

# Seattle Nets Sustainable Urban Growth Management and Multiple Resource Conservation Through the Neighborhood Power Project

Janice M. Boman, Seattle City Light, City of Seattle

A sustainable city thrives without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs. Sustainable cities manage energy and water needs wisely and they balance the need for growth with the need for prudent use of resources. Moving toward a sustainable city requires making changes, and change can generally be implemented on a small scale more easily than at the city, state, national or global level. A neighborhood or small community is where sustainability can quickly move from theory into action.

Seattle's municipal electric utility, Seattle City Light, developed the Neighborhood Power Project (NPP) as a strategy to promote a sustainable urban environment at the neighborhood level. The project tested joint agency delivery of resource conservation programs. The project's intent was to increase program participation in existing city-wide conservation programs by focusing collaborative marketing and program delivery efforts geographically. The uniqueness of the NPP is characterized by the variety of agencies involved. Project partners include municipal utilities, urban planners, the police department and a neighborhood artist organization.

This paper outlines the design and development of the NPP collaborative approach and the way it complements Seattle's sustainable growth management policy. Energy and water savings results, and waste management activities are presented. Lessons learned include a successful collaborative recognizes the value of community and agency perspectives and seeks active participation of all partners in planning, decision making, and problem solving. In addition, employing a broad concept of partnership leads to innovative linkages among disparate agencies.

## INTRODUCTION

Community-based planning and cost effective resource efficiency are brought together in the Neighborhood Power Project (NPP). The City's municipal electric utility, Seattle City Light (City Light) in partnership with other municipal departments, government agencies and Seattle citizens tested the concept of providing comprehensive resource management services across the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors to a targeted Seattle neighborhood. The NPP was designed to address aspects of Seattle's growth management policy that focused on neighborhood planning and environmental stewardship. The project's purpose was to acquire quantifiable resource conservation with an emphasis on community involvement and empowerment as a mechanism for achieving sustained savings.

The NPP process involved:

- identifying appropriate collaborators;
- forming an interdepartmental planning team (core group);

- selecting a neighborhood;
- developing a neighborhood outreach strategy;
- packaging multiple conservation programs;
- implementing the project; and,
- measuring the results and effectiveness of the collaboration.

## Background

In 1992, Mayor Norm Rice articulated his vision for Seattle's future in a plan titled "Toward a Sustainable Seattle: Seattle's Plan for Managing Growth" (Comp Plan). In this plan, the Mayor recognized the interconnectedness of the environment to healthy economic growth:

"I consider environmental protection and management to be an integral piece of the overall urban agenda. It is not separate from our efforts to improve our neighborhoods, our

economy, our schools, our transportation system and our public safety—it is part of them.”

The main component of the Mayor’s policy on urban growth management was to focus growth in existing and evolving neighborhoods within Seattle. Through neighborhood planning, citizens and business owners would decide how to direct growth in their communities. Among many other urban growth issues, managing resources wisely was identified by citizens and business owners as integral to sustaining the quality of life in Seattle.

The Mayor and the City Council also saw a need for City departments to improve coordination of services and to take advantage of opportunities to collaborate. Based on the focus on neighborhoods, the identification of resource conservation as a growth management issue, and the policy direction to encourage collaboration, the potential existed for Seattle’s demand-side management (DSM) programs to collectively offer significant contributions to the City’s strategy for managing growth.

City Light supports departmental and private sector collaboration. Collaborating with other departments allows the City to save money by eliminating duplicative marketing costs of delivering conservation programs separately. Collaborating with a neighborhood can provide excellent customer service and the opportunity to gain market intelligence. Design and implementation of the NPP was viewed by City Light management as an opportunity to demonstrate the value of agency collaboration in the field, while contributing to the City focus on neighborhood sustainability. In July, 1993, City Light was awarded a \$50,000 grant from the Department of Energy’s Urban Consortium Energy Task Force to develop a plan for a pilot NPP. The pilot project would serve the residential, commercial and industrial sectors. It would last for one year and the implementation target date was set at January 1995.

## **THE NEIGHBORHOOD POWER PROJECT PROCESS**

In September, 1993, the following project goals were set:

- increase resource conservation in the targeted neighborhood through hardware installations and behavior changes;
- motivate, involve, and empower the community so there is a sustained commitment to resource conservation after the pilot project has ended; and,
- increase the effectiveness and accountability of City departments working together and working with the community.

Identification of measures to be installed through NPP included: efficient lighting; efficient industrial motors; efficient water heaters; insulation; efficient windows; low-flush toilets; showerheads; and, aerators. Examples of behavior changes included drought-resistant gardening, composting garden waste, picking up litter, and donating usable items to charity instead of throwing them away.

### **Identifying Appropriate Collaborators**

In October, 1993, City Light approached the Department of Neighborhoods and Seattle Water and invited them to be partners in the NPP. Other City departments, state agencies, and neighborhood organizations were invited to participate as City Light staff recognized the links and relationships that needed to be built in order to offer a comprehensive program. All departments responded positively to the project concept, though some hesitated to commit resources to the project, initially. As the plan developed further, resources were provided to the project by a group of program operation staff representing several city and state departments. These employees personally supported the idea of collaborative delivery of conservation services and were enthusiastic in playing a part to test the concept. They formed the NPP core group in March, 1994. Neighborhood volunteers joined the core group in July, 1994.

Table 1. lists the various agencies that formed the NPP core group and their roles. They are listed in order related to their level of involvement.

### **Forming an Interdepartmental Planning Team (Core Group)**

City Light staff, as the lead agency, had the task of building a team among the core group members and establishing a common sense of purpose. The project concept had captured their interest, however, the real challenge was sustaining their interest despite competing demands on each representative’s time. The first order of business was to establish guidelines for working cooperatively and effectively in a collaborative effort. By March, 1994, the core group developed a guide for decision making within the group as indicated in Table 2.

### **Selecting a Neighborhood**

Next, neighborhood selection criteria were developed. Staff researched demographic data with the assistance of the Department of Planning. The demographic data was mapped and categorized. Seattle is divided into 12 districts that include approximately 100 designated neighborhoods. Based on the criteria, staff narrowed the selection to four neighborhood recommendations for consideration. The core group

**Table 1. NPP Core Group**

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Function</u>
Seattle City Light	Lead agency—energy conservation
Seattle Water	Marketing assistance—water conservation
Seattle Solid Waste Utility	Evaluation assistance—waste management (residential)
Seattle Dept. of Housing and Human Resources	Environmental education—low income energy conservation
Fremont Neighborhood Council, Chamber of Commerce, Arts Council	Advisors and outreach
Washington State Energy Office	Coordinate workshops and demonstrations
Business Industry and Recycling Venture	Waste management (commercial/industrial)
Seattle Dept. of Neighborhoods	Neighborhood liaison
Seattle Dept. of Planning	Mayor's office liaison
Seattle Dept. of Police	Coordinate Block/Business Watch
Bonneville Power Administration	Finance energy conservation programs

then conducted “drive and walk throughs” of the four finalists to determine the physical layout. The four neighborhoods were rated on the basis of the selection criteria detailed in Table 3. The result of this process was the selection of Fremont as the pilot neighborhood. There are 4,635 households (2,459 single family and 2,176 multifamily) and 375 commercial and industrial customers within Fremont’s borders. The commercial sector is weighted heavily toward small business. Ninety-two percent of the businesses use less than 150,000 kilowatt hours (kWh) annually. In many ways, Fremont mirrors a small town (population 9,000) located in the center of a large city (Seattle’s population is 531,000).

**Table 2. NPP Core Group Process**

**Decision Making Context—Who has control outside our group?**

- Department Heads
- Mayor
- City Council
- Customers

**What Power Do We Have?**

- Make recommendation to Department heads.
- Set aside staff time and marketing budget for NPP.
- We can make it happen.
- Power to publicize the partnership idea and our agencies.
- Power to make connections with communities and other agencies.
- Power to hire consultants or contractors.

**Core Group Common Values**

- Resource efficiency.
- Consensus—work as a team of Departments.
- Communication and connection make programs work better.
- Further City values and goals.
- Belief in our agencies and NPP product.
- This project is laying groundwork for long-term partnerships.

**Respect—All Ideas are Valued**

- Make informed decisions by soliciting all opinions.
- Objections are valid and will be explored.
- Teams take time to develop.
- We will work to overcome communication barriers.
- Seattle City Light is the project lead and facilitates group process.
- Decisions will be made by vote; compromise and consensus will be sought.

**Developing a Neighborhood Outreach Strategy**

Prior to approaching the Fremont community for participation in the NPP, City Light staff attempted to discover the formal and informal networks within the community. Together, City Light and the Department of Neighborhoods staff researched Fremont history as documented by previous neighborhood needs assessment plans, reports, and demographic data. NPP Staff studied local socioeconomic characteristics, the employment base, community facilities and services, the retail/business core, community groups and organizations, local media and significant local issues. This

**Table 3. NPP Neighborhood Selection Criteria**

First Order Criteria—The neighborhood should:

- Contain a mix of commercial, industrial, and residential sectors.
- Be within the Seattle City limits.
- Be ethnically and economically diverse.
- Present sufficient savings potential to warrant participation by each Department.

Second Order Criteria—The neighborhood should:

- Be within the Comp Plan Neighborhood Planning area.
- Be a manageable size and have clearly defined borders.
- Have an established network of residential and business community organizations.

upfront study was extremely helpful to NPP staff in gaining acceptance and credibility in the community because staff had taken the time to learn about the community and the issues it faced (Sharpe & Watts 1992).

The next step was to create an outreach strategy for involving the community leaders in the initial design for the NPP project. Through the Department of Neighborhoods, invitations were sent out to selected individuals to attend a “get acquainted” meeting in June, 1994. The meeting was not a public meeting where a plan is presented for comment. Instead the approach was, “We have an idea, what do you think?.” The neighborhood turnout was sparse. Approximately five individuals attended out of the 15 that were invited. But, those that attended offered helpful advice on how the core group should proceed. Neighborhood representatives indicated a preference for project staff to attend regularly scheduled neighborhood meetings as guest speakers versus holding separate public meetings to solicit input. Staff acted on this advice and relationships were built with the Fremont Neighborhood Council and the Chamber of Commerce Boards. Updates on the NPP were included on the monthly agenda of these meetings. In addition, several of these original “get acquainted” meeting attendees joined the core group and provided opportunities for project staff to network with and engage additional neighborhood volunteers throughout the term of the project.

### **Packaging Conservation Programs and Project Implementation**

Determining which resource conservation programs and services to offer through the pilot project and the most effective delivery mechanism were the next challenges for the core group. The core group started with the commercial and

industrial programs because there were only five programs to package for this sector. By July, 1994, multi-resource facility audits had been selected as the preferred approach for Fremont’s ten largest customers. These customers were identified through City Light and Seattle Water billing records. The multi-resource audit approach consisted of a team of energy, water, and waste management specialists jointly inspecting a facility. The customers were contacted by City Light staff via phone and offered the free joint audit or the option to focus on an energy, water or waste management audit individually based on business needs or interest. The multi-resource audit option was offered throughout 1995.

The remaining 20 medium businesses and the 345 small businesses were contacted through a door-to-door canvassing effort and were offered free lighting audits by a City Light contractor. The high costs and staff needs associated with delivering multi-resource audits at the small commercial level led to the decision to focus on lighting audits. However, these customers received a water use survey, and written information about the low-flush toilet rebate and business waste management programs during their audit. The small business audit service and subsequent lighting equipment installations occurred from March, 1995 to September, 1995. The Fremont Chamber of Commerce supported the project by hosting presentations by NPP project staff on energy, water and waste management issues during their monthly meetings. They also published resource conservation articles in their monthly newsletter.

By September, 1994, the idea of a customer pledge or a written commitment to action as a means of educating, as well as soliciting participation in the 18 residential programs (only nine programs are listed in the Results section, Table 5. because project goals were not set for all 18 programs), was agreed upon as the marketing approach for the residential sector. The pledge idea, after further discussion, was titled the Environmental Action Statement (EAS). The EAS was a brochure that listed actions that customers could do to conserve resources or to request additional information on City programs. Customers received their EAS from high school students hired for a residential, door-to-door canvassing effort that occurred in March and April of 1995. Residential canvassing was conducted by the Student Conservation Association via their Conservation Career Development Program. SCA is a national organization that recruits high school students, particularly women and people of color, to enroll in a program that steers them toward careers in conservation. As part of their participation in the NPP, the students received training in environmental concepts and sales skills.

The students explained the purpose of NPP and asked the customers to indicate the actions they were willing to do or to request additional program information by checking the

appropriate box. Table 4. lists the top five environmental actions that customers checked on the EAS.

Once the EAS brochures were collected (via student pick up or mail in to City Light) they were tracked and entered into a database. The number of times customers checked particular items was counted and requests for program information were filled. Telephone calls were then made to customers to answer questions about the most frequently requested topics including, composting, do-it-yourself home energy audits, household toxics, and compact fluorescent bulbs. Included with the conservation information distributed through both the residential and commercial canvassing efforts were membership applications to join the Fremont Chamber of Commerce and Fremont Neighborhood Council. This helped support the neighborhood organizations that had endorsed the project and provided an opportunity to contribute to community building.

The EAS served several functions. It introduced people to specific conservation actions that help make their community more efficient and less wasteful; it solicited interest in programs; it provided customers the opportunity to indicate their personal commitment to resource conservation activities; and, it identified members of the community who were interested in sharing conservation information and volunteering in their neighborhood (Castillano & Boman 1994). Other NPP activities that occurred during the year include 19 free neighborhood conservation workshops; demonstrations of compact fluorescent lights, and free drawings for conservation products at the local hardware store; “shopping ecologically smart” demonstrations at the grocery store; interactive

presentations on energy, water and recycling activities for the Boys and Girls Club daycamp and the local elementary school in Fremont, and a joint agency booth promoting resource conservation at the neighborhood street fair.

In June, 1995, 65 neighborhood residents were surveyed to find out additional activities of interest to the community that support resource conservation. A neighborhood swap meet and a neighborhood toxic-free garden tour in Fremont were planned and implemented by five neighborhood volunteers identified in the survey.

## RESULTS

NPP measured savings and examples of program participation are outlined in Table 5. The project accomplished 83 percent of its kilowatt (kWh) savings goals.<sup>1</sup> Energy program goals were set at five percent of City Light’s overall goals for conservation programs. This was an aggressive target because only two percent of Seattle residents and commercial facilities are located in Fremont. It was the project’s intent to increase program participation via the targeted neighborhood approach versus a city-wide delivery approach. The NPP approach was successful in the small commercial conservation program and the apartment weatherization program (non-low income). Both of these programs exceeded their NPP kWh savings goals. The new efficient apartment units program came close to meeting their goal. The remaining programs were less successful at increasing program participation through the NPP approach.

The small commercial conservation program was the most successful energy program in NPP. The program exceeded its energy savings goal by 263,957 kWh (20% of goal). The small commercial population for Fremont totaled 345 businesses. Virtually none of these businesses had been offered energy efficiency services prior to the NPP. Two hundred and thirty three customers agreed to the free energy audit and 185 businesses had cost effective energy savings potential. One hundred and thirty seven customers did agree to install energy efficient lighting in their businesses. Planning estimates for this program forecasted a savings of 7,500 kWh per site. The goal for small commercial was based on this planning estimate multiplied by 150 sites. However, in the field, engineering estimates averaged much higher (11,781 kWh) and the impact evaluation confirmed an actual savings of 11,428 kWh per site.

The low-flush toilet rebate program was the most successful NPP program overall, exceeding its goals by 675,615 gallons of water saved annually (120% of goal). This program offered a rebate to businesses for replacing their existing toilets with a more efficient model. Engineering estimates for annual water savings per toilet was 31,025 gallons. However,

**Table 4. The Top Five Most Frequently Checked Items on the Environmental Action Statements (EAS)**

	<u>Requests</u>
(1) Requests for <i>Do-It-Yourself Home Energy Audit Guide</i> .	418
(2) Requests for <i>Leave a Light On</i> (about security lighting).	416
(3) “I will donate usable items to charity instead of throwing them away.”	387
(4) “I will wash full loads of clothes and dishes.”	386
(5) “I will put food coloring in my toilet tank to check for leaks.”	386

metered consumption of five of the toilets revealed actual water savings six times the engineering estimate. The annual gallon savings figure in Table 5. reflects actual metered results for those five toilets and engineering estimates of savings for the remaining eight toilets. The goals for the other City departments are much less defined. Their primary interest was exploring the process of working collaboratively with other departments in a neighborhood setting.

The NPP contributed more than just resource savings to the community. It also supported community empowerment. One thousand, three hundred and thirty six EAS's were delivered to Fremont residents. Seven hundred EAS's were returned with written commitments to conserve resources and requests for information. Through the EAS promotion 118 people listed that they would assist a neighbor with at least one conservation-related action. Two hundred sixty-

seven people indicated an interest in volunteering in Fremont and the Fremont Neighborhood Council mailing list grew by 340.

An important component in the NPP strategy was the development of a legacy of a resource conservation ethic to continue in the neighborhood when the project ended. This component was seen as an opportunity to involve and empower community members to continue resource conservation activities and thus contribute to the sustainability of their neighborhood. The community-organized swap meet and the garden tour are good examples of how the bulk of the planning and implementation of these events was driven by neighborhood volunteers responding to the NPP. In January, 1996, the Continuing Fremont Conservation Committee (CFC's) was formed by five neighborhood volunteers to lead resource conservation activities in the neighborhood

*Table 5. Fremont NPP Resource Savings*

<b>Energy Programs</b>	<b>Units (goal)</b>	<b>Units (achieved)</b>	<b>kWh* Annual Savings</b>	<b>kWh* Annual Savings (achieved)</b>
Homes weatherized	52	17	128,024	41,854
Low-income homes weatherized	10	0	28,410	0
Apartment units weatherized	100	118	188,000	221,840
Low-income apartment units weatherized	53	13	99,640	24,440
Apartment units—lighting only	190	43	133,000	30,100
New efficient apartment units built	50	45	55,000	49,500
Efficient water heater rebates	470	98	112,800	23,520
Install 2 CFLs** per household	320 CFLs	48 CFLs	19,200	2,880
Industrial facilities conservation (sites)	3	2	518,110	185,200
Small commercial conservation (sites)	150	137	1,350,000	1,613,957
<b>TOTAL SAVINGS</b>			<b>2,632,184</b>	<b>2,193,291</b>
<b>Water Programs</b>	<b>Units (goal)</b>	<b>Units (achieved)</b>	<b>Gallons Annual Savings (goal)</b>	<b>Gallons Annual Savings (achieved)</b>
Commercial conservation (sites)	1	0	—	—
Commercial toilet rebates	18	13	558,450	1,234,065
<b>Solid Waste Programs</b>	<b>Units (goal)</b>	<b>Units (achieved)</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
Apartment buildings started recycling	8	1		
Businesses join "Buy Recycled Alliance"	5	1		

\*kWh = kilowatt hours

\*\*CFLs = compact fluorescent lights

following the formal end of the NPP. The CFC's are planning a second annual swap meet and toxic free, drought-resistant garden tour in 1996.

City Light essentially tapped its program infrastructure and focused additional outreach efforts in the Fremont neighborhood. Additional expenditures outside of existing program budgets were a full time project manager and a quarter time administrative support. NPP marketing expenditures were \$20,000.

## **Effectiveness of the Collaboration**

In December 1995, the project's core planning group (city and state staff and neighborhood volunteers) participated in a focus group. The purpose of the focus group was to critically review the project; to identify what worked well and what didn't work; to highlight benefits of the project; and, to share and develop insights about what should be addressed in implementing another project of this kind. The focus group participants unanimously supported the concept of coordinated conservation program outreach, and declared NPP a success as a pilot. They also identified non-conservation benefits to the project including increased knowledge of other City department functions and of working with community volunteers. The neighborhood volunteers greatly appreciated personalized contact with City department staff, and developed greater comfort in working with the City in general. Suggestions for improvement included gaining support of all partners' upper management to dedicate the resources to deliver the project successfully and to closely analyze costs associated with joint delivery.

## **Lessons Learned**

The approach of the NPP was planned in concert with neighborhood residents and business owners to deliver education and incentive programs, and volunteer opportunities that simplify conserving energy and water and reducing waste. Successful programs of this type typically have one thing in common. They are endorsed by key leaders in the community. These key leaders become champions of the program. They become "early adopters" of program services, provide credibility and "open doors" to utility staff (Berkowitz, Karl & Ramsay 1994). One example of this concept occurred after a presentation on the benefits of energy efficient lighting to the Fremont Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber President became the first business owner to participate in the small business conservation program. She also promoted the project to other businesses in the neighborhood.

Endorsement of the project by key Fremont business leaders resulted in the development of relationships between business owners and utility staff. For example, a Fremont brew-

ery had initially declined both water and energy audits several years ago when approached individually by electric and water utility staff. However, during the course of working closely with the Fremont Chamber for several months, the NPP project manager connected with the brewery's marketing manager. The brewery marketing manager then encouraged the maintenance manager to proceed with the multi-resource audit. The result of the multi-resource audit included identification of water savings potential in the bottle washing process, metering that detected faulty electrical equipment, identification of lighting energy savings potential in a warehouse, and assistance in finding a supplier for recycled burlap bags. The brewery eventually proceeded to fix the electrical equipment for an estimated energy savings of 10,000 kWh annually.

Another example of the benefits of the collaborative approach is a local property management firm's commitment to utilize water, energy and waste management design assistance in the development of their proposed business park in the Fremont neighborhood. Initially, the firm was only planning to focus on efficient lighting design because their first and only contact with City conservation programs was with City Light. However, through NPP, City Light involved the other utilities and the firm agreed that it made sense to address multiple resources in their construction plans.

The benefits of collaboration are apparent. Sharing costs can either reduce costs for each utility or extend the program to more customers. Sharing information offers an extra pair of eyes and ears for each partner, not only focusing on energy issues but noting water and waste management issues as they come up. Different perspectives and experiences brought to the table yield a greater likelihood of thinking "outside the box" and of more comprehensive solutions. When multiple agencies are involved in a program, it intensifies program credibility and momentum, achieving far greater impact. Collaborating isn't easy however. It takes time and patience. Outlined below are general recommendations for establishing and maintaining a partnership based on City Light NPP experience.

**Establishing a collaborative team.** Be persistent. Make several contacts within a single agency and follow up regularly. It takes time to identify the right person or persons to contact and to find a partner that shares the passion for an integrated approach to program delivery. Get to know each partner's programs, issues, priorities and motives. Keep in mind that there is no "cookbook" approach to partnerships, and the concept should be interpreted as broadly as possible. Getting in tune with each other will allow you to spend your time productively on developing partnership ideas that will meet your needs and address their priorities. Also, maintain programmatic flexibility. Have a clear vision of what your

goals are, and your desired outcomes, but be flexible in your approach to programmatic design and implementation.

**Managing a partnership.** Effective communication is absolutely vital to a collaborative's success. Never underestimate a partner's interest in new information. Initially, it was difficult to share draft material that previously wouldn't have gone further than internal review. However, the willingness to share less than perfect documents developed openness between City departments and a strong sense of trust between project staff and neighborhood advisors.

Clarify roles, responsibilities, and expectations upfront. It is never too early to start talking about these issues. Often, project planning ends up placing this step out of sequence. Program managers begin with a project idea and then become immersed in working through the myriad of programmatic details. Roles and responsibilities are often dealt with ad hoc. Preferably a first step, defining roles and responsibilities tends to be an iterative process and continues to need refinement through project implementation.

Share the responsibility of planning and decision making. This seems pretty risky to some because of the perceived loss of control, however, a successful collaborative recognizes the value of different perspectives and seeks active participation of all partners. And, share the glory and the disappointment. No project is ever completely without snags. Group discussion of problems can lead to potentially creative solutions. But most importantly the willingness of the lead agency to share credit and the limelight with the other partners stands out as an unwritten rule of successful collaboration.

## CONCLUDING STATEMENTS

City Light developed few new initiatives for NPP. What the utility did do is find a way to align its traditional energy conservation programs with a larger City agenda and to offer customers a multiple resource conservation package. In the Spring of 1996, several events took place related to the future of NPP. First, the department managers of the three utilities (energy, water, and solid waste) involved in the pilot voted unanimously to pursue a second pilot effort in another Seattle neighborhood to further evaluate the benefits of the approach. The remaining four City departments also pledged their support of a second NPP. The second pilot core team is expected to expand to include additional City departments such as Seattle Parks and the Drainage and Wastewater Utility. Second, networking among NPP core group members has resulted in an multi-departmental resource management initiative in the Seattle School District. The initiative called "Green Schools" includes an environmental education curriculum coordinated with efficient lighting and water

conservation measure installations, and recycling in school buildings. Third, Seattle's Mayor and the City Council are studying the savings potential associated with the consolidation of the City's four utilities into a single public works department. The Fremont NPP collaborative effort was studied as a model for future collaborative efforts housed under a single conservation department.

Through education, incentives, and coaching the NPP core team fostered neighborhood responsibility for conservation of resources. This is an important first step in building a sustainable city. The project also united various agencies, who traditionally operate independently, toward a common goal of resource efficiency. A precedent has been set in Seattle city government to encourage partnerships that evolve from identification of common interests. The benefits of establishing partnerships through the NPP with neighborhoods and other City departments will be realized in years, not months. Ultimately, the Neighborhood Power Project is about partnerships and partnerships are a renewable resource.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author attributes the success of the Fremont Neighborhood Power Project to the enthusiastic support and commitment of the many individuals and citizen groups involved in this undertaking. The following individuals and groups deserve special recognition for their contributions to this broad-based conservation effort: Marc Sullivan, Miale Jose, Fran Duffy, Steve Lush and Marya Castellano (project staff and mentors) Seattle City Light; the Fremont Chamber of Commerce Board; the Fremont Neighborhood Council Board; the Fremont Arts Council; and, the core group (representatives of seven City of Seattle Departments, the Washington State Energy Office and Bonneville Power Administration).

## ENDNOTES

1. KWh savings outlined in Table 5. are derived from evaluation data of energy conservation programs compiled in Tachibana, D., B. Coates, and D. Pearson (Editors). 1994. *Energy Conservation Accomplishments: 1977-1993*. Seattle, Wash.: Seattle City Light.

## REFERENCES

Anderson, S., J. Deakin, and R. Norton. 1992. *Sustainable Energy A Local Government Planning Guide for a Sustainable Future*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Consortium of Public Technology, Inc.



Berkowitz, P., S. Karl, and J. Ramsay. 1994. "Capturing Conservation through Community Energy Management." *Home Energy* March/April: 21–28.

Castillano, M. and J. Boman. 1994. *Neighborhood Power Project: Research and Development Phase*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Consortium of Public Technology, Inc.

Edgar, G., P. Berkowitz, and S. Harmelink. 1994. *Design & Implementation Strategies For Community Energy Efficiency Projects*. Sun Prairie, Wisc.: Wisconsin Public Power Inc., System.

Flanigan, T., and P. Berkowitz. (Editors) 1993. *Community-Based Energy-Efficiency Programs, An Effective DSM*

*Option?* Aspen, Colorado: The Results Center, IRT Environment, Inc.

Nicholas, S., K. Ray, and H. Sharpe. 1992. *The City of Seattle's Environmental Action Agenda: Environmental Stewardship in Seattle*. Seattle, Wash.: City of Seattle Planning Department.

Tachibana, D., B. Coates, and D. Pearson (Editors). 1994. *Energy Conservation Accomplishments: 1977–1993*. Seattle, Wash.: Seattle City Light.

Sharpe, V., and D. Watts. 1992. "Beyond Traditional Approaches to Marketing Energy Conservation: The Espanola Experience." *In Proceedings of the ACEEE 1992 Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings*, 10:149–156. Washington, D.C.: American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy.