



A JOINT PROJECT of NRDC + IMT

DECEMBER 2018

ENGAGING THE COMMUNITY IN POLICY DEVELOPMENT



ABOUT CITY ENERGY PROJECT AND THE CITY ENERGY PROJECT RESOURCE LIBRARY

A joint initiative of the Institute for Market Transformation and the Natural Resources Defense Council, the City Energy Project supported bold yet practical ways to deploy energy efficiency at the city level to boost local economies, reduce pollution, and create healthier, more prosperous communities nationwide.

The project partnered with 20 local governments across the U.S. from 2013–2018 to design locally appropriate energy efficiency policies and programs. Building upon the past successes and innovation of cities, the City Energy Project established best-in-class practices for energy efficiency to be customized and replicated nationwide. Models and recommendations have been distilled into the City Energy Project Resource Library. This curated set of resources contains the necessary blueprints for a city government to craft and implement customized solutions to productively manage energy efficiency initiatives across commercial, multifamily, and public buildings in its jurisdiction.

For more information on the participating cities and counties in the City Energy Project, and to search the City Energy Project Resource Library, visit cityenergyproject.org.

The City Energy Project was generously supported by Bloomberg Philanthropies, Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, and The Kresge Foundation.

© Institute for Market Transformation and Natural Resources Defense Council, 2018





TABLE OF CONTENTS

WHY STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS ARE CRITICAL TO POLICY DEVELOPMENT.....	5
IDENTIFYING APPROPRIATE STAKEHOLDERS TO INVOLVE	6
INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS TO INVITE	6
REQUIRED INTERNAL STAFF CAPACITY.....	7
EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS TO INVITE	8
CHOOSING A MEETING STRUCTURE.....	9
WHEN TO HOST OPEN MEETINGS.....	9
WHEN TO HOST INVITE-ONLY MEETINGS.....	10
WHEN TO USE A HYBRID MEETING STRUCTURE	11
FACTORS TO CONSIDER IN SETTING THE TIMELINE FOR MEETINGS.....	12
CITY COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND OUTREACH.....	12
POLITICAL MOMENTUM.....	13

MAYORAL TERMS.....	13
ORDINANCE ADOPTION P ROCESS AND TIMELINE	14
DETERMINING MEETING FREQUENCY	15
NUMBER OF MEETINGS.....	15
FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS	16
KEY MEETING TOPICS	17
CONTEXT AND VISION	17
EXAMPLES FROM OTHER CITIES	18
BUILDING STOCK AND BENCHMARKING TOOLS	18
DATA ACCESS, PRIVACY, AND USE	19
POLICY STRUCTURE, COMPLIANCE, AND RECOGNITION	19
IMPLEMENTATION PHASING AND SUPPORT ...	20
MEETING LOGISTICS	21
SCHEDULING	21
LOCATION	21
INCENTIVES	22
STAKEHOLDER FOLLOW-UP	22
CONCLUSION.....	23
APPENDIX A: INVITATION TEMPLATES.....	24
APPENDIX B: AGENDAS AND MEETING NOTES.....	25
APPENDIX C: SUPPORTING FORMS	28



WHY STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS ARE CRITICAL TO POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Policies aimed at increasing the energy performance of buildings are only effective if the decision makers in those buildings are aware of and understand their energy consumption—and then take action to improve the energy efficiency of their buildings.

In order to successfully design policies that achieve these outcomes, it is critical to secure the involvement and participation of the community's stakeholders—those that will be impacted the most by the new policy, including residents, businesses, local community groups, and others. City policymakers should make every attempt to bring these stakeholders into the policy development process and should solicit their feedback as early and often as possible. When done correctly, stakeholder engagement ensures that policies are crafted thoughtfully and with full consideration of local circumstances and concerns. Effective stakeholder engagement can also help foster goodwill and cooperation between the implementing body and the regulated parties, creating the best environment for maximizing mutual benefit and future compliance.

Stakeholder meetings are one of the main ways city government improves their understanding of how a policy will affect the community, and how the unique attributes of the community should shape the proposed policy. Listening to and incorporating interests, suggestions, and concerns from affected groups and individuals ensures that the final policy is best suited to the concerns and challenges of stakeholders. Properly done, stakeholder meetings smooth the path to adoption and create excitement, understanding, and buy-in for a city's eventual implementation. Stakeholder meetings can also serve as an ongoing forum for strengthening lasting city-community relationships, which can be leveraged after policy passage to provide guidance and feedback on community implementation needs and activities. In the best-case scenarios, stakeholder meetings create and mobilize a community of energy efficiency advocates whose actions and peer encouragement lay the groundwork for a high-performing built environment.

This guide provides an overview of the types of meetings a city can host and how often they should be run, as well as guidelines on whom to invite, and recommendations for how to achieve high-impact outcomes.



IDENTIFYING APPROPRIATE STAKEHOLDERS TO INVOLVE

The city can follow these recommendations when determining which internal and external stakeholders to involve in meetings.

INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS TO INVITE

In many cases, staff from the sustainability department plans and convenes these meetings. Often the policy originates from this office and aligns closely with existing city sustainability goals and efforts. However, other relevant departments might include the Mayor's Office, the Office of Resiliency, the Department of Economic Development, Building or Permitting Departments, etc., depending on who internally is developing the policy or under whose jurisdiction it falls.

Regardless of who convenes the meetings, staff from all these departments (and any others that might have an interest or relevance, such as Facilities Management, Schools, Water & Sewer) should be included in internal outreach and invited to participate in the meetings. Often, mayoral leadership or sustainability leadership from other departments choose to attend some or all of the proceedings. If the implementing department is anticipated to be different than the convening department, extra effort should be made to involve and solicit buy-in from staff within the implementing department. For instance, while the Mayor's Office of Sustainability staff may instigate the development of a benchmarking policy in a city, once the policy is passed by city council, the department implementing the policy could be the Buildings Department. This means that high-level staff from the Buildings Department must be engaged early in the process to align existing internal administrative processes with the new policy and create as streamlined an experience for the regulated building owners as possible.

REQUIRED INTERNAL STAFF CAPACITY

A series of stakeholder meetings can typically be planned and convened by one full-time employee (FTE), depending on the size, frequency, and duration of the meetings, and whether a third-party professional facilitator is involved. That staff person may spend anywhere from 25–100 percent of their time on the effort over the course of the meetings—though 30–40 percent is most common—which could be anywhere from six months to a year or more in duration. Other factors that influence this work stream include: how much outreach is needed ahead of meetings to ensure appropriate participation (and whether city staff have existing relationships with potential stakeholders that can be tapped); how much follow-up is needed with individual stakeholders that have more questions and concerns than can be addressed during meetings; what format the meetings take, which dictates what must be prepared ahead of time (presentations, guest speakers, workshop materials, research, etc.); and what format outcome report-outs take (website posting, email to participants, etc.). Options for various timeframes are discussed later in this guide.



EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS TO INVITE

Building the invitation list of external stakeholders should be an early focus in the stakeholder process. It is often better to over-invite than to risk excluding key members of the community. Invitations should be personalized and there should be consistent follow-up if no response is received. Some cities have found that a phone call after several emails is very helpful to show every effort to include a potential participant. Direct, person-to-person discussions (in person or over the phone) are also valuable in neutralizing the opposition of an invited stakeholder who later complains of being left out of the process.

SAMPLE EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER INVITATION LIST

- Affordable housing representatives
- Architects
- Builders/developers
- Building owners (including associations representing these professionals, such as the Building Owners and Managers Association [BOMA])
- Commercial office tenants (example: major companies headquartered in the city)
- Energy efficiency vendors and contractors
- Energy managers
- Facility managers (including associations representing these professionals, such as the International Facility Management Association [IFMA])
- Green building associations and researchers
- Housing authority representatives
- Labor groups
- Local nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) addressing energy efficiency, sustainability, clean energy, and public health
- Property managers (especially those who are already sustainability leaders)
- Multifamily rental housing representatives such as the Apartment Association
- (Interested) State departments
- Universities, hospitals, and other large institutions
- Utilities (electric, gas, and water if applicable)
- Additional stakeholders such as appraisers, multifamily tenant associations, commercial real estate brokers, and lenders



CHOOSING A MEETING STRUCTURE

The format and structure of stakeholder meetings can have a significant impact on how well cities are able to gather information from the community to inform policy development. There are two primary ways to engage participants in the stakeholder process: open and invite-only meetings. In both structures, cities send tailored invitations to key stakeholders who have expertise or interest in the topic being discussed.



QUICK TIP

Hiring a Meeting Facilitator

A meeting facilitator brings expertise and experience managing meetings and provides unique services in the overall stakeholder meeting process. Meeting outcomes are best met when the facilitator is crystal clear on his or her role before the process begins. Some facilitators merely run meetings and guide the group to stay on topic while others act as mediators, helping to negotiate sticky points and develop meeting topics. If using the facilitator as a mediator, one-on-one interviews with opposing parties are helpful to tease out the real issues. The facilitator does not necessarily have to be an expert in energy efficiency, but he or she should be familiar with government entities and policy. Often it helps if the facilitator isn't an expert in energy efficiency, so as not to bias the stakeholder interactions.

Open meetings are, as their name implies, open to the public to attend and participate in the same capacity as invited participants. In an invite-only structure, only invited participants are permitted to attend and participate. Meeting minutes and outcomes of invite-only meetings can—and should—still be made public. It is also possible to host use a hybrid structure, as explained below.

WHEN TO HOST OPEN MEETINGS

An open structure is ideal for cities seeking to engage as many stakeholders as possible in the community, or for cities that are unsure whether they have included every critical stakeholder in the input and feedback process. More recently formed administrations with less political capital or fewer relationships in the community often find open meetings to be the best fit.

The open meeting structure is likely to require more time spent educating participants, navigating divergent discussion topics, and reaching consensus on policy development decisions. This is not ideal for cities on a tight timeline. A third-party facilitator is highly recommended to keep meetings focused and streamlined. However, hiring a third-party facilitator is an additional cost to cities, both monetarily and in terms of the time it takes to bring them up to speed and plan meeting structure and topics. This cost is often warranted because facilitators add legitimacy and objectivity to the stakeholder meetings and can keep the meeting moving forward without seeming partial to any one perspective.



CITY EXAMPLE

Reno Commercial Green Building Task Force Stakeholder Engagement Facilitator Scope of Work

Reno hired a professional facilitator to help plan and conduct a series of meetings with stakeholders. The scope of work included:

- Stakeholder process plan development
- Stakeholder meeting planning for 10–12 meetings
- Stakeholder meeting facilitation for 10–12 meetings
- Stakeholder workshop planning
- Stakeholder workshop facilitation
- Evaluation of stakeholder process and summary report

WHEN TO HOST INVITE-ONLY MEETINGS

Invitation-only meetings are ideal for cities that have strong working relationships with the local community and are confident that they have an inclusive, representative set of contacts. The city sends invitations to people and groups with an interest or expertise in the ordinance, including language that the meetings are for invitees only. If an invitation is non-transferable, this should also be noted. Often, these meetings are framed with the targeted goal of developing a comprehensive and thoughtful policy with key stakeholders in a “task force.” It is easier to keep the focus of these meetings on task because participants have been explicitly invited to represent sectors relevant to the chosen issues and should be more familiar with the topics under discussion. However, there is a potential risk of unintentionally excluding key members of the community. Such exclusion—which fails to include stakeholder opinions as diverse as the interests of the local community—introduces the risk that under-represented stakeholders’ views are unaddressed in the policy design, and that sub-optimal policies are designed in the absence of the broader community’s ideas and contributions. Incorporating feedback that was not solicited early and therefore arrives late in the process, may result in delays that the city was not anticipating.

If a task force stakeholder structure is chosen, the topics, minutes, and findings of the meetings should still be made as public as possible. This will allow the community to track the process and to remain informed of developments coming out of the engagement. For example, in developing its Building Energy and Water Scoring Program, the city of Fort Collins, Colo., held invite-only meetings of a building energy and water scoring working group, with participating stakeholders being representative of the real estate community and others affected by the potential policy, over the course of a year. While the group meetings were closed, meeting notes and associated resources were posted online for public access.





QUICK TIP

Planning for Dissenting Viewpoints

Stakeholder meetings facilitate gathering of a diversity of viewpoints and input; they also provide a platform for early expressions of opposition. It is important for city staff to acknowledge that genuinely integrating stakeholders' viewpoints into the program and policy design process takes time.

If an uphill battle is likely with public opinion, a longer process to educate the community and receive input can be useful. If a shorter timeline is required, a compressed stakeholder process can still yield robust insight and guidance on the unique realities of each city and keeps momentum for policy passage moving in the right direction.

In an open meeting format, one way to anticipate opposing viewpoints is to review RSVP lists, and perhaps ask a registration question about what the participant hopes to learn from the meeting. This can help prepare the meeting organizers to understand the potential perspectives, concerns, and questions of their attendees. In an invite-only meeting format, the city should invite known skeptics or opposition to ensure a variety of perspectives are captured in the policy creation process.

WHEN TO USE A HYBRID MEETING STRUCTURE

Another way to structure stakeholder meetings is to create a hybrid model. In this structure, the city sends invitations to key stakeholders it has identified as active participants, while opening the meeting to the public to allow others to listen, observe, and ask questions at the end of the session. Another option is the city can host invite-only meetings followed by additional public meetings at the end of the process that are specifically structured to take public commentary and questions on what the task force developed.

A hybrid option enables cities to take advantage of the benefits of both structures while tailoring their process to the community's needs. Regardless of structure, all available materials including agendas, presentations, and minutes should be made as publicly available as possible.





FACTORS TO CONSIDER IN SETTING THE TIMELINE FOR MEETINGS

There are multiple factors to consider when scheduling stakeholder engagement meetings, including city culture, political momentum, mayoral terms, ordinance adoption process and timeline, and potential opposition.

CITY COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND OUTREACH

City structures and community expectations vary widely. Some cities have a strong mayoral system, and some have a strong city council system. This can affect which stakeholders might be especially critical to engage. City structure also refers to the level of bureaucracy in a city and how that translates to the amount of time it typically takes to pass a policy and the level of public engagement typically desired in city actions. In places where there is a strong focus on community consensus, a stakeholder process should take longer and be inclusive and exhaustive.

KEY QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER WHEN EVALUATING THE CITY CULTURE:

- Does the city have any high-level, public goals related to the policy already in development (for example, climate/sustainability plans, carbon reduction goals, or renewable energy commitments)?
- What is the normal pace of decision making in the city?
- What is the typical process to introduce and pass policy?
- What are the key areas of concern in the community?
- What are the top priorities for the mayor and city council?
- Are there vocal stakeholders that commonly participate in city activities (for example, a stakeholder who is anti-regulation across the board, or a stakeholder who broadly supports sustainability initiatives whenever they are proposed)?
- Is quick, prescriptive policy common or are policies better received with extensive outreach?

POLITICAL MOMENTUM

High-quality stakeholder engagement is often politically important to mayors and city council members. Thoughtfully engaging constituents matters a great deal to elected officials, and when taking on any kind of regulation, constituent grievances must be aired, respected, and addressed—even if the answer is not to the constituent's liking. The process of engagement alone holds great political value and provides prominent political coverage. For instance, it is much more feasible for an elected official of a downtown district with hundreds of potentially covered commercial buildings to support a benchmarking and transparency ordinance even if some constituents are unhappy when the stakeholder engagement process is robust, inclusive, thorough, and attempted to meaningfully address concerns of those constituents. Conversely, when an elected official who ran on a platform of sustainability or climate change efforts is excited about the proposed energy efficiency policy, stakeholder engagement can generate excitement in a community and provide needed political backing and validation for the elected official to champion a potentially controversial piece of legislation through the council process.

Further, how past environmental or sustainability policies fared in the community is another key political consideration. For instance, if a prior attempt had been made on a green building policy in a prior administration that had a poor stakeholder engagement process, the current city staff and advocates may be saddled with that historical baggage and will have to make more significant overtures with the buildings community to differentiate the benchmarking policy stakeholder process from prior attempts. This might mean needing to take more time to build buy-in and consensus before policy introduction.

KEY QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER WHEN EVALUATING POLITICAL MOMENTUM:

- Did the mayor campaign on any environmental or sustainability platforms? Will a win around energy efficiency and sustainability help the mayor or help create a positive legacy?
- Has there been pushback or opposition around other sustainability policies in the past?
- Is there a strong public figure who might oppose this policy?
- Are there any state laws or political actors that may affect the local program or policy?
- Are there competing priorities that may distract from or delay a new policy?

MAYORAL TERMS

Mayoral and city council terms also can play an integral part in determining the timeline for a piece of legislation. The stakeholder processes, policy introduction, and passage should ideally take place under a single mayoral administration. Transitions require a new round of education on the policy for newly appointed staff and can delay or derail policy if it does not fit within new mayoral priorities. In addition to the actual term length, election cycles should be considered. Elected officials (including the mayor and city council) may want to wait until after a primary or general election to move on a policy that is perceived to be controversial. Considering all of this, if the mayor's term is ending or if a council champion is ready to move quickly, a condensed stakeholder process may be preferred.

KEY QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER WHEN EVALUATING MAYORAL TERMS:

- When are the city's elected officials up for re-election? Do they have term limitations? Do they face significant opposition?
- Is the mayor a champion on energy or sustainability measures?
- Are there key champions on energy or sustainability measures in city council?

ORDINANCE ADOPTION PROCESS AND TIMELINE

Familiarity with the ordinance adoption process is necessary in planning meeting timelines. Some cities require lengthy periods for public comment; others require that the proposed policy be filed well in advance of the first reading in city council. Many cities require two or three readings of the ordinance over a matter of weeks or months in order to provide ample opportunity for community feedback, and still others have lengthy internal procedures and approvals that must be navigated before introduction can occur, such as city attorney approvals. This timing should be considered when designing the stakeholder engagement process. If a city requires significant public support for a program or policy, having an extended stakeholder engagement process may create champions who are able to speak out in support of the policy or program. In addition, extensive stakeholder engagement allows for opposing views to be heard and for concerns to be considered and incorporated, which may result in some opponents becoming supporters or at least neutral parties.

When a firm end date is in mind (around a specific milestone such as an election cycle, avoiding budget season, or the conclusion of a funding cycle), the city should first factor in the length of time that the actual ordinance passage process will take before planning the preceding stakeholder engagement meetings.

KEY QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER WHEN EVALUATING ORDINANCE ADOPTION PROCESS AND TIMELINE:

- Who in the city writes the ordinance (staff, city attorney)?
- What is the legal review process for the policy? Who else needs to review and approve of the policy, and how much time will each of those reviews take?
- How is a policy introduced? Do you need a sponsoring councilmember, or can the mayor introduce policy?
- How many readings are required between introduction and passage? How much time is required between readings?
- What supporting materials or documents must be created at what points in the process?
- What are the different avenues and requirements for public comment? Is there a grace period after policy passage before it becomes law?
- Is the mayor required to sign the policy? Is there a required period of time that must elapse before the mayor can sign?



DETERMINING MEETING FREQUENCY

Once the structure and timeframe are decided, cities will need to determine how many meetings are needed and how frequently to meet. This will drive the time commitment cities will ask of their stakeholders. Some cities choose to outline the number and frequency of meetings before inviting stakeholders to participate. This allows stakeholders to plan their engagement and ensure they are available for the duration of the process.

If cities are unsure how committed their stakeholders will be, it can be helpful to have a kickoff meeting. During these meetings, stakeholders are introduced to the topics and where the city is asking for feedback. The city also has the opportunity to share examples of how other cities have approached the stakeholder process so that stakeholders may weigh in on how many meetings to hold and how frequently they should meet. When possible, having the mayor or a council champion host the kickoff meeting can help increase stakeholder excitement about and commitment to the process, and may increase turnout.



RESOURCE

Decisions Framework: Creating A High Impact Local Policy

Cities need to know what decisions to make and how to engage stakeholders in the process of soliciting and gathering feedback on proposed, planned, and enacted building performance policies and programs.

[VIEW GUIDE >](#)

NUMBER OF MEETINGS

The stakeholder meeting process not only engages the community around the policy, but also solicits feedback on several decision points. There should be enough meetings to cover all relevant topics, educate stakeholders about each topic, and come to an understanding around the decision points. The stakeholders should feel informed and comfortable with their recommendations.

The ideal number of meetings ranges from four to 10, with six meetings being the most common number of meetings held by jurisdictions in the City Energy Project.

If participants move quickly through decision points, it is always possible to eliminate a meeting. However, adding a meeting after the initial schedule has been agreed upon can be challenging and make the process feel rushed. In each stakeholder meeting, city staff should review past content to make sure everyone feels up-to-date on the process. Staff should also present new content and educate stakeholders on the value of the topic, what aspects

are up for consideration, how those aspects affect the policy and its impacts, and what ramifications they will have for successful implementation. The goal of the presentation should be to give stakeholders all the information and background necessary to form an educated opinion on the topic based on their individual expertise and perspective. The city staff is then responsible for incorporating that feedback into the city's final recommendation, ensuring that it reflects local context and hopefully maximizes support for the selected elements of the policy.

FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS

Meeting frequency is another consideration to ensure that stakeholders are engaged and able to build on previous meetings to move the agenda forward but are not overwhelmed. City staff should consider both the availability of stakeholders and their interest in the topic.

While regular meetings are essential, the length and frequency of those meetings may vary. For instance, a jurisdiction may prefer to hold longer meetings of 2–3 hours each on a monthly basis. This may be appropriate for jurisdictions planning to host a series of 4–6 meetings, and that have either highly engaged and knowledgeable stakeholders or that need additional time for education and participation between meetings. However, longer meetings may result in stakeholders losing interest or needing to step out for other commitments. Less frequent, monthly meetings will also require a longer meeting recap which can be more time intensive for staff to compile and require more time for a stakeholder who misses a meeting to catch-up.

Shorter meetings of 1–2 hours require less time commitment from stakeholders but leave limited time for both a presentation and a discussion. These may be held more frequently, thereby maintaining a feeling of momentum and consistent progress, or on a monthly basis, which may help to overcome scheduling difficulties.

For jurisdictions with an open stakeholder process and a high level of political commitment and momentum to be maintained, longer meetings on a more frequent basis may be suitable. While a more significant time commitment runs the risk of losing engagement over the process, this allows the city or county to present a great deal of new information and have time for a discussion, and the increased frequency allows for a shorter recap in each individual meeting.

Regardless of the length of each meetings, jurisdictions typically take at least six months to navigate a robust stakeholder engagement process. In certain cases, this can be shortened to at little as four months, but the quality of the engagement and the validity of stakeholders arguing they were not properly briefed on the policy to meaningfully engage increases. Some of the most successful stakeholder engagement processes in City Energy Project averaged closer to nine months in total length.



KEY MEETING TOPICS

Meeting content is the final key component to consider when structuring stakeholder engagement meetings. Regardless of the length of the process or the meeting frequency, there are certain topics that need to be covered.

In San José, the topics covered per stakeholder meeting as they developed the Energy and Water Building Performance Ordinance were:

1. Public kick-off of City Energy Project, and introduction to benchmarking and transparency policy package
2. Overview of building benchmarking and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's ENERGY STAR Portfolio Manager, examining San José's building stock
3. Reporting and transparency
4. Examining policy structure and strategies, reporting process, and compliance
5. Implementation and enforcement, education and workforce trainings
6. Final workshop

CONTEXT AND VISION

Cities need to provide context for stakeholders so that they understand how the outcomes of the meetings will contribute to the larger goals for the city. This will demonstrate the value of the stakeholders' contributions and remind stakeholders that they are participating in something meant to benefit and improve the whole community, not just the participants.

KEY QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

- Does the city have sustainability goals? Is it on track to meet the goals?
- What are the community's goals for the future?
- Are there similar policies already in place that these efforts build on or complement?
- What are stakeholders already doing independent of this policy to help achieve these goals?

EXAMPLES FROM OTHER CITIES

Success stories from other cities help demonstrate both the precedent for policies and the beneficial outcomes of those policies. This is especially useful if cities have known opposition among their stakeholders. Drawing parallels between other cities, their policies, and their savings will paint a more detailed picture for stakeholders to understand the value of the policy. While it is compelling to show that these policies are a demonstrated best practice, care should be taken to emphasize that the policy framework will be uniquely tailored to account for and incorporate the needs of the individual jurisdiction and the characteristics of its market.

KEY QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

- Have other peer cities of similar size or building stock implemented similar policies?
- What benefits have other cities seen?
- Are the goals and plans of other cities similar? If so, how does the proposed policy complement these goals?

BUILDING STOCK AND BENCHMARKING TOOLS

In the case of a benchmarking and transparency policy, stakeholders need to be aware of the building stock in the city before they make recommendations on components of the policy. Understanding the building stock will inform decisions on the square footage threshold for the policy, options for phasing in the policy, and potential complications to implementation. Demonstrations of benchmarking tools such as ENERGY STAR Portfolio Manager are also useful to stakeholders. Many stakeholders will have never used the tool and will have questions regarding how to fit it into their current practices. Familiarity with Portfolio Manager is a best practice. If possible, a local voice that can provide the demo and examples of how they use the tool, as well as the benefits they've seen, can be extremely valuable for this session.

KEY QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

- What does the city's building stock look like? Can the policy capture the greatest amount of square feet with the smallest possible percentage of buildings?
- Do any of the stakeholders currently benchmark their building's energy usage? Would those stakeholders be willing to speak on their experience?
- Does the city have a challenge program? If so, has it been successful?

DATA ACCESS, PRIVACY, AND USE

Benchmarking and transparency policies yield data on building energy use and many stakeholders will have questions on how this data will be used and who will have access to it. Benchmarking and transparency go hand in hand, but stakeholders might be sensitive to publishing data. There are several ways to accommodate significant concerns about privacy.

KEY QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

- What data are useful for buildings to collect and report?
- What is the community's precedent for sharing information or data?
- What have other cities done to disclose data?
- Have the utility companies servicing the community agreed to provide whole-building data to buildings that are subject to compliance with the policy?
- Can the utility join the meeting and speak to the way they will support compliance with the policy?

POLICY STRUCTURE, COMPLIANCE, AND RECOGNITION

No single policy fits every city's circumstances. Stakeholders will have to help cities shape their policy to their city's needs. Cities need to listen to their stakeholders but maintain focus on their overarching goals, the anticipated benefits from the policy, and the initiatives needed to move the market towards greater uptake of energy efficiency. Bold action must be contextualized and framed appropriately so that stakeholders who might be more cautious or resistant to change are generally comfortable with the direction the city wants to go.

KEY QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

- How will this policy's structure and compliance rates affect the city's sustainability goals?
- Is this policy proposal ambitious but feasible?
- What elements, if any, should be included to require action on energy efficiency beyond benchmarking and transparency?
- What will be the compliance cost for affected building owners?
- Does the city have programs, planned or in place, to assist with education and compliance around the policy?

IMPLEMENTATION PHASING AND SUPPORT

Based on a city's building stock and current state of energy consumption, stakeholders will need to help decide how to implement the policy and whether to phase in different sectors or square footage thresholds. Phasing allows the city to stagger implementation to ensure building owners have time to become familiar with benchmarking, and to provide information on the ample training and support that will be available to building owners and operators to help them comply.

KEY QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

- How much time do you have to achieve the city's goals?
- How many buildings will be affected by this policy and over what timeframe?
- How much capacity does the implementing department have to support the policy?
- Will there be filing fees?
- How will the city structure enforcement? Will there be fines for late submissions?
- What exemptions should be included in the policy?

Trainings and workshops ensure building owners and operators are aware and comfortable with a policy's requirements, are able to move forward with compliance, and that they are in the best possible position to take action on their benchmarking information to improve the energy performance of their buildings.

KEY QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

- Are there resources to host trainings and provide support for all buildings that will need to comply?
- Will the city create a help center or provide other hands-on support for benchmarking?
- What partners in the community could be helpful in providing this support?
- What else do stakeholders need to be successful?
- Are there any other incentives that can be considered? (e.g. building permit priorities, fee waivers, community awards)



RESOURCE

Implementing Building Performance Policies: How Cities Can Apply Legislation for Maximum Impact

Cities that have enacted ordinances need to know how to launch and implement a building performance policy or program. This guide is designed to help cities establish the supporting processes and systems to help building owners track building energy consumption and deploy the data to encourage building owners to improve building energy efficiency, saving money and vitalizing a city.

[VIEW GUIDE >](#)





MEETING LOGISTICS

Once cities have decided the structure, timing, topics, and invitees for their stakeholder engagement meetings, they need to begin to set the agenda and topics for the individual meetings. It is the city's job (or a third-party facilitator where applicable) to facilitate the discussion around the topics for each meeting, listen to and record opinions from stakeholders, incorporate feedback into subsequent meetings, and keep meetings on track.

Cities should be clear in the beginning of the process how stakeholder input will be utilized. The [IAP2 public participation spectrum](#) is a recommended reference to use. In addition, logistical considerations to determine in advance include scheduling, location, refreshments, parking, agenda items, and note taking arrangements.

SCHEDULING

Once the number and frequency of the meetings has been decided, the city should work with stakeholders to schedule the meetings. It is most common to set a regularly recurring time and adjust as needed to ensure people can plan around the meetings. However, if stakeholders prefer, each meeting can be set using a poll or scheduler such as 2meet or Doodle to find a convenient time for everyone. Using these or other platforms, one can distribute a customized survey to determine the next meeting date at the end of every meeting and give stakeholders about a week to reply. This method makes sporadic scheduling a little easier. Once a meeting time has been decided, it is best not to adjust or change the meeting time unless there is a critical need.

LOCATION

The meeting location should be neutral and central. A neutral location implies that it does not have any ties to stakeholders involved in the process. A central location is somewhere that is easily accessible for the majority of stakeholders invited. Preferably, meeting locations are near public transportation and provide ample parking space. If possible, cities should offer reimbursement or vouchers for parking to reduce the burden on stakeholders.



QUICK TIP

Tips for Delivering Testimony

When preparing for testimony before city council, cities will be supporting stakeholders as they voice their opinions and make public statements about the legislation. This document summarizes tips for delivering testimony as well as coordinating that of stakeholders.

[LEARN MORE >](#)

INCENTIVES

Cities should consider offering incentives to meeting attendees, such as free parking or complimentary food and drink. These small gestures can make coming to a meeting less of a hassle for stakeholders or make longer meetings more pleasant. Cities should find a balance with incentives that maximize attendance and minimize costs.

STAKEHOLDER FOLLOW-UP

Once a formal stakeholder process concludes, there is often a gap in time before the proposed ordinance is introduced to city council. This gap is due to time needed to draft or refine the language of the ordinance, manage efforts to navigate the proposed ordinance through internal review processes like the city attorney's office, or due to scheduling constraints and council calendars filling up with other agenda items. Sometimes this gap in time could be four months to a year. During this time, city staff must keep stakeholders informed about the progress of the policy on at least a monthly basis until the policy is introduced to city council. Otherwise, stakeholders could feel unappreciated and resent the time they spent contributing to something that is not currently advancing through no fault of their own. Giving stakeholders regular updates ensures they know their work was valued and that there could be a future role for them once the policy is introduced.

Once the policy is introduced, the city must notify the stakeholders. Stakeholders can then determine how they would like to be involved in the public comment process. For instance, many stakeholders may opt to supply a letter of support for the policy or testify during the city council committee or general meeting.



CONCLUSION

When done correctly, the stakeholder engagement process amply informs and aligns policy design with community perspectives, needs, and challenges—resulting in a better policy, and ultimately building a base of energy efficiency champions by establishing long-lasting partnerships between city government and the private sector that will grow the market for energy-efficient buildings for years to come. While the city may call on these stakeholders to build support for policies or take part in an implementation working group to ensure change-inducing rollout of a policy after it is enacted, the true hallmark of effective stakeholder engagement is the private sector’s understanding of the benefits of energy efficiency. This lasting commitment between cities and private sector then translates into a more energy-efficient built environment that saves businesses and residents money and help cities collectively achieve our broader climate goals.



ATLANTA



APPENDIX A: INVITATION TEMPLATES

The invitation should explain the process, the ask, and other relevant details. The invitation should be on city letterhead and, ideally, be signed by the mayor. This gives appropriate weight and importance to the meeting and shows invitees that their input is genuinely valued by the city in its aims to further building efficiency. Download a word document of this invitation.

[city logo]

City name here
Office of the Mayor

[Insert date]
Dear [Stakeholder Name,]

On behalf of [insert council member, mayor, sustainability department and others,] I would like to invite you [or a representative from your organization] to join us on **date** to discuss the future of energy and water efficiency in **City Name's** buildings.

As you know, our City is committed to [insert carbon reduction and climate action goals.] We have completed past projects and have current projects under way to reach these goals. [Insert stories, descriptions and facts about current initiatives.] Now we need your help. Buildings account for [X percent] of our greenhouse gas emissions and we've put together an [insert name of advisory group/ task force/stakeholder group] to move the needle forward.

The goal of this effort is to [insert goals.]

By joining this advisory group you can expect to

- [List time commitment]
- [List topics to be discussed or deliverables]
- [List level of effort and decision making]
- [Explicitly state how feedback will influence final city decision]

Please RSVP for our first meeting (details listed below)

When: [Insert details on time]

Where: [Insert details on location]

We look forward to your participation and thank you for being involved in helping your community. If you have any questions please feel free to contact [Insert name of contact and information..]

Sincerely,
[Insert mayor name]



APPENDIX B: AGENDAS AND MEETING NOTES

AGENDAS

Meeting agendas should be clear, concise, and direct the flow of the meeting. Any materials that stakeholders need to review should be sent with the agenda at least 24 hours before the start of each meeting. Copies of the agenda should be printed out and distributed, assuming most participants will not use their laptops. It is reasonable to decide among the group to have a paperless meeting and ask participants to bring an agenda electronically for themselves if they so desire.

KEY ELEMENTS OF A GOOD AGENDA ARE:

- Title, date, time, and location
- Objective statement
 - » A clear objective statement at the start of every agenda will set the goals for the meeting. Stakeholders can then go into the discussion knowing what the city's goals are for the day and formulate their opinions accordingly.
- Discussion list
 - » A list of topics with the anticipated time frame for discussion will dictate how the meeting flows. Time stamps are used to keep discussion times for each topic organized and ensure there is enough time to cover each topic. Time stamps also demonstrate the importance of different discussion topics. For example: How much time is required to recap the last meeting's main points? Does it require five minutes or 25 minutes?
 - » Designate time for questions and discussion. The city should present new material for stakeholders to consider and allow time for the stakeholders to respond to the material and provide feedback through a discussion. It is harder to predict the length of a discussion, but it is better to overestimate than have the meeting run long because of a useful dialogue.
- Recap
 - » The beginning of every meeting should recap the previous meetings and the end of every meeting should summarize the key points of this meeting. Take this time to also explain next steps and describe how this meeting fits into the big picture of the policy or program process. At every possible stage in the stakeholder meeting process, demonstrate that stakeholders have been heard and that the ideas are incorporated into the policy decision-points.

- Questions and commentary
 - » Depending on the meeting style chosen, leave time at the end of meetings for the public observers to ask questions or give their commentary.



CITY EXAMPLE

Fort Collins Building Energy Scoring Working Group Session Agenda

Building Energy Scoring (BES Working Group Session III)

January 25, 2018, 1:00-3:00pm

222 Laporte Avenue, Colorado River Community Room

BES Working Group Mission:

Recommend processes and resources for Fort Collins Utilities to effectively implement a required building energy benchmarking, scoring, and transparency program

Meeting Objectives:

Review benchmarking and building energy scoring

Generate feedback on ENERGY STAR Portfolio Manager around data access and ease of use

Agenda:

1:00-1:05pm	Opening announcements
1:05-1:40pm	Discussion on benchmarking experiences
1:40-1:50pm	Benchmarking and building energy scoring overview
1:50-2:00pm	ENERGY STAR Portfolio Manager demonstration
2:05-2:50pm	Data inputs exercise and discussion
2:50-3:00pm	Reminders and closing announcements

MEETING NOTES

Notes from the meeting should be sent following each meeting and should capture the essence of what was discussed. They do not need to be a transcript of everything that was said, but should include main talking points, key takeaways from the discussion, questions that were asked, answers that were provided, and any next steps or assignments. The notes should look like a more detailed version of the agenda. Keeping the formatting of the agenda and meeting notes similar makes it easier to see the parallels in what was planned and what was executed. All notes and agendas should be archived. Some cities choose to publish on their website, but this is at the discretion of the city. These notes can prove a useful starting point for the recap section of the next meeting.

MEETING NOTES TEMPLATE

Group Title – Meeting #
Month Day, Year – Time of Meeting
Meeting Location Address

AGENDA

Meeting Objectives:

Time	Welcome and Recap
	Key Points & Takeaways
Time	Meeting item #1
	Description (Presentation, Q&A, Discussion, etc.)
	Key Points & Takeaways
	Links to any presentations/Handouts
	Questions Asked & Answers Given
Time	Meeting item #2
	Description (Presentation, Q&A, Discussion, etc.)
	Key Points & Takeaways
	Links to any presentations/Handouts
	Questions Asked & Answers Given
Time	Next Steps for Meeting #
	Follow up/Action Items
	If planning next meeting time – survey/poll to be completed
Time	Adjourn

*Append to the notes any handouts or follow up material from the meeting.



APPENDIX C: SUPPORTING FORMS

SIGN IN SHEET

It is helpful to have a sign-in sheet for meetings to capture attendees so city staff can follow up with any stakeholders who were unable to attend. Follow-up calls to missing attendees ensures they remain informed and shows a strong commitment to their involvement. Sign-in sheets are also helpful if meetings are open to the public to keep those people informed about progress or decisions. At the kickoff meeting, it is helpful to set norms around sharing contact information. For closed stakeholder meetings, it is helpful for attendees to have the contact information of the other attendees. With open or hybrid meetings, it is understandable that many would prefer their contact information remain private. Always confirm that sharing email addresses and phone numbers is acceptable with the group before doing so. At a minimum, collect the name, organization, and email address of each attendee.

ABOUT THE INSTITUTE FOR MARKET TRANSFORMATION AND THE NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

ABOUT THE INSTITUTE FOR MARKET TRANSFORMATION

The Institute for Market Transformation (IMT) is a national 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization that catalyzes widespread and sustained demand for energy-efficient buildings. Founded in 1996 and based in Washington, D.C., IMT specializes in driving the intersection of real estate and public policy to make buildings more productive, affordable, valuable, and resilient. A trusted, non-partisan leader, IMT focuses on innovative and pragmatic solutions that fuel greater investment in energy-efficient buildings to meet local market priorities. IMT offers hands-on technical assistance and market research, alongside expertise in policy and program development and deployment and promotion of best practices and knowledge exchange. Its efforts lead to important policy outcomes, widespread changes in real estate practices, and lasting market demand for energy efficiency—resulting in greater benefits for all people, the economy, and the environment. Visit us at www.imt.org and follow us on Twitter [@IMT_speaks](https://twitter.com/IMT_speaks).



ABOUT THE NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

The Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) is an international nonprofit environmental organization with more than 3 million members and online activists. Since 1970, our lawyers, scientists, and other environmental specialists have worked to protect the world's natural resources, public health, and the environment. NRDC has offices in New York City, Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Bozeman, MT, and Beijing. Visit us at www.nrdc.org and follow us on Twitter [@NRDC](https://twitter.com/NRDC).





LOOKING FOR MORE?

[Visit the City Energy Project Resource Library](#)

PROVIDENCE