -2.387 | 1.687 | 0.157 | -5.694 | 0.919 |
| Gender | -2.038 | 1.453 | 0.161 | -4.887 | 0.810 |
| Bachelors | 0.555 | 2.099 | 0.791 | -3.558 | 4.668 |
| Republican | 6.421 | 11.591 | 0.580 | -16.298 | 29.139 |
| Democrat | 8.421 | 10.947 | 0.442 | -13.034 | 29.877 |
| Home Owners | -1.460 | 1.565 | 0.351 | -4.528 | 1.608 |
| Price (Log) | -6.820 | 0.849 | 0.000 | -8.484 | -5.156 |
| All parameters are model as random parameters. All parameters are normally distributed except price is log-normally distributed. Attributes in the parenthesis are the reference category. All variables from the choice scenario are dummy (0/1) except price is continuous. Income low (1 = Below $49,000 and 0 = $50,000 or above), Gender (1 = Female, 0 = Male), Race (1 = White, 0 = Nonwhite), Bachelors (1 = Bachelor’s degree, 0 = High school, associates) Democratic/Republican (Binary variables with Independent as the reference group), Homeowner (1 = Homeowner, 0 = Rent home, rent apartment, own apartment) N = 5,676 , Log likelihood = -1525.61, Chi-squared = 96.78 | | | | | |

The following tables below explore how demographic characteristics impact habits around GRs and government support and WTP for the *GR Program*

**Table 7: Logistic regression Awareness of GR**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Aware of GR | Coef. | | S.E. | p-value | [95% Conf | Interval] | | Sig |
| Race | .427 | | .453 | .345 | -.46 | 1.314 | |  |
| Income Low | -.074 | | .249 | .766 | -.563 | .414 | |  |
| Gender | .085 | | .243 | .726 | -.391 | .562 | |  |
| Married | -.728 | | .365 | .046 | -1.444 | -.013 | | \*\* |
| Bachelors | -.288 | | .442 | .514 | -1.154 | .577 | |  |
| Democrat | .167 | | .395 | .672 | -.607 | .942 | |  |
| Republican | .304 | | .434 | .484 | -.546 | 1.154 | |  |
| Urban | .689 | | .276 | .012 | .149 | 1.23 | | \*\* |
| Homeowner | .547 | | .273 | .045 | .011 | 1.082 | | \*\* |
| West | .264 | | .3 | .379 | -.324 | .851 | |  |
| Northeast | -.119 | | .406 | .769 | -.916 | .677 | |  |
| Midwest | .222 | | .334 | .506 | -.433 | .878 | |  |
| Greenspace Freq | .179 | | .259 | .491 | -.33 | .687 | |  |
| Constant | -.687 | | .647 | .288 | -1.954 | .58 | |  |
| Mean dependent var | | 0.515 | | SD dependent var | | | 0.501 | |
| Pseudo r-squared | | 0.046 | | Number of obs | | | 305.000 | |
| Chi-square | | 19.430 | | Prob > chi2 | | | 0.110 | |
| Akaike crit. (AIC) | | 431.124 | | Bayesian crit. (BIC) | | | 483.208 | |
| Notes: Significance indicated by, \*\*\* p<.01, \*\* p<.05, \* p<.1  Aware (1 = Yes, 0 = No or Unsure) Income low (1 = Below $49,000 and 0 = $50,000 or above), Gender (1 = Female, 0 = Male) Race (1 = White, 0 = Nonwhite), Urban (1 = Urban, 0 = Rural or Suburban) Homeowner (1 = Homeowner, 0 = Rent home, rent apartment, own apartment) Married (1 = Married, 0 = Single, widowed, divorced) Greenspace Freq (1 = visits green space weekly, 0 = visits green space less than weekly) Bachelors (1 = Bachelor’s degree, 0 = High school, associates) Democratic/Republican (Binary variables with independent as the reference group) West/Northeast/Midwest (Binary variable with South as the reference group) | | | | | | | | |

**Table 8: Logistic regression Visitation Frequency to a GR**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Visiting Freq GR | Coef. | | S.E. | p-value | | [95% Conf | Interval] | | Sig |
| Race | -.338 | | 1.301 | .795 | | -2.888 | 2.212 | |  |
| Income Low | .194 | | .5 | .697 | | -.785 | 1.174 | |  |
| Gender | .314 | | .46 | .495 | | -.587 | 1.216 | |  |
| Married | .656 | | .745 | .379 | | -.805 | 2.116 | |  |
| Bachelors | 1.766 | | 1.165 | .13 | | -.517 | 4.048 | |  |
| Democrat | .978 | | .789 | .215 | | -.569 | 2.525 | |  |
| Republican | 2.01 | | .864 | .02 | | .316 | 3.704 | | \*\* |
| Urban | 1.535 | | .517 | .003 | | .522 | 2.548 | | \*\*\* |
| Homeowner | .207 | | .555 | .709 | | -.881 | 1.296 | |  |
| West | .367 | | .588 | .533 | | -.785 | 1.518 | |  |
| Northeast | -.612 | | .783 | .435 | | -2.146 | .923 | |  |
| Midwest | .099 | | .618 | .873 | | -1.112 | 1.31 | |  |
| Greenspace Freq | 1.223 | | .48 | .011 | | .283 | 2.163 | | \*\* |
| Constant | -4.664 | | 2.239 | .037 | | -9.052 | -.276 | | \*\* |
| Mean dependent var | | 0.698 | | | SD dependent var | | | 0.461 | |
| Pseudo r-squared | | 0.195 | | | Number of obs | | | 129.000 | |
| Chi-square | | 30.875 | | | Prob > chi2 | | | 0.004 | |
| Akaike crit. (AIC) | | 155.233 | | | Bayesian crit. (BIC) | | | 195.270 | |
| Notes: Significance indicated by, \*\*\* p<.01, \*\* p<.05, \* p<.1  Visiting Freq GR, is the frequency the respondent reported visiting a GR (1 = Weekly or Biweekly, 0 = Less than biweekly, once a month, every few months, once a year, and once) Income low (1 = Below $49,000 and 0 = $50,000 or above), Gender (1 = Female, 0 = Male) Race (1 = White, 0 = Nonwhite), Urban (1 = Urban, 0 = Rural or Suburban) Homeowner (1 = Homeowner, 0 = Rent home, rent apartment, own apartment) Married (1 = Married, 0 = Single, widowed, divorced) Greenspace Freq (1 = visits green space weekly, 0 = visits green space less than weekly) Bachelors (1 = Bachelor’s degree, 0 = High school, associates) Democratic/Republican (Binary variables with independent as the reference group) West/Northeast/Midwest (Binary variable with South as the reference group) | | | | | | | | | |

**Table 9: Linear regression WTP for GR Program Prior to Information**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Payment for GR | Coef. | | S.E. | p-value | | [95% Conf | Interval] | | Sig |
| Race | -43.196 | | 24.284 | .076 | | -90.992 | 4.599 | | \* |
| Income Low | 14.768 | | 13.7 | .282 | | -12.195 | 41.731 | |  |
| Gender | -28.584 | | 13.336 | .033 | | -54.831 | -2.338 | | \*\* |
| Married | 25.264 | | 19.445 | .195 | | -13.007 | 63.535 | |  |
| Bachelors | 69.24 | | 24.112 | .004 | | 21.784 | 116.697 | | \*\*\* |
| Democrat | 29.518 | | 21.545 | .172 | | -12.885 | 71.921 | |  |
| Republican | 26.857 | | 23.602 | .256 | | -19.596 | 73.31 | |  |
| Urban | 17.13 | | 15.028 | .255 | | -12.448 | 46.708 | |  |
| Homeowner | -10.371 | | 14.953 | .488 | | -39.801 | 19.058 | |  |
| West | 27.352 | | 16.318 | .095 | | -4.764 | 59.468 | | \* |
| Northeast | 43.32 | | 22.498 | .055 | | -.96 | 87.6 | | \* |
| Midwest | .883 | | 18.416 | .962 | | -35.362 | 37.128 | |  |
| Greenspace Freq | 19.831 | | 14.259 | .165 | | -8.234 | 47.895 | |  |
| Constant | 63.732 | | 34.842 | .068 | | -4.842 | 132.306 | | \* |
| Mean dependent var | | 153.902 | | | SD dependent var | | | 118.191 | |
| R-squared | | 0.119 | | | Number of obs | | | 305.000 | |
| F-test | | 3.012 | | | Prob > F | | | 0.000 | |
| Akaike crit. (AIC) | | 3765.151 | | | Bayesian crit. (BIC) | | | 3817.236 | |
| Notes: Significance indicated by, \*\*\* p<.01, \*\* p<.05, \* p<.1  Payment for GR (continuous $0 to $500) Income low (1 = Below $49,000 and 0 = $50,000 or above), Gender (1 = Female, 0 = Male) Race (1 = White, 0 = Nonwhite), Urban (1 = Urban, 0 = Rural or Suburban) Homeowner (1 = Homeowner, 0 = Rent home, rent apartment, own apartment) Married (1 = Married, 0 = Single, widowed, divorced) Greenspace Freq (1 = visits green space weekly, 0 = visits green space less than weekly) Bachelors (1 = Bachelor’s degree, 0 = High school, associates) Democratic/Republican (Binary variables with independent as the reference group) West/Northeast/Midwest (Binary variable with South as the reference group) | | | | | | | | | |

**Table 10: Linear regression WTP for GR Program After Information**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Payment for GR | Coef. | | S.E. | p-value | | [95% Conf | Interval] | | Sig |
| Race | -39.362 | | 25.194 | .119 | | -88.949 | 10.225 | |  |
| Income Low | 8.279 | | 14.253 | .562 | | -19.774 | 36.331 | |  |
| Gender | -23.923 | | 13.89 | .086 | | -51.262 | 3.416 | | \* |
| Married | 21.222 | | 20.412 | .299 | | -18.953 | 61.397 | |  |
| Bachelors | 49.235 | | 25.069 | .05 | | -.106 | 98.576 | | \* |
| Democrat | 39.967 | | 22.325 | .074 | | -3.973 | 83.907 | | \* |
| Republican | 50.637 | | 24.524 | .04 | | 2.368 | 98.906 | | \*\* |
| Urban | 28.275 | | 15.577 | .071 | | -2.383 | 58.933 | | \* |
| Homeowner | -.071 | | 15.598 | .996 | | -30.771 | 30.629 | |  |
| West | 22.107 | | 16.907 | .192 | | -11.17 | 55.384 | |  |
| Northeast | 65.38 | | 23.579 | .006 | | 18.971 | 111.789 | | \*\*\* |
| Midwest | -18.404 | | 19.231 | .339 | | -56.255 | 19.447 | |  |
| Greenspace Freq | 14.007 | | 14.831 | .346 | | -15.183 | 43.196 | |  |
| Constant | 76.138 | | 36.114 | .036 | | 5.059 | 147.217 | | \*\* |
| Mean dependent var | | 168.964 | | | SD dependent var | | | 123.332 | |
| R-squared | | 0.131 | | | Number of obs | | | 303.000 | |
| F-test | | 3.363 | | | Prob > F | | | 0.000 | |
| Akaike crit. (AIC) | | 3762.002 | | | Bayesian crit. (BIC) | | | 3813.995 | |
| Notes: Significance indicated by, \*\*\* p<.01, \*\* p<.05, \* p<.1  Payment for GR (continuous $0 to $500) Income low (1 = Below $49,000 and 0 = $50,000 or above), Gender (1 = Female, 0 = Male) Race (1 = White, 0 = Nonwhite), Urban (1 = Urban, 0 = Rural or Suburban) Homeowner (1 = Homeowner, 0 = Rent home, rent apartment, own apartment) Married (1 = Married, 0 = Single, widowed, divorced) Greenspace Freq (1 = visits green space weekly, 0 = visits green space less than weekly) Bachelors (1 = Bachelor’s degree, 0 = High school, associates) Democratic/Republican (Binary variables with independent as the reference group) West/Northeast/Midwest (Binary variable with South as the reference group) | | | | | | | | | |

**Table 11: Logistic regression Vote on GR Program Prior to Information**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Vote | Coef. | | S.E. | p-value | | [95% Conf | Interval] | | Sig |
| Race | -.071 | | .522 | .891 | | -1.094 | .951 | |  |
| Income Low | -.187 | | .337 | .579 | | -.847 | .473 | |  |
| Gender | .138 | | .329 | .676 | | -.508 | .783 | |  |
| Married | .342 | | .429 | .426 | | -.5 | 1.183 | |  |
| Bachelors | -.208 | | .542 | .7 | | -1.27 | .854 | |  |
| Democrat | .117 | | .516 | .821 | | -.895 | 1.129 | |  |
| Republican | -.618 | | .554 | .264 | | -1.703 | .467 | |  |
| Urban | .44 | | .356 | .217 | | -.259 | 1.138 | |  |
| Homeowner | .004 | | .356 | .99 | | -.693 | .701 | |  |
| West | .081 | | .406 | .842 | | -.715 | .877 | |  |
| Northeast | .212 | | .572 | .71 | | -.908 | 1.332 | |  |
| Midwest | -.172 | | .438 | .695 | | -1.03 | .686 | |  |
| Greenspace Freq | 1.12 | | .344 | .001 | | .446 | 1.793 | | \*\*\* |
| Constant | .861 | | .75 | .251 | | -.609 | 2.331 | |  |
| Mean dependent var | | 0.832 | | | SD dependent var | | | 0.374 | |
| Pseudo r-squared | | 0.069 | | | Number of obs | | | 304.000 | |
| Chi-square | | 18.930 | | | Prob > chi2 | | | 0.125 | |
| Akaike crit. (AIC) | | 284.082 | | | Bayesian crit. (BIC) | | | 336.120 | |
| Notes: Significance indicated by, \*\*\* p<.01, \*\* p<.05, \* p<.1  Vote (1 = Voted for, 0 = Voted against or unsure) Income low (1 = Below $49,000 and 0 = $50,000 or above), Gender (1 = Female, 0 = Male) Race (1 = White, 0 = Nonwhite), Urban (1 = Urban, 0 = Rural or Suburban) Homeowner (1 = Homeowner, 0 = Rent home, rent apartment, own apartment) Married (1 = Married, 0 = Single, widowed, divorced) Greenspace Freq (1 = visits green space weekly, 0 = visits green space less than weekly) Bachelors (1 = Bachelor’s degree, 0 = High school, associates) Democratic/Republican (Binary variables with independent as the reference group) West/Northeast/Midwest (Binary variable with South as the reference group) | | | | | | | | | |

**Table 12: Logistic regression Vote on GR Program After Information**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Vote | Coef. | | S.E. | p-value | | [95% Conf | Interval] | | Sig |
| Race | -2.114 | | 1.066 | .047 | | -4.203 | -.026 | | \*\* |
| Income Low | .056 | | .353 | .874 | | -.636 | .748 | |  |
| Gender | -.044 | | .349 | .899 | | -.729 | .64 | |  |
| Married | -.004 | | .483 | .993 | | -.95 | .942 | |  |
| Bachelors | -.808 | | .651 | .215 | | -2.084 | .468 | |  |
| Democrat | .207 | | .574 | .718 | | -.919 | 1.333 | |  |
| Republican | -.858 | | .601 | .153 | | -2.035 | .319 | |  |
| Urban | .275 | | .387 | .478 | | -.484 | 1.034 | |  |
| Homeowner | .575 | | .366 | .116 | | -.142 | 1.292 | |  |
| West | -.414 | | .42 | .324 | | -1.237 | .409 | |  |
| Northeast | -1.116 | | .514 | .03 | | -2.122 | -.109 | | \*\* |
| Midwest | -.118 | | .503 | .814 | | -1.104 | .867 | |  |
| Greenspace Freq | .703 | | .358 | .049 | | .002 | 1.404 | | \*\* |
| Constant | 3.988 | | 1.307 | .002 | | 1.427 | 6.549 | | \*\*\* |
| Mean dependent var | | 0.849 | | | SD dependent var | | | 0.358 | |
| Pseudo r-squared | | 0.093 | | | Number of obs | | | 305.000 | |
| Chi-square | | 24.148 | | | Prob > chi2 | | | 0.030 | |
| Akaike crit. (AIC) | | 262.570 | | | Bayesian crit. (BIC) | | | 314.655 | |
| Notes: Significance indicated by, \*\*\* p<.01, \*\* p<.05, \* p<.1  Bill (1 = Voted for, 0 = Voted against or unsure) Income low (1 = Below $49,000 and 0 = $50,000 or above), Gender (1 = Female, 0 = Male) Race (1 = White, 0 = Nonwhite), Urban (1 = Urban, 0 = Rural or Suburban) Homeowner (1 = Homeowner, 0 = Rent home, rent apartment, own apartment) Married (1 = Married, 0 = Single, widowed, divorced) Greenspace Freq (1 = visits green space weekly, 0 = visits green space less than weekly) Bachelors (1 = Bachelor’s degree, 0 = High school, associates) Democratic/Republican (Binary variables with independent as the reference group) West/Northeast/Midwest (Binary variable with South as the reference group) | | | | | | | | | |