



CLIMATE EQUITY & COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN BUILDING ELECTRIFICATION

A TOOLKIT

*A COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL & STRATEGIES TO CENTER EQUITY IN
BUILDING ELECTRIFICATION*

This content is freely available under a [Creative Commons License](#). If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must give [appropriate credit](#), [indicate if changes were made](#), provide a link to the license, and distribute your contributions under the [same license](#) as the original. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. This material may NOT be used for [commercial purposes](#).

Table of Contents

FOREWORD: WHO WE ARE AND HOW DID WE GET HERE?	3
EMERALD CITIES COLLABORATIVE	3
People Organizing to Demand Environmental & Economic Rights (PODER)	3
ABOUT THIS TOOLKIT	3
ENGAGING IN RESIDENTIAL BUILDING ELECTRIFICATION	4
Section 1: Background	5
How To Use This Toolkit	6
Centering Equity in Building Decarbonization	6
Why Community Engagement Matters	7
Who is The Community?	9
Selecting Community Partners: Who to work with?	11
The Spectrum of Community Engagement	13
Section 2: Getting Started: Work Plan Assessment and Development	
Developing A Compelling Case	16
Developing the Work Plan	20
Section 3: Implementation: Community Engagement Work Plan Tools and Resources	
A Starting Point - Building Unity in Support of an Equity Approach to Electrification	24
Community Engagement & Outreach Strategies	27
Vision & Principles of Community Engagement	29
Achieving Equity: Procedures for Inclusion	30
Community Collaboration: Process of Co-Creating Building Decarbonization Strategies	33
Moving Forward: Implementation	35
Section 4: Case Study - San Francisco Residential Building Equity & Decarbonization Initiative	
Introduction/Preface	35
Framing Story/Context	38
Lessons Learned	40
Moving Forward Towards Implementation	41
Conclusion	41
SECTION 5: APPENDICES	42
Appendix A: San Francisco Anchor Partner Network Strategies	
Recommendations	43
Appendix B: Jemez Principles for Democratic Organizing	43
Appendix C : Glossary of Terms	44

FOREWORD: WHO WE ARE AND HOW DID WE GET HERE?

EMERALD CITIES COLLABORATIVE

Emerald Cities Collaborative (ECC) is a national nonprofit organization of community, labor, business, advocacy, and academic organizations united around the goal of “greening” our metropolitan areas by creating high-road – sustainable, just and inclusive - local economies.

People Organizing to Demand Environmental & Economic Rights (PODER)

People Organizing to Demand Environmental & Economic Rights’ (PODER) mission is to organize with Latinx immigrant families and youth in San Francisco and put into practice people-powered solutions that are locally based, community led and environmentally just. PODER nurtures everyday people’s leadership, regenerates culture, and builds community power.

ABOUT THIS TOOLKIT

Our toolkit was derived from the City of San Francisco’s engagement with Urban Sustainability Directors Network’s Zero Cities Project, a three-year initiative with cities and community-based organizations to help cities achieve a zero-net carbon building sector by 2050. The purpose of this initiative was to experiment with different forms of community engagement to highlight best practices, lessons learned and models for creating effective community engagement around equity and climate resiliency through anchor-community strategies.

The intent of this toolkit is to share our perspectives as community-based organizations working to address climate change through building decarbonization¹ - decreasing the ratio of carbon dioxide (CO₂) or all greenhouse gas emissions related to primary energy production - and electrification² - replacing direct fossil fuels use with electricity - in partnership with their community and local government.

This community engagement framework addresses the legacy of social and economic vulnerabilities of low-income communities and communities of color, but also climate change as an exponential threat to already disadvantaged communities. As multiple cities move towards addressing these vulnerabilities

and threats, building decarbonization can be used as a transformative process to move towards equity, climate resilience, and economic inclusion through institutionalizing community engagement. To learn more about the Zero Cities Project, go to: <https://www.usdn.org/projects/zero-cities-project.html#/>.

From this work, ECSF and PODER have developed the San Francisco Community Engagement and Climate Equity Collaborative (SF CE+CE) and have begun to work on creating an implementation plan. This toolkit is intended to make our work accessible to other organizations and agencies that may be able to build off of our model to create your own workforce and equitable building electrification plan and strategies.

¹ [World Resources Institute](#)

² [New Buildings Institute](#)

ENGAGING IN RESIDENTIAL BUILDING ELECTRIFICATION

As climate change continues to negatively impact communities, there is a demand to act swiftly to address the climate crisis in order to limit the amount of harm that communities experience. Residents are advocating for their cities to develop strategies to confront the climate crisis. Local governments are feeling pressured to create and implement policies and programs to mitigate or adapt to climate change. With time being of the essence, community engagement may seem unnecessary as elected officials and key stakeholders can act as representatives of their community and create feasible solutions with the aid of technical consultants in a short time period. However, it is fundamental to understand that we must change the process of how we engage communities to create equitable climate solutions.

Effective and inclusive community engagement is an advantageous and valuable tool for local governments and community-based organizations and their constituents to achieve consensus on issues that influence residents' livelihoods and daily life. Though there are many forms of engaging a community, it is important to create a process that does not exclude the voices of the community. This exclusion can take form by engaging only representatives and technical experts to guide agencies and organizations to develop decarbonization strategies. These individuals provide essential insight and appropriate assessments of the climate burdens of a city and the solutions needed to address these burdens. In a best case scenario, these individuals may also be able to provide a general overview of how socioeconomic issues create barriers for residents to participate in the development of their city. However, if the individuals that are engaged in these processes are not reflective of the social, cultural and economic demographics of the community to be served, then the process will not yield equitable climate solutions. Building decarbonization can only be successful within a community if the barriers to accessing and using building electrification technologies are removed.

Section 1:

Background

How To Use This Toolkit

The purpose of this toolkit is to provide a hands-on resource for your city or region to develop a community engagement work plan for building electrification with equity as a lens. It is designed for both city officials developing building electrification policies and programs, as well as, community-led organizations and climate justice organizations who can partner with cities and towns and become key leaders in the process of community outreach, engagement and strategy development. Working together, city officials and community-led organizations can jointly develop strategies, actions and policy recommendations that advance effective equitable climate solutions. The toolkit is divided into four sections.

Section 1 provides the background. It discusses the “**why, who, and what**” of community engagement.

Why is an engagement process important, who is the community, and what does an engagement process look like? To do this, we will explore how to frame decarbonization in the context of equity and justice, as a way to define goals, objectives, and strategies for developing building electrification policies and plans.

Section 2 offers a **guide for developing your community engagement strategy**. It starts with: a) a local unified vision based upon principles and values shared by institutional and community partners, b) coming up with priority issues, and c) finding appropriate community engagement strategies, including recruitment, messaging and figuring out what tools and strategies can help you meet your goals.

Section 3 provides **tools to create a process** of developing building electrification strategies and actions through community engagement and collaboration.

Section 4 provides a **case study from San Francisco’s Residential Building Equity & Decarbonization Initiative** and highlights the framework, process, tools, conclusions, and lessons learned from the Anchor Partner Network.

Think of this as a **living document**. Take time to write down ideas that are sparked or other thoughts that come up, plans you’d like to pursue, and questions that you have. The ideas presented here will evolve as you learn more by thinking together and doing.

As you move ahead, remember that community engagement looks different in every city and community. Also, recognize that different types of community engagement strategies - from information sharing to power building - produce different outcomes. What you read here should help you think about the vision you want to work towards, important principles to uphold, and desirable outcomes for your partnership. But **the strategy you come up with will be unique** to your local environment and your climate change goals.

The intent of this toolkit is to be a resource for each town or community based on where you are with your work. The toolkit can be used by starting with section one and moving through to sections two and three, or by starting with whichever section that most fits your current stage of work. Section four is a case study from San Francisco, California, which gives an example of an approach to develop a process that generates

recommendations for integrating building decarbonization and equity.

There is some redundancy in each section to help make sure that each section stands alone, with key points included. Thank you for all of your work! United we can work together we have to make the change we want for a healthier planet and communities.

Centering Equity in Building Decarbonization

Advancing building electrification policies addresses both climate and immediate public health, and supports climate and the health of vulnerable populations. However, if the implementation of building decarbonization policies and programs does not center equity, the climate crisis and decarbonization policies will exacerbate existing inequities. These consequences may take the form of eviction of low-income tenants, displacement of low-income communities of color, unfair utility cost burdens, and even job losses or not benefiting from jobs created with new policies.

As stated in a report by the Greenlining Institute and Energy Efficiency for All,

“While building electrification has promising benefits for residents, it must be pursued equitably—ensuring that environmental and social justice communities can benefit, rather than being left with polluting and increasingly expensive gas appliances. It will require intentional policymaking and a planned transition for environmental and social justice communities to gain access to the major benefits of electrification, including cleaner air, healthier homes, good jobs and empowered workers, and greater access to affordable clean energy and energy efficiency to reduce monthly energy bills.”³

Questions regarding equity issues related to this emerging electrification policy agenda have not been sufficiently addressed despite the critical need. The equity questions are unanswered for one simple reason: the equity advocates and impacted communities are not yet in the idea creation, planning and decision-making processes.

City and regional planning processes need to engage with community-based organizations and their constituents to promote equitable and just development and fair planning practices, creating benefits such as energy security, job creation, community resilience, and racial and economic equity and justice. Creating procedural equity is as important as equitable outcomes from the policies; i.e., access, voice and leadership roles for disadvantaged, frontline communities in the policymaking process will result in more inclusive, impactful and effective policies.

³ *Equitable Building Electrification: A Framework for Powering Resilient Communities*, Greenlining Institute and Energy Efficiency for All, 2019

Why Community Engagement Matters

Why engage the community? A strong community engagement commitment and practice is foundational to effective climate initiatives, both in terms of creating equity and addressing the climate crisis. Community residents and stakeholders together will be better able to generate impactful strategies for supporting communities to thrive and effective ways to make the changes needed to create sustainable practices. Unified organizational partners have a strong stake in community change outcomes and add additional resources to institutional transformation. When combined, the assets and capacities of government and communities produce more impactful decisions and policy outcomes.

This toolkit is designed to help towns, cities and regions answer several questions:

1. How do we ensure a broader, deeper and more meaningful engagement of community members in defining, living and prospering in sustainable, healthy, equitable, resilient buildings and communities?
2. What are the capacities, tools and strategies that we need in order to be catalysts for transformative institutional change?
3. How do we bring a range of community engagement strategies together to create a larger movement for sustainable, equitable towns, cities, and regions?

In order to confront the enormity of community-level environmental, socio-economic and political challenges, local governments and community partners need to address these questions. By designing and implementing local community engagement work plans and sharing ideas, experiences and reflections across towns, cities and regions, we can move to creating answers.

Community-driven engagement creates procedural equity by co-creating a planning process with city staff members that develops inclusive solutions for policies and programs, which generate equitable outcomes. Procedural equity is embedded in each stage of your building decarbonization planning and implementation process, and may be viewed as a resource intensive task.

However, partnering with community-based organizations (CBOs) can create capacity for developing and implementing building decarbonization strategies in tandem with community members, as they can play a leading role in managing the outreach, engagement, and organization of community members. CBOs are best suited to manage the resources for engaging community members, along with managing necessary negotiations to build consensus within the community, as they are seen as trusted members of the community. These tasks take time and effort, but these CBOs bring incomparable value and unparalleled knowledge to your building decarbonization strategies.

There are three important roles to utilize while structuring this process, 1) a leadership group, 2) a facilitator, and 3) meeting participants representing networks of community members and community members themselves. The city must form a leadership group that includes community stakeholders at the table to help develop the engagement process, while ensuring that the city remains accountable to this process. The development of the meeting topics, content, and discussions should be generated by a facilitator embedded in the community to ensure that the values of community engagement are upheld, while driving an equitable community engagement process. Lastly, the attendees of these meetings are members of various networks in the community, and have a vital role as technical experts on the community.

For community transformation to ensue, cities must support and provide capacity and resources to organizations that improve how communities are organized and how they work, while shifting entire sectors of the economy and their relationship with communities.

Having community-based organizational leadership throughout the engagement process is essential as it builds knowledge, unity, and networks that can be leveraged to address opportunities and challenges that arise for promoting community-wellness. This leadership role needs to be identified and established before engaging the community on specific issues, policies, and programs.

Community Participatory Action Research, a collaborative, community-driven model for gathering data, ideas, information, and thinking together that results in a set of determined actions, is an excellent tool that will facilitate the following objectives:

1. **Collaborative Solidarity:** It is important to build an inclusive table with impacted communities, and not invite them to an already set table.
2. **Racial Equity:** The partnerships needed to implement zero-carbon roadmaps requires a commitment to the shifts that uproot racial bias, ensure self-determination, and close equity gaps.
3. **Climate Justice:** Concentrating on the disproportionate impacts of the climate crisis on low-income communities, communities of color, immigrant and refugee communities can be used to inform the leadership from impacted communities to design, implement and manage solutions.
4. **Energy Democracy:** Policies and programs must be developed by community-driven efforts to transition energy systems from extraction and exploitation, and instead have a clear set of equitable and inclusive energy goals.
5. **Equitable Economy:** Building decarbonization roadmaps should support job creation and workforce development in low-income communities, and result in tangible investments in affordable housing and community-controlled energy infrastructure.
6. **Environmental Justice:** Building decarbonization roadmaps should ensure the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, ethnicity, national origin, immigration status, or income in the development, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.
7. **Community Resilience:** The development of policies, programs, and projects around building decarbonization that builds a world where everyone has a chance at a good life, and equips communities with the capacity to address, mitigate, or adapt these policies, programs, and projects where any negative consequences arise.

8. Just Transition: Policies and programs should adhere to a unifying and place-based set of principles, processes, and practices that build economic and political power to transition from an extractive economy to a regenerative economy. The transition itself must be just and equitable, redressing past harms. If the process of transition is not just, the outcome will never be.⁴
9. Community Ownership: Ensure communities are able to attain the resources and have capacity to hold lawmakers and program implementers accountable to the needs of the community.
10. And of course, ending the climate crisis quickly and effectively to ensure a thriving planet that includes a home for humans.

Who is The Community?

Before we go further, let's ask ourselves a fundamental question. Who are we talking about when we talk about community engagement - **who is the community?**

That is the most frequently asked question among institutional stakeholders. It can be a complex landscape of organizations and individuals needing to build time, resources, and partnerships. There are extensive networks and people representing geographic, demographic, and political perspectives. All of these need to be engaged, but the priority and leadership have to be by resident-led groups that work on environmental justice issues.

These groups include:



⁴ Adapted from the definition of Just Transition by the Climate Justice Alliance.

Other stakeholders include:

- Labor unions
- Contractors & Minority-, Women-, Veteran-, Disadvantaged-owned Business Enterprises (MWVDBEs)
- Workforce Development and Training Organizations
- City agencies like the Planning Department, Department of Building Inspection, Board of Supervisors or councilmembers, municipal energy utilities, Workforce Investment Board, and others.
- Investor-owned energy Utilities
- Community Development Corporations
- Affordable Housing Developers and Building Owners
- Low-to-moderate Income Homeowners Associations
- Developers/Architects/General Contractors
- Community Researchers and Scientists

These organizations represent segments of the larger community, not its entirety. They also do not represent all the voices and interests of their particular sector. Factors in considering who to work with should include the community engagement goals and capacities.

1. **Organizing the organized** involves working with existing organized groups. It provides a bridge to organizing stakeholder interests, reaching specific target populations, getting critical input, feedback and engagement. It is important to take note that sometimes the largest, loudest, most financially endowed organizations, may not have credibility in the larger community. Look for existing organizations that have an impactful policy track record and are part of larger coalitions, and newer groups that are innovative.
2. **Organizing Labor** involves building consensus among trade unions and contractor associations about the livelihood and rights of their constituents. There are four levels of labor engagement: local level, council level, state level, and national/international level. For this work, it is important to engage local level and council level trade unions and associations.
3. **Organizing coalitions** involves tapping into existing efforts to organize multi-stakeholder coalitions. The work involves coalescing multi-stakeholder interests around a common vision and purpose, in this case ending the climate crisis and building equity. This is especially useful for the consensus building community-engagement model.
4. **Organizing the base** involves getting direct input and participation from residents that may or may not be involved in a community organization. This seeks the broadest level of community engagement as opposed to “representative” input. This is a slower, more difficult terrain. It is essential to incorporate direct community engagement by partnering with organizations that have ongoing community organizing strategies in order to build long-term community change and to make a meaningful impact. In partnering with community-based organizations, it is essential to engage in a manner that fosters genuine and authentic collaboration by sharing resources, planning and decision-making and a commitment to equity.
5. **Sector specific organizing** involves organizing specific communities that are directly impacted by issues of concern including low-income housing, deed restricted affordable housing, public health, tenant rights, environmental justice, and community resiliency, as well as constituencies including community-based workforce training providers, low-income people, people of color, renters, homeowners, immigrants, youth, women, LGBTQ, etc, as participants in designing and implementing solutions.

A first step to thinking about who to engage is mapping the existing community resources and organizations. (See more about mapping in section 2)

Selecting Community Partners: Who to work with?

Factors to consider who to work with include community engagement goals and organizational capacities. Each group provides different assets and capacities, and has their own goals and objectives that can range from direct service to community transformation. Most strategies include partnering with more than one organization to incorporate a breadth of strengths and expertise such as, equity, climate, workforce, housing, and business, for a defined community. A community resilience framework requires a broad and collaborative tent.

Social justice ecosystem mapping is an important tool that identifies strengths and assets within the non-profit or community-driven sectors who can be engaged in the development and implementation of successful plans. The purpose of mapping is to identify potential partner organizations (described below) with the expertise, track record, and capacity to partner with cities, towns, and regions in assessing climate equity impacts, setting climate equity goals, and helping to design an action plan with solutions for both climate and equity.

A first step for developing a map is to identify key themes, constituencies or subjects that will inform an outline of types of community-based organizations that need to be present at the planning table.

Community Organizations as Partners and Community Engagement

Community organization(s) within a city, town, region, and a community's social and political landscape are essential in an effective process that engages and organizes communities, builds power, as well as, catalyzes movements for social and racial equity that connect across issue areas and promote needed and just transformation. Community organizations, along with the ecosystem of organizations they work with, are necessary for a community-driven, climate-resilient, and just planning approach. As the USDN explains,

The key to closing equity gaps and resolving climate vulnerability is the direct participation by impacted communities in the development and implementation of solutions and policy decisions that directly impact them. This level of participation unleashes much needed capacity but also requires initial capacity investments across multiple sectors to achieve systems changes and culture shifts needed.⁵

While equity criteria and scans can be helpful tools, the key is an equity process that directly engages stakeholders in thinking about issues that relate to the transformation of the energy system in a specific geographic region. This procedural equity is a process where stakeholders work together with government staff and elected officials to create recommendations.

Through deeper engagement, partners help define who to bring to the planning table, through assessing the key issues and key stakeholders that are currently engaged in these issues. Identifying the critical partners and the role(s) they play will help get to impactful community engagement and resulting effective climate plans and policy actions. The following are some key selection criteria⁶:

⁵ Through their Zero Cities work, Urban Sustainability Directors Network (USDN) worked with the National Association of Climate Resilient Planners, Movement Strategy Center, and Facilitating Power to support and to develop a plan for community engagement strategies in four US cities. Documentation of their work and case studies from each of the four cities can be found in their report From Community Engagement to Ownership (2019, USDN). This report can be [downloaded here](#).

⁶ Source: Movement Strategy Center

- Aligned: Actively working on issues related to and/or impacted by climate goals.
- Accountable: Cultivated base of resident leaders who set strategic direction; led by and rooted in communities impacted by poverty, pollution, and political disenfranchisement.
- Trusted: Track record of meeting community needs; when residents have concerns, this is a group they can turn to.
- Connected: Forms broad-based alliances to win; builds bridges across difference; Connected to relevant networks with access to key resources, playing key roles (faith based, land, technical assistance, housing, buildings, community land trusts).
- Collaborative: Capacity to anchor a multi stakeholder table, build bridges across differences.
- Capacity: Collaborate with local governments; organizational structure, time and resources.
- Effective: Improves quality of life in impacted communities through dynamic combination of community-driven solutions and complementary policy wins; Engages in community-driven planning.
- Transformative: Leads with bold vision and embodies the values of that vision now.

NOTES

The Spectrum of Community Engagement

The meaning and implementation of community engagement can vary widely by location and context. Rosa Gonzalez, from the Movement Strategy Center, created a spectrum of community engagement tool that explains the range of engagement and gives CBOs and government leaders opportunities to develop their own strategy for engagement. This spectrum can be used to acknowledge marginalization, create a vision, articulate processes, and assess and move towards engagement goals where the partnership develops solutions and makes decisions.

The Spectrum of Community Engagement to Ownership

	0	1	2	3	4	5
Stance Towards Community Impact	Ignore	Inform	Consult	Involve	Collaborate	Defer To
	Marginalization	Placation	Tokenization	Voice	Delegated Power	Community Ownership
Community Engagement Goals	Deny access to decision-making processes	Provide the community with relevant information	Gather input from the community	Ensure community needs and assets are integrated into process and inform planning	Ensure community capacity to play a leadership role in implementation of decisions	Ensure community capacity to play a leadership role in implementation of decisions
Message to Community	“Your voice, needs, and interests do not matter”	“We will keep you informed”	“We care what you think”	“You are making us think (and therefore act) differently about the issue”	“You are making us think (and therefore act) differently about the issue”	“It’s time to unlock collective power and capacity for transformative solutions”
Activities	Closed-Door Meetings Misinformation Systematic Disenfranchisement Voter Suppression	Fact Sheets Open Houses Presentations Billboards Videos	Public Comment Focus Groups Community Forums Surveys	Community Organizing & Advocacy House Meetings Interactive Workshops Polling Community Forums	MOUs with Community-Based Organizations Community Organizing Citizen Advisory Committees Open Planning Forums with Citizen Polling	Community-Driven Planning Consensus Building Participatory Action Research Participatory Budgeting Cooperatives
Resource Allocation Ratios	100% systems admin	70-90% to systems admin 10-30% to promotions and publicity	60-80% to systems admin 20-40% to consultation activities	50-60% to systems admin 40-50% to community involvement	20-50% to systems admin 50-70% to community partners	80-100% to community partners and community-driven processes that ideally generate new value and resources that can be invested in solutions

Steps on the community engagement spectrum can be used to develop collaborations, and with effective engagement, unleash capacity for impactful racial, social, economic, and environmental justice transformation. Each stage allows for a transparent assessment of where community leaders or policymakers are and enables partners to explicitly build toward a more impactful partnership. As the USDN explains,

“To achieve racial equity and environmental justice, we must build from a culture of collaboration to a culture of whole governance in which decisions are driven by the common good. Whole governance and community ownership are needed to break the cycle of perpetual advocacy for basic needs that many communities find themselves in. Developmental stages allow us to recognize where we are and set goals for where we can go together through conscious and collective practice—so key to transforming systems” (USDN, 2019, Community Engagement to Ownership, p.5)

Building collaborative governance through community engagement includes a range of steps that seek to bring low-income and BIPOC, especially those on the frontline of experiencing climate change, into decisions and processes that affect them. The goal of city-community partnerships focused on climate equity requires different forms and depths of community engagement in hopes of transforming society and the built environment towards community wellness, resilience, equity, and justice.

The strategies and depths of engagement differ according to the project goals and the roles and capacity of participants, and often, several different inclusive strategies are pursued at the same time to address multiple objectives.

NOTES

Section 2:

Getting Started Work Plan

Assessment and Development

Developing A Compelling Case

Natural gas emits methane, which is estimated to contribute to about 25% of global greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions⁷, and is a fundamental reason why buildings are one of the top contributors to GHGs emissions. With the US experiencing an increase in heat, droughts, fires, dry winds, hurricanes, and deteriorated transmission infrastructures, the conditions create natural disasters that impact lives, communities, and businesses.

We are in a climate crisis. We have a limited window of opportunity to transform the ways we live to be sustainable for people and the planet. In 2018, a United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)⁸ report emphasized the immediacy of the climate crisis, which led to a call to action within the United States.

Despite withdrawing from the Paris Agreement, a growing number of US cities and states are implementing roadmaps and action plans that lead to net-zero emissions, creating ordinances that ban natural gas from new construction and updating building codes that remove carbon from our buildings.

IPCC estimates as of 2020, we have seven years before we reach a tipping point where we can not reverse the damage we have done to the earth. The United States has been a major contributor to GHGs causing the climate crisis. We can transform our relationship to the environment to one where we are part of the solution, and not the problem. We can work together in a unified effort to make the changes we need in order to create a resilient and healthy world, where everyone gets a chance at a decent life.

With the climate crisis becoming more imminent and turbulent, there is a fear that equity issues may become an afterthought. The climate crisis we are facing has been created by the same systems that have created institutional oppression and the resulting inequities. In addition, as explained by Rachel Morello, Manuel Pastor and et al in a 2009 report “The Climate Gap,”⁹ the climate crisis is hitting first and worst communities, countries, regions, that are not the primary contributors to the crisis.

At the same time, indigenous communities, immigrants, women, youth, communities of color, workers, low-income communities, and more, have tremendous wisdom, leadership, and understanding that makes centering their engagement in creating the solutions imperative to developing effective solutions both for ending inequity and ending the climate crisis.

Our transition to efficient 100% electric buildings is an important step. Eliminating fossil fuels through building electrification may radically change the communities making them stronger or more depleted, depending on how governments implement their building electrification policies, projects, and financing programs. The following are key thematic areas that are central to thinking through the intersection between equity, climate, and creating an effective plan for change.

In the current anti-climate change, and anti-diversity and inclusion political environment, it is essential that cities and states demonstrate what the alternative—sustainable, just, and inclusive—economy looks like and demonstrate at scale how to do it. This is the moment.

⁷ [Overview of Greenhouse Gases | Greenhouse Gas \(GHG\) Emissions](#)

⁸ [Summary for Policymakers of IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C approved by governments](#)

⁹ “The Climate Gap: Inequalities in How Climate Change Hurts Americans & How to Close the Gap.” By Rachel Morello Frosch, Manuel Pastor, Jim Sadd, and Seth Shonkoff, USC Equity Research Institute, May 2006. [Download here.](#)

Key Intersectional Issue Areas

Affordable Housing

Access to affordable housing for everyone is a central issue. Building decarbonization creates an opportunity to engage affordable housing developers and asset managers and strategize about using the building electrification process to increase opportunities to improve and increase affordable housing. With coordination, a plan and strategies can be created where affordable housing and building decarbonization can be mutually supportive. It is crucial in this process to engage affordable housing developers and asset managers, explaining the context, the importance of building decarbonization, and working together to develop this plan.

The affordable housing sector faces one major challenge limiting its ability to accelerate and scale-up: a fragmented efficiency and clean energy sector. Building electrification programs are often uncoordinated and do not work together without considerable hands-on, time-consuming project management. In addition, affordable housing developers and asset managers often do not have the technical capacity or funding to support needed retrofits.

Energy Affordability and Democracy

The just transition to building decarbonization is an opportunity to evaluate and address structural issues that create energy burdens on poor, working and middle class people. In addition, a comprehensive energy democracy approach is crucial to effectively transforming the energy system to one that enables the world to actually create a sustainable built environment. In particular, the scale of change that is required for the energy production, distribution, and storage infrastructure surpass the market driven solutions capacity. A coordinated public approach is required.

To make a material difference in the lives of vulnerable communities, the just transition movement must build a public-based project delivery system and infrastructure similar to what undergirds energy as a right.

The U.S. (and international) energy democracy movement is a revolutionary approach to transforming the fossil fuel economy to not only address climate change, and the environmental crisis it represents, but to also address long-standing issues of economic and social justice.

Some key challenges include:

- Currently, electricity is more expensive compared to gas.
- Upfront capital costs for low to moderate-income homeowners and affordable housing building owners.
- Other building upgrades may need to take place before electrifying a building.
- Lack of outreach to low to moderate-income homeowners on financial incentives, rebates, programs, and subsidies.
- Access to energy-efficient technologies for low-income homeowners and renters

Displacement and Gentrification

As cities move towards natural gas bans in all types of building stocks, policymakers should be attuned to the possibilities of how these types of bans can be used to displace low-income residents from their homes due to the potential renovations that will need to take place. This can lead to low-income residents being displaced from their neighborhoods, communities and cities.

Building owners who are required to make renovations due to natural gas ban ordinances may be enticed to use this opportunity to evict tenants and increase the rent for new tenants. These types of evictions are known as “renovictions,” and may be disguised as “no-fault” evictions. Building owners may also pass down the costs of these renovations to tenants, which is known as “pass-throughs.” As a result, these communities can be gentrified through an increase of rents or property taxes, shifting the socio demographics of cities, as people of color are most likely to be displaced, and decrease the amount of affordable housing available to low-income residents. Past market trends within the real estate industry have proven that when new building technologies are integrated into the residential sector, there is an increase in housing prices. As housing prices continue to rise, there will be a decrease in homeownership and increase in rentals. To reduce the risk of renovictions, pass-throughs, displacement, and gentrification, it is important to develop an electrification policy that begins with transitioning the newly constructed buildings from gas to all-electric and continuously work with residents and building owners to conduct retrofits on existing buildings.

Health and Quality of Life

With the effects of climate change becoming more drastic, low-income communities and communities of color are being hit first and the worst. Determinant factors on adverse health outcomes due to climate change are as follows: age, race, income, language, educational attainment, housing conditions, and pre-existing physical conditions.¹⁰ Many low-income communities and communities of color across America are located in areas with high environmental risks, such as flooding, pollution, severe heat events, droughts, and wildfires. As cities move towards electrification, it is important to also mitigate these adverse environmental effects by focusing on the health and livelihoods of city residents.

Burning gas and propane emits nitrogen oxide (NOx), which are known to cause respiratory and fertility complications in humans.¹¹ Substandard housing with poor ventilation and insulation coupled with more frequent abnormal weather conditions, can cause negative health impacts to the individuals residing in homes with natural gas. Poor health outcomes of residents in these types of homes are due to the inability to access technologies such as air conditioning, heating, and non-fossil fuel-burning appliances. It is important to educate community members on the adverse health effects of gas-burning appliances through the engagement process. Working with community partners to understand vulnerabilities and interventions for addressing these public health and environmental issues can serve as a basis to address health inequities in neighborhoods.

Access to Economic and Job Opportunities

The Associated General Contractors of America (AGC)¹² reported that two-thirds of contractors are struggling with a shortage of qualified workers, to the extent that one in four firms has passed on projects. As these new emerging technologies start to enter the building sector, there is a need for strategic and proactive investments in equitable workforce and business development strategies to protect displaced workers with training programs in new industries, target training and hiring programs for individuals with barriers to employment, and build the technical capacity of minority and women-owned business enterprises (MWBE) and disadvantaged business enterprises (DBE). To support workers and small business owners within the building sector, cities must embed requirements for diversity, training, pre-apprenticeship, and apprenticeship into Building Electrification policies.

¹⁰ [The Social Determinants of Health: It's Time to Consider the Causes of the Causes](#)

¹¹ [Basic Information about NO₂ | Nitrogen Dioxide \(NO₂\) Pollution | US EPA](#)

¹² [Eighty Percent Of Contractors Report Difficulty Finding Qualified Craft Workers To Hire As Firms Give Low Marks To Quality Of New Worker Pipeline](#)

There are mechanisms for ensuring that workforce and development strategies lead to transforming the construction industry to a high-road industry, such as project labor agreements, community workforce agreements, community benefits agreements, that enact local hire policies, especially for disadvantaged workers.

Multiple licenses, such as plumbing, electrical, and refrigerant, are needed to install, maintain, and replace HVAC building electrification technologies. It is important to assess the type of workforce development training organizations that can prepare individuals for jobs in the construction sector. Some of these partner organizations are as follows:

- o Community College: CTE programs and contract education
- o Apprenticeship Programs with Building Trades MC3 Curriculum
- o Pre-apprenticeship Community-based training programs
- o WIAO/WIBs
- o Case management/supportive services

Socio-Cultural Change and Competency

As cities ask their residents to transition to newly developed technologies that residents will have to interact with on a daily basis, it is important to understand the personal changes that residents must make to comply with building decarbonization standards. It is vital to engage community members to understand their concerns around building electrification, especially as it relates to changing social and cultural traditions. In some communities, gas stoves are used as a source of heat, an affordable or reliable form of energy, a tool to easily cook traditional foods, or a compliant form of energy for heating hair styling tools. Although lifestyle changes may seem small compared to the threat of the climate crisis, engaging community members in a process that includes information and generating solutions to address needed change is central to effective change. As cities develop natural gas bans, they must work with their communities to understand what support their residents need to make a full transition to 100% electrified buildings that are culturally competent and inclusive of all socio-cultural traditions that communities practice.

Conclusion

These themes are key to creating the scope for developing a work plan concerning building electrification and community engagement. The work plan can serve as an effective strategy for addressing systemic and structural conditions negatively affecting communities. These key themes provide parameters for the work plan in order to achieve the following objectives:

1. Provide the science behind building decarbonization, electrification, energy efficiency, and renewable energy to support and direct climate action.
2. Review and create potential decarbonization strategies that enhance equity and move quickly to address GHG emissions.
3. Create climate solution policies and programs that integrate local sustainable social enterprises, jobs, a just transition for workers, and other economic opportunities.
4. Develop strategies that ensure that equity and climate justice principles are maintained throughout the implementation of a transition to 100% electric buildings.
5. Identify and prioritize policy and project opportunities for implementing recommended actions.
6. Create community messaging for recommended actions.

Centering these issues will promote a compelling process that can build a unified collective voice and power base as a force for effecting change. This process is based on a collaborative and community ownership model, which is considered the deepest and strongest form of community engagement. When community

engagement opens up space for people to form new policies and programs in partnership with the City, the approach enables stakeholders to both understand the issues the city is tackling and fosters a shared culture of deep understanding of the community's priorities. The process of deep community engagement and ownership creates the conditions for the creation and implementation of impactful climate and equity programs and policies.

Developing the Work Plan

Community engagement differs depending on the social and political context of the policy or program being developed, as well as, how the engagement is formed and led. The work plan must promote an open and transparent process and empowers community members. The work plan should be broad-based and harness the capacities and strengths of various stakeholders willing to work to ensure equity is embedded in this work.

The work plan can be structured by directing the focus of a policy or program on key issues, which can be determined through literature reviews, policy landscape analyses at the regional, state, and national level, building typology assessments by interviewing technical experts, and identifying and interviewing key community stakeholders. The key issues that arise from this research can set the framework for developing the work plan that is compelling to the community. These key issues can also be the central topics throughout the community engagement process, and inform the content that will be developed and shared through this process. The assessment of these key issues should define the scope of work, and the necessary modes of community engagement.

Building decarbonization and equity is an emerging concept. To design and set policies and programs around these two priorities, the community will need to be informed on the definition, goals, opportunities, and challenges of building decarbonization. In addition, a generative process needs to be developed that surfaces the issues that could impact on community members. One place to start is sharing information and resources relating to building decarbonization creates a process that generates solutions that are relevant and specific to the community and develops consensus amongst community members in transforming the community and its economy. This empowers communities to make informed decisions and creates procedural equity in developing policies and programs that are fair, just, and inclusive.

To make the impactful change and drive solutions that will move the community forward, equity cannot be an afterthought. The goal of the work plan must be to generate and institutionalize a process that guarantees that communities are entitled to discuss issues that directly or indirectly impact them and develops community-led solutions that remove barriers and inequities to receiving the benefits these policies and programs set out to create.

Embedding procedural equity into each stage of the process of implementing building decarbonization is a tool for addressing how past climate policies have historically impacted low-to-moderate income communities disproportionately. The purpose of engaging community stakeholders in this process is to incorporate their knowledge into a building decarbonization roadmap that can provide potential solutions and reparations from past environmental harms consciously and unconsciously inflicted on a community. Therefore, the design of the work plan should not only focus on developing a strategy for building decarbonization but ensures that the community is engaged at every important stage of the process to create effective solutions and build consensus around these solutions.

The work plan should be geared towards meeting the needs of community stakeholders and creating capacity for them to engage collaboratively in the development and implementation of building decarbonization policies and programs. It is also vital that the network of community stakeholders brought to the table can address an

array of topics and issues such as environmental and/or climate justice issues, economic and job training opportunities, and tenant and housing rights.

Therefore, it is important to reach out to key community stakeholders who are represented by environmental justice, climate justice, MWDVBEs, labor, housing advocacy, community development corporations, and affordable housing building owners organizations. It is also important to work with different government agencies as many of these issues require interagency collaboration, and will need to engage community members to help them generate feasible solutions.

A requisite for this work plan is to build a team and a steering committee with the technical and cultural expertise to understand the capacity and capabilities of this engagement process, while ensuring that this process is sustainable and leads to resilient outcomes. The purpose of this work plan, team, and steering committee is to guide the community's journey to creating building decarbonization policies and programs. Therefore, the expertise needed to do this tactfully, will require knowledge on the stances, allies, and disagreements within the community, while recognizing the accessibility of the content being provided and the process being enforced.

While the work plan is being developed, it is beneficial to acknowledge that there are key parts of the work plan that should be developed with community feedback and suggestions. Certain aspects of the work plan that should be addressed with community stakeholders prior to the community engagement process is as follows:

- Modes of accountability for city officials creating strategies to address social, political, and economic issues
- Exercises that will create consensus of goals, potential strategies, and recommendations
- Various lenses and metrics to assess goals, potential strategies, and recommendations
- Forms of engagement that will lead to the development of a long-term governance structure to oversee and support transparency of the implementation of policies and programs
- Defining key community partners and stakeholders to engage

Before developing the work plan, you will need to pull community level information on the following topics, that should be shared with your stakeholders and community members prior to co-creating strategies and actions for building decarbonization programs and policies:

- Geographic Socio-economic Demographics
- Geographic Data on Energy Burdens
- Community Assessment on Workforce Opportunities and Challenges
- Assessment on Housing Stability
- Geographic Data on Climate and Natural Disaster Vulnerabilities
- Geographic Air Quality Data
- Assessment of Community Assets & Institutions

From this data, assess the themes, patterns, causes, and data gaps evaluated, as it provides a preliminary understanding of the systemic feedback loops present within a community, and can be utilized in conversation with community members around perceived opportunities and challenges within building decarbonization.

As you begin to visualize this process, partnering with community based organizations (CBOs) will be an important preliminary step as they can provide information and data, such as neighborhood assessments, community values, financial and economic needs, social and human assets. CBO's are representative of the vision, mission, and values of a community, and understand the power dynamics of this community and how to address these dynamics. To develop a compelling message for the work plan, it is key to understand these

dynamics, mission, vision, and values to produce an inclusive and equitable process that leads to proactive and impactful solutions. CBOs hold a repository of information relating to evaluating and assessing communities and creating programs that have been tried, tested, and supported by community members. Understanding their process and how to best work with communities will lead to policies and programs that are effective and creates consensus amongst residents.

Developing a community engagement strategy is a multi-step process. For an anchor-community engagement process to be successful, the work plan must achieve the following milestones:

1. Convening a community engagement workgroup

- Conduct sociodemographic and geographic research on the livelihoods of residents
- Develop an ecosystem social map of community stakeholders
- Create a list of stakeholders to facilitate, organize, or participate in the anchor-community network
- Outreach to stakeholders
- Interview and select a community facilitator and community steering committee

2. Establishing values and principles that govern the community partnership

- Defining a vision and establishing a set of principles
- Defining roles and capacity assessment
- Host one-on-one pre-meetings with key community stakeholders
- Define and set expectations for the engagement process

3. Developing a community engagement strategy and workplan.

- Select topics and format for meetings
- Develop an agenda for each meeting
- Create content for each meeting
- Manage logistics for each meeting: finding a venue, creating handouts and surveys

4. Executing and monitoring the plan.

- Conduct outreach for each meeting
- Host and facilitate each meeting
- Conduct a self-assessment for each meeting
- Review & synthesize feedback with the steering committee, different city staff members, and key community stakeholders for each meeting
- Create a draft of goals, strategies, actions, metrics, and working groups to be reviewed by the community
- Review community input and finalize goals, strategies, actions, metrics, and working groups

Section 3:

Implementation: Community
Engagement

Work Plan Tools and Resources

A Starting Point - Building Unity in Support of an Equity Approach to Electrification

How to Begin - One effective place to begin is a generative conversation with those who have started the efforts for building electrification and equity for creating climate solutions. To elaborate, an equity approach to creating solutions is creating a process where communities of color and low-income communities are engaged in thinking about the challenges of the climate crisis and developing solutions. A procedural equity approach will help develop solutions that will address inequity and the climate crisis. It is important to use an equity lens for this work as the climate crisis itself reproduces inequities for low-income communities and people of color as they are on the frontlines of the climate crisis, but are too often an afterthought when developing climate solutions.

The following is a list of framing questions for building unity utilizing procedural equity:

- What successes and challenges have you experienced in addressing equity in building electrification work in your town?
- In what ways and how do you think an equity approach to building electrification could be effective in your town?
- What opportunities and challenges do you see moving forward utilizing an equity approach?
- How can you build an engagement process that builds unity and co-creates solutions to equity and building electrification challenges? Who would you reach out to first?

At this point, you want to get a chance to think about your answers to these questions. The point is not to know all the possible answers to these questions at the start, but to begin to formulate answers to each question together. As you engage in the outreach work itself, you will discover new answers and build a new understanding of the impact of this approach.

NOTES

Guidelines For Groups to Think Through Ideas

What we are working towards is creating the conditions where we can learn from each other's ideas and perspectives, and also create new ideas. A little structure can go a long way in creating the conditions where everyone can find their minds and thoughts about a topic. Here are some guidelines for your discussion or think and listen groups:

1. Choose someone to be the facilitator (this person's job is to relaxedly remind the group and check in so that each person has opportunities to say what they are thinking).
2. Talk about each question one by one.
3. Take turns where everyone gets a chance to speak, uninterrupted, once for each question.
4. Everyone gets a chance to speak once before anyone speaks three times.
5. Everyone gets a chance to speak twice before anyone speaks four times.
6. You may find it useful to set a timer to ensure that each person has a chance to speak.
7. When you are the person speaking - know that it is a chance to think out loud and that you can always change your mind later (even a minute later). This may seem obvious - but often what stops people from sharing their thinking is that they may end up changing what they think.
8. When you are listening - listen. Know that you will get a chance to speak later so you don't need to worry about that and you can go ahead and listen to the person speaking. Look pleased and like you like the person. This may seem obvious too - but often we don't have a pleased expression on our face (we may disagree with the person or are concerned about something completely different - like the toast we burned in the morning). It makes a difference to people's ability to say their thinking, if you can be pleased with them.

Climate and equity are not in conflict (be suspicious if someone tells you they are.) It sometimes happens that equity is used as an excuse to slow down transformational change and policies that work to end emissions. While deep community engagement processes take resources and time, it is the lack of process that slows the work, leading to mistakes and misguided efforts that pit low-income people and communities against climate solutions. There is no inherent conflict between equity and ending the climate crisis. In fact, solutions that propose to end the climate crisis but exacerbate equity are false solutions. In order to end inequities, we need to end the climate crisis. The effective way to end the climate crisis is an equity approach. The roots, structures, policies, systems and institutions that have created the climate crisis are the same that have created inequity.

Building the unity that comes from an equity approach creates the power needed to make the widespread transformation of systems and institutions to end both inequity and the climate crisis. As you begin this approach, you may not see the full potential or all of the answers to the challenges. The process itself, with everyone's minds and efforts in it together, will help to generate those real solutions. As well, unity does not require full agreement on every point, just enough agreement to work together (and you can always return to the unresolved disagreements later).

Community Engagement & Outreach Strategies

Generally, the prevailing question is always “who is the community?” This suggests a level of confusion and paralysis when introduced to the dense array of organizations that have different needs, if not demands, on public institutions. You are likely to encounter a host of divergent points of view, significant cleavages, competing interests, and splintered subgroups. The likely difficulties of organizing a representative and accountable residents’ group to be a part of a cohesive and enduring anchor-community partnership can not be understated in the face of competition and, often, distrust of institutions.

Once you have identified the key areas as a starting point for the focus of work, in this case building decarbonization and equity, you can begin to think about different types of stakeholders to consider engaging. Once you have mapped the networks and people representing geographic, demographic, and areas of work, you can begin to identify specific lists. Therefore, you need to define your geographic target area. Where is your sphere of influence? Where do you want to make a difference? These may or may not coincide with the political, economic and social geographies that ultimately define the resiliency of a community or the resources you need to affect structural or community change. Here is what you need to consider:

- **Service territories** - Service territories are artificially constructed geographies that are essentially planning areas likely constructed without clear rhyme or reason, and certainly not with a community-centered wellness framework. A well-functioning health service area should nestle within or otherwise align with clearly defined and well-functioning services territories of fire, police, emergency management, chambers of commerce, etc.
- **Jurisdictional/political territories** include your power resources. Policy pushes and changes in a community’s well being requires a working relationship with local, state and federal agencies and elected officials.
- **Neighborhood geographies** are at the impact level. Where do you need or can you make the greatest impact, where do you want to have the most visible, material differences?

In addition, there will likely be a number of organizations and individual activists that are already engaged in climate and building decarbonization, for example a ban on natural gas for new construction. These organizations and leaders can add resources to your work and be active allies. However, it takes directly reaching out to them and explicitly asking them to support an equity approach to ending the climate crisis and engaging in your input process. It takes staying in touch and asking for specific support for specific policy recommendations. Over time, a unified approach can be built where equity is at the center and shown to strengthen the process and speed of reducing our GHG emissions.

NOTES

Once the community has been defined, evaluate your community engagement environment. Be clear that what works in one community, town, city, or region, may not work in others. Think about these questions and use the space provided to write down your thoughts.

Questions:

- 1) What is the culture of grassroots activism in your community, town, city or region?
- 2) What sort of community engagement activities around climate change and environmental impacts are currently being (or have recently been) undertaken in your community-city-region?
- 3) Are any CBOs addressing climate impacts and/or housing, displacement, gentrification, energy affordability, health, or economic issues?
- 4) What current climate programs and policies are working well in your community? And, why?
- 5) What are the challenges? How would you overcome them?
- 6) As you expand the community partnership, who are the allies you already have (i.e., connections you have that are already strong).
- 7) Who are potential allies? Who are the mainstream environmental organization leaders and who can you reach out to to ask for support in an equity approach?
- 8) Who are your labor union, MWVDBE, community college, apprenticeship, workforce training and development, and WIAO/WIBs allies?
- 9) Who are the affordable housing nonprofits and advocates that serve low-income residents?
- 10) What are the low-income and communities of color that are in your town, city, or region? What are the organizations that currently work in those communities?
- 11) Who are other key stakeholders?
- 12) Are you open to community leadership on building electrification policy issues?

NOTES

Vision & Principles of Community Engagement

The starting point for your working group is consensus among the city and community based organizational leads concerning vision and principles for working together. A shared vision paints an inspiring picture of the future for a group of people. It allows us to see what the community will look like once we have achieved our goals and unites us around our common dreams. A vision and a message that conveys this vision are what distinguishes social movements from isolated policy change. A vision can be articulated in a vision statement. Here is an example:

“We believe that we can grow a healthy, sustainable economy that is just and inclusive of all of its residents, and where everyone has a chance at a good life.”

This vision:

- Employs a wide spectrum of workers with a range of skills suited for the new economy that also ensures a just transition of workers from the old economy into high paying jobs and opportunities.
- Prioritizes environmental and public health most impacted by environmental, social, and economic inequities.
- Provides just, sustainable working conditions, and safe and healthy jobs that utilize the safest chemicals, materials and products through their life-cycle based on green chemistry and engineering principles
- Empowers all residents to shape more sustainably just communities by pursuing fair and equal opportunities for populations typically facing barriers to employment, including but not limited to people of color, low-income people, immigrants, incarcerated people, LGBTQ people, disconnected youth, women, veterans and differently enabled.

Principles are the shared values and norms to which we adhere as we work towards a vision. While the vision may be local in nature, the principles are universal and include standards for how we relate to communities, the environment, and each other. The Jemez Principles for Democratic Organizing provides an example of principles that centers economic and environmental justice through engaging diverse groups of stakeholders. The principles are as follows¹³:

#1 Be Inclusive

#2 Emphasis on Bottom-Up Organizing

#3 Let People Speak for Themselves

#4 Work Together

#5 Build Just Relationships Among Ourselves

#6 Commitment to Self-Transformation

¹³ See Jemez principles in Appendix

Questions

- 1) What does success for your anchor-community partnership look like?
- 2) What is your vision for your community, city or region?
- 3) Do you have agreement between city agencies and community partners on where you are on the spectrum of community engagement? (See table on page 13) If so, what is the decision?
- 4) Why is it important to engage the community in building community health, wealth and climate resilience?
- 5) What would it look like to embed the Jemez Principles into your work?
- 6) What other principles should guide the work with communities in all anchor- community partnerships?

NOTES

Achieving Equity: Procedures for Inclusion

Building community resilience entails a community-centric wellness approach that prescribes solutions that lead to generative and positive economic, political, and social outcomes. In other words, a community where everyone gets a chance at a good life and no group of people or environment is sacrificed. Sometimes approaches to developing strategies follow a process of assessing the community to develop solutions that change individual behavior to lessen the individual's impact on the environment.

While these approaches may have some benefit, they typically fail to address root causes or engage people in creating effective solutions. With community resilience strategies that focus on the larger socio-economic factors that produce and reproduce these climate challenges, impacts are often too small and ineffective and the climate crisis continues to put entire communities at risk. Therefore, reaching crucial goals with effective solutions requires community generated solutions.

An equity based process for developing solutions builds on the existing infrastructure at the center of the community.

- 1) What are the existing well organized and cohesive community resources and how do their existing goals intersect with what is required for developing an effective approach to electrification?
- 2) What are the institutional assets and how well connected are the different stakeholders and the various parts of the community?

Start with building on where the community gets things done, or how they address problems, and develop strength and resilience in the face of challenges.

Because the work of building decarbonization and climate equity are newly developing, organizations and communities may not see the link to their area of work. Even though communities of color and low-income communities are already faced with the implications of the climate crisis, it may not be clear to the organizations the ways in which building electrification policies and their justice work intersects. Inviting community leaders to a large meeting is not likely to be the engagement tool that will enable leaders to connect their work to building decarbonization.

A effective step is more likely a one-on-one or small group conversation where you:

- 1) Introduce yourselves, your role, your work and why you care about your work to each other
- 2) Listen to their priorities
- 3) Give some information about the current situation, the impact of natural gas on GHGs and health and role of building decarbonization,
- 4) Think together about how this work can strengthen their existing priorities.

Once these initial connections are made, a variety of group engagement strategies can be effective.

The prerequisites to advancing a climate and community resilience involve uplifting data and metrics that present information on how economic, educational, social and physical environments influence access to resources, opportunities and, ultimately, the status of a community and an institutionalized social network and structure that allows for procedural equity. Many communities must overcome legacies of rural and urban poverty, segregation, economic dislocation, racial discrimination, and decades of divestment and now displacement through gentrification from reverse migration.

The goal of this engagement is to foster climate resilient communities, by capturing and reversing the structural conditions linked to environmental injustices of an entire population that live in disinvested communities. This

goal can only be achieved by addressing these key issue areas in partnership with the community that likely include:

- 1) Affordable Housing,
- 2) Energy Affordability and Democracy,
- 3) Displacement and Gentrification,
- 4) Access to Job and Economic Opportunities, and
- 5) Socio-Cultural Change and Competency.

The fact is, while different levels of community engagement are more participatory than others, a variety of community engagement strategies are needed at the same time to address multiple objectives. This is the all-in approach. In this context, there are three broad community engagement categories to consider: Involve, Collaborate, and Defer To.

You will need to vet your issues to make sure they respond to current community challenges.

Questions:

1. How would you map the journey of the community throughout this process?
2. What is the purpose of engaging community stakeholders?
3. What expected outcomes would you expect from the following community engagement strategies: Involve, Collaborate, and Defer To.
4. What procedures of engagement have worked for your community?
5. What questions do you expect to be raised from the community?
6. What questions do you have for the community?
7. What are the key issue areas currently affecting your community?
8. What topics can you discuss with community members relating to building decarbonization and key community issues?
9. How will success improve people's lives?
10. What are possible messages for the issue you think is most urgent in the community?
11. What are the messages that the opposition might use to frame the issue?

NOTES

Community Collaboration: Process of Co-Creating Building Decarbonization Strategies

In order to increase movement towards sustainable, healthy and just economies - i.e., healthier lifestyles, clean energy, jobs - we have to change knowledge and attitudes. Most residents, politicians, or institutional stakeholders do not know, understand or believe how changes in personal and institutional behaviors can impact community health, wealth and resilience. This requires education to build knowledge about electrification, environmental challenges, climate resilience, current practices and the potential gains from different approaches. This kind of education takes place by talking with community members and educating and informing them of 1) current climate vulnerabilities and 2) the tools and technologies that can be used to generate climate resilience for the community. As concerns arise, listen to what the issue is and work together to identify an approach that addresses the concern.

Listen, really listen, add information and perspective, think together. Take people's concerns seriously.

- If the issue is "it will raise costs to heat or cool my home" - think about how to solve that.
- If the issue is "cooking on a gas stove is my luxury" - think about how to solve that.
- If the issue is "in our affordable housing development, we do not have the expertise or resources to manage and implement a retrofit" - solve that.

Whatever the concern is, take the time to think together about how to address that issue. If you can not solve the challenge within your jurisdiction, reach out to organizations that organize on the state or federal level and explain this is what we need to change. In the end, real climate solutions will strengthen justice work.

Policy change and implementation is an important strategy for city-community partnership. For example, contractors can come together to demand change in hiring and procurement practices so as to increase economic opportunities and thus health and wealth of local residents and business. Economic markets can not solve the climate crisis, it will take government policy. A policy change strategy requires community education and tools associated with changing attitudes and behaviors to build consensus on the goals and strategies for implementation of the policy.

- 1) What city or town policies are in your way and need to be changed to transition off of natural gas equitably?
- 2) What policies can you create in your city or town to create real solutions?
- 3) What policies do you need to coordinate statewide, regionally, nationally or internationally?

NOTES

Changing opportunity means creating new sources of income and developing opportunities for shared wealth creation in low-income communities. Equitable climate solutions and policies must position residents as producers/providers (food, energy, health, jobs) and not merely consumers. To achieve these goals, cities should implement community benefit agreements to ensure that residents capture some percentage of wealth generated by new large-scale development, green jobs campaigns to ensure that workers of color have access to high road jobs in construction, and models of community ownership of local businesses. Changing opportunity is essential to developing actions that are used to support a strategy developed by community members to ensure that equity is embedded in the strategy. As you assess opportunities for shared wealth creation in your community, keep the following questions in mind:

- 1) Why is it important to engage low-income communities in building electrification?
- 2) What tools or support does your city, town, or region offer low-income communities?
- 3) What community engagement strategy do you think is most viable and effective for your goal/rationale?
- 4) How will you measure success as you progress towards your goal?
- 5) What are the critical next steps you need to take? Who will take the lead? By when do these steps need to be accomplished?
- 6) What do you need help with? What's missing?

NOTES

Moving Forward: Implementation

Equitable community engagement is the first step to create a building electrification plan. The process, however, cannot stop with the creation of a plan. This engagement process provides a framework to move towards community-driven policy implementation. The knowledge, partnerships, and tools built through the plan contribute to the implementation of the strategies. The next step includes creating a working group structure, with community stakeholders in the leadership and oversight of the implementation of the developed strategies. Implementation also includes developing metrics and tracking key milestones to hold the local government accountable and ensure this process remains equitable. Working groups need the resources and capacity to continue engaging community members and technical support to address challenges that arise throughout the process.

Building electrification touches on many aspects that cross government departments. An inter-departmental collaboration that includes community leaders, can coordinate the implementation plan and strategies developed through the equity process. This collaborative can also leverage new forms of financial mechanisms to resource the working groups and pilot projects.

Section 4: Case Study

San Francisco Residential Building Equity & Decarbonization Initiative

Introduction/Preface

Our work together on residential building electrification and workforce began with the San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFE) convening the San Francisco Anchor Partners Network (APN). SFE convened the APN in an effort to move more deeply on the continuum of community engagement and establish impactful equitable zero emissions residential building strategies and actions¹⁴.

In 2018, California Governor Jerry Brown convened the Global Climate Action Summit (GCAS) in San Francisco, bringing local government leaders, non-governmental organizations and corporations from around the world together to think about how to increase their net-zero emission commitments, despite the US federal government's decision to leave the Paris Accord. During GCAS, the Rise for Climate Jobs and Justice march, the largest climate mobilization on the West Coast ever, and other organizing efforts emphasized the importance of generating strong and impactful commitments and the centering of a justice-based approach to the climate crisis. San Francisco's commitment to update their climate action plan was a result of Mayor London Breed's increased commitment to ending the climate crisis from her engagement in the 2018 Global Climate Action Summit (GCAS).

Thus, San Francisco's Department of Environment convened four Zero Emission Buildings working groups focused on new construction, existing commercial buildings, existing municipal buildings, and existing residential buildings that would provide recommendations to the 29 key stakeholders on SF's Zero Emission Buildings Executive Steering Committee.

The objective of the Zero Emission Building Taskforce was to use building decarbonization as a tool to reduce the inequities that arise from adverse climate events - such as pandemics, extreme heat, droughts, wildfires, poor air quality, sea level rise, and flooding – with a focus on vulnerable communities as these communities are disproportionately impacted from climate change. The taskforce used the recommendations from each working group as a framework to create a natural gas ban ordinance in new constructed buildings. The task force report will guide San Francisco's Climate Action Plan and Zero Emissions Building Roadmap.

The residential building electrification working group was funded and supported by Urban Sustainability Directors Network's Zero Cities Project, a 3-year initiative designed to engage community members in 12 metropolitan areas in the US to develop programs and policies that would define effective, equitable, and inclusive carbon reduction strategies through building electrification.

The City of San Francisco selected Anchor Partners for the building a residential building taskforce. The criteria for this Anchor Partner were:

1. Partially Aligned: Actively working on energy, buildings, health, resiliency;
2. Accountable: community leaders rooted in impacted communities;
3. Trusted: track record of meeting community needs;
4. Connected: form broad-based alliances; build bridges across difference;
5. Collaborative: capacity to anchor a multi-stakeholder table & collaborate with the City;
6. Effective: improving quality of life in impacted communities through community-driven solutions & policy wins; and
7. Transformative: leads with bold vision.

¹⁴ See Rosa Gonzales', Movement Strategy Center, The Spectrum of Community Engagement to Ownership, outlined in Section 1 above.

Emerald Cities San Francisco (ECSF) and People Organizing to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER) were selected as co-anchor partners of the existing residential buildings working group. Emerald Cities supports and PODER organizes with frontline communities, including low-income people and people of color, those most burdened by the impacts of the climate crisis, and at the forefront of promoting genuine climate solutions.

The APN used the Jemez Principles for Democratic Organizing (see appendix) as a guidance for genuine partnership for all stakeholders. Our goal was to establish long-term partnerships between members of the network and city officials, build trust between San Francisco's disadvantaged communities and anchor partners, and to identify opportunities for community engagement and action.

The APN built a broader stakeholder group of over 250 key community stakeholders that can advocate for an equitable and just transition by:

1. Providing education on the science behind building decarbonization, electrification, renewable energy, and energy efficiency in the context of climate action.
2. Reviewing decarbonization strategies to enhance equity and develop local green social enterprises, jobs, and a 'just transition' for workers
3. Ensuring that equity and climate justice principles are maintained throughout implementation of a transition to 100% electric buildings in SF.
4. Prioritizing policy and project opportunities, and community messaging for implementing the recommended actions.

Our network included Community Development Corporations, Tenants Organizing/Legal Rights Groups, Affordable Housing Building Owners, Labor, Contractors, Workforce Training and Development organizations, Architects, Designers, Climate and Environmental Justice groups, Investor-owned Utilities, Community Choice Aggregators, Municipal Utilities, and various city and county agencies. These community stakeholders had the ability participate in the three following meetings to share potential opportunities, challenges, recommendations around building electrification on these topics:

- Workforce opportunities and challenges in the transition to 100% electric buildings
- Equity impacts: Electrifying deed-restricted affordable housing
- Equity impacts: Electrifying single & multifamily housing for low-income communities and communities of color

The opportunities, challenges, and recommendations helped shape a strategy to decarbonize privately-owned housing and protect communities of color and low-income residents; to decarbonize deed-restricted affordable housing, protect communities of color and low-income residents, and preserve affordable units; to plan for the equitable decarbonization of energy distribution infrastructure, and to increase the opportunities of disadvantaged workers and Minority, Women, and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises (MWDVBEs) by extending workforce development programs to building decarbonization.

Framing Story/Context

The Anchor Partner Network (APN) utilized an environmental justice approach to create an innovative initiative with the twin goals of decarbonization and equity - beginning with building decarbonization and focusing on energy efficiency, on-site renewables, and building electrification - that transitions San Francisco to zero emissions and creates a just and equitable model for becoming part of the climate solution. APN served as a partner to city officials and provided a governance structure that fostered equitable participation of community members in a transparent and open forum that provided consistent, long-term, and mutually beneficial engagement with San Francisco's Climate Action Plan and Decarbonization Roadmap.

Social change ecosystem mapping identified strengths and assets within community-driven sectors that can be engaged in the development and implementation of successful roadmaps. ECSF and PODER understand that our work is only effective if we are setting the table together with impacted communities, not inviting them to an already set table. The partnerships needed to implement zero-carbon roadmaps require a commitment to the shifts that uproot racial bias, ensure self-determination, and close equity gaps.

The themes for our meetings were the following:

Themes-Meeting 1: Workforce Impacts:

- Create solidarity between labor needs and climate policy
- Attract skilled “high road” workers to residential retrofits market
- Build skills of low-road workers so they can access high road MUSH jobs
- Work with apprenticeship programs to get residential workers certified
- Provide contractor training to ensure quality work
- Multiple licenses required (plumber, electrical, bldg modifications)
- Clearinghouse of information for homeowners, building inspectors, contractors
- Neighborhood-scale approach to electrify increases volume of jobs

Themes-Meeting 2: Multifamily Affordable Housing

- Lift up examples of all-electric multifamily affordable properties; share real project cost and performance data
- Planning for future investments: have technologies/components ready in advance
- Develop new utility rates and alternative structures/tariffs that can favor electrification, make it more cost effective for owners and renters
- Ensure new technologies/programs not limited to tenant meters - ensure there are no unintended consequences for tenants

Themes-Meeting 3: Single & Market Rate MultiFamily Housing

- Equity concerns higher in SF residential market-rate sector
- Building all-electric new homes can lower construction costs by eliminating gas infrastructure (to & in building)
- Electrifying existing homes is more complex: focus on planned renovations, equipment end-of-life replacements
- Electric service upgrades are expensive and complicated
- Owner-tenant split incentive issues, costs passed thru to tenants
- Upgrading buildings raises home value & can trigger displacement
- Layer and stack rebates, incentives and financing

Recommendations

The APN came up with the following strategies and recommendations for equitable electrification policies:

Strategy 1: Decarbonization of privately-owned housing and protection of communities of color and low-income residents

Develop and deliver a suite of planning, policies, programs, funding mechanisms, technical assistance, education and partnerships over the next 2-10 years that will enable a systematic, strategic and rapid transition to efficient all-electric residential buildings powered by renewable electricity. Expand measures to protect housing affordability, stable utility costs, and increase opportunities for communities of color and low-income tenants and homeowners.

Strategy 2: Decarbonization of deed-restricted affordable housing, protection of communities of color and low-income residents, and preservation of affordable units

Develop and deliver a suite of planning, policies, programs, funding mechanisms, technical assistance, education and partnerships over the next 2-10 years that will enable a systematic, strategic and rapid transition to efficient all-electric deed-restricted affordable housing buildings powered by renewable electricity. Expand measures to protect housing affordability, stable utility costs, and increase opportunities for communities of color and low-income populations. Enhance capacity of community housing organizations to preserve affordable units.

Strategy 3: Plan for the equitable decarbonization of energy distribution infrastructure

For effective and rapid decarbonization of buildings and transportation, changes to energy distribution infrastructure are needed. In the next 5 years, San Francisco will develop a phased process to decommission gas distribution infrastructure while fortifying and increasing electrical distribution capacity.

Strategy 4: Increase opportunities for disadvantaged workers and Minority, Women, and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises (MWDVBEs) by extending workforce development programs to building decarbonization. Building decarbonization and the transition away from an extractive economy cannot be realized without workers. There is an opportunity to increase diversity of the green building workforce and advance racial and social equity if workforce development measures are intentionally designed to do so.

- Lessons Learned

As the effects of climate change continue to become more severe each year, it is apparent that cities must electrify and decarbonize their building stocks with haste. Cities must understand that equity is an important part of reducing environmental and climate change. Furthermore, the notion that equitable community engagement slows down the environmental movement is a fallacy.

Climate movement needs to emerge from the grassroots. From SFE's engagement with community stakeholders, the most important lesson learned is that this process is a catalyst for consensus development on climate solutions. Equity can serve as a lens for economic inclusion and social cohesion, which is needed for the most vulnerable residents in a community to electrify and decarbonize their buildings. This provides opportunities for building alliances and collaboration amongst the climate movement, workers rights, climate justice, social justice organizations, and the environmental justice movement as climate change is a multidimensional issue. These movements already understand what policies their communities need to address socio-economic issues because they understand the challenges and barriers their communities have faced - and most beneficial - they understand where the opportunities are to make effective change.

A diverse large coalition is key towards building the capacity necessary to address all stakeholders concerns at the front end. This ensures procedural equity and consensus-based planning leads to better and more inclusive policy outcomes.

Cultivating relationships is key. SFE had an existing relationship with PODER and Emerald Cities, but had not worked directly with these CBOs before. With the Zero Cities Project, they began meeting one to two times a week, cultivating deeper connections and an even better working relationship.

Deep community engagement takes time. The community engagement process took longer and was more work than the anchor partners and city staff anticipated. But they recognized that while deep community engagement takes time, when it is done right, it results in better policy in terms of ending inequity and the climate crisis, and avoids unintended consequences. Engagement with different stakeholders may need to take different forms. For example, workforce development organizations, contractors, labor unions have a deep understanding of what best practices must be implemented when it comes to developing a just transition plan.

In another example, housing and tenant rights and advocacy organizations may not be connected to the current climate and environmental justice actions taking place within their community. There may need to be separate meetings between these groups and city staff to develop a mutual understanding of how building electrification may exacerbate housing and tenant issues within the community before hosting a public forum.

Community engagement adds capacity to City staff in devising and implementing equitable policy options to address climate. Leveraging long standing relationships and through information sharing and strategic conversations, CBOs are able to build their knowledge base and exert their support for the policy recommendations.

Equity requires community engagement during planning *and* implementation. Community engagement shouldn't stop at the policy planning phase. For truly equitable outcomes, local engagement, ownership, and participation must happen during both policy planning and implementation.

Local environmental justice groups are at capacity. Resources are needed for CBOs and community members to stay at the table. Cities and counties need to commit to consistently set aside funding and budget for community engagement and/or collaborate in joint funding efforts with community partners. The goal for any equitable community engagement process is to ensure that the community develops the capacity to have ownership of the policymaking process, along with the content itself.

Moving Forward Towards Implementation

As we approach the end of the first phase, it is crucial to prepare and develop the second phase of APN, especially as San Francisco's economy and health has been heavily impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic. More than ever, improving indoor air quality is even more important when residents, especially low-income families are spending vastly more time sheltering in their homes. In addition, the current economic crisis offers potential opportunities to target stimulus investments to have both equity and climate positive transformative impacts on San Francisco and beyond. Based on our work over the past year of engaging a broad range of stakeholders, we are positioned to offer solutions and ways to move forward united together towards a just recovery.

Conclusion

As the APN moves forward, our hope is to serve as a laboratory that models best practices in advancing community engagement strategies that improve the quality of the social, physical, and economic environment of surrounding communities, particularly those facing the greatest inequities. However, our goals and our mission will not be maintained – or even obtained – if city agencies do not fully commit to ensuring community stakeholders are engaged in every part of planning and implementation and have ownership of the processes, policies, programs, and content developed. This will require a shift in procurement and investment processes such that there is internal alignment and commitment to social capital, community resiliency and building health and wealth through community-based strategies and partnerships, and transparency from city officials on who the stakeholders involved in these processes are and the role they play in developing our policies and programs.

Cities need to enact equity-first engagement processes that centers equity as the foundation for policies and programs to accrue the benefits of genuine economic inclusion, which requires building alliances and collaboratives with key community stakeholders in the climate justice movement, worker's rights organizations, labor movement, social and economic justice organizations, and the environmental justice movement; along with building partnerships amongst different departments of the city, as issues around inequity cannot be solved by local government departments acting in silos.

Therefore, it is also important to create a decentralized inter-agency engagement process that centers the goals and objectives of community members. Creating and supporting these alliances allows for actions with real impact to rise, such as grid infrastructure improvements, halting renovations, and addressing housing and tenant needs. Key community stakeholders understand the unanimity of needs of a community that can shape policies and programs to be implemented without contention. Hence, our findings prove that equity does not slow down the impacts that can be made by the climate and environmental movements but acts as a catalyst for real action against climate change.

SECTION 5: APPENDICES

Appendix B: Jemez Principles for Democratic Organizing

#1 Be Inclusive

If we hope to achieve just societies that include all people in decision-making and assure that all people have an equitable share of the wealth and the work of this world, then we must work to build that kind of inclusiveness into our own movement in order to develop alternative policies and institutions to the treaties policies under neoliberalism. This requires more than tokenism, it cannot be achieved without diversity at the planning table, in staffing, and in coordination. It may delay achievement of other important goals, it will require discussion, hard work, patience, and advance planning. It may involve conflict, but through this conflict, we can learn better ways of working together. It's about building alternative institutions, movement building, and not compromising out in order to be accepted into the anti-globalization club.

#2 Emphasis on Bottom-Up Organizing

To succeed, it is important to reach out into new constituencies, and to reach within all levels of leadership and membership base of the organizations that are already involved in our networks. We must be continually building and strengthening a base which provides our credibility, our strategies, mobilizations, leadership development, and the energy for the work we must do daily.

#3 Let People Speak for Themselves

We must be sure that relevant voices of people directly affected are heard. Ways must be provided for spokespersons to represent and be responsible to the affected constituencies. It is important for organizations to clarify their roles, and who they represent, and to assure accountability within our structures.

#4 Work Together

In Solidarity and Mutuality Groups working on similar issues with compatible visions should consciously act in solidarity, mutuality and support each other's work. In the long run, a more significant step is to incorporate the goals and values of other groups with your own work, in order to build strong relationships. For instance, in the long run, it is more important that labor unions and community economic development projects include the issue of environmental sustainability in their own strategies, rather than just lending support to the environmental organizations. So communications, strategies and resource sharing is critical, to help us see our connections and build on these.

#5 Build Just Relationships Among Ourselves

We need to treat each other with justice and respect, both on an individual and an organizational level, in this country and across borders. Defining and developing "just relationships" will be a process that won't happen overnight. It must include clarity about decision-making, sharing strategies, and resource distribution. There are clearly many skills necessary to succeed, and we need to determine the ways for those with different skills to coordinate and be accountable to one another.

#6 Commitment to Self-Transformation

As we change societies, we must change from operating on the mode of individualism to unity. We must “walk our talk.” We must be the values that we are working towards and we must be justice, be peace, be community.

Appendix C : Example Glossary of Terms - San Francisco, California

Building Decarbonization – Reducing carbon emissions generated from the operation of buildings through a combination of energy efficiency (reducing energy load and demand through improvements to the building envelope, e.g. roof and wall insulation, air sealing, and windows), and strategic electrification of equipment (heating, cooling, and water heating) away from the use of fossil fuels towards the utilization of renewable electricity, which can be provided on-site (with rooftop solar photovoltaics), and/or by the utility or other electricity provider (CCA).

CalGreen – CALGreen is California’s green building code. It is formally known as the California Green Building Standards Code, Title 24, Part 11, of the California Code of Regulations. Its purpose is to improve public health, safety, and general welfare through enhanced design and construction of buildings. Since its inception in 2008, CALGreen has continued to raise the bar in keeping with California’s commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting building health. The latest updates to the code will become mandatory in January 2020. California’s Energy Code (Title 24, Part 6), which CALGreen references regarding energy efficiency standards, remains the most stringent such code in the nation.

Climate Action Strategy (CAS) – A Climate Action Strategy (also referred to as a Climate Action Plan) is a detailed and strategic roadmap for measuring and reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and planning to prepare for climate change impacts. A CAS builds upon the data gathered by a greenhouse gas inventory, and generally focuses on activities that can achieve the greatest emissions reductions in the most cost-effective manner. San Francisco’s approach for the 2020 CAS update will center its approach within a racial equity framework that seeks to reverse historic racial inequities; prioritize social, economic, and environmental benefits derived from implementing the CAS; and ensure the equitable distribution of those benefits.

Climate Equity – Climate Equity ensures the just distribution of the benefits of climate protection efforts and alleviates unequal burdens created by climate change. This requires intentional policies and projects that simultaneously address the effects of and the systems that perpetuate both climate change and inequity.

Co-benefits – Co-benefits are the added positive benefits related to actions to reduce greenhouse gases, above and beyond the direct benefits of a more stable climate. Examples include improved air quality, reduced household cost burden, or improved health outcomes, among others.

Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) – Community choice aggregation (CCA), also known as municipal aggregation, are programs that allow local governments to procure power on behalf of their residents, businesses, and municipal accounts from an alternative supplier while still receiving transmission and distribution service from their existing utility provider. CleanPowerSF is San Francisco’s CCA.

Disadvantaged Community (DAC) – “Disadvantaged communities” in California are geographic areas that are specifically targeted for investment of Cap & Trade proceeds. In 2012, the Legislature passed SB 535, directing that 25 percent of the proceeds from Cap & Trade revenues go to projects that benefit disadvantaged communities. SB 535 gave CalEPA responsibility for identifying those communities. In 2016, the Legislature passed AB 1550, which requires that 25 percent of proceeds from the fund be spent on projects located in disadvantaged communities. Following a series of public workshops in February 2017, CalEPA released its list of disadvantaged communities. In June 2018, an update of results to address a minor flaw in the software program algorithm used to calculate overall census tract scores. Because of this update, CalEPA added two census tracts to its Disadvantaged Communities List (census tract numbers 6067000800-Sacramento, and 607501230-San Francisco).

Disadvantaged Worker – A San Francisco resident who (i) resides in a census tract within the City with a rate of unemployment in excess of 150% of the City unemployment rate; or (ii) at the time of commencing work on a covered project has a household income of less than 80% of the average mean income, or (iii) faces of has overcome at least one of the following barriers to employment: being homeless; being a custodial single parent; receiving public assistance; lacking a GED or high school diploma; participating in a vocational English as a second language programs; or having a criminal record or other involvement with the criminal justice system.

Electric Resistance - Electric resistance heaters produce heat by passing an electric current through a wire or other obstacle which impedes current and causes it to give off heat. While electric resistance heat has been available for many decades, it is much less efficient and more expensive to operate than heat pumps, and generates more emissions as a result.

Electrification – The vast majority of buildings in California use natural gas as the primary fuel source for space and water heating; gas usage accounts for over 80% of total emissions generated from residential buildings in San Francisco alone. Electrification means switching building systems and equipment away from natural gas to those that use low-carbon electricity generated from renewable resources such as wind and solar.

High Road Jobs – A description of work in which skill, experience, and work quality are key elements driving competitive dynamics between firms.

HPWH - Abbreviation for “Heat Pump Water Heater”.

HVAC – Abbreviation for “Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning” for buildings.

Just Transition – Just Transition is a vision-led, unifying and place-based set of principles, processes, and practices that build economic and political power to shift from an extractive economy to a regenerative economy. This means approaching production and consumption cycles holistically and waste-free. The transition itself must be just and equitable; redressing past harms and creating new relationships of power for the future through reparations. If the process of transition is not just, the outcome will never be. Just Transition describes both where we are going and how we get there.

Low Road Jobs – A description of work where low cost is the key element driving competitive dynamics between firms.

MUSH – Abbreviation for “Municipal, University, Schools, and Hospitals” building sectors.

MWDBE – “Minority, Women, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises” are a certified class of local, smaller businesses that are enabled to compete more effectively against non-local firms through contracting laws and regulations that are applied to certain contracts issued by the City and County of San Francisco.

Natural Gas – A naturally occurring flammable gas, consisting largely of methane and other hydrocarbons, which can be used as fuel. Methane has a Global Warming Potential of 84 over 20 years, which means that in the first two decades after the methane is released, it is 84 times more powerful than carbon dioxide at destabilizing the climate.

Net Zero Emissions – Also known as carbon neutrality, refers to achieving a balance between carbon emitted into the air and carbon removed from the atmosphere through natural forms of sequestration, offsets or technologies that capture/remove or store carbon dioxide.

Paris Agreement - Ratified in 2016, the Paris Agreement commits signatories (nations) to holding the increase in the global average temperature below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature rise to 1.5 degrees Celsius. Signatories also commit to strengthening the ability of countries to deal with the impacts of climate change through adaptation and increased resilience. Delivering on the Paris Agreement will create a more inclusive urban society, with new protections, empowerment and involvement of the groups that have been historically marginalized by the fossil fuel economy.

Racial Equity – The San Francisco Human Rights Commission defines racial equity as “closing the gaps so that race does not predict one’s success, while also improving outcomes for all.”

Ratepayer - One who pays for a utility service according to established rates. In California, a small portion of electricity and gas rates collected generates \$1 billion per year for energy efficiency programs. These programs are mostly administered by the state’s four investor-owned utilities: PG&E, Southern California Edison, San Diego Gas & Electric, and SoCalGas. More recently, newer entities such as Community Choice Aggregators (CCA’s) and “Regional Energy Networks” in the Bay Area and Southern California have been approved to design and implement programs that fill gaps in the marketplace.

SB 1477 - A 2018 state bill that authorized \$200 million from ratepayer funds over 4 years to kickstart new building decarbonization initiatives. The BUILD (Building Initiative for Low-Emissions Development) program will provide financial and technical assistance support for builders of new housing. The TECH (Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating) program will support market development for low-emissions space and water heating technologies by incentivizing distributors and retailers to make equipment available, and providing customer education and contractor training. Both programs will have carve-outs that will be reserved for low-income residents.

Weatherization - Refers to the practice of protecting a building and its interior from the elements, particularly from sunlight, precipitation, and wind, and modifying a building to reduce energy consumption and optimize energy efficiency. Typical measures include: sealing air gaps around windows, doors, pipe penetrations, light fixtures, air ducts; installing insulation; replacing old windows with insulated dual-pane units. Since 2014, the California Department of Community Services and Development (CSD) has

administered the Low Income Weatherization Program (LIWP) to provide low-income households with solar and energy upgrades and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. LIWP is funded by Cap & Trade revenues and serves both multifamily and single-family homes. All properties participating in the LIWP must be located within DACs. To date, 68% of LIWP-funded properties have received energy efficient heat pumps and have achieved an average of 42% energy savings and 32% in utility bill savings.

Meeting #2 Terms:

CDLAC - the “California Debt Limit Allocation Committee” administers the tax-exempt private activity bond program that are used to finance projects and programs to benefit the public. To qualify, affordable housing applicants must demonstrate improved energy efficiency above the modeled energy consumption based on existing conditions, with at least a ten percent (10%) post-rehabilitation improvement over existing conditions.

SOMAH - “Solar on Multifamily Affordable Housing” is a financial assistance program overseen by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for installing solar photovoltaics (PV) on multifamily affordable housing and is administered through the Association for Energy Affordability (AEA), the Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE), and GRID Alternatives (GRID).

LIWP - the “Low-Income Weatherization Program” is the only incentive program in California that provides low-income households with solar photovoltaic (PV) systems and energy efficiency upgrades for residents of multi-family housing, farmworker housing, or communities with solar projects.

Master-metered - metering infrastructure that allows measuring electric, water or natural gas usage of multiple tenants with the same meter, usually done under the landlord’s name. The landlord/property owner receives the bills measured through one meter for all tenants. In master-metered affordable housing buildings, owners pay the utility costs, and the costs to tenants is included in their net rent (there is no utility allowance to subtract.).

Split Incentives - Split incentives occur when those responsible for paying energy bills (e.g. the tenant) are not the same entity as those making the capital investment decisions (the landlord or building owner). In these circumstances, the landlord may not be inclined to make the necessary upgrades to building services when the benefits associated with the resulting energy savings accrue exclusively to the tenant.

Tenant Metered - metering infrastructure that allows monitoring and tracking utility consumption for individual tenants. In tenant-metered affordable housing buildings each household has a separate utility account, pays utility cost directly, and receives a utility allowance that is based on an estimate of typical energy use (i.e., kilowatt-hours for electricity or therms for gas) by building and unit type, or an estimate of the cost of that energy.

TCAC - California’s “Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC, pronounced “Tea-cack”) administers the federal and state tax credit programs to promote private investment in affordable rental housing for California’s low-income residents. TCAC typically receives significantly more applications for Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTCs) than are available, creating a highly competitive market among developers. TCAC scores LIHTC applications across a range of public purpose goals, including sustainable building and increased energy efficiency. For new construction, that has meant verified a percentage better than

the minimum state energy code; for rehabilitation projects, it has meant verified improvement over the existing condition energy performance.

Utility Allowance - Affordable housing rents are set based on the affordability restrictions of the specific housing program used to fund or finance the property. Depending on the specific program, tenant rents are based on either: (1) affordability to the income segment(s) specified in the regulatory agreement (e.g.% of Area Median Income), or (2) a percentage (usually 30%) of each tenant's actual annual household income. In either case, the definition of maximum "affordable" rents for tenants includes both housing and reasonable utility costs. Where some or all utilities are tenant-paid, the rent actually charged to the tenant (the "net rent") must be reduced by the utility allowance.

Virtual Net Metering - Virtual net energy metering (VNEM) is a billing arrangement allowing for a single solar electric system to offset multiple common area and tenant meters. The monthly solar generation is divided out to the participating accounts using predetermined percentages that are defined by the property owner. Using those percent allocations, the utility applies solar credits directly to the multiple account holders' utility bills. The SOMAH program requires all projects use VNEM to allocate a minimum of 51% of the solar credits directly to the tenants.

Meeting #3 Terms:

(From SF Planning's [Community Stabilization Report](#))

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) – ADUs are housing units added to existing or proposed residential buildings. ADUs are also often called in-law units, granny flats, secondary units, or basement or garage apartments.

AMI (Area Median Income) – A metric used to benchmark different income levels. The San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development has determined \$123,150 as the 2019 AMI for a household of four in San Francisco (SFMOHCD, 2019).

'At-fault' evictions – At-fault evictions cite the tenants' actions (such as a breach of lease or creating a nuisance, etc.) as justification for their eviction.

Below Market Rate unit (BMR) – A BMR is a unit that is priced to be affordable to households that are moderate income or below. Moderate income is 80-120% Area Median Income (AMI) or \$133,000 for a household of four.

The Committee to House the Bay Area (CASA) – CASA is a diverse, multi-sector body of stakeholders from private and public sectors working to build consensus around protecting tenants, preserving existing affordable housing, and increasing housing production at all levels of affordability.

Costa Hawkins – Costa Hawkins state law allowed for landlords to raise the rent to market rate once a unit was vacated, prevented cities from capping rent on units constructed after February 1995 or jurisdictions that already had a specific date such as San Francisco, and exempted single-family homes and condominiums from rent control (with limited exceptions).

Cultural District – A cultural district is a geographic area or location within San Francisco that embodies a unique cultural heritage. Cultural Heritage is defined as containing a concentration of cultural and historic assets, culturally significant enterprise, arts, services, or businesses and a significant portion of its

residents or people who spend time in the area, are members of a specific cultural community or ethnic group that historically has been discriminated against, displaced or oppressed.

Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) – HSH launched on July 1, 2016. The department combines key homeless serving programs and contracts from the Department of Public Health (DPH), the Human Services Agency (HSA), the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), and the Department of Children Youth and Their Families (DCYF). This consolidated department has a singular focus on preventing and ending homelessness for people in San Francisco.

Development agreement – The purpose of a Development Agreement (DA) is to use a contractual approach to garnering community benefits that otherwise couldn’t be achieved through legislated requirements. A DA reduces the risks associated with development, thereby enhancing the City’s ability to obtain public benefits beyond those achievable through existing ordinances and regulations.

Displacement – The process by which a household is forced to move from residence—or is prevented from moving into a neighborhood that was previously accessible to them because of conditions beyond their control (“Urban Displacement Project,” 2018).

Ellis Act evictions – Landlords have the unconditional right to evict tenants to “go out of business” by removing all the units in the building from the rental market by giving tenants a 120-days withdrawal notice and prohibits the unit from being rented for 10 years.

Gentrification – A process of neighborhood change that includes economic change in a historically disinvested neighborhood—by means of real estate investment and new higher-income residents moving in—as well as demographic change—not only in terms of income level, but also in terms of changes in the education level or racial make-up of residents. The definition used for this report is the Urban Displacement Project (UDP)’s (“Urban Displacement Project,” 2018). Gentrification is often used as a politicized term with different meanings depending on the context and author. This report only refers to gentrification in the context of the UDP research.

Inclusionary Housing Program – San Francisco’s Inclusionary Housing Program requires new market-rate residential projects of 10 or more units to pay an Affordable Housing Fee or meet the inclusionary requirement by providing a percentage of the units in the project as “below market rate” (BMR) units. BMR units must be rented or sold at a price that is affordable to low- or middle-income households, either “on-site” within the project, or “off-site” at another location in the city, generally within one mile of the market-rate project. All inclusionary units, whether they are rental or ownership units, are distributed through a lottery system run by MOHCD.

In-lieu Fees – A developer has the choice of paying a fee in-lieu of building on-site or off-site affordable housing as required by inclusionary zoning. In-lieu fees are not the same as impact or linkage fees.

Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) – MOHCD administers a variety of financing programs to enable the development and preservation of affordable housing, to assist low-income homeowners, and to help San Franciscans become first-time homebuyers. MOHCD is also responsible for monitoring and ensuring the long-term affordability and physical viability of the City’s affordable housing stock.

‘No-fault’ evictions – No-fault evictions allow landlords to take possession of their property from the tenant without any fault of the tenant. The two most common types of evictions under this broad category are the Ellis Act and the Owner Move-In (OMI).

Owner Move In eviction – Owner Move-In (OMI) evictions allow owners to evict the tenant for the owner to live in the unit as their principal place of residence. It is restricted to one OMI per building.

Relative Move-In evictions – Relative move-in evictions allow a landlord to evict a tenant if a relative is going to move in and live there. Landlords must already live in the building or seek simultaneous possession of a unit in the building. RMIs have no restrictions on number per building.

Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) – OEWD advances equitable and shared prosperity for San Franciscans by growing sustainable jobs, supporting businesses of all sizes, creating great places to live and work, and helping everyone achieve economic self-sufficiency. OEWD’s programs are responsible for strengthening San Francisco’s many diverse neighborhoods and commercial corridors, creating a business climate where companies can grow and prosper, and ensuring a continually high quality of life for all San Franciscans.

San Francisco Arts Commission (SFAC) – SFAC is the City agency that champions the arts as essential to daily life by investing in a vibrant arts community, enlivening the urban environment and shaping innovative cultural policy

San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA) – SFHA was a local public housing authority for the City and County of San Francisco that was established in 1938. It was responsible for the management of public housing and Section 8 vouchers for primarily low-income housing. In 2018, SFHA came under scrutiny for its \$29.5 million shortfall in its budget. In March 2019, the Authority was ordered by the federal government to cede the administration of its programs either to the federal government or to the municipal government of San Francisco.

Senate Bill 35 (SB35) – Senate Bill 35 is a state law, passed in 2017, which allows for ministerial approval of housing projects that include at least 50 percent of units affordable to low-income households (80 percent AMI or below), and meet several other eligibility requirements. In San Francisco, the primary beneficiaries of this law are 100 percent affordable projects, which, if found eligible, are exempt from CEQA review (including appeals) under the law.

Short Term Rental – Under San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 41A, a short-term residential rental is a rental of all or a portion of a home for periods of less than 30 nights.

Single Room Occupancy Hotel (SRO) – Historically, SRO hotel rooms were populated by low-wage workers, transient laborers, and recent immigrants for long stays. SRO rooms are differentiated from tourist hotels in that they were meant to house a transient workforce, not tourists visiting the City for pleasure. A typical room in a residential hotel is a single eight (8) x ten (10) foot room with shared toilets and showers on each floor.

Small Sites Program – Launched in 2014, the program was created to protect low- and moderate-income tenants and establish long-term affordable housing in smaller rental properties throughout San

Francisco. It is generally less costly to acquire rather than build new housing, and it is generally more effective to stabilize tenants in their existing homes rather than relocate them.

Tenancy in Common (TIC) Buildings – TICs are buildings where multiple persons each own a percentage interest in the property. TICs are generally more affordable to purchase due to the absence of an individual deed to the housing unit and due to legal complexities with liabilities and difficulties with financing.

Unauthorized Units (UDUs) – Unauthorized units (UDUs) are defined in Planning Code as one or more rooms within a building that have been used, without the benefit of a permit, as a separate and distinct living or sleeping space independent from other residential units on the property.

Urban Displacement Project (UDP) – The Urban Displacement Project is a research initiative based out of UC Berkeley in collaboration with UCLA and Portland State University. UDP researchers developed interactive maps that analyze the timeline and location of gentrification and displacement in the Bay Area, Southern California, and Portland. The maps are based on regional housing, income, race, transit, and other demographic data, and build upon an academic methodology for analyzing neighborhood change (Chapple & Zuk, 2016; Zuk & Chapple, 2015).

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) – HUD is a Cabinet department in the Executive branch of the federal government. The purpose of the Department is to provide housing and community development assistance and to make sure everyone has access to “fair and equal” housing.

Vulnerable Populations and Groups – For the purpose of this report, vulnerable populations and groups refer to categories of people who are at higher risk of displacement after eviction due to individual and institutional barriers to acquiring market-rate housing. The vulnerable populations included in this report are not an exhaustive list of all categories of people at higher risk and include people of color (Black, Latinx/Hispanic, Asian, Native American/American Indian, and Pacific Islander), people living with disabilities, low-income households, people experiencing homelessness, seniors, youth, immigrants, LGBTQ+, refugees, linguistically isolated households, small businesses, veterans, and non-profit organizations.