

Net Zero Task Force Working Group: Engagement & Behavior Change

April 8, 2014 Meeting Notes

Present Working Group Members: Caitriona Cooke, Andrea Love, Quinton Zondervan, Emily Grandstaff-Rice, Amanda Harding (for Stephen Turner), Grey Lee, Audrey Shulman

CDD Staff: Jennifer Lawrence, Susanne Rasmussen, Ellen Kokinda

Consultants: Rachel Moscovich, Dave Ramslie, Barbra Batshalom

Members of the Public: Paula Phipps, John Pitkin

Roadmap & Process

Working Group recommendations scheduled to be finalized by September 2014. The responsibility of the working groups is to brainstorm ideas and make preliminary recommendations. All recommendations that come from the Working Group will be presented to the full Task Force, who will ultimately decide what the final recommendations will be.

Working Groups will meet once a month. All ideas will be accounted for in a Google Doc, which members will have access to look over or add content between meetings.

Items to address:

1. Defining the current situation – an inventory of difficulties and barriers
2. Based on existing conditions, what does the future look like?
3. Develop vision and objectives- Develop SMART goals (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Timely); what might we need to refine?

Stakeholder Analysis

- Determines who are the partners the City needs to work with
- Engagement – how broadly are we going to solicit from stakeholders?
- Objective – to transform the language of the community
- Address who is the actor – the city? Partners of the city?
- Getting to net zero cannot just be the city's own action, it will require a broad mix of regulation, incentives
- Articulate stakeholders and their possible roles in the final recommendations
- The working groups will address what the City has direct authority over; what the City can influence, and instances where the City has little to no influence, which will require partnerships
- Consider creating new entities and collaborations

Initial Brainstorm List of Stakeholders

- Community groups like Green Cambridge, Mothers Up Front, Friends of Alewife, etc
- The City
- Communities of faith
- Utilities

- Universities
- Public and Private Schools
- Media
- Business community (chamber), small businesses (especially Tags)
- HEET (EE providers)
- State Agencies
- Professional Associations and service providers, building operators
- Museums (Museum of Science, Children's Museum, Aquarium)- two are outside of the City of Cambridge, but residents go there – include places that Cambridge residents go (and pay attention!) – for potential partnerships like museums and airport
- Target age range 14-25 – that is the sweet spot where people are engaged, plugged in/wired, developing their voice; do not dismiss this age group in terms of their power

The Current Community Context

- Varied population; contrast of transients and lifers
- Range of literacy – varies quite a bit amongst different populations within Cambridge
- Different messages all over, different metrics being used (confuses people); lack of measurement or wrong measures
- Technology adoption is on the rise - being used for many different things; Hailo to get cabs, craigslist, lyft, airbnb
 - Appeal to what is sexy, (Nest)
- Social media: tweets were WAY up from last NZTF meeting
- Low publicity by media (of topic)
- Universities, schools, museums have existing programs, can be expanded
- Low awareness/understanding and there are disconnects about future impact of actions
- Energy issues, commitment to sustainability and NZ are not “visible” everywhere (like Chicago and San Francisco)
 - There is no cohesive message
- Landlords haven't engaged energy efficiency
- Resident/renters get savings, also there is fast turnover
- People may not know where to go (we don't know who knows and who doesn't)
- Perception of aesthetic issues
- HEET has 3500 volunteers and has done low hanging fruit (14%)
- Solar very popular, most accepted
 - How popular is solar in Cambridge versus other areas?
 - Solar as carrot
- Mismatch of housing stock and programs
- Does the City have the proper infrastructure to support this effort?
 - What is the community and the city willing to leverage?
 - How will municipal historic preservationists respond? (from an aesthetic and perception standpoint)

Mindset/Perception

- Competing priorities make it hard for people to take action
- “We are in this together” doesn't currently define our culture
- We are traditionally a “sharing averse” culture with an “ownership” mindset – not used to being ACTIVE about energy – much more passive

- We are competitive (while still being “sharing averse”) – neighborhood scale competition hasn’t been leveraged
- Challenging to raise the status of the “concept of the commons”? – individualism
- The concept of buildings as part of a network – not isolated objects – in terms of energy systems – is foreign
- Condos particularly hard to reach market because of ownership structure

Utility

- Low uptake on energy efficiency programs and rebates
- There is a mismatch of multi-family structure with existing incentive programs
- There are no targeted programs for labs (?)
- Universities are engaged with utilities in partnership (MOUs)
- Energy bill feedback: you compared to your neighbors exists

Professionals

- Low comfort level of professionals regarding NZE strategies
- New energy code trainings starting now

Stakeholder Mapping Analysis

Dave Ramsle, Integral Group, led a group exercise to map out the level of engagement for a variety of Cambridge stakeholders.

Actively Engaged Stakeholders

- Cambridge Housing Authority
- Youth Groups
- Housing non-profits
- Researchers
- Professional associations
- Power providers
- Other cities
- Building managers
- Product suppliers
- Green groups
- Cambridge Redevelopment Authority
- Professional groups
- Tool providers

Manage Closely

- Legislative delegation
- Dept. Public Works (DPW)
- School Department
- Historic Commission
- Laboratory owners
- Chamber Commerce
- DPU

- City Council
- DOER
- BBRs
- Homeowners

Passively Engaged

- Condo associations
- Restaurants
- Renters
- Service providers
- Neighborhood associations
- Landlords
- Teachers

Strategically Engaged

- Utilities
- Media
- City finance
- Law department
- Small business association
- MBTA
- City Executive
- Foundations
- Financial institutions
- CRG Land holders
- Police & Fire
- ESCOs
- Developers
- Planning Board
- State legislators
- ISD
- Faith community