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ABSTRACT

Some social movement organizations have begun to use collaborative methods to create decentralized network power for shared action through long-term alliance development and participation in collaborative public decision-making forums. Through the history of Community Labor United (CLU), a Boston-based long-term community-labor alliance, I establish the existence of mutual benefits between organizing and collaborative methods for creating solutions to complex problems. The prerequisites for the application of collaborative methods—diversity of interests, interdependence of interests, and authentic dialogue (DIAD)—are used to describe CLU’s application of collaborative methods to the development of their alliance and their participation in statewide energy efficiency planning and implementation. I conclude by providing recommendations for the co-application of social movement organizing and collaborative planning practices to energy efficiency planning and complex public policy issues more generally.
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Preface

On October 21, 2009 a fascinating talk was hosted by the Department of Urban Studies and Planning as a part of the semester speaker series. I missed it. I only heard the summary in passing later from someone else. Anecdotally I learned that near the end of the event the speakers—Drs. Balakrishnan Rajagopal, Larry Susskind, and Phil Thompson, all DUSP faculty—were asked to describe in one word what they thought was the most important characteristic of a planner (or something along those lines). It was related to me that Dr. Susskind said “empathy,” Dr. Rajagopal “accountability,” and Dr. Thompson “solidarity.” This fascinated me and stuck in my mind. Not the divergent views of planning, which was a staple of the DUSP Gateway course and planning practice and theory, but rather the summary of an approach to practice in a single, powerful word. These ideas sounded so different, but were they in conflict? How would I describe my approach to planning if I had to do so in one word?

The best I can do right now is a phrase. To me planning is about making connections, or “building bridges.” By accident and by choice this has become a central part of my theory of practice. To me connecting diverse worldviews, interests, and capacities to create better and mutually beneficial decisions and actions is the most powerful promise of planning.

My professional experience before MIT included a stint as a director of a neighborhood canvass office that ran campaigns for environmental and other public interest organizations. Everyday I was forced to bring big ideas related to the tragedy of the commons, utilitarian and intrinsic value, and the role of government to the stark reality of people’s doorsteps. Stumbling into someone’s life demanded that I was willing to meet them where they were at. It couldn’t be just about some issue that I wanted them to act on. It had to be about concretely relating to their
life, experiences, and values. That opportunity to experience the rich symphony of the human condition was an emotional rollercoaster: draining and inspiring, frustrating and enlightening.

I have since worked on affordable housing, economic development, energy policy, environmental planning, and other issues across the United States and on three other continents. The recurring theme in every sector and location is that the work cannot be done alone. Enough resources, knowledge, capacity and authority do not rest with any one person or organization to implement solutions that address the complex entanglements that make up most of the world’s, the country’s, the city’s, the neighborhood’s most pressing problems. Collective intelligence and collective action is needed. Our diversity and interdependence must be recognized and harnessed.

This thesis is an attempt to explore one narrow piece of this theory of practice. It has contributed an additional piece in helping me to envision how to proceed with my own work in the face of complexity and uncertainty. I am far from having the answers for myself, let alone others, but I have come to accept that the practices of empathy, solidarity, and accountability and many other worldviews are in conflict but compatible, diverse but interrelated. In the real world contradictions abound and each one is needed in the challenges and opportunities ahead.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

A Convergence of Material and Capacity Crises

In 2008, the Massachusetts legislature passed the Green Communities Act. The Act represented a revolutionary— and in many ways confusing— leap of faith in energy policy and economics in the state. Energy utilities would no longer earn revenue based on selling energy. Energy efficiency, i.e. not using energy, would become the primary means of providing new energy. Not only were legislators making huge changes to the energy policy, but so were regulators, the gatekeepers between legislation and reality. After legislators and regulators both had their say, agreement was reached that state-level spending for energy efficiency would be quadrupled, resulting in the highest per capita level ever for any state. The goals for energy savings were set at a level that had never been met before. Therefore no one was completely sure how to meet them— or even that they certainly could be met. But if you talked to the decision-makers, they would likely tell you that they hope this will just be the beginning of changes to the way energy markets work. To the average economist, let alone a layperson, this new system of energy management would all seem like the world turned upside down. Of course, the theory behind all of these changes was based on a large body of research, but the tricky part, actually doing it, was unproven. How would it all get done? And how could reelection-minded legislators and technocratic regulators have let this drastic and risky change happen?

In the story that follows I will further discuss energy efficiency planning in Massachusetts, but I want to first discuss these two questions in general. They are some of the most important questions for policy and planning in our time. In our increasingly complex world
we have problems—from climate change to financial crises—that are increasing in pace and scale. We are in need of more policies like the Green Communities Act, ones that are not only drastic and risky but also innovative and game-changing. Even more importantly, we need to have the capacity to implement these policies, not only economically but also socially. In the face of these looming challenges, with solutions already too long delayed, things don’t look promising.

We live in a society that is increasingly devoid of social capital. Many authors have documented how as society has grown more connected through globalization and the information revolution, individuals have grown more disconnected from their traditional social institutions of local communities, neighbors, and families.¹ Not only is this a tragedy for the human condition in the abstract but it also has tangible impacts on the efficacy of policy-making and the societal resilience needed to address complex problems.² Instead of uniting around solving problems that affect all of humanity—such as global economic, health, and environmental crises that continue to amplify—our political system seems to grow even more inward looking and gridlocked. Regardless of the decisions, or lack thereof, of policy makers, there is serious doubt about the capacity of our economic and social infrastructure to implement solutions. Are people willing to choose mutual self-interest over a narrow vision of self-interest? Do we have any other choice but to hope that they will in a global culture where individual choice and democracy are held sacred?

¹ See for example, Castells, *The Rise of the Network Society.*, vol. 1.  
² See for example, Young et al., “The globalization of socio-ecological systems.”
The Intersection of Two Planning Styles

There is hope to find solutions to these problems. To start, two disparate styles of planning—collaborative decision-making and social movement organizing—must learn that they need each other to address the severity of the interconnected problems of social capital deficits in our communities and politics. The collaborative style has the ability to reach decisions when used with complex problems. The organizing style can ensure that all stakeholders have the ability to participate in collaborative processes, and it also can develop the capacity necessary to successfully implement policies.

In this thesis I describe the integration of collaborative methods in the context of social movement organizing. Much of the practice of and scholarship on building social movements has focused exclusively on injustice framing, the opposition to an “other,” and the use of confrontation in the construction of rhetoric, motivation, and identity. While this oppositional emphasis has been central to developing the power of social movements as political forces, there are other methods that have factored into the success or failure of social movements. Most notable, from the vantage point of this thesis, is the ability of social movement organizations to strategically engage in collaboration when opportune. Just as rhetoric, identity, and actions of opposition are tools to gain power and shape the tenor and symbolism of a debate, so too is collaboration. The ability of social movement organizations to know when best to apply collaborative strategies instead of, or in addition to, oppositional strategies is a major factor in their resilience to changes in the social, political and economic environment.

Through discussion of the case to follow, an examination of the development of the organizing methods of Community Labor United (CLU), I will describe the characteristics and

3 See for example, Snow et al., “Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation.”
components of collaborative decision-making practice that are integrated into a social movement organization. As an extension of the CLU case, I will look at the potential for social movement organizations to participate in collaborative public decision-making processes, with a particular focus on engagement in energy efficiency planning and implementation. I will also identify several variables from the case that may be instructive to other social movement organizations interested in developing and strategically deploying their collaborative capacity as an additional organizing method to create power and gain benefits for their members.
Chapter 2: Reconciling Social Movement Organizing and Collaborative Planning

The Social Movement Organizing Style

The argument that collaboration is a part of social movement organizing should not be foreign to the practice of social movement actors. Most social movement leaders can identify times when they have “come to the table.” However, the assertion that collaboration itself can be a movement building strategy, rather than simply a conceit to the reality of deal-making politics, may be controversial.

In the rhetoric, history, and mythology of social movements collaboration is a dirty word and is often seen as the antithesis of solidarity—a core social movement virtue. In the history of social movements the word “collaborator” is most commonly associated with cooperation of citizens with enemy forces occupying a country, most famously, supporters of the Nazi-allied Vichy government of France in World War II. It is considered a form of treason, but, in contradiction, some credit this form of collaboration with helping to maintain French national independence.\(^4\)

In contrast, the dominant community organizing model, typified by the writings of Saul Alinsky, focuses on forceful and public opposition to a target based on a principled stand against injustice. The world is defined in absolute terms. In Alinsky’s terminology, the “Have-Nots” define themselves in opposition to the “Haves.” To gain power, the Have-Nots must organize themselves to act together, because people, not money, are the main resources available to them. And the role of an organizer is to “stir up dissatisfaction and discontent; provide a channel into

\(^4\) Innes and Booher, *Planning with Complexity*, 113.
which the people can angrily pour their frustrations.”⁵ He summarizes his approach through a series of rules about tactics, which can be summarized in his statement: “The real action is in the enemy’s reaction…The enemy properly goaded and guided in his reaction will be your major strength.”⁶ Here the goal is to put the “enemy” in an uncomfortable position and get them to make themselves look worse through their reaction. The hope is that eventually the target will be sufficiently embarrassed so as to give in to the demands of the organized group.

However, Alinsky himself recognizes that implementing his model requires balancing dual versions of reality: one that is simplified and one that recognizes complexity.

The organizer must become schizoid, politically, in order not to slip into becoming a true believer…[T]he organizer must be able to split himself into two parts—one part in the arena of action where he polarizes the issues to 100 to nothing, and helps to lead his forces into conflict, while the other part knows that when the time comes for negotiation that it really is only a 10 per cent difference.⁷

For Alinsky, issues and motivation must be kept simple to create a clear and uniting message. Complexity is too complicated and does not lend itself to a viscerally understandable narrative of injustice or the motivational power of “us vs. them.”

**The Collaborative Planning Style**

For the human mind, opposition to an “other” is a very effective mobilizing technique, but when it comes to solving complex and intractable issues, an overly simplistic oppositional approach can narrow the options available for creating a broadly acceptable solution. The disciplines of collaborative planning and consensus building have explored this dilemma and have established methods for co-creating solutions to complex problems. At their most general

⁶ Ibid., 136.
⁷ Ibid., 78.
these approaches “involve a variety of stakeholders in long-term, face-to-face discussions to produce plans and policies on controversial public issues.”

One of the most common critiques of collaborative planning is that it is missing an analysis of power. How can all stakeholders meaningfully participate in a collaborative process if they have unequal resources? How is a neighborhood-based organizing group supposed to have its interests taken seriously when it is in the shadow the largest regional employer? Marc Weiss has argued that collaborative planning methods are biased toward development and the interests of the business community. David Harvey has asserted that planning is designed to protect the capitalist system through balancing all interests.

Many supporters of collaborative planning methods respond that these criticisms are only valid under a very narrow definition of power, one based purely on coercion through resources. They note that attempts to exercise this simple sort of power in a complex world frequently fail to achieve their aims. “Often the powerful player gets acquiescence but not results, or even results contrary to his intentions.” In place of this narrow definition, they cite three types of power as defined by Giddens—the power of action; the power of ideas, modes, and methods; and the power of deep structure. (Similar concepts have described by Gaventa’s three instruments of power: superior bargaining resources; ability to construct or eliminate barriers to participation; and ability to shape shared consciousness through myths, ideology, and control of information.)

---

8 Booher and Innes, “Network Power in Collaborative Planning,” 221.
9 Innes, “Consensus Building.”
11 Harvey, The Urban Experience.
14 Gaventa, Power and Powerlessness.
Network Power and DIAD

Booher and Innes argue that when the discussion of power is realigned with this nuanced identification of its sources, collaborative planning can effectively create “network power.” Network power is “the ability of linked agents to alter their environment in ways advantageous to these agents individually and collectively.” To begin creating network power it must be recognized that superior resources for action cannot alone successfully address complex problems. Collaborative processes, especially those based on seeking consensus, go a long way toward equalizing the power of methods and barriers to participation. Through creating a new problem-solving structure, the linked agents can create a new shared consciousness and relational structure over time, which can lead to “new options that were not available to them individually or when they were in conflict mode with others.”

Although collaborative planning can successfully create a new kind of power, it cannot be applied in all situations. Booher and Innes describe three necessary preconditions with the acronym DIAD: Diversity of Agents, Interdependence of Agents, and Authentic Dialogue (Figure 1). They use the analogy of the pieces of an organic system in describing the importance of these preconditions. Diversity of agents, including the full range of interests and knowledge relevant to the issues at hand, provides the material (in the form of knowledge and resources) to create new options, solutions, and conditions. Through interdependence of agents participants recognize that they have something that the others want and that they want something from the others. Interdependence provides the energy to bring participants together and keep them in the system. To Booher and Innes, authentic dialogue is the genetic code, which

---

16 Ibid.
17 Ibid., 226-31.
processes the ingredients of diversity and interdependence. Such dialogue requires that all participants can speak honestly and in an informed way about their interests and perspective and that all participants are listened to. Authentic dialogue can create reciprocity, relationships, learning and creativity. Emerging from these elements can come mutual adaptations and common value such as shared identities, meanings, and heuristics, as well as innovative solutions.

**Figure 1: The Network Dynamics of Diversity, Interdependence, and Authentic Dialogue**

![Image of a diagram showing the network dynamics of diversity, interdependence, and authentic dialogue.](image-url)

*Source: Adapted from Booher and Innes, “Network Power in Collaborative Planning,” (2002)*

**A Typology of Planning Styles**

Innes and Booher\(^\text{18}\) as well as Innes and Gruber\(^\text{19}\) have developed a typology of planning styles in keeping with the DIAD model (Figure 2). They identify four styles of planning that are often applied to a single issue by different actors. They call the styles Technical/Bureaucratic, Political Influence, Social Movement, and Collaborative. They note that social movement and

---

\(^{18}\) Innes and Booher, “Collaborative policymaking.”

\(^{19}\) Innes and Gruber, “Planning styles in conflict.”
collaborative planning styles both address conditions of high interdependence well. However, they claim that only the collaborative style can address conditions of high interdependence and high diversity, as found in most complex issues. They state,

The social movement model is an approach that emerges when interests are excluded from the policy process… The social movement approach to planning depends on an understanding of the importance of interdependence, as it is only the strength of the coalition that gives them political clout… What the social movement approach does not do well is deal with diversity of interests. By its very nature, it cannot include all interests or it will be unsuccessful in holding the coalition together.²⁰

Explaining this assertion further, they claim that social movement planning “could not accommodate widely ranging viewpoints, since this would require dilution of the vision.”²¹

Although it is almost certainly correct to state that social movements cannot include all interests, it is important to note that some social movement planning methods do aim to include increasingly diverse participants. In particular, social movement organizations based on a long-term alliance model aim to expand the appeal of a message to bring new types of social movement organizations into the coalition. These organizations must also be open to the message evolving through a process of co-creation and deliberation. On this point, the descriptions of “converting” and “co-evolving” as the respective theories of change in social movement and collaborative planning are overly simplistic. There are aspects of co-evolving that can be found in the social movement planning style as well.

²⁰ Innes and Booher, “Collaborative policymaking,” 53-4.
²¹ Innes and Gruber, “Planning styles in conflict,” 183.
Figure 2: Four Styles of Planning – Conditions for their use and their theories of changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity of Interests</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Bureaucratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Convincing</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Converting</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Co-opting</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Co-evolving</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Innes and Gruber, “Planning styles in conflict,” (2005)

**Collaboration and DIAD in Organizing**

Despite the chasm created by the simple descriptive dichotomy of conflict and collaboration, there is much in common between the practice of community organizing and collaborative planning. Some scholars have separately identified that the DIAD prerequisites to collaboration are also required characteristics for successful community organizing.

**Interdependence**

Speer and Hughey, equating community organizing to a natural system, use an ecological metaphor in which they emphasize the importance of interdependence at the individual, organizational and community level of analysis. They note “individual congregations often join forces with other organized congregations to create the power necessary to move community-level issues. These federated organizations are fashioned out of coinciding organizational interests of single congregations—interdependence.”

22 Speer and Hughey, “Community organizing,” 740.
The importance of interdependence, often phrased in other terms such as solidarity, is well established in community organizing and social movements. The philosophy of community organizing is about creating power from organized people. This is summarized in a phrase often used to describe the philosophy of Saul Alinsky, “Power goes to two poles: to those who’ve got money and those who’ve got people.” This power only comes from organization and acting together. For communities as well as other organized bodies like labor unions, the support of people is what they have and what other parties want. In the language of DIAD, community organizing can make the interdependence of interests—that community members have things they share and other interests want—clearer in situations where they had been previously obscured by a lack of aggregation.

_Diversity_

Other authors have noted the importance of diversity for bringing new energy and power to organizing. Michael Eichler, a major proponent of “consensus organizing” methods, describes the outcome of a youth organizing project in Brooklyn, “They have struggled with the complexities of diversity and gained skills and experience, which has both energized and humbled them…[W]e must encourage and develop organizers who can find the commonalities among seemingly divergent people.” The growing focus on long-term alliances and networks between different social movements is another example of recognition of the increased knowledge and power available from diversity. These developments are especially notable on

---

23 Eichler, “Consensus Organizing: Look to the Future, Learn from the Past.”
environmental justice\textsuperscript{24} and community-labor issues\textsuperscript{25} and regional planning\textsuperscript{26} but are demonstrated in other issues as well.

Although social movements have been successful in enabling a voice in society for disempowered populations, thereby encouraging more diversity in public policy processes, embracing diversity within the movements themselves has been a struggle. Social movement organizations have historically faced challenges when moving beyond narrowly defined interest group or identity-based politics. Following the turmoil of the late 1960s and 1970s, interest group politics emerged as the dominant mode of operation among progressive organizations. Single-issue groups with narrow advocacy and organizing agendas have since proliferated. These groups are largely organized around the issues of labor, environment, or social equity but come in a thousand flavors within each of those broad categories. Each of these groups pushes to have their issue at the top of the policy-making agenda and often end up competing rather than collaborating to promote a larger progressive agenda.

Attempts to overcome these dynamics and build coalitions and alliances within the progressive movement have been made. Recent examples include the emergence of labor-community collaboration on the local and regional scale supported by national level organizations and the development of labor-environment agenda mostly on the national level. These separate efforts have begun to intersect with the proliferation of local green economic development initiatives.

\textsuperscript{24} Faber and McCarthy, “The Evolving Structure of the Environmental Justice Movement in the United States.”
\textsuperscript{25} Dean and Reynolds, \textit{A New New Deal: How Regional Activism will Reshape the American Labor Movement}.
\textsuperscript{26} Pastor, Benner, and Matsuoka, \textit{This Could Be the Start of Something Big}.
**Authentic Dialogue**

It is important to also point out that, although less common, authentic dialogue can happen in planning situations that are not collaborative. Again, this is required in a long-term alliance model of social movement planning. Participants in these alliances require similar development of reciprocity, relationships, learning, and creativity through acting under conditions of sincerity, accuracy, comprehensibility, and legitimacy in authentic dialogue as identified in successful collaborative planning situations. Additionally, the staff members of the convening organization in these alliance often act as mediators—anticipating points of conflict, suggesting options, and equalizing power around the table through guaranteeing a certain level of voice and resources to participants.

**The Co-benefits of Collaborative Planning and Social Movement Organizing**

The collaborative and social movement organizing models of planning have much more in common than is often recognized. If used properly, these approaches can provide an important dialectic in the development of problem solving and the structure of power. Organizing can help create an opportunity for collaboration and serve to keep dialogue authentic. Frequently issues have to be intractable before collaborative methods are considered. The diversity of interests concerned must be organized to express their perspectives in order for policy makers to recognize the complexity of the issue. Community-based and other movement organizations make sure that the interests of disadvantaged populations are organized and then heard. As Alinsky says, “No one can negotiate without the power to compel negotiation.”

Likewise, organizing can help make interdependence clear when populations that were

---

previously ambivalent or in tacit support begin to express interest in an issue or withhold support. Even when a collaborative process is underway organizing techniques can be used to attract public attention if the conditions of authentic dialogue are not being met and to demonstrate and improve alternatives to a negotiated agreement for the organizing group.

Although certainly not the only important variable, there seems to be some correlation between states and regions that embrace collaborative planning and strong civil society and organizing traditions (e.g. San Francisco Bay Area, Los Angeles, Massachusetts).

Perhaps the value that organizing contributes can best be summarized as authentic representation. Through methods of democracy, accountability to their membership and aggregation of interdependent interests, social movement organizations can act as authentic representatives of a subset of interests. This aggregation and accountability serves to create organizations at scales that can be recognized by other stakeholders and organizations with the necessary capacity to engage in policy and planning processes.

Collaboration can also bring new resources and opportunities to organizing groups. Once their interdependence with organizing groups is recognized by other stakeholders, the perception of the value of organizing groups can grow from being seen simply as an absence of opposition into an asset in helping to implement plans. As this happens organizing will move from being perceived as an activity at the margins to an essential piece of community development and other issues. This new recognition will likely provide more opportunities for funding from public, private and foundation entities and opportunities to participate in implementing components of plans and leverage them to expand organizing activities. In this sense, rather than taking power from social movements, participating in collaborative planning can more equally distribute power across a network of participants and in the process provide benefits to organizing groups.
Chapter 3: The Development of Network Power by Community Labor United

To test the hypothesis of compatibility between organizing and collaborative decision-making methods I will look at the case of Community Labor United (CLU), a long-term alliance of organizing groups in the Boston area. Collaboration between labor union and community groups has been central to its mission since its founding. More recently it has also begun engaging in collaboration with organizations outside of the organizing tradition. I will use the DIAD framework to describe and evaluate the presence of these important variables in the development of CLU and its work to establish network power within the alliance and with actors outside of it. Booher and Innes describe the steps in the emergence of network power as

1. Diverse participants in a network focus on a common task and develop shared meaning and common heuristics that guide their action.  
2. The power grows as these players identify and build on their interdependencies to create new potential.  
3. In the process, innovations and novel responses to environmental stresses can emerge.  
4. These innovations in turn make possible adaptive change and constructive joint action.  

I hope to describe how those steps have played out in the story of CLU. In particular, I focus on the development of CLU’s internal deliberation and joint campaign planning culture. I also look at their balance of collaborative insider and confrontational outsider strategies in the regulatory process of the Massachusetts Energy Efficiency Advisory Council.

Methods

My primary data comes from a series of twenty-six individual, semi-structured interviews lasting between a half-hour and two hours conducted between December 2009 and February 2010. These interviews were focused on stakeholders to my research case: Community Labor

---

United and their engagement in the regulation and program design of energy efficiency implementation in Massachusetts. The interviews included all six of the staff members of CLU as February 2010; eight staff at member organizations of CLU or the CLU-convened Green Justice Coalition (including five from community groups, two from labor union organizations, and one from an environmental group); four employees of utility companies or efficiency sector businesses; two career government officials; two voting, non-government representatives to the stakeholder-based regulatory process; and four funders and other members of the non-profit green development sector in the Boston area. Additionally, I spent a few hours every week for the span of two months observing the operation of the CLU offices and attended various CLU committee meetings and working groups as well as a meeting of the Energy Efficiency Advisory Council.

Throughout this research, I reviewed literature on the environmental justice movement, social movement organizing, collaborative planning, and efforts to create shared action across the movements of progressive politics. I also reviewed a number of primary written sources from organizations working on community-based implementation of energy efficiency, with a particular focus on internal documents from the development of Community Labor United and the Energy Efficiency Advisory Council.

**Community Labor United and the Green Justice Coalition**

Community Labor United (CLU) was founded in 2004 to be a long-term, progressive movement-building alliance for the Boston area. It has a central focus on supporting the work of labor unions and community organizations that practice base-building organizing. This is reflected in its mission statement:
Our mission is to move strategic campaigns combining the joint power of community-based organizations and labor unions in order to protect and promote the interests of low and middle-income working families in the greater Boston area. Through a program of coalition building, research and policy development, public education and grassroots mobilization, we will move forward policies that promote quality jobs, secure healthcare and affordable housing for all of the Boston area's working people.\(^\text{30}\)

CLU’s founder and co-director, Lisa Clauson, described what she aimed to create with the organization:

> [W]e set up CLU to be a coalition of organizations. I also wanted it to be partner organization-driven and not so much staff-driven in terms of what campaigns to take on, what issues to move… So I wanted to setup a structure where there was clear accountability across organizations.

CLU, like similar labor-community alliances in other cities, was initiated by the regional labor council, the Greater Boston Labor Council. This regional community-labor coalition model, developed in California in the late 1990s, has been dubbed the Regional Power Building model.\(^\text{31}\) Clauson’s vision for CLU emerged from knowledge of this model but also from her thirteen years of experience working at the Massachusetts office of the community organization Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN). At ACORN she had worked with local union leadership on the Boston Living Wage Ordinance campaign and at the state-level on state minimum wage increases. Her role as a labor union outsider who was trusted by labor leadership afforded her a unique position from which to construct an alliance with an orientation that moved beyond a labor-centric model.

The CLU member organizations represent a racially, ethnically and geographically diverse swath of the Boston area. The main leadership and decision-making body of Community Labor United, the Strategy Committee, provides an example of how CLU’s diversity of interests

---

\(^{30}\)“Our Mission and Goals | CLU | Community Labor United.”

is managed to ensure its legitimacy is maintained among all members. It is composed of equal numbers of community groups and labor unions (Table 1). All Strategy Committee organizations are organizing groups, meaning that they are actively seeking new members. The Strategy Committee is a standing body that evaluates and decides which campaign opportunities, research reports, and potential members to pursue.

Table 1: Strategy Committee of Community Labor United (February 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base building community groups</th>
<th>Labor Unions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alternatives for Community and Environment (ACE)</td>
<td>1. Boston Teachers' Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chinese Progressive Association</td>
<td>5. SEIU Local 1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. City Life/Vida Urbana</td>
<td>6. SEIU Local 615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mass Affordable Housing Alliance</td>
<td>7. UFCW Local 1445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Project RIGHT</td>
<td>8. UNITE HERE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLU has run three campaigns. The first was a joint campaign between the Painters Union and community groups to win a union contract to paint Boston Public Schools and simultaneously provide jobs with good pay, training and union membership to residents of the communities surrounding the schools. The second campaign was a partnership between the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) and a number of community groups to organize security workers in downtown Boston office buildings and simultaneously negotiate benefits, such as foreclosure protection, for the communities in which the majority of the workers lived.

Most recently, CLU embarked on a multi-phase, statewide, community-group-led campaign with an expanded coalition focused on environmental justice, dubbed the Green Justice Coalition (GJC). Although CLU is not an environmental justice organization at the initiation of this campaign they adopted an environmental justice frame as their primary approach to messaging and organizing. This campaign has required building out their coalition
geographically and sectorally to include environmental, faith-based, and workforce development organizations across the state.

Each campaign that CLU runs has its own leadership body made up of representatives from interested member organizations. Interest from diverse membership is verified through an exploratory phase at the beginning of the campaign development process. This exploratory phase, described in detail in a later section, allows CLU member groups to opt-in to a campaign when they recognize an interdependence of interests on the issue. Not all members are involved in every campaign. For example, the Green Justice Coalition, has been largely led by community organizations and supported by unions representing the building trades (Table 2).

The Green Justice Coalition, as a statewide campaign, draws leadership from across the state. The maps in Figure 3 show the geographic diversity of CLU through displaying the office locations of the Green Justice Coalition Steering Committee members in Massachusetts and Boston.

Table 2: The Steering Committee of the Green Justice Coalition (February 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base building Community Groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alternatives for Community &amp; Environment (ACE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alliance to Develop Power (ADP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New England United for Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Boston Workers’ Alliance (BWA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chelsea Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Chinese Progressive Association (CPA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Coalition Against Poverty/Coalition for Social Justice (CAP/CSJ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative (DSNI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Greater Four Corners Action Coalition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. MassCOSH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Neighbor to Neighbor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Project RIGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizing Labor Unions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Laborers’ New England Regional Organizing Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. New England Council of Carpenters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Painters &amp; Allied Trades DC35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Utility Workers Union of America Local 369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Boston Climate Action Network (BCAN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Clean Water Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Massachusetts Energy Consumers Alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLU is one of many organizations around the country acting at the regional scale to shift the direction of economic development in their communities. CLU is connected to these other organizations and networks through national affiliations. CLU is a long-time member of the Partnership for Working Families, and the Green Justice Coalition is a local affiliate of the
Apollo Alliance. These organizations are national alliances with regional chapters that, like CLU itself, are focused on building long-term relationships and taking mutually beneficial action among various progressive constituencies. The Partnership for Working Families focuses on building relationships between labor unions and community groups, particularly in low-income communities and communities of color. The Apollo Alliance focuses specifically on creating common frames and action across progressive movements around a transition to a clean energy economy that creates broad benefits for working Americans, including the creation of family-supporting jobs with career ladders. These affiliations provide CLU and GJC with technical support and a community of learning.

The following sections focus on two venues of collaboration from the history of CLU: developing an internal culture of joint deliberation and joint campaign action, and engaging collaboratively with non-social movement public and private actors in the planning and implementation of energy efficiency programs through the Green Justice Coalition. The DIAD variables of diversity, interdependence and authentic dialogue were present and played an important role in the development of collaboration in each of these situations.

**Developing an Internal Culture of Joint Deliberation and Joint Campaign Action**

**Membership Diversity and Interdependence**

At CLU’s founding, Lisa Clauson established criteria for membership in the organization as well as guiding principles for selecting campaigns. The criteria allowed for recruiting a diversity of types of organizations, while limiting the number of member organizations to a manageable number and ensuring that members had some obvious shared identities and
interdependencies to start with. These shared characteristics allow for movement co-development and organizing between two diverse movements, a process that can be fraught with difficulties, to happen under conditions of greater certainty.

Initially I spent six months doing one-on-ones with a bunch of organizations about their interests and ended up having many more organizations interested in getting engaged with CLU than seemed feasible to not be too process-focused. So we setup a set of criteria for organizations of who would get engaged. We decided it would focus in on groups that were organizing, [those that] [1] had a similar constituency of low- and moderate-income communities or workers that were [2] aggressively doing new organizing and not just maintaining the membership base, and [3] where there was a commitment of senior staff to participate in the work.

Overlapping constituencies, some shared methods, and a common level of commitment provided a particular vision of interdependence and diversity that would help to ensure that the organization was quickly seen as valuable and legitimate to most members. Through the membership criteria there was immediate agreement among members on a general definition of the problem (marginalization of low and moderate income people in economic and political process), an general approach to problem solving (empowerment of low and moderate income people through base-building), and the start of a common identity (base-building organizations that draw their power from their memberships, all committed to working together over the long-term for common benefits). Additionally, shared interdependencies such as common geography and issues of interest that no single group can successfully address by themselves provides incentive for the group to come together and stay together. These commonalities were further amplified through CLU’s activities.

The Foundational Relationships of CLU

There is a long history of tension between labor unions and communities of color in the United States. This is especially true in Boston where, for example, disagreement on issues of
integration and school busing turned into physical violence between white and black working class communities in the 1970s. Soledad Boyd, a Senior Organizer at CLU and former organizer at City Life/Vida Urbana as CLU member organization, describes how this has impacted the development of working relationships within the coalition.

[Integration of workers from communities of color into unions] is not going to happen overnight, and the bad feelings… You have got to realize that some of these [community group] folks when they are looking across the table at a union guy, white union guy, they are looking and they’re saying, whether it is the actual person, they’re saying, ‘That’s the kid that threw the rock at me when I was bused to South Boston High.’ They hear the voice, they hear the whole South Boston patois or whatever and that is what they see. Those tensions run deep. ‘OK, they were throwing rocks at me when I was a kid. They were locking me out of the unions when I was a young adult…’

One of the initial challenges that CLU faced in trying to move beyond this dysfunctional past was to balance the need to build trust between its labor and community organizations with the need to have an “win.” A shared win early on was needed to prove CLU’s value, build momentum, and retain the commitment of its member organizations. In order to make progress on both of these needs, CLU organizations embarked on a series of meetings and activities to learn about each other and simultaneously search for campaigns that would benefit both community and labor groups. This process was the beginning of creating an internal deliberative culture within CLU.

One of these meetings was a Leadership Institute run by Amy Dean, a founder of Working Partnerships USA, one of the first regional power building coalitions. Lisa Clauson, articulated that the goal of the meeting was
to help [CLU member organizations] think through labor understanding community interests, community understanding labor interests and therefore putting self-interest on the table, understanding those self-interests, and out of that coming up with goals and priorities for the organization. … I think it was very useful and eye opening for many of the organizations to understand each other’s organizations in the same terms that they use, in terms of members and what does membership mean and how many members do they have. Most of the community partners had no clue about the details of the different
unions at the table and some of them had little clue about each other as well. And
definitely the unions at the table had no clue about the community partners and the type
of organizing that they do. It was exciting to kind of see the connections and then from
the discussion, from the get-go we were always talking about potential issues and
potential campaigns. It was exciting to see how quickly people realized the self-interest
that they do have in the overlap of issues that come and different approaches to it.

Clauson also described how storytelling was used as a departure point to establish self-interest
and learn about points of commonality and difference. The emergence of empathy and
reciprocity out of the storytelling became a starting point for developing relationships.

For example, I believe it was Brazilian Immigrants Center talking about the problems of
day labor work and how people find jobs waiting outside of Dunkin Donuts or Home
Depot and the different ways that they get taken advantage of and trying to understand
where were there some potential campaigns that could get at those different issues. The
Painters [Union] immediately, kind of getting very excited about how that looks and how
they are dealing with day-laborers around what happens on the jobs and how they are
undercutting the work of their union contractors, but a desire not to go after the worker
but instead try to figure out ways to fold them into the union and make the work that they
are doing Union as well. The synerg[y] across that [issue] was exciting to be a part of.

This meeting was soon followed by another that focused more heavily on the application
of the accumulated knowledge and interests of individual groups to the creation ideas for
mutually beneficial campaigns. Clauson describes this second gathering as

a meeting where we evaluated potential campaigns and deciding on the first campaign for
the organization and doing kind of a power analysis together of potential issues, and who
we would be taking on, and which organizations were down for which fights, where there
might be fights that might divide us that clearly did not make sense for us to be taking on
initially as an emerging organizations. And again I think that process and the
commitment, ownership of the organizations at the table was exciting to be a part of.

Participants were able to speak with increasing openness about their interests and therefore were
able to approach points of difference with respect, empathy, creativity and an interest in learning.

Clauson describes how the admission of differences paradoxically led to the recognition of the
value of working together.

[T]here was a definite interest from…a couple of [community] groups to take on the
Boston Redevelopment Authority [BRA] and how development gets done in Boston, and
kind of what a crazy process it is that there is no City Council oversight, there is no Planning Department, it is just the Mayor and the Mayor’s folks at the BRA who have such total control over the development process. It has very much not worked for them and their issues on affordable housing and land control issues…[But the unions said], ‘Look, it totally works for us. We like the Mayor and the system works. Through this process the Mayor forces developers to agree to building things Union. And if you take on this campaign we are going to be on the other side of the fight with you on it.’ That could have been a very divisive moment and it could have kind of torn apart the coalition before we even started, but there was just really good discussion of people understanding each others self-interest, of understanding where organizations are coming from, and understanding that there are going to be issues on which we do not agree upon, but there is still enough value for each organization of what they can get out of this emerging coalition for them to stay in it. Even though their primary issue was not going to be taken on in the case of [those community groups] they still wanted to be a part of what was being built.

Lydia Lowe, the Executive Director of the Chinese Progressive Association (CPA), a CLU member, describes the emotional importance of this sort of meeting and its relevance toward building reciprocity, and later trust and ongoing relationships.

There was a garment factory in New Bedford that was raided by Immigration. CLU had this somewhat impromptu discussion about the raid, and about immigration and immigrant workers rights…. And the union representatives in that discussion they were really struggling with that discussion in a really honest way. I thought that was very moving. It kind of made me feel like more positive about the potential of this, building the community-labor alliance as a progressive force.

These experiences of storytelling, empathy, and authentic dialogue were important for members to develop a shared understanding of CLU as a long-term, member-driven alliance.

Lowe describes its importance to her:

[T]here was kind of a whole year or more that was mostly relationship building and the different partners learning about each other. So we went to different organizations, different union halls, and community organizations to meet and then to tell about those different organizations so that we would have more appreciation and understand of where we were both coming from. And then we tried to do a little bit of mapping who our constituencies and membership were, what are the issues we are working around. Having that basic level of information really laid the groundwork for us to then consider campaigns. And to look at those campaigns not just for the sake of an immediate, short-term campaign, but to think about it in terms of how it would help build this alliance.
Power within the Alliance

Beyond facilitating and providing a venue for authentic dialogue, CLU helps to ensure that the dialogue is seen as representative and legitimate to all member organizations through efforts to equalize power within the structure of the alliance. CLU has adapted many methods of accountability and democracy found within its member organizations for use at the alliance scale. CLU’s governance is designed to ensure accountability, opportunities for involvement of all members, and the provision of resources to member organizations with less capacity.

The vision of CLU as a long-term alliance in which capacity to collaborate and network power increases over time has required constant attention to issues of power. Penn Loh, former Executive Director of Alternatives for Community and Environment (ACE), a CLU member, and professor at Tufts University, describes.

CLU is in itself a coalition structure. But they operate…I would say the difference between a short-term coalition and a long-term alliance. They really function as a long-term alliance. They have tried to adapt different methods of group accountability and democracy that you find more commonly in community-based organizations. So more bottom-up type stuff within an alliance structure. That is why I would say that there is no major, major policy decisions that get made without them checking back with folks and having some sort of explicit group discussion and sanctioning of it.

The focus on equality and accountability is evidenced by the diversity and interdependence of CLU’s governing bodies and their emphasis on consensus-based decision-making.

CLU also supports leadership and capacity development among its member organizations. The alliance plays the role of a base-building organization, but with a twist: its base consists of other base-building organizations. CLU co-director Darlene Lombos describes how the backgrounds of CLU staff in base-building organizing groups has influenced their approach to developing the alliance.

[A CLU] organizer’s job is to figure out ways in which to increase leadership and participation at all levels, just the same as in a base-building group… [O]rganizations that
are highly involved that are highly participatory, we try to get them to support other organizations in thinking through how they can get their entire organization participating and involved. So organizing for us also becomes supporting other folks in interacting and developing those relationships and supporting each other and organizing… It is our job as coalition organizers and as base building groups to always have a very deliberate, intentional plan for increasing that leadership, for finding opportunities for participation and engagement across the board.

However, for CLU, working through an alliance structure does imply some differences. It requires a much larger emphasis on complementing and facilitating the work of other organizations and avoiding competition with them. The issue of maximizing support and minimizing competition was a central consideration as Clauson was developing the structure of CLU:

I didn’t want the entity that we built, CLU, to be sucking a lot of resources from the community organizing groups, because we would be competing for some of the same funds. We would be applying to grants to fund the work. And that inevitably sets us in competition with some of our community partners… So I also wanted to create CLU as something that was not staff-heavy, leaner and also used the organizing that we were doing to drive resources to the community partners.

CLU has engaged in both re-granting of funds to its members and in co-writing of grant applications to foundations with its members. Lombos describes how this approach of fundraising work helps to facilitate the work of the alliance.

So while we are fundraising, we are fundraising for our members groups as well. Or at least connecting them to the groups, saying that, ‘the strength of our coalition is the strength of our member groups and if you can’t fund them you shouldn’t be funding us necessarily.’ Many of the foundations that really like us and want to fund us will fund other groups in our coalition, which is great. [2009] has been a big year for us to be able to leverage funds because of [the Green Justice Coalition], because it is a statewide campaign, because we have a couple of foundations that really believe in CLU and the model.

These re-granted funds have gone exclusively to community group members because of their dependency on foundation funding. In contrast, union members have their own regular streams
of revenue from individual member dues. These funds allow community group members to devote more time to and to more consistently participate in the activities of the alliance.

Constantly focusing resources, accountability, and leadership development on the needs of the member organizations to be able to participate in a long-term alliance has allowed CLU to establish legitimacy and develop capacity among its members. CLU was founded on the notion that its diverse member organizations will disagree on many things, but they can still find common goals that they can better advance together. For the CLU organizations, the bridging of their previously unarticulated interconnection of interests was made possible through a long-term commitment to ensuring legitimate and authentic representation and developing authentic dialogue to build reciprocity, trust and a search for shared opportunities.

Building a Shared Identity through Joint Campaign Action

The insistence on finding campaigns both with mutual benefit and that draw joint commitment means that shared interests are emphasized even as differences are recognized. This does not mean that benefits from and commitments to a particular campaign are necessarily equal, just that enough common interest and value is perceived to justify a continued collaboration. Although the existence of common interests can be established through deliberation, for many parties establishing it conceptually means very little until it is proven through action. In order to provide a venue for shared experience and to create concrete results from its work, CLU puts a heavy emphasis on joint campaign work. Lombos describes the importance of experiencing common interests rather than just talking about them:

[CLU is] very committed to concrete campaign work as opposed to coming together for ‘solidarity’ and ‘helping each other out.’… [Building trust] really is about the day-to-day getting your leaders out in the street, seeing each other in the street together that really makes that bond much more concrete. So I liked the fact that [CLU] was concentrating
on joint campaign work, that the idea was to try to find a campaign that would expand
organizing for both the union and community group, expand membership, and also deal
with the issues and concerns of both constituencies.

Lombos describes a memorable shift in identity and relationships through action from
CLU’s “Secure Jobs, Secure Communities” campaign:

[Un]ions typically go out and do a blitz, where they go out for about a week or two, from
6am to 6pm or however late. Go out to the workplace, go out to the homes. Try to catch
as many potential union members as they can. We actually got a bunch of our
community groups to do the blitz with them. And the union did pay stipends for folks in
the community to go out in the community to make that connection. ‘You live in my
neighborhood. I live here. You should join the union.’ That was the idea of it. …I went
out with a woman from Boston Workers Alliance … We go into one of the buildings
downtown. It was during one of the morning shifts. There was this woman she was
trying to convince to sign a postcard. She was very union friendly. … And then they
realized that they knew mutual people, they had shared at some point a neighborhood
they lived in, they had shared some experience at some church. And I just thought it was
beautiful. I just thought ‘this is what is it. It is about people seeing themselves not as
workers, not as working on community issues but as a community.’ A working class
community who is fighting for justice in a ways that we have shared interest, shared goals
shared targets. And having her and also our other community members go out and do the
blitz with the union, really helped the union.

Joint action can serve as a form of authentic dialogue. Through joint action participants
can co-construct shared identities, meanings and heuristics. These actions provide an
opportunity to develop new capacity for innovation and adaptation to changing circumstances.
Without shared action the alliance is not helping to develop the capacity of its members to
exercise network power. Penn Loh notes that the creation of shared experiences and identity are
why CLU staff spend much of their time engaging in deliberation and leadership development
with their member organizations even when it might be easier to do it themselves:

I would say that [CLU] staff are very, very careful about keeping people involved
because they understand that if they end up doing all the work and calling all the shots
and getting people to kind of rubber stamp it then you are not really running an alliance.
You are running your own show and having some window dressing to go along with it.
And those people won’t materialize when you really need to exercise your strength.
To CLU, shared action and leadership development, in addition to deliberative efforts to identify shared interests and opportunities for mutual gains, serve as forms of authentic dialogue. These methods provide the ability to develop reciprocity, trust, relationships, learning and creativity.

Creating a Shared Meaning of “Green Justice”

In 2007, Alternatives for Community and Environment (ACE), one of CLU’s founding member groups, and CLU staff began to explore the concepts of green jobs and green economy and their applicability to CLU. ACE, as a community group with an environmental justice focus, had already done some work internally toward developing green jobs programming and was the only CLU member group who had much experience with environmental issues. Out of these discussions emerged the “Principles of Green Justice,” written largely by Penn Loh, ACE’s director at the time. These principles had a strong focus on high-quality jobs with good pay and career opportunities, because there was concern that these components were likely to be lost in the phrase “green jobs.” Instead the phrase “green justice” was chosen to express that CLU’s focus was not on creating any kind of jobs, but rather on creating good jobs in communities that had not received the economic benefits from pollution and were instead carrying a disproportionate burden of the environmental hazards created.

Importantly, the “green justice” framework put a strong emphasis on economic transformation and would eventually articulate concrete ways to shift a particular industry as a starting point. This important distinction from other framings of green jobs or green development emerges directly out of CLUs emphasis on base-building and regional power building. A more narrow formulation of green jobs has often been interpreted to mean sector-specific job training, job placement programs, and technical assistance for contractors,
sometimes targeted to benefit low-income and minority populations. To CLU, this definition would not have been appropriate because it would only give benefits to those directly involved in the programs and fail to build power for workers or community members more broadly.

The deliberative process that led to the development of the Green Justice Principles into a campaign started as a discussion among the staff of a few member organizations, expanded to community groups who were interested, and then to interested labor unions. During the entire time, the growing cohort consulted periodically with the CLU Strategy Committee to ensure their continued support. This particular sequencing was chosen because CLU leadership felt it was important to have a community-driven campaign after two campaigns that were more strongly oriented toward the interests of its union members. At each point in the process CLU staff were looking to improve their working idea of the campaign and to learn if the campaign would be valuable to a critical mass of members. Penn Loh describes the sequencing:

“I was pretty involved in drafting some initial principles, an initial vision statement. By the end of ’07, early ’08 we kind of had those things and CLU started to convene the community groups in the alliance that they thought who would be most interested in having the discussion and seeing if that was something that they would want to turn into a CLU campaign. Starting in early ’08 we went through that process. We probably convened, I want to say, three or four meetings. The CLU staff did a lot of one-on-ones with individual groups to assess their interest, their capacity, how they saw this approach. And out of that, a number of groups came and said ‘we have to be doing this thing.’…”

We went through some real dialogue around this vision statement and principles and I think people felt pretty good about it. But at that point it was still exclusively a community group discussion. CLU very intentionally did not bring in labor at that point. Because they felt ‘we want this campaign to be founded on principles that the community groups feel ownership over and then we will try to pull in the progressive elements of labor that we think really get it and will back it.’…”

They brought a bunch of these discussions to the board level as well to do a bit of education and to see if the board thought this was something really worth investing in. At the same time once we had this vision and principles, there was a basis to go out and talk to the other members of CLU and then to convene the strategy committee which would decide formally should we move ahead with this or not.
Broad recognition of the importance of equal voice between community and labor groups and the trust built between the member organizations through previous campaigns allowed CLU to take a strategic and deliberate approach to the development of the Green Justice campaign. It was designed to be a community-driven, concept-oriented campaign as opposed to the labor-driven, target-oriented model of the Painters and Security Workers campaigns. The result was a campaign more ambitious and complex than any of CLU’s previous. Their starting point with a concept of “green justice” would eventually lead CLU into multi-year engagement in statewide energy policy and implementation, completely new territory—in terms of timescale, topic and geography—for CLU.

Discussion

As a long-term alliance, CLU’s organizational mission is to unite diverse groups around issues of common concern and interdependence. CLU aims to build working relationships, increase collaboration, and bring an adaptable structure to interactions between progressive social movements. Ultimately, CLU has the goal of co-creating a shared frame and shared power among a network of progressive social movement organizations in the Boston area. CLU has emphasized both joint dialogue and joint action. Authentic dialogue has helped to build reciprocity, relationships, and opportunities for mutual learning and creativity. Joint action toward common goals has facilitated the development of shared meanings, identities and innovations in the face of uncertainty.

Although CLU has components of each of the DIAD characteristics, as a long-term alliance, it intentionally does not meet the complete Booher and Innes criteria for a collaborative planning. This is because it does not make an effort to include the full diversity of
interdependent interests on a particular issue. Instead, CLU puts an intentional emphasis on providing a venue for diverse perspectives from progressive organizing groups that have typically been excluded from policy making. CLU’s purpose is to give a voice to stakeholders who would not have been included in a policy process. This alliance is intended to use the diversity and interdependence of this subgroup of policy stakeholders to develop capacity for collaboration and the application of network power among its participants. These limited diversities and closely aligned interdependencies make managing the group simpler and more sustainable compared to managing a full group of stakeholders.

Even more importantly, CLU’s long-term alliance aggregates the interests of its member organizations through accountable, democratic procedures to create authentic representation. Authentic representation at the alliance scale can be used to increase the voice of the member groups on their issues of common interest and will increase the likelihood that other stakeholders will recognize the importance of the diversity and interdependence of the alliance members to the resolution of related policy issues and engage them in authentic dialogue. Organizing at the alliance scale provides an opportunity to create increased social capital through network power. CLU has done this through identifying common issues and approaches such as the articulation of the Principles of Green Justice, which have resulted in the recognition of community and labor organizations as stakeholders in environmental and energy policy.

Beyond providing a venue for dialogue, CLU also acts as a mediator among its member organizations.\(^{32}\) The staff and leadership of CLU anticipate points of agreement and disagreement among the membership, work to equalize influence and resources within the alliance, and ensure that membership in the alliance creates value to all members. Although

\(^{32}\) For a description of the roles of mediators see Elliott, “The role of facilitators, mediators, and other consensus building practitioners.”
CLU cannot reconcile power differences between the members in their activities outside the alliance, voice and influence within the workings of the alliance can be affected. The sequencing of discussions has been an important part of CLU’s deliberative activities. Sequencing serves as a way for the convener to understand different interests and anticipate points of conflict on an issue before a conversation takes place among diverse stakeholders. Additionally, deliberative processes at different scales have served different purposes. One-on-one meetings, meetings with a particular group of stakeholders, and meetings between groups can provide different functions on a spectrum from clarifying interests to understanding the interests of others. Additionally participation in the CLU alliance encourages members to know their interests, hold out for them, and to be accountable to and in constant dialogue with their own constituencies. All of this happens through articulating their self-interests in dialogue with other members and through exploring new approaches to working with other organizations.

An Outsider Within the Policy-making Process

Engaging in Public Collaborative Planning through the Energy Efficiency Advisory Council

Green Justice was the first CLU campaign that was developed from the articulation of a concept rather than identification of an organizing target. It was not born out of a short-term focus on meeting an immediate need that fit into the alliance’s existing approach. Instead it was formed through the articulation of a new common frame that was then applied to identify an appropriate campaign. “The Principles of Green Justice” and a detailed conceptual report were formulated before there was a strong sense of what the campaign would look like on the ground.
Eventually CLU would find itself engaged in another deliberative process, but this time they would be collaborating with non-movement actors in an official policy-making capacity.

Even two years into its conceptual development, the substance of the Green Justice campaign was still unclear. In early 2009, Mary Jo Connelly, CLU’s Research Director, developed a “Pots of Money” diagram that showed the different sources of money for green investments. According to her research, the source with the greatest amount of money annually and the most enduring future funding stream was the state-regulated utility energy efficiency programs. Additionally, allocations for these funds were in the midst of a planning process. This was the result of the Green Communities Act (GCA) passed in June 2008, which pushed for increased spending, aggressive goals and new approaches to energy efficiency. Because of the amount of resources available to utility-administered energy efficiency programs, Green Justice members chose to influence the regulation of these programs. The planning process for these programs was to happen through the Energy Efficiency Advisory Council (EEAC, or The Council, in some quotations), a newly created statewide, stakeholder-based advisory body charged with overseeing the increase in efficiency spending through creating three-year plans with the utilities.

In the three-year planning process, the basis for setting efficiency goals and the process through which they would be established were still under development while the EEAC determined how to interpret the Green Communities Act. When CLU entered the process there were a lot of questions still unanswered. Relations among member of the EEAC and the public had not yet been established nor had a particular decision-making process become legitimated.

---

All stakeholders were beginning to adjust to new ideas of their goals and their roles. The change in regulatory mandate and procedures provided CLU an opportunity to engage in shaping them.

Utilities had administered energy efficiency programs for years prior to the passage of the Green Communities Act. These programs were funded by ratepayer fees from a system benefits charge (SBC) that was added to the price of every kilowatt-hour of electricity or therm of natural gas on a consumer’s bill. However these programs had set budgets based on the amount of money brought in by the SBC, and once the money was spent for the year the utilities were finished with their efficiency efforts. The Green Communities Act largely continued the same system for efficiency funding; however, it changed how spending was to be calculated. After its passage, instead of setting the systems benefits charge and efficiency program spending at politically palatable and easily achievable levels, these caps were lifted. The Green Communities Act called for all cost-effective efficiency to be achieved. In theory, this meant that any efficiency measures that could save one kilowatt of electricity at a cost less than generating one kilowatt should be undertaken. If implemented correctly, this would result in energy needs being met with less cost and with reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

The job of figuring out what the GCA meant in practice for regulation and spending was assigned by the Act to the new EEAC. The EEAC was tasked with developing Three-Year Plans for electrical and natural gas energy efficiency to be implemented by each utility in the state. The plans would then be submitted to the Department of Public Utilities for formal approval. The EEAC was the formalization of a collaborative planning process, called the Non-Utilities Parties (NUPs) process, also referred to as The Collaborative, which had been in operation in Massachusetts since 1989. The Collaborative was an informal forum through which
participating stakeholders could have input into utility plans before they entered the more rigid and formal regulatory process at the Department of Public Utilities.

The organization chairing of the EEAC, the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources (DOER), had by design included many of the same stakeholders in the new EEAC as had been in the NUPs process, mostly technical experts in energy efficiency from private and non-profit energy efficiency business, advocacy environmentalism, and state government. The full membership of the EEAC is listed in Table 3. While there are many similarities between the bodies, there are also a number of differences. Mike Sherman, Director Energy Efficiency Programs at DOER, compares the Collaborative and the EEAC:

The Council itself was conceived of as a more formalized extension of the Collaborative. The Collaborative operated entirely on consensus. It never had any rules. There were no votes. So it was a constant negotiation process.

While the organizations and personalities on the EEAC had been working together for years through the Collaborative they did have to adjust to their new officially sanctioned roles in the EEAC and to differences in operation. Simultaneously, they had the challenge of figuring out how to administer the biggest change in utility regulation in decades and the largest jump in energy efficiency spending in the state’s history. Penn Loh describes the significance of the shift to the EEAC:

So this Council creates a very interesting dynamic politically. It shakes up the very entrenched interest group, pluralist approach that there had been in this world, and very insular through the ‘90s. Not a lot of people were paying a lot of attention and energy issues hadn’t been linked as clearly to so many different issues as it is today. So a lot of the folks who have been doing this work have been in roughly the same small circle of people for the last 25 years. You have a bunch of people who are experts at this kind of stuff in DOER, they all got their start doing work in the low-income sector or many of them have worked as consultants to utilities or back and forth. It is like this layer of people who have been involved in this work for a long time and now the world has changed around them and many more people have interest in it.
Table 3: Membership of the Massachusetts Energy Efficiency Advisory Council (January 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Voting Members Appointment</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Consumers</td>
<td>Penn Loh</td>
<td>Tufts Univ. Dept. of Urban &amp; Environmental Policy and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Weatherization &amp; Fuel Assistance Network</td>
<td>Elliot Jacobson</td>
<td>Low-Income Energy Affordability Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Community</td>
<td>Jeremy McDiarmid</td>
<td>Environment Northeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses incl. Large C&amp;I End Users</td>
<td>Rick Mattila</td>
<td>Genzyme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Industry</td>
<td>Robert Rio</td>
<td>Associated Industries of MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency Experts</td>
<td>Heather Clark</td>
<td>WinnDevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized Labor</td>
<td>Charlie Harak</td>
<td>National Consumers Law Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Department of Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Lucy Edmondson</td>
<td>MA Department of Environmental Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Attorney General</td>
<td>Martha Coakley</td>
<td>MA Office of the Attorney General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Economic Development</td>
<td>Debra Hall</td>
<td>MA Department of Housing and Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Energy Resources</td>
<td>Phil Giudice</td>
<td>MA Department of Energy Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Non-voting Members Appointment</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency Business</td>
<td>Paul Gromer</td>
<td>Peregrine Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating Oil Industry</td>
<td>Michael Ferrante</td>
<td>Massachusetts Oilheat Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Light Compact</td>
<td>Kevin Galligan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTAR</td>
<td>Penni Conner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid</td>
<td>Tim Stout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Mass Electric</td>
<td>Dick Oswald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unil</td>
<td>George Gantz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay State Gas</td>
<td>Derek Buchler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone Gas</td>
<td>Andrew Newman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire Gas</td>
<td>Michael Sommer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Gas Company</td>
<td>Jody Steifel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EEAC Website, “Membership”
http://www.ma-eeac.org/docs/Docs%201-21-10/EEAC%20Membership%201-19-10.pdf

The EEAC differs from the Collaborative in that it does take votes when needed. However it still strives to act through consensus in the tradition established by the Collaborative. As the EEAC bylaws state:

The EEAC is intended to operate primarily through a process of consensus agreement. Statutory requirements require a vote for approval of statewide energy efficiency plans that come before the Council. In those cases, and in the cases where consensus on other matters cannot be reached, the Council will operate by majority vote, where a quorum is
required, and a majority of the voting members is sufficient to approve or reject a proposal.\textsuperscript{34}

Loh describes the practical implication of the collaborative and consensus-seeking approach:

[T]he Council was set up and became an organizing platform for the state, for the administration, to really push the utilities to go beyond the envelope, to go beyond their comfort zone...[I]n the end the EEAC is still advisory, but the levels of agreement, the amount of work that went into that process, the amount of political capital spent in that process really assured that whatever we got to real agreement on in the EEAC should give the DPU a real signal of ‘you know what, don’t mess with it. If they came to agreement, you should go with it.’

CLU and the members of the Green Justice Coalition had never been stakeholders in the advocacy world of the Collaborative and they came late to the formation of the EEAC, but as they became increasingly interested in how the regulation of utility energy efficiency could provide important benefits to communities and workers, CLU requested to fill the soon-to-be-vacant Residential Consumer seat on the EEAC and DOER approved the request. Jeremy Shenk, Senior Organizer with CLU, explains the reasoning behind joining the EEAC:

[D]uring the EEAC campaign we weren’t sure whether to play the insider or the outsider role. We thought originally that a couple other good groups on the EEAC would be insider and we would be outsider. We actually realized through that campaign that we had to do both.

Penn Loh, who had now transitioned to Tufts University as a Professor of the Practice in the Department of Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning, filled the insider position on the EEAC. Green Justice now had someone with official capacity set the agendas, push issues, and initiate research. Mike Prokosch, CLU’s Internal Organizer, describes the significance of getting someone on the EEAC:

Penn had the credentials and the chops to be a credible nominee and we campaigned hard to get him on. That was a critical step because then we had direct access to submit proposals. Penn was very careful, as the new kid on the block on the EEAC, to go slow,

kind of not push the point, assessed before he moved and figured out how to present things. But he was able to bring idea after idea, proposal after proposal within the EEAC and build relationships with other EEAC members as we were doing from the outside.

CLU also built their insider, collaborative credentials through meetings with each member of the EEAC individually, including the utilities who act as observers. Prokosch explains:

We had meetings with I think every member of the EEAC, even the ones that we knew weren’t going to be with us, which included CLU staff and member organizations. We were trying to build relationships in that way too.

Mary Jo Connelly describes further how these meetings were used to continue leadership development work among CLU members:

Our way of engaging was to figure out a way to be constructive and seen as contributing and raising questions that weren’t crazy, but not giving up our base-building, the fact that that was at the core of everything. That whoever we sent into meetings ideally included a representative of the base groups. If a meeting gets set up maybe one CLU staff or organizer goes and three or four people from the coalition go, representing the ones that have the biggest stake in it.

With Loh holding down a seat on the EEAC and CLU staff also building insider relationships, GJC was able to amplify an equity-based “green justice” framing of energy efficiency in the EEAC. At the same time, by working closely with other members of the EEAC, the Green Justice Coalition became party to the developing collaborative identity among the members. Because of Loh’s efforts, an Equity Committee of the EEAC was established to explore how to best ensure that equal access to efficiency programs and the resulting jobs.

Members of the EEAC now recognized that GJC was a part to their shared collaborative identity.

The interactions between EEAC and the GJC required both bodies to deal with higher levels of diversity and interdependence than they had previously. Because of its collaborative philosophy, the EEAC had to recognize that the GJC represented a group with a legitimate stake in the process and which had assets that could also provide value to the other participants. Also,
when GJC decided that it wanted to ensure that Green Justice concepts were integrated into the work of the EEAC, they were forced to expand their coalition—to include partners from around the state as well as from other interest groups such as environmentalism and faith communities—in order to be seen as a legitimate stakeholder on a statewide and traditionally technical issue.

“Outsider” Tactics Remain

Although CLU did participate in collaboration and negotiation through their representative on the EEAC and their constant meetings with the EEAC members, they intentionally complemented their insider tactics by also engaging in public confrontation. Clauson explains CLU’s reasoning for maintaining a dual approach:

What is key with this work always is having some forums created where…we have an ability to mobilize people and bring constituency into this work that will then hold them more accountable to the agenda that we are moving between those larger meetings.

The EEAC provided an opportunity to create such a forum because, as a public body, it is subject to public reporting requirements, public meetings open to the public, and requirements to take public comment. This was another major departure from the informal, professional, closed-door practices of the Collaborative. To CLU these changes were very important because it meant that decision-making on energy efficiency was now an issue that average people could learn about, participate in, and organize around. For CLU it provided a venue where they could engage in negotiation, and also organize confrontation. This second kind of attention was new and unwanted by most members of the EEAC. Many of the long-time members were used to being able to have technical conversations with each other and were not used to efficiency being of interest to the public. CLU’s engagement in EEAC process allowed them to use the professed
collaborative nature of the body as an opportunity to watchdog its openness and position themselves as upholding the values of democracy and transparency.

On July 14, 2009, after some lobbying to get the time on the agenda, the Green Justice Coalition engaged in the first of two “extended comment period” actions in which individual members from the coalition member organizations spoke to the EEAC about why equity in energy efficiency regulation was of personal importance to them. Soledad Boyd, Senior Organizer for CLU, describes how public transparency allowed CLU to shine a spotlight on the EEAC’s work and provide citizen input into the process.

We mobilized over a hundred people throughout our organizations that came to one of the EEAC meetings. And seeing the [EEAC] members having to be confronted with the power and the strength… I think that [the EEAC] felt that they could solve the problem of the people without including us. And having the ability to prove that point to them and have the people in their face. And people on [the EEAC]…being confronted with the disconnect between them and the people…was really a significant moment.

Beyond any impact on the direction of policy decisions or the frame that the EEAC was willing to consider, participating in action together played a signifying role for members of the coalition. “Green justice” was still a new concept for many of the long-term CLU members, and because of the statewide nature of the campaign, many new member organizations had been recruited and were still adapting to the diverse coalition and the environmental justice framing. Through action they were able to make the frame and the goals a little bit more concrete.

However, from the perspective of many EEAC members, the actions had little or no effect on their own approach to their responsibilities. Mike Sherman describes the event from his vantage point:

People made a lot of personal statements about their situations, some of them very heart wrenching, just kind of things that impacted them, either looking for jobs and sustainable career paths or what sort of things had suffered because everybody is poor and trying to pay their energy bills was another thing. It personally makes connections but to my mind I don’t think it changed a single thing about what we intended to do.
Clarifying his statement he says, “Thirty minutes of that was affecting; two hours of that was numbing. But at the end there were no alternatives to take away to consider so the whole event had essentially no effect.”

Finally, some members of EEAC described parts of the conflict-oriented approach as damaging to the working relationships of the body. In particular, CLU filed for “intervener” status in the process for approving the EEAC endorsed plans at the Department of Public Utilities. CLU attempted to get the DPU to insert pieces of their proposals that did not make it into the EEAC plans. Mike Sherman states:

[One thing they] did that was destructive, which I think hurt their credibility some, was in the hearing process…[W]e went through nine months last year of developing these three-year plans, the plans were debated and adopted by the Council, and then the utilities submitted the statewide and their individual plans to the DPU [for official adoption] at the end of October… What Green Justice did, which I thought was foolish, is that they were critical about a number of things but then they said that these faults were so bad that the DPU should not approve the plans, that they should basically send them back to the drawing board… And that was just a very poor tactic because there was just no way that that was going to happen. And so they didn’t build any credibility with the DPU.

Loh reflects on his mixed feelings about the outsider tactics used by the coalition in their approach to the EEAC:

What I’ve learned in my short time there is that Green Justice took kind of a frontal attack on it the same what the many of us in the community organizing world got used to having to confront decision makers. So we kind of figure out ‘Who’s the decision-maker? Who can we target? Who can give us what we want?’ and we go after them…And again it was interesting because it was not clear to me from being an insider on the EEAC how much it affected members. From Green Justice’s perspective I get the whole routine, you show them you have strength through all these people.

Shenk elaborates on the strategic value of a dual approach:

Even though we were building relationships that were tight, it is like that latent threat that says, ‘We can do this. We would like you to do it with us. But we have the ability to do this thing that could be very embarrassing, could muck up this process a lot, and we’re clearly willing to do that. But we would much prefer to be able to sit down and work on
stuff.’… And then that is how you start talking about policy, but it is all about how far you can move someone.

For Shenk, the question of balancing insider and outsider tactics is about more than relationships. It is a matter of ability to adapt to changing environments and, when it comes to CLU, also about identity:

We’re having to continue to straddle that line [between insider and outsider] which I think is really hard. But… I don’t think just an insider strategy works. I think you always have to have an outsider strategy… I think our Steering Committee will always just make us have that because that is what they do. They are power building, mobilizing kind[s] of groups.

On one level the more confrontational techniques that CLU used with the EEAC were aimed at keeping the collaborative process honest to the values that it espoused. CLU’s actions were intended to make sure that certain participants, issues, or forms of knowledge were not privileged over others. Through their comment periods they attempted to introduce storytelling and local knowledge into a process that was biased toward assuming that technical knowledge is the most valuable form. Additionally, they introduced issues of equity and accountability to low- and middle-income ratepayers that had previously been missing or submerged in the debate.

In the end a mutually agreed upon level was set for both program spending and utility compensation and was adopted unanimously by the EEAC in October 27, 2009. The final plans called for a statewide reduction in energy use of 2.4 percent for electricity and 1.15 percent in natural gas each year and lifetime saving of 30,884,096 MWh of electricity and 897,481,544 therms of gas. This would be achieved through an increase in energy efficiency spending to $1.27 billion for electric and $336 million for natural gas over the three-year period from 2010 through 2012. This spending would ramp-up over the three years to result in 341

---

percent more investment in electric efficiency and 377 percent more in gas efficiency in 2012 than in 2008. These expenditures were projected to result in net economic benefits of $3.71 billion from the electric investments and over $700 million from the gas investments and create a total of 3,878 jobs. Additionally there are program-specific goals within the residential, low-income, and commercial and industrial (C&I) sectors to be met within this larger target. For meeting these efficiency goals utilities would be provided with a revenue “incentive pool” of $65 million for electric and $14 million for natural gas over the three-year period. For exceeding the targets utilities can get additional revenue incentives up to 125 percent of the incentives for meetings the goals. The goals set by these plans were at the time the most ambitious efficiency goals in the nation.36

The Green Justice Coalition was able to get some of their central concerns included in the plan. Funding for the “community mobilization initiatives” or “CMIs,” as the Green Justice Coalition calls its program for implementing community based pilots, was the most tangible win for the Green Justice Coalition coming out of the final EEAC plans. The CMIs largely fulfilled their second request. They made some gains on their other three asks as well.37

1) Financing – The EEAC established a “Financing and On Bill Repayment Working Group” to work toward implementing a system where instead of providing payment upfront program participants can pay off their contribution to an efficiency investment over a period of time on their regular utility bill. Additionally, the EEAC resolved that the utilities should set targets to raise outside funding for financing—for electric $100

36 Kaufman, “Massachusetts Sets Ambitious Energy Standards.”
37 More details can be found in “Green Justice Wins in the Three-Year Utility Plans” October 27, 2009.

2) **Community-driven approach** – Community pilots were funded and a commitment was made to evaluate the pilots in the first year and consider expanding them to other locations in the state.

3) **High road jobs with standards and career pathways** – Green Justice felt that it won the least in this area. The EEAC resolved that utilities should make hiring processes more open, “make reasonable efforts to encourage” their contractors to provide “a livable wage, fair benefits and the opportunity to move along a career path.” Additionally they encouraged compliance with applicable labor law.

4) **Equity subcommittee** – An Equity Committee of the EEAC was convened and Penn Loh became one of the first members. Loh hopes to establish equity metrics that can be applied to evaluating utility performance.

**Joint Implementation of Community-benefitting investment: the Community Mobilization Pilots**

One outcome that came directly after, and arguably out of, the first GJC comment period at the EEAC was a meeting between Green Justice and Ian Bowles, the Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs, the cabinet-level agency that oversees DOER. Darlene Lombos of CLU recounts the conversation at the meeting about CLU’s request that the EEAC require a “community-driven” approach to implementing energy efficiency:

It was interesting because he was like, ‘Look, everybody is supportive of your ideas. Everybody wants to do good but how do we know it is going to work? We would be really supportive of figuring out some sort of pilot that shows that this works.’ It dawned on us, we were like ‘oh, this is about implementation. They can do whatever they want in putting the language in but we need to start thinking about implementation.’
From this point on Green Justice shifted their approach from just pushing for a community-driven model of energy efficiency to actively working with the utilities to design a pilot to prove that such a model could work. This meant that Green Justice had to transition from thinking of the utilities as targets to thinking of them as partners. This partnership would require GJC and the utilities to act together to reach a shared goal and along the way cause them to engage in learning through joint action.

Green Justice was promoting a particular model of energy efficiency programs, which they called “Community Mobilization Initiatives” or “CMIs.” These are defined in the Three-Year Plans as:

… a new term for energy efficiency outreach campaigns where community-based organizations that have long-standing relationships with homeowners, tenants and small businesses in economically marginalized communities and other groups that have a strong record of clean energy education and outreach, develop a ‘community mobilization outreach model’ that implements a large-scale ‘bundled’ neighborhood approach to energy efficiency retrofitting.  

Lombos states that the Green Justice Coalition conception of CMIs has a more specific definition:

CMIs have two important elements 1) a lead community base-building partner who is already established in the neighborhood or city that the pilot will be taking place to coordinate the initial outreach and education on energy efficiency, organize other groups on the ground to support the work and bundle residential homes, multi-unit buildings and small businesses interested in implementing energy efficiency measures, and 2) a lead union or community-based cooperative to bring in a responsible contractor committed to local hiring, good wages and benefits and establishing career pathways for new workers.

Green Justice conceived CMIs to go beyond providing improved outreach services and to create a community-run, vertically integrated program, which would provide outreach, employees, training, and implementation services. They intended to call on the diverse assets of the GJC

members in multiple cities to implement the program. The pilots were built around the idea that each partner could contribute something valuable:

*National Grid and NStar* are funding the Community Mobilization Initiatives and are paying the higher cost of labor that the pilot programs will require.

*Community Labor United* is hiring staff to coordinate the pilot projects and it has raised money for an independent evaluator who will identify practices that the utilities are to apply statewide.

*The union partners* are setting up training programs and allocating staff time to implement the pilot programs. They are bearing the costs of training programs (which are free to workers) and in at least one case, subsidizing part of workers’ benefit packages.

*The community partners* are contributing staff and member time to negotiate and implement the pilot programs locally.\(^{39}\)

---

**The Chinatown Community Mobilization Pilot**

Discussions with NSTAR, the electric utility for Boston, progressed most quickly. Both organizations talked about what they wanted to get out of a particular pilot. For NSTAR, learning how to access particular market segments was a major priority. Non-English language populations, particularly the “Asian market,” were seen by NSTAR as a particularly important place to invest to increase participation.

For Green Justice this was an easy opportunity to match their strengths with NSTAR’s goals. GJC member the Chinese Progressive Association (CPA) has been organizing in the Chinese community since 1977 and is based out of Boston’s Chinatown, the center of public life for the Chinese and broader East and Southeast Asian diaspora in New England. CPA was an early member of CLU, had been deeply involved in the Green Justice campaign, and had begun doing other energy work as well, including collaborating with ACE and the Boston Workers Alliance to create a community-owned energy services company.

---

Additional partners engaged in the pilot include the International Union of Painters and Allied Trades, the most active building trade union in CLU and the GJC. The Painters would help to provide pre-apprentice training for local employees and a pathway to union membership. The Painters helped to recruit the Aulson Company as the general contractor for the project, an employer they had worked with before, deemed responsible in their labor practices, and who was willing to take on new employees for and abide by the terms of the Chinatown project.

Green Justice proposed a series of five pilots around the state, Chinatown being the first, to ensure that the broad geography of the coalition was included, that the CMI concept could be tested and proven in diverse communities with varying building stock and social networks, and so relationships with different utilities could be built. The rest of this section focuses primarily on the Chinatown pilots.

From the perspective of the Green Justice coalition the goals of the Chinatown Pilot were many fold. The Chinatown CMI facilitates the implementation of neighborhood-scale bundled energy efficiency retrofits in a designated hard-to-reach neighborhood and aims to: promote energy efficiency, energy conservation and the installation of clean energy technologies in the designated neighborhood; reduce the designated community’s energy consumption and energy costs; reduce the designated community’s greenhouse gas emissions; support sustainable development in the community; create green job opportunities for community residents, including new entrants into the workforce, long-term unemployed and underemployed residents, and displaced workers; create energy efficiency job training opportunities for community residents, including on-the-job training and pathways into construction careers; pilot innovative community-mobilization outreach mechanisms to engage residents and small businesses in implementing energy efficiency building improvements and behaviors; and pilot bundled neighborhood-scale contracting mechanisms to engage a responsible contractor and an adequately trained and compensated workforce to install energy efficiency building improvements.\footnote{The Aulson Company, Chinese Progressive Association (CPA), Community Labor United, Inc. (CLU), and International Union of Painters and Allied Trades DC 35 (IUPAT DC35) “Chinatown Community Mobilization Initiative Proposal.” Draft March 12, 2010. p. 3.}
From the perspective of NSTAR and National Grid the scope of the pilot was much narrower and more quantifiable than the comprehensive community and economic development vision of the GJC:

By definition, a pilot is the trial of an alternative program delivery model or measure on a scale that will allow for assessing the merits of the proposed change while minimizing the risk associated with the expenditure of rate payer funds. Based on these criteria, the scope for a CMI will be limited to:

- 50 homes (each unit is counted separately for buildings with more than one unit)
- 4 multi-family buildings with 20 or fewer units

The goals were also defined to be similarly narrow:

- Completion of insulation/air sealing in 50 homes (each unit is counted separately for buildings with 2-4 units) and 4 multi-family buildings with 20 or fewer units by September 30, 2010.
- Based on experience gleaned through the outreach efforts, provide the [utilities] with an understanding of the motivations that drove some customers to participate as well as the barriers that prevented others in the same population from participating.\(^{41}\)

To accomplish these goals, CPA and the Painters in partnership with the Aulson Company plan to develop the Chinatown Green Collar Pathways workforce development program. The training program will create a bilingual workforce consisting of Chinatown residents. The program aims to ready twenty to twenty-four immigrant adults for work in the energy efficiency industry. Graduates of the program hired by onto the project will become members of the Painters under the classification of “Weatherization Pre-Apprentices,” and will be eligible for an $18.48 hourly wage plus benefits. These workers will then be eligible to apply for the Painters’ three-year Apprenticeship program.\(^{42}\)

The original timeline had planned to have program negotiations between the utilities and GJC completed in February 2010, the Outreach and Delivery Plan completed in March, initial


\(^{42}\) Aulson, et al., 5.
outreach to be finished by the end of March, the efficiency measures to be installed by the end of September and the evaluation of the program to be completed by the end of 2010. However the project has fallen behind schedule, mostly because of a gap in funding. Central to the CMI model is help for moderate-income residents to finance the energy efficiency measures and “pre-weatherization” building improvements. The required up-front resident contribution—typically about twenty-five percent of the costs of the installed measures in Massachusetts utility programs—is out of reach for many middle income people or people with poor credit. Additionally, in neighborhoods with old building stock, like Chinatown, additional improvements to meet codes would be needed in many buildings before energy efficiency measures could be installed. The continuing absence of on-bill financing, revolving loans, or other mechanisms makes this barrier nearly impossible to address within the confines of the existing system. Green Justice had received a verbal agreement from the City of Boston to help fill this funding gap. However funds had not been received at the time of writing in May 2010 and in the meantime the project was stalled.

Creating Mutual Value

The cautious partnership between GJC and the utilities on the pilots was made possible because of the belief that there was something valuable in the relationship for all parties. For Green Justice, embarking on the pilots was an opportunity to build resources, strengthen the coalition, and demonstrate success and tangible benefits of the green justice model. The pilots provided a project to unite the diverse and growing coalition through action, a prime opportunity to build mutual understanding through working side by side. Acting in partnership with the

43 NSTAR et al., 8.
44 Aulson, et al., 10.
utilities meant getting funded to do organizing that the organizations would be doing anyway—
engaging and empowering community members through base-building, expanding and
diversifying communities and workplaces where the unions have a presence. Additionally
building relationships with the utilities at an early stage could result in long-term opportunities to
continue getting funding and help to control the development of these community based-efforts.
Finally, the pilots are an opportunity to prove the benefits of the green justice paradigm at a
small scale. If all goes well, communities will benefit from increased investment in their
building stock at a heavily discounted cost, residents will save money and be able to spend it
locally, new local jobs will be created, and communities and workers will be able to expand their
power in new areas (local people in unions, unions in the residential construction industry) and
better protect their interests in the future.

For the utilities, partnering with Green Justice provided a chance to innovate through
existing networks, implement a difficult but potential valuable program, and appease both their
regulator and a potential opponent. From one perspective, the utilities were handed a gift of
eager partners, with deep experience in community-centered work, interested in working with
energy efficiency issues, and who want to create an innovative program for them. The
community group members of the GJC, in particular, have existing networks and trust in their
communities beyond anything the utilities have or could hope to build in a reasonable length of
time. These networks could potentially be activated to recruit large numbers of building owners,
get them to commit to making energy efficiency investment, leading to valuable economies of
scale. To the utilities, the partnership with Green Justice was a simple step to meet some
expectations of the EEAC and DPU regulators. Finally, by working with Green Justice instead
of opposing them, the utilities have partially disarmed a potentially troublesome enemy.
To move beyond the hunch that working together could produce value and begin actually putting a program in place, the partners first had to learn about each other. Participants from the utilities and Green Justice described the beginning of the partnership as an extended learning phase for both sides. There was vocabulary and processes that that both partners had to learn. Terms like “coalition,” “responsible contractor” and “living wage” were new to the utilities and Green Justice still had a lot to learn about utility energy efficiency implementation. For example, NSTAR outlined for GJC all the steps in their energy efficiency programs. With that information, GJC representatives were able to better articulate which step they were and were not interested in implementing.

The co-creation of a whole new efficiency program model required a detailed understanding and recognition of where each party is coming from and what they have to offer. After the initial stage of mutual learning, CLU, NSTAR and all the other GJC and utility partners spent a whole day mapping out the program delivery process for the new program that they were creating. The group created iterative flowcharts on a whiteboard that described how services would actually get to customers. There was particular attention paid to the new steps or steps where new components, such as translation for customers with limited English, were being inserted.

The partners continued weekly or bi-weekly planning meetings for the next few months figuring out the remaining details. In the end CLU and their community and labor partners are helping to design and implement an entirely new model for delivering energy efficiency through collaboration with the existing utility program administrators to adapt their experience and existing models. To CLU this was an opportunity to co-create a different framing on the value
and delivery of energy efficiency between organizations coming from very different perspectives. Connelly explains:

[The pilots] actually are discussed in [the three-year utility plans], but there is no commitment to doing their community outreach in a particular way. So they could do it community mobilization style… or they could do some other… The concept of what [the utilities and the EEAC] think of as community is really odd. Our whole thing is about honoring and building on the role of the community-based organization that is already there, that knows the terrain, that has trust, and can help you wisely negotiate and can help you to get people to take on this commitment to doing retrofits. And they have a different…it’s very different, it’s a market-based mentality. It’s all about individual purchasing decisions.

Despite these different starting points, each party recognized their interdependence, recognized the value of each other’s diversity, and participated in an authentic dialogue to figure out an approach of mutual value. Now each party is voluntarily engaging in the community mobilization pilots with the hope of learning about how to operate a new model of energy efficiency that combines technical energy efficiency expertise and existing community networks and local knowledge to achieve greater efficiency while leveraging the program to gain additional community benefits. The pilots continue to serve as action-based dialogue in that they provide a venue to create shared identities and meaning between the diverse partners through acting to create a unified and compelling program.

Regulation as Enabler and Barrier

Planning for the pilot evaluation began in early 2010, even before a completed agreement on implementing the pilot had been reached. While the utilities and the EEAC plan to evaluate the pilots primarily for cost effectiveness and parity of cost, as required by law, GJC hopes to capture data on a broader swath of issues, including equitable participation in the program, job access and quality, and is planning to bring in their own evaluators to ensure that this data is
captured. Despite the considerable collaboration, these major differences in goals have not been reconciled. So far the differences in end goals have not mattered because the parties are willing to work together because the interim goals are the same, but this is not guaranteed to continue. Although GJC intends for the pilot model to continue and be expanded, the utilities have made no commitment to any further pilots beyond the initial five. The utilities will need to prove to the EEAC and the DPU that the pilots are cost-effective and compare favorably in cost to other efficiency programs before they can be expanded.

Regulatory constraints are what allowed the partnership to be initiated, but they are also the most likely candidates to cause it to fail. The strong sway of the EEAC led the utilities to be receptive to new partnerships and experimental programs, but the statutory requirement of least-cost procurement of energy efficiency means that more expensive, but still cost-effective, programs may not get funded even if they produce other benefits to communities and workers. The newly created Equity Committee of the EEAC is working to develop “equity metrics,” to measure access to energy efficiency programs and jobs, but the DPU has ruled that questions of equity are outside of its regulatory purview. The attempt to introduce considerations of equity into the selection criteria for efficiency programs may prove to be a major test for the flexibility of the quasi-consensus-based EEAC, as well as the value of engaging in external collaboration for CLU.

Discussion

Beyond the use of collaborative methods within its own alliance, CLU has used collaborative methods with non-social movement actors, in particular policy-makers and energy utilities, who are more often seen by social movement actors as opponents rather than as
partners. Through its organization as an alliance and the issue focus of the Green Justice Coalition, CLU was able to articulate the interdependence of their interests with the issue of energy efficiency and successfully advocate for a seat on the EEAC collaborative planning body. The value of the added diversity provided by CLU to the EEAC was also recognized. The capacity that organizing groups have to build social capital and activate social networks provided an opportunity for CLU to partner with the utilities to test a new type of energy efficiency program centered around organizing-based variation on social marketing.

The collaborative practices of CLU’s long-term alliance model provides evidence that social movement organizing and collaborative planning need not be seen as in conflict, as described by Innes and Gruber. Instead the alliance model shows that they are each applicable under different conditions of recognition of diversity and interdependence and willingness for authentic dialogue from all stakeholders. Social movement organizing is necessary when populations or organizations are not viewed as stakeholders to a policy process. Collaborative planning is needed to resolve complex policy issues once the importance of including the interdependence and diversity of all stakeholders is recognized by all stakeholders. As seen in the EEAC planning process and the design of the CMI pilots, these differing planning approaches also provide co-benefits to each other. Organizing articulates the interdependent interests of unrepresented populations, creates a manifestation of the diversity of interests on an issue, and develops social capital within and between the organizing groups that creates more options for policy and implementation. Collaborative planning provides benefits to disempowered populations and organizing groups in terms of increased input into the policy process, policy changes, funding, and new opportunities around which to organize.
The engagement of CLU with the EEAC and the utilities provides one model of how an alliance of organizing groups—traditionally outsiders—can relate to a policy-making process through engaging in collaboration as an insider, while still maintaining its organizing identity. Maintaining its organizing capacity is essential for CLU, because it is what allowed them to not only gain recognition as a legitimate stakeholder in the policy process but also to contribute skills and capacity that made new policy and implementation options possible.
Chapter 4: Conclusion—Navigating New Relationships

This thesis has shown that the qualifying conditions of a collaborative process—diversity of interests, interdependence of interests, and authentic dialogue—can also exist within social movements, especially in the structure of long-term alliances such as Community Labor United. I have described two examples of CLU creating network power through applying collaborative methods: strengthening community-labor relations in Boston via a long-term alliance and joint campaigns, and the expansion of possibilities for utility energy efficiency regulation and implementation through the inclusion of the Green Justice Coalition in the planning process. Authentic dialogue within social movements can happen experientially through actions and events in addition to a traditional discursive setting. Additionally, social movement alliances can apply collaborative methods not only within and across movements but also between movement organizations and non-movement organizations like regulatory bodies and corporations.

**Long-term cross-movement alliances**

Despite many challenges and differences among its members, establishing shared interests and options for mutual gain through engaging in collaborative deliberation and joint campaigns has led CLU to success in achieving many of its stated aims and establishing a durable alliance entity. Present among CLU member organizations were a series of structural, ideological, resource, and cultural differences. These are factors that have been described as destructive to alliance development.\(^\text{45}\) Despite this, establishing an alliance with base-building organizations at its core provided some initial common reference points among the new

members. Additionally, emphasis on similarities and interdependencies rather than differences in relationship building and campaign planning practices has helped to build a shared identity. Finally, alliance governance based on clearly defined collaborative processes that strive to include equal voice from different partners, in addition to successful campaigns, has helped to establish long-term commitment to the coalition from its members.

CLU is an example of a type of long-term alliance of social movement organizations that can potentially to act as a bridge between social movement organizing and collaborative planning. The alliance structure can create a venue and provide facilitation for the recognition and development of DIAD conditions between diverse social movement organizations to build network power. Additionally, alliances can sufficiently aggregate the diversity and interdependence of its member organizations so as to act as an authentic and recognized representative in collaborative planning venues with non-social movement actors.

**Collaboration with Government and Corporations**

“[A]fter activists are allowed places at the policy-making table, they soon realize that the "output" side of the process (i.e., reaching decisions and implementing them) is more difficult than the "input" side (i.e., getting to the table). This is in part because for the first time, they are negotiating directly with state and industry, an entirely new terrain.”

The role of policy maker and implementer is completely new territory for CLU. It has proven to be time consuming and has once again put their work on someone else’s schedule. If the pilot projects are completed successfully, this role may prove to be effective for building network power locally and can potentially offer a model that can be transferred to other cities. However, it remains to be seen if undertaking the pilots was a good decision for CLU and GJC

---

from the perspective of their organizational development. Even assuming the success of the Green Justice Coalition in implementing the pilot programs meeting both their goals and the goals of the regulators, the situation creates a whole series of questions. What does it mean to transition from a political adversary to a program partner? How do community-based organizations and labor unions begin to work with utility companies without “selling out?” How does the alliance retain its vision while working closely with other organizations on the same program but because of different goals?

None of these questions are new to the literature on collaborative planning. Innes argues that co-optation is only a concern if partners are not aware of their own leverage or if they are happy just to be part of a dialogue and therefore do not hold out to ensure their group’s interest is met. In the case of CLU neither of these cases hold true (although in the absence of ideal dialogue all parties are likely to only partially understand their own leverage). However, there are other considerations, such as mission drift, that are not addressed by Innes. CLU must remain vigilant to maintain the sources of its leverage. Its base-building organizing practice is the source of its “people power” and also the source of its access to the social networks that are so valuable to stakeholders primarily concerned with increasing participation in energy efficiency programs.

---

48 An historical aside: Another member organization on the EEAC is the Low-Income Energy Affordability Network (LEAN). They are an association of Community Action Program (CAP) agencies that implement the federal Weatherization Action Program, a low-income energy efficiency program. They also receive a portion of the system benefit charge funds in Massachusetts to allow an expanded reach for their programs. LEAN is widely seen as an effective service provider and a model for collaborative implementation of low-income programs (Sarin 2009). However, CAP agencies, founded in the 1960s as a part of the War on Poverty, were originally intended to create network power among low-income communities. However, the conditions to create collaborative networks often did not exit and many of the agencies became examples of co-optation (Booher & Innes 2002, note 12; Moynihan 1969). Although
The practice of actively participating in crafting policy and then participating in direct implementation of it seems relatively new for social movement organizations. These two activities have been done separately (for example, lobbying and rallies to influence policy and “bucket brigades” for citizen implementation of pollution monitoring), but forming and then implementing policy on the same issue with the participation and support of all parties involved is a relatively new development. As evidenced in the interactions between CLU and the EEAC, there is growing recognition that community-based groups and their partnerships with unions bring value to the implementation of energy efficiency through their networks which act as a gateway to the community.

The entry into consensus-based decision-making processes by social movement organizations could be considered the next step beyond existing tactics used by community-labor partnerships. Community benefit agreements and project labor agreements (or when combined, as in the Clean Energy Works program in Portland, Oregon, a Community Workforce Agreement) that are negotiated with developers on a project-by-project basis, have become a common tactic for organizations in the Partnership for Working Families network. CLU is taking that tactic one step further by attempting to integrate community benefits and labor standards at the policy-level, rather than the scale of a single development project. Shenk describes:

A lot of groups like ours focus almost exclusively on community benefit agreements around big projects. We haven’t done a ton of that … We have taken a different tact on those. Those come with the political work [we] do. We haven’t focused in on one construction project. Because the critique of that model is, ‘what happens when that

CLU has emerged from a very different tradition, the history of CAP may provide a case study for CLU and other similar organizations to plan how to balance organizing and service provision functions.

49 Baxamusa, “Empowering Communities through Deliberation The Model of Community Benefits Agreements.”
project is over?’… [But with the policy approach] you still have to do the political work and power building work to enforce the policy.

The publicly regulated sector of energy efficiency programs—providing a meso-level for organizing between economy-wide and project-based standards—may end up being more the exception than the rule. But getting job and community standards into efficiency policy would provide a foothold for CLU to continue their work into the future whether through policy or projects.

However some observers question the long-term impacts on movements of engaging collaboratively in policy-making. Faber and McCarthy, have criticized the collaborative turn in the mainstream environmental movement:

[T]he traditional environmental movement has increasingly become involved in informal neocorporatist bodies involving industry groups, trade associations, and government agencies for the purpose of negotiating compromises around various issues of contention…. The effect of participating … neocorporatist bodies, therefore, has been the reduction in internal democratic practices within mainstream environmental organizations and state regulatory agencies. As a result, the growing focus on technical–rational questions, solutions, and compromises, rather than issues of political power and democratic decision-making, is causing a decline in public interest and participation in national environmental politics. 50

They would likely have similar concerns about the collaborative tactics of environmental justice organizations as described in this thesis. Will engaging in collaborative planning on public policy issues decrease participation in the environmental justice movement or will it provide an opportunity to expand organizing and participation?

The emphasis on collaboration as a path toward economic transformation can create challenges in balancing desires to maintain the legitimacy of the organization and the movement while capturing opportunities to shift the course of decision-making from the inside of the policy

process. CLU and other organizations using a similar mix of tactics are straddling the line between what McAdam has dubbed institutionalized and non-institutionalized tactics. Pellow describes the niche that some environmental justice organizations have developed for themselves in consensus-based decision-making process as a “punctuated access [that] makes them periodic players—a sort of ‘outsider within.’” Often this has played out as a combination of negotiation and confrontation as seen in with the interactions of GJC and the EEAC.

This balance between insider and outsider tactics may foretell the emergence of complex, context-specific strategies and frames: oppositional framing for a social movement audience and collaborative framing for a non-movement audience. Although it is clear that these mixed cultures and strategies can co-exist within the same organization, the big question that remains is: will the partial shift into collaboration be able to foster true collaborative problem-solving with opponents over the long-term? Or, will it lead to half-hearted efforts, lowest common denominator outcomes, reactionary push back from those within the organizations that want to see more confrontation strategies, and co-optation through not understanding the consequences of becoming part of the process? With the evidence at hand the answer looks closer to the former, but, with the pilot still underway, it is too soon to tell.

Mike Sherman talks about what he thinks the relationship between the EEAC and CLU could look like going forward:

We’re all getting to know each other better. I think that many of us operate in very personal brands of operation here. We have all...If you go around the energy community in Massachusetts everybody knows everybody else. The Green Justice [Coalition] folks are not in the position. They don’t have many years worth of these relationships. So I think what people are willing to do is hold out a hand to them to help them establish those relationships and I see the positive part of that is participation in the Council, participation in the working groups. Just being around to pick up the phone and discuss

---

51 McAdam, “The framing function of movement tactics,” 344.
things with is kind of the operating style here. A more contentious style is likely to have less success because people have adopted a way of doing business.

But as Connelly states, CLU does not want to become just one of the insiders:

It has been a real hard balance between insider-outsider. I try to keep whenever I am in a meeting very clear, like, ‘here is our coalition’s concern and here’s why.’ So they never just say, ‘OK, it’s her. She’s just now one of the boys.’

Will the balance of insider/outsider strategy and maintaining the relationships and framings of both grow too difficult to maintain in the long run without choosing one or the other? Or, can CLU carve out a niche that stays true to their organizational roots in base-building organizing while innovating with other actors through collaborative processes? As this is a story in process, we will just have to wait and see.
Chapter 5: Implications for Practice

Energy Efficiency Planning\textsuperscript{53}

This case has much to offer to the rapidly changing and expanding field of energy efficiency planning. The trends in Massachusetts of increased focus on energy efficiency in utility planning and the sharp ramp-up of spending and savings goals are being echoed in elsewhere in the country. Because of its low cost and positive climate impact, many states are moving toward prioritizing energy efficiency as the “first fuel.” These legislative and regulatory measures include energy efficiency resource standards, all cost-effective efficiency mandates, decoupling, and profit incentives for efficiency implementation. One estimate suggests that if these trends continue, this could mean additional increases in spending nationally on utility energy efficiency alone from $3.1 billion annually in 2008 to $12 billion by 2020.\textsuperscript{54}

As a result of these increased expectations, there is growing interest in the social and behavioral dimensions of energy use. There is widening recognition that technology, while an essential tool, cannot alone improve and bring to scale energy efficiency programs. Despite its favorable economics, there are many identified barriers to energy efficiency that prevent it from adhering to a rational market model.\textsuperscript{55} As an attempt to address these barriers, utilities and other efficiency providers have begun to think about complex individual consumer motivations and decisions about energy use and efficiency investments. Additionally, utilities, most of which are use to operating without competition, must build new kinds of relationships and trust with their

\textsuperscript{53} This section was adapted from a report by Harvey Michaels, Lily Song, Eric Mackres and Veronica Metzner, “Community Energy Efficiency Programs: Identifying Challenges and Uncovering Solutions.” MIT, June 2010.
\textsuperscript{54} Barbose, Goldman, and Schlegel, “The Shifting Landscape of Ratepayer-Funded Energy Efficiency in the U.S.”
\textsuperscript{55} Jay et al., “Cross-Sectoral Collaboration for Promoting Energy Efficiency.”
customers in order to get them to voluntarily adopt energy efficiency measures and technology. A focus on efficiency requires utilities to shift their thinking from a sales model to a service-based business model that takes into consideration the persisting needs and preferences of their clients. On each of these points, the community social networks and organizing experience of social movement organizations means that their diverse voice is an essential asset to efficiency planning.

At a broader political and ideological level, energy efficiency has become a policy arena of great public visibility and interest. Numerous civic groups along with federal, state, and municipal governments have signed onto energy efficiency for reasons beyond the traditional motivations of energy reliability and affordability. For environmentalists, energy efficiency represents one of the most affordable ways to decrease the carbon emissions that contribute to climate change. From the perspective of social justice groups, green jobs in the energy efficiency sector represent potential “pathways out of poverty” for low-income and minority communities. Finally, for many states, cities, and communities, building energy efficiency retrofits, besides provide a starting point for addressing climate change and energy challenges, can generate place-based industries that can reduce poverty, unemployment, and crime.

These multiple strands of thinking are increasingly intermingled in federal and state policies that frame energy efficiency investment as a major tool for economic recovery and job creation, strengthened energy reliability, and improved environmental quality. The most obvious illustration is the visible role that energy efficiency played in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), the federal stimulus bill of early 2009, which invested around $60 billion in energy related programs. Of the $36.7 billion administered by the Department of Energy an unprecedented $12 billion focused explicitly on demand-side efficiency. The
injection of federal dollars into energy efficiency brings its own set of requirements, including Davis Bacon prevailing wage requirements and fair employment provisions.

All of these developments are making communities and social movement organizations more central stakeholders to energy efficiency planning and implementation. Along with this recognition, come opportunities for communities and social movement organizations to create value (for themselves and other stakeholders) and gain resources. The favorable national context provides an opportunity for social movement organizations to participate in or encourage the creation of collaborative planning forums on climate change and energy efficiency at the state, regional, and local levels. While federal funds and national trends will guide priorities to some extent, control over the use of funds and opportunity to innovate remains at the state and local level. At these scales social movement organizations can make their most compelling case for their value in energy efficiency implementation and the importance of community workforce agreements and other arrangements that serve their interests. Participating in implementation may gain broader respect for the value of organizing and provide organizing groups with additional resources to expand their efforts.

*Development of Social Capital and Network Power*

More generally, the CLU case provides some guidance on how to develop social capital and network power at the intersection of organizing and collaborative planning. Long-term alliances may prove to be a valuable institutional model through which to apply both organizing and collaborative methods. Alliances provide a way of further aggregating diverse underrepresented interests for inclusion in the policy process. The emphasis on creating long-term alliances, as in the regional power building model, is significant because it provides a venue
to develop collaborative capacity and network power in an ongoing manner in order to better
tackle a variety of issues in which actors recognize their interdependence. Short-term alliances
or coalition, although valuable for dealing with particular policy issues, do not provide the joint
benefits or challenges of creating shared meaning, identities or innovations. Alliance structures
and their staff can also play a mediator role. If the organization is perceived as fair and
accountable to its members, then it can help to anticipate points of agreement and disagreement,
equalize voices and resources, structure interactions to build reciprocity and relationships, and
help to develop options that create value for all parties.

Even as alliances help to bridge the practices of organizing and collaborative planning, it
is essential that alliances and their member organizations retain an organizing focus. Organizing
is an important part of the diversity of skills and knowledge that social movement organizations
bring to a policy process. A focus on leadership development at the scale of the alliance and
member organizations should continue in order to build network power—knowledge to improve
policy-making, skills to improve policy implementation, and capacity for action that will
increase the recognition of the value of organizing groups among other stakeholders. Organizing
also remains essential as an alternative to collaboration. It is what allows social movement
actors to visibly exit, or threaten to exit, a policy process. The threat or use of confrontational
tactics may at times be needed to enforce ground rules or to ensure that all parties around an
issue or policy process are meeting their commitments and responsibilities.

Organizing is one way in which social movement organizations learn about the value of
their own diversity and interdependence. However, this can also happen through internal
collaborative processes, research, learning from other organizations. Recognizing and increasing
this value is essential to creating better proposals and ultimately better policy solutions. CLU,
through its exploration of the interdependence of the “green justice” concept was able to uncover and articulate the connection between energy efficiency, good jobs, and community development. Through research CLU staff were able to identify a venue—the EEAC—through which to pursue their goals. From their understanding of interdependence they were then able to articulate the value of their specific knowledge and skills amongst the diversity of the EEAC and make the case that their organizing experience could be put to work to implement energy efficiency. The value of other actors must also be explored and recognized. For example, CLU was able to recruit environmental organizations into the Green Justice Coalition who helped them understand energy efficiency planning.

Finally, a willingness and ability to actively organize and expand membership to new sectors has proven very important for the CLU and the Green Justice Coalition. Expanding diversity while managing it to ensuring a sufficient degree of interdependence and alignment of interests and methods can bring additional skills, knowledge, networks and capacity. Opportunities must be actively created to ensure that the diversity of membership is able to co-create shared meanings through authentic dialogue and, perhaps most importantly, tangible shared actions and identities.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study only looked at one case of collaboration by a social movement organization, which took place under very particular institutional and political circumstances. It would be of value to explore this concept in planning contexts with varying political histories, collaborative cultures, and capacity constraints. Additionally, the match of implementation needs and
organizing capacity on the issue of energy efficiency regulation may be an outlier. It will be important to explore the application of these methods to other policy issues.

Future research should help to expand knowledge of the role played by long-term alliances at the intersection of organizing and collaboration. Exploration should also be undertaken to develop an understanding of other institutional arrangements and methods that can straddle these planning styles. Additional data regarding the long-term impacts on the organizational development of social movement organizations that regularly engaging in collaborative planning must be collected and analyzed. The effect of including social movement actors and different scales of social movement actors (single organization, city-wide alliance, state-wide alliance, etc.) in collaborative planning processes on the outcomes of the planning processes should also be studied. The hypothesis of co-development of practices of collaborative and social movement planning should be further explored through looking at prevalence and historical development of the respective practices in particular states and metropolitan regions.

**The Network Power Planner/Organizer**

Recognition of the value of social movement organizing to collaborative planning and vice versa provides an opportunity to create a new hybrid vision of organizing and planning to build network power. Depending on the approach taken, organizing can enable or discourage the DIAD preconditions of collaboration. Organizers, who already see deepening democracy as a major part of their role, can focus their work toward encouraging collaborative processes where appropriate. Organizers can point out where DIAD conditions are present but are not being recognized or where they are not present but could be developed. Collaborative planners can
begin to more actively encourage and support organizing in order to ensure the development of
the authentic representation necessary for an effective collaborative planning process.

As planners and organizers begin to understand the mutual benefit of the two styles they
can experiment with new combinations of their methods. Instead of seeing the models as
dichotomous with discrete characteristics (Table 4), they can begin to understand the fluid nature
of their practice and the applicability of the styles to different contexts of recognition of diversity
and interdependence and willingness to engage in authentic dialogue. When recognition and
willingness only exists among a subset of stakeholders collaborative methods may be able to be
applied within that group through the creation of a long-term alliance to pursue a series of
interdependent issues. The creation of an alliance and its application of organizing and
confrontational strategies may help to facilitate recognition and willingness among the wider
group of stakeholders on an issue. If willingness, recognition, and representation already exist or
are formed among all stakeholders than a collaborative planning or policy process can be
undertaken. The same actors and organizations can engage in both organizing and collaborative
planning to meet their needs and effectively address policy issues.

| **Table 4: Characteristics of Social Movement Organizing and Collaborative Planning** |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| **Contribution** | **Social Movement Organizing** | **Collaborative Planning** |
| **Initiation** | Exclusion from policy process | Complex policy problem |
| **Scale** | A class of stakeholders | All stakeholders |
| **Method** | Organizing/aggregation | Co-evolution |
| **Forum** | Coalition/Alliance | Public planning process |
| **Output** | Aggregated representation | Consensus-based plan |
| **Prerequisites** | Exclusion from policy process | Complex policy problem |
| | Joint recognition of value | Joint recognition of value |
| | Willingness to participate | Willingness to participate |
| | Interdependence of interests | Interdependence of interests |
| | Aggregation of diverse interests | Diversity of interests |
| | Methods of accountability | Inclusion of all interests |
Booher and Innes’ description of collaborative planners in a world of network power can also applied to the organizer’s role of facilitating empowerment:

The network model of power dissolves the dilemma that has made many planners feel trapped in a no-win choice between serving power or challenging it. Planning and policy professionals instead can be a key part of a self-organizing process that brings agents together, enables information to flow, builds trust and reciprocity, represents interests, connects networks, and mobilizes action…. [T]hey provide informational power in shaping procedures, processes, and agendas that may allow network power to emerge.  

And interestingly enough, even Alinsky’s description of an organizer, although stated in more radical language, has much in common with the role of Booher and Innes’ collaborative planner, in particular the emphasis on making space for authentic dialogue:

The function of the organizer is to raise questions that agitate, that break through the accepted pattern…. He detests dogma, defies any finite definition of morality, rebels against any repression of a free, open search for ideas no matter where they may lead… As with all life, this is a paradox, for his irreverence is rooted in a deep reverence for the enigma of life, and an incessant search for its meaning.

It would seem that the network power planner/organizer with DIAD as her guiding principles has a growing role to play at the intersection of community empowerment and collaborative decision-making.

---
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