



Low Emissions Community Plan

What We Heard Interim Report

October 15, 2019



Contents

Contents	2
List of Tables	3
1 Background.....	4
1.1 Strategic Goals	5
1.2 Abbreviations	5
1.3 City Project Team	5
1.4 Spokesperson(s).....	5
1.5 Summary of Engagement Strategy	5
2 Preliminary Meetings	9
2.1 Intended Audience	9
2.2 Marketing Techniques.....	10
2.3 Analysis	10
2.4 What We Heard	10
2.4.1 Comments Regarding the LEC Plan	11
2.4.2 How Should We Engage?	18
2.4.3 Current Sustainability Goals and Actions	19
2.4.4 Potential Opportunities for Working Together.....	21
3 Evaluation	25
4 Engagement Summary	26
4.1.1 Identifying Potential Priorities	27
4.1.2 Areas of Concern	28
4.1.3 Understanding Impacts on Stakeholders.....	29
4.1.4 Understanding Stakeholder Aspirations and Concerns	29
4.1.5 Understanding Stakeholder Ideas to Meet LEC Plan Targets	30
4.1.6 Understanding How Stakeholders Want to Work Together	30
4.1.7 Making Sure Future Engagement Opportunities are Accessible to Stakeholders	30
4.2 Data Limitations	30
4.3 Consideration of Results	31
5 Next Steps	35

List of Tables

Table 1: Summary of Engagement Strategy.....	6
Table 2: Stage 1A Meeting Schedule	9
Table 3: Comments on the LEC Plan	11
Table 4: What Should Future Stakeholder Engagement Look Like?.....	18
Table 5: Current Sustainability Goals & Actions by Stakeholders	19
Table 6: Opportunities to Work Together.....	21
Table 7: Engagement Summary.....	26
Table 8: Potential Priorities	27
Table 9: Areas of Concern	28
Table 10: Project Team Statements	31

1 Background

The City of Saskatoon (City) has developed the Low Emissions Community Plan (LEC Plan), which is a high-level roadmap of the actions required to meet both community and corporate emissions reduction targets for 2023 and 2050, and to ultimately reduce greenhouse gases (GHG) by 80% by 2050.

The full plan includes:

- An update on the City's emissions inventories results for 2016 and 2017;
- Emissions, population, and energy modelling projections of the City over the next 30 years to 2050 for both a Business as Planned (Status Quo / Inaction) Scenario as well as for a Low Emissions Scenario;
- 40 detailed actions are presented, that would enable the City to achieve the Low Emissions Community scenario;
- Benefits of investing in a low emissions community;
- A high level financial analysis for each action in the LEC Plan Scenario to identify the investment required, the net present value, the return on investment, marginal abatement costs, and employment impacts; and
- High-level implementation plan for the actions.

The Low Emissions Community Plan and the Preliminary Low Emissions Community Plan Initiatives were received at City Council on August 26th, 2019. The following motions relating to future engagement and partnerships were carried:

1. That engagement with the community and stakeholders is undertaken to further advance planning and to develop comprehensive implementation strategies for preliminary initiatives included in the LEC Plan.
2. That the Administration report back on ways we can partner with the private, institutional, and non-profit sectors in order to provide opportunities for other sectors to take the lead on, and provide feedback on the initiatives they are undertaking and intending to undertake with respect to the relevant portions of the LEC Plan; and
3. That the Administration report back on how we can partner and collaborate with, but not limited to, Saskatchewan municipalities, SUMA, and the provincial government with respect to the proposed LEC Plan.
4. That City Council forward the comprehensive list of items included in the attachment LEC 2020-2021 Actions to the budget prioritization process and request additional information from Administration on these projects related to: - anticipated emissions reductions - anticipated financial returns on investment - comments from Administration on implementation timelines.

Council will be deciding which actions in the LEC Plan to prioritize for funding in the 2020/2021 budget. There will also be numerous future decisions relating to implementation of each action in the LEC Plan. The project team is currently engaging with various stakeholders about the LEC Plan and how they would like to be engaged moving forward. The LEC Plan is a high-level road map and implementation of the items (except for those in the direct control of the municipality) will take participation by businesses and residents. The following is an interim report on ongoing engagement activities.

1.1 Strategic Goals

The City established the need for a Climate Action Plan in the Strategic Plan: 2018-2021 through the Strategic Goal of Environmental Leadership. Specifically, that “the effects of climate change on civic services are proactively addressed.” Consistent with the Strategic Goal of Environmental Leadership, the City signed an agreement with the Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy in November 2015. This is an international pact that requires the City of Saskatoon to take action on both the causes and effects of climate change by reducing emissions and building resiliency plans for our infrastructure and services.

1.2 Abbreviations

LEC Plan Low Emissions Community Plan

GHG Greenhouse gas

1.3 City Project Team

Hilary Carlson, Special Projects Manager, Utilities & Environment

Shannon Dyck, Environmental Coordinator, Utilities & Environment

Amber Weckworth, Education and Environmental Performance Manager, Utilities & Environment

Jeanna South, Director of Sustainability, Utilities & Environment

Leighland Hrapchak, Marketing Consultant, Strategy & Transformation

Mandy Fehr, Public Engagement Consultant, Strategy & Transformation

1.4 Spokesperson(s)

Jeanna South, Director of Sustainability, Utilities & Environment

1.5 Summary of Engagement Strategy

An original engagement strategy for Climate Mitigation was designed in 2017, and updated in 2018, to guide public and stakeholder engagement through three distinct project phases:

- Phase 1: Building Awareness and Gauging Interest – November 2017 – February 2018;
- Phase 2: Designing Recommendations – February 2018 to September 2018;
- Phase 3: Implementation Planning.

Because of limited stakeholder participation during Phase 2, the significant amount of time between Phase 2 Engagement and the LEC Plan going to Council in August 2019, and concerns raised by stakeholders regarding engagement, the need for additional engagement was identified. A new engagement strategy was developed in September 2019 to address the motion from Council “that engagement with the community and stakeholders is undertaken to further advance planning and to develop comprehensive implementation strategies for preliminary initiatives.” This engagement strategy is outlined in two stages.

- Stage 1A: Communications & Preliminary Meetings (September 16th-October 1st)
 - Preliminary Meetings with stakeholders for inclusion in an Interim “What We Heard” Report to be attached to the Oct. 21 Governance and Priorities Committee Report.
- Stage 1B: Continuing Engagement on the LEC Plan (October 1st-TBD)
 - Details TBD by preliminary engagement work in Stage 1A.
 - Continuing engagement activities with stakeholders.
 - Develop an updated engagement strategy for Stage 2.

- Stage 2: LEC Plan Implementation (TBD)
 - Potential work with any partners identified in earlier stages.
 - Details TBD by earlier phases.

Stage 1 of the strategy focuses on engaging with stakeholders to potentially clarify aspects of the LEC Plan and to work on relationships with key stakeholders that will be important as we move into engaging on implementation. The division between stages 1A and 1B is entirely due to reporting schedules that only allowed a three week window for preliminary engagement. As a result, this work has been divided—with stage 1A focusing on preliminary meetings with some associations, institutions, and large businesses. Continuing engagement in stage 1B will have a longer timeframe that enables engagement that is inclusive to more stakeholders. The following “What We Heard Report” should be considered as an interim report on preliminary stakeholder engagement.

A summary of the entire engagement strategy for each stage is provided in the Table 1: Summary of Engagement Strategy.

Table 1: Summary of Engagement Strategy

Stage	Stakeholder	Level of Participation	Objective	Engagement Goal	Engagement Component
1A	Business Associations	Consult	We will listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	Identification of potential priorities.	Preliminary Meetings
	Building Industry			Identification of areas of concern that may need some deeper engagement.	
	Institutions	Involve	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	A thorough understanding of how stakeholders could be impacted by the LEC Plan.	
	Large businesses with capacity for leadership and action			An understanding of stakeholder aspirations and concerns. An understanding of stakeholder ideas to meet LEC Plan targets. An understanding of ways that stakeholders would like to work together to begin	

				implementing the LEC Plan.	
		Collaborate	We will work together with you to formulate solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decision.	Working together to find solutions to make sure that future engagement opportunities are accessible to stakeholders.	
1B	Business Associations Building Industry Institutions Large businesses with capacity for leadership and action Non-Profits Indigenous Communities & Organizations	Involve	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	A thorough understanding of how stakeholders could be impacted by the LEC Plan. An understanding of stakeholder aspirations and concerns. An understanding of stakeholder ideas to meet LEC Plan targets. An understanding of ways that stakeholders would like to work together to begin implementing the LEC Plan.	Meetings
		Collaborate	We will work together with you to formulate solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decision.	Working together to find solutions to make sure that future engagement opportunities are accessible to stakeholders.	
1B	Businesses & Organizations Residents	Consult	We will listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	Identification of potential priorities. Identification of areas of concern that may need some deeper engagement.	Survey

		Involve	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	<p>A thorough understanding of how non-profits could be impacted by the LEC Plan.</p> <p>An understanding of stakeholder aspirations and concerns.</p> <p>An understanding of stakeholder ideas to meet LEC Plan targets.</p> <p>An understanding of ways that stakeholders would like to work together to begin implementing the LEC Plan</p>	
2	Project Partners	Collaborate	We will work together with you to formulate solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decision	TBD	TBD
2	All Stakeholders	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

2 Preliminary Meetings

Stage 1A included eight meetings between Administration and various business and industry associations as well as some large businesses and institutions with the capacity for leadership and action. Given the short time frame for Stage 1A, meetings were the most appropriate tactic. They enabled the project team to share information about the LEC Plan directly with stakeholders, answer questions, respond to concerns, and begin to make plans for next steps. A total of fourteen participants representing 10 organizations met with the project team. Two of these meetings, those with the North Saskatoon Business Association (NSBA) and with the Business Improvement Districts (BIDS), also included engagement on other sustainability projects that are outside the scope of this report.

Additionally, the Mayor's Office organized meetings with Nutrien and the NSBA. Members of the LEC project team were invited to these meetings for the purposes of addressing specific questions about the Plan and for providing background and operational information. The content of the meeting with Nutrien (on September 17th) significantly informed Administration's subsequent meeting with Nutrien, and is therefore included in this report. The meeting with the NSBA that was organized by the Mayor's Office is outside the scope of this report as it provided a general overview of the LEC Plan and did not address any specific collaborations or projects.

Table 2: Stage 1A Meeting Schedule

Stakeholder Group	Meeting	Date
Large businesses with capacity for leadership and action	Meeting with Federated Co-operatives Limited, Sustainability Unit	September 16 th
Building Industry / Professional Association	Meeting with Saskatoon & Region Home Builders' Association (SRHBA)	September 19 th
Large businesses with capacity for leadership and action	Meeting with Nutrien*	September 19 th
Institution with capacity for leadership and action	Meeting with University of Saskatchewan	September 20 th
Business Association	Meeting with the North Saskatoon Business Association (NSBA)* / **	September 24 th
Business Association	Meeting with the Greater Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce	September 25 th
Business Association	Meeting with the Business Improvement Districts (BIDs): Riversdale BID, Broadway BID, Downtown BID, and Sutherland BID**	September 25 th
Large businesses with capacity for leadership and action	Meeting with another section of Federated Co-operatives Limited	September 30 th

*Indicates groups that had earlier meetings with the Mayor.

** Indicates meetings where additional sustainability files (i.e. ICI Waste Engagement; Climate Adaptation) were also discussed with stakeholders.

2.1 Intended Audience

The intended audience for this preliminary stage of engagement were business associations, the professional association representing the building industry, institutions, and large businesses with

capacity for leadership and action. The project team was able to arrange eight meetings with representatives from ten different organizations, which is significant given the three week time frame for engagement and report writing. The project team was able to meet with nearly all of the business associations in Saskatoon. The 33rd street BID was invited, but unable to attend. The project team met with the Saskatoon & Region Home Builders' Association as the professional association representing the building industry. The project team elected to meet with Nutrien, Federated Coop, and the University of Saskatchewan because of the leadership and capacity of these organizations in regards to sustainability, and their availability to meet during our short timeframe for this work. Additional stakeholders have been identified in the larger engagement strategy. Stage 1B of engagement will include opportunities for this broader audience to engage.

2.2 Marketing Techniques

Those who were interviewed were contacted directly by the project team to set-up a meeting.

2.3 Analysis

A meeting guide was developed in advance. Most of the meetings followed a semi-structured interview style that covered the questions from the guide. Some of the meetings took more of an unstructured approach and did not cover all of the questions from the guide. Meeting minutes were prepared by the project team and provided to the participants for validation. Some preliminary work has been done to identify themes from meetings. Because of the small sample size these themes do not suggest agreement amongst all of the stakeholders. Themes were identified based on topics that were emphasised in a single meeting as well as topics that were raised in multiple meetings. A more thorough thematic analysis will be possible with additional engagement in Stage 1B. The meetings also included commitments by the project team that are outlined in Section 4.3 Consideration of Results.

2.4 What We Heard

Administration explained at the beginning of most meetings that they were looking to gain feedback on the Low Emissions Community Plan (in particular the 40 actions), learn about sustainability actions participants are already pursuing or are interested in, and to identify potential opportunities to collaborate over the long or short term. Participant comments have been grouped thematically, and organized according to general areas of questioning: comments about the plan, how they would like to be engaged in the future, what they are already doing in terms of sustainability, and opportunities to work together.

It should be noted that not all questions were asked at all meetings, which was partially influenced by the amount of time stakeholders had to meet, as well as the number of meeting participants.

Additionally, the meeting with Nutrien was framed as a follow up meeting to discuss opportunities on solar with Saskatoon Light and Power. Because of this, some information from the Mayor's meeting with Nutrien has also been included in this report.

Only comments made in meetings for which the stakeholder(s) had opportunities to vet meeting minutes are included below.

2.4.1 Comments Regarding the LEC Plan

Opportunities for participants to comment on the LEC Plan were included in all meetings, though the Administration meeting with Nutrien focused specifically on opportunities for solar. It should be noted that not all participants had an opportunity to read the entire LEC Plan prior to meeting with Administration.

The preliminary themes identified are drawn from specific comments that were either emphasised by a single stakeholder or raised by more than one stakeholder. Generally there was support for clearer communications, and incentives rather than mandating changes. However, some of the details of what this should look like differed amongst stakeholder groups. There are also areas where stakeholders hold different views. The following section should not be read as representing the viewpoints of all stakeholders; rather, in order to show the breadth of stakeholder opinions, the Key Points column includes a variety of specific comments made by individual stakeholders. Additional engagement is needed to further clarify stakeholder perspectives and to be able to identify clear differences, similarities and/or themes between stakeholder groups.

Table 3: Comments on the LEC Plan

Theme	Key Points
There are some differing views on the LEC Plan and the best ways forward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders had different views about the LEC Plan and the various components of the Plan. Moving forward it will be important to distinguish between businesses and builders, and business associations and professional associations.
More information about costs and other impacts needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feeling of uncertainty – want to see the costs and numbers clearly communicated. For example, what is the impact specifically for businesses? There is a sense of caution as it relates to the cost of the plan. There is interest in obtaining a more fulsome understanding how this plan is to be paid for. Businesses will require an understanding of this type of information moving forward. Will the Plan lead to increased tax burdens? Do we have any numbers associated with this for the next budget cycle and future budget cycles? Want to make sure that infrastructure continues to get funded. There is some worry that the LEC work will be prioritized over infrastructure and/or that there will be tax increases in order to do it all. Businesses need time to adapt to changing costs of projects. The 19 billion number doesn't show the cost per homeowner and business. What does the Plan mean in the context of specific households and businesses? Businesses are asking: what does this look for me in the future? What does our capital schedule have to look like? How does my business plan have to

	<p>change? Make sure the timeline is doable for business.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about the cost of administrative work if the Plan doesn't align with other jurisdictions. • The Plan didn't clearly say how the City and community are going to execute these actions. • When the economic analysis is being conducted for each action, we need to keep in mind the affordability/economic lens for the homeowner when looking at the actions that impact residents. • Will PACE have a mill-rate impact? • When businesses are choosing where to locate, they look at rate of return. And building codes or requirements could impact where businesses locate themselves if not implemented strategically and thoughtfully. • How can the City create certainty for the business sector? • The City of Saskatoon will need to determine / think about what successful program uptake will look like.
Cost implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost, affordability is a concern. • Concern that one group will have more costs or burden than others. • It's not really about whether or not businesses want to do environmental action, it's about whether they can afford to do it. • Capital costs for infrastructure and permitting are challenges. • Currently, investing in EV infrastructure is something that doesn't lead to a direct return on investment. • Even businesses from the 80s say there is nothing more than can do to improve their building that is cost effective and will provide a return on investment at this time because the codes have progressed so far. • Businesses are starting to change – better lights, less electricity, less material use. There's buy-in on the electrical savings. These things lead to direct cost benefit analysis. • If businesses only see themselves as a drop in the bucket in terms of GHG impact, the requirements we place on businesses shouldn't outweigh that impact. • The property tax ratio that business pays relative to residential is 1.75 to 1. Perspectives are lost when we don't acknowledge that businesses pay more property tax so residents don't have to pay as much. • Do a good job of implementation. We don't want second rate infrastructure and services. No more pilot projects, just roll this out properly. Put your money where your mouth is.

Concerns about mandating language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The section that concerns us a lot – mandating any renovation. A prescriptive nature of renovations is not in line with what our professionals would recommend due to the damage it can do to the market and to the situation of many homeowners. • Adjust the mandating language for home renovations and retrofits. • Some stakeholders had concerns that mandated actions that will increase home prices. • Other stakeholders were concerned about forcing home owners into renovations they cannot afford or having a negative impact on the market. • Businesses are scared of some of the mandating language because it seems like it's coming too soon, before people are able to afford it. The capital upfront costs are the hardest to cover. • Clarify whether or not retrofits will be mandated (for businesses and residential). • We don't want to see a prescriptive approach. We don't want mandating. Let's take approaches or offer incentives that makes businesses want to change on their own.
Innovative incentives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need more information on what businesses can do that have a great payback. • Incentives: financial incentives are important, but so is certainty in terms of how we communicate / work with the City and cutting red tape / removing barriers. • Incentives – there are two types: those for builders and those for homeowners. • Need to develop business cases that would work in Saskatchewan. • Fossil fuel regulations mean that businesses are looking at opportunities to offset emissions. • We'd need favourable regulations and incentives to make the business case work. • Suggest that PACE upgrades need to be transferable assets that could be showed on a lease or purchase, where it's considered in the lending discussion. • We want to be a part of the solution. We also want to make sure we're still in business. We want to help, but also want to receive help to transition.
Need to support existing communities within Saskatoon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about what constitutes a "high traffic" area (specific to LEC Action 19). Will vehicle pollution pricing in high traffic areas negatively impact Business Improvement Districts and / or the downtown? If there are penalties around getting to/from the city centre (and other established areas), we need to be careful. LEC Action 19 could lead people to go to peripheral / green field areas of the city instead (i.e. where there is

	<p>free parking and penalty free driving), which could negatively impact the downtown and contradict the goal of lowering emissions. The built form is already encouraging people to drive to the periphery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to compare Saskatoon to downtown London / Vancouver / Portland. We're different. • Better to encourage and incentivise people to live downtown to reduce traffic volume and create community, than to penalize drivers who can access services elsewhere. • The Land Use actions in the LEC make it sound like we're focusing on <i>new</i> communities rather than <i>existing</i> ones. A complementary focus on established communities needs to be reflected in the plan as well.
Harmonization with other jurisdictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the City collaborating with the Provincial Government and neighbouring municipalities? • Concern that businesses could move to other jurisdictions because of uncertainty caused by this Plan. • Support for harmonization of regulations between municipalities – when it's different between jurisdictions, there are additional costs and administrative work for businesses. • High house prices in a city leads people to drive out further for better prices (i.e. to purchase more affordable homes in adjacent towns or regional municipalities). This is proven data with the national Avid homebuyer preference survey. • We see good examples (i.e. of infrastructure and services) in other cities. Let's replicate those good examples.
Need for conversations with utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for continued conversation with utilities to ensure they are also ready. • Will energy savings ultimately lead to an increase in utility costs in the future? • Could companies potentially buy green power to offset their own emissions? • With regards to EVs: who pays for the electricity used to charge the vehicle - does government pay, the developer, the business, the customer? • Much is being said about a 'clean grid'; however, with many tech and design companies here, along with needs for security cameras and debit card machines which require quality power supply, whatever the source of power, it needs to be reliable. • Weir Hydro Project – what are we waiting for? Must include a water feature to attract youth. It also harnesses energy. Why aren't we doing this yet?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water rates – will water conservation lead to an increase in rates? Ensure this is explored in the City's Water Conservation Strategy.
Need for additional communications and education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While some stakeholders thought the Plan was clear, others were unsure about the Plan or found it to be overwhelming. Some suggested more time be spent on education. • How does the information in the LEC Plan get conveyed in a concise, easy to process way? • Education for home owners – Could we do some education on what the best steps are to improve your home, because each home is different. • Provide more clarity– what do things like PV, ICI, and CHP mean? • Recommended adding a frequently asked questions page – could address some of the obvious misconceptions. Also, focus on the savings and benefits. • Develop a supplementary communication piece that is targeted at businesses. • Want to learn more about PACE – could the City create a one pager? • Communicate how this Plan can make Saskatoon more competitive. Make a fact-sheet about how this makes Saskatoon an attractive place to do business. • Ensure transparency on exactly what is happening. The City needs to communicate better when rolling out new standards. • Communicate better with specific industries involved in aspects of the Plan. • Communicate directly with associations to help circulate information. • Engage with professional associations. • Communication on LEC and climate adaptation is huge. The way it has been worded has put businesses in the wrong frame of mind. Can the conversation be framed instead as “how this saves you money as a business over time?” • Provide information early, and explain the benefits of doing things early. Let's reveal some stories and quick solutions that businesses could work on today.
Timing and relationship to other City projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing standards isn't a bad thing, but it does change the economics of a project. The way the City times, communicates, and roll outs their changing standards could be improved. And the business community needs to understand <i>why</i> it's being done. • Businesses need time to adapt and need a far enough lead time to adjust business plans, determine

	<p>feasibility, and run calculations to meet changing standards. A year is probably more than enough time. If the City knows what else is coming down the pipe, it's important to signal that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement the actions in the plan at a time when those actions are financially viable. Know these actions will work before doing widespread implementation. • Can the municipality signal to retail businesses, what's coming down the pipe? • It can be challenging for businesses to plan for whose ready to actually use an EV. • The City will need to prepare its own processes too (e.g. to adapt to changing standards, such as the National Building Code).
Alignment with National Building Code	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Research Council (NRC) has signaled that a step code will be introduced in future updates to the National Building Code (NBC) – with a future goal of net zero for new buildings. Once more information is released, we can start digesting what that looks like. • Development of the NBC has been based on a consensus approach with industry professionals, scientists, academics, and NRC staff. The more diversity at the table, the better decision you're going to make. It's so important to have a solid process. If the process is solid, robust, and well-researched, we can get behind that. • Want to make sure the City does not get ahead of the National Building Code in terms of standards or timing. • The National Building Code – that's the respected standard. As long as our jurisdiction continues to adopt that, the industry will keep up to date with it. The City should not go above and beyond what the National Building Code is mandating. Everyone is on board with keeping pace with the national code (rather than getting ahead of it). • Important to remain competitive with other jurisdictions and aligned with other levels of government (harmonization and reduced administrative burden is key). • How buildings are built and retrofitted is important to BIDs (e.g. any new City requirements should not detract businesses from starting or staying in the established BID areas).
Relation to how we experience our communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solar panels on adjacent roofs or adjacent fields can be eye sores. Need to ensure balance of solar energy and quality of life, including access to green space. • Specifically regarding heritage requirements – could there be some allowances there to provide more grace

	<p>for heritage buildings? It's important to preserve heritage buildings, but it will be hard to upgrade them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We wouldn't want to see the LEC actions turn into a controversial issues (i.e. between neighbours). • Building up - Where are our parks and amenities for densified urban areas and those living in high rises? Need to meet the needs of those people who don't have yards. • Supportive of ground source heat pumps – because it doesn't matter if it's sunny or cloudy for them to provide power, and they aren't unsightly.
Concerns the LEC Plan is already endorsed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception that the "Message from the Mayor" at the beginning of the plan is a stamp of approval of the Plan in its entirety. • Don't want to see a rubber stamp approval of all actions in the plan. Would like this communicated more clearly.
Consistency at the City / with other City projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What happens if something is built adjacent to a building that blocks solar access? Building standards or requirements would need to be adjusted to avoid impacts to light. • Urban Design needs to consider infrastructure for charging stations going forward. • Taller buildings can block views and adding solar panels can make a building even higher. What are the limitations or restrictions going to be on solar? • Riversdale BID has opposition to a solar farm on the contaminated site between 19th and 20th Street; Avenue K to Avenue M. The need for a civic center at this site will greatly contribute to the wellbeing of the communities surrounding this location. • Council is not passing what they say they want – infill, compact communities, and dual stream waste trucks. If you want those things, approve / fund those things. • We need to identify the location of the future landfill and start zoning for that. Plan for future. • The City will need to be able to inspect efficiently and effectively as changes to the National Building Code occur. The building industry doesn't want more administrative burden, permit or inspection wait times, etc. So far so good with the last updates to the code. • Walking infrastructure – we see asphalt overlays that look like bad dental work. We need proper investment into sidewalk infrastructure and wheelchair ramps. • Are the new Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI meters) considered in any of the LEC Actions?
Importance of City leadership and to walk the walk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Happy to see that the City is putting its own operations first to showcase leadership and use their projects as an education opportunity.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the City is implementing a project that proves it can benefit their bottom line, it's no longer a hypothetical but shows real paybacks. • If Council wants solar, why did they vote down Solair? If you want it, do it. • The City's outdoor sprinklers – why are they on when it's raining?
The actions in the LEC Plan are necessary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The actions identified are aggressive and challenging and necessary. • The initiatives are the right ones. • There are other opportunities too. • Innovative incentives are the right way to go.

2.4.2 How Should We Engage?

The question, “how could we best engage with you or your members,” was asked at some meetings. The following do not include comments from the Greater Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce or Nutrien. Responses to this question as well as the new City of Saskatoon Public Engagement Policy will inform continuing engagement on this project.

Table 4: What Should Future Stakeholder Engagement Look Like?

Theme	Key Points
Early engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we have an opportunity to talk to someone pre-emptively, we're going to try to take that opportunity. • We'd like to leave space to go to a higher decision making body (like Council) if need be. But this isn't always the best first step. Are there opportunities to engage with Administration earlier? That way we can decide what the best avenue to communicate back is. • We'd appreciate if the City would check in and ask: Do you think you are a stakeholder in this initiative (per action)? Then we can have the opportunity to identify whether we see ourselves as a stakeholder or not. Gives the opportunity to validate whether we should be involved. • BIDs want to be apprised of everything that impacts their members. Need to know what is going on across the board. And there might be opportunities to discuss multiple things in one meeting.
Feedback loops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICI Waste and Organics engagement was a really excellent example of engagement with us and the community. The City got way ahead of it and there were feedback loops, so it will put us in a better place when the decision gets to Council.
Only engage if we can influence a clear and specific outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't want engagement if we can't influence the outcome.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders may not want to sign off on the entire 40 LEC actions all at once. Each action has multiple decision points that require engagement.
Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing engagement is needed with those who will be needed to help implement the LEC Plan. Changes to organizations can mean different opportunities. Check back in. Plan debrief meetings after Council budget deliberations. Work with us to determine how best to engage on these topics going forward. We want to be a part of the solution. We also want to make sure we're still in business. We want to help, but also want to receive help to transition.
Build off existing relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build off existing relationships and successes. Saskatchewan was the last to adopt the energy code (section 9.36). When they did, there was an excellent process of collaboration between SRHBA and City Administration. The City determined whether a builder was meeting new standards via the permitting process, educated them on gaps, and then, after 18 months, builders had to comply. It worked well.
Identifying the right stakeholders and appropriate levels of influence for different stakeholder groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement with appropriate stakeholders for each Action Item in the Plan. Ensure appropriate levels of influence for different stakeholders during future engagement activities. The SRHBA will not have an opinion on all LEC Actions, only on those that have implications for their members/industry. Include property owners, developers, architects, and professional associations in conversations, not just businesses. Touch base with realtors when designing educational materials related to PACE and / or energy efficiency retrofits – they understand what's important to home buyers / sellers. Some credit unions already have some green home incentives. Bring to the table down the road. Keep reaching out to us directly on matters related to our work.

2.4.3 Current Sustainability Goals and Actions

Many organizations and associations are already working towards sustainability goals and actions.

Table 5: Current Sustainability Goals & Actions by Stakeholders

Organization	Comments
--------------	----------

Chamber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are a membership based organization and we will continue to advocate for and support our members as they work towards their sustainability goals.
NSBA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focused on our member businesses and how we can support them moving forwards.
Nutrien	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nutrien recently introduced a new sustainability strategy. Nutrien is targeting LEED Gold Certification for their new Saskatoon Headquarters. Focus on sustainable agriculture, diversity and inclusion, and climate change. Nutrien brings a global perspective. Prioritizing and looking for opportunities to move the needle on their environmental footprint.
Federated Coop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability is one of FCL's corporate goals. FCL recently developed a high-level sustainability strategy. FCL is looking at opportunities in new business lines so they're successful in 2050 and beyond in a new low-carbon economy. Interested in receiving funds to do their own research and development on EVs and/or learning from research done by others. FCL would be open to partnering with others on EV network, research, and infrastructure.
University of Saskatchewan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the fall of 2010, the University signed the University and College Presidents Climate Change Statement of Action for Canada and set a reduction target in the 2012 Climate Action Plan to reduce annual greenhouse gas emissions by 20% below 2006 / 2007 levels by 2020, which equates to a GHG level of 128,800 MT CO₂e. USask has a Sustainability Revolving Fund. USask has pursued building efficiency projects, waste management programs, amongst others.
Saskatoon & Region Home Builders' Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will assist our certified professionals in meeting the objectives of building Net Zero Ready Homes and renovations by 2030 (to meet code). We will continue to assist with education and sharing of best practices and also working with our governments to make sure they are also ready. Continually mesh moving to net zero by 2030 with an affordability lens. SRHBA demonstrates success stories of certified professional home builders who are already building to net zero standards. SRHBA published a Housing Matters public opinion piece on the LEC Plan. The SRHBA's Housing Matters

	document was done in consultation with its Building Industry Liaison Committee. We conducted a working session and the discussion was encouraging. We have the green light required to take the positions set out in that document.
Business Improvement Districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some member businesses in the BIDs are pursuing sustainability projects. • We represent property owners primarily, and the businesses stationed in those buildings. Many businesses lease their spaces. Some of the property owners aren't even in Saskatoon. • The BIDs are interested in learning more about the LEC Plan and sharing information with their members. • The BIDs want to balance sustainability with affordability and protecting the Business Improvement Districts.

2.4.4 Potential Opportunities for Working Together

During the preliminary meetings, several opportunities to work together were identified. These opportunities relate to education and communication as well as specific action items in the LEC Plan.

Table 6: Opportunities to Work Together

Organization	Opportunities
The Greater Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interested in working directly on the development of the education pieces, especially on the tangible items. • Communicate what the LEC will do for businesses and how they will be impacted; communicate how the LEC Plan can create more certainty in the business environment and ultimately promote economic growth. • The Chamber is interested in PACE financing and would like to hear more details on where this is at for local use.
NSBA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate what the LEC actions will do to / for business – the positive and negative. Talk about how it could motivate economic growth, and allow business to be more competitive. (E.g. the City's Procurement Policy has an environmental piece in there, so there are positives to getting on board). • NSBA might be interested in learning about Communities of Practice if they develop in the following areas. They would want to see the terms of reference to see if they (or their members) have something to bring to the table. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Building retrofits b. PACE program c. Electric vehicle projects d. Solar projects e. Building Code development • Supportive of PACE financing. NSBA would like to hear from the City – where are we at for securing PACE for

	<p>local use? And what could the NSBA do to help further PACE?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Appreciate less government intervention. ○ When and if the PACE program goes ahead, make sure to communicate well to the industry in terms of what is included in PACE retrofits, i.e. communicate which things will pay themselves back over time, and within what timeframe. So that businesses don't have to do that payback math themselves. ○ Give examples so that businesses can see what projects lead to what paybacks, either a City demonstration project or by a business.
FCL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes continued conversations on opportunities to collaborate on EV charging, renewable fuel/power, and solutions to reduce waste. • Provide FCL with the opportunity to participate in engagement. • FCL had been actively exploring the potential for EV charging stations across Western Canada. While capital costs (i.e. for the charging stations and upgrades to electrical infrastructure), permitting, and regulations have been identified as challenges, they view EVs as part of a longer terms strategy of meeting their sustainability goals. As such, they have expressed interest in partnerships, research and development, co-investments, co-branding, and leveraging expertise from various partners. FCL is also pursuing federal funding for electric vehicle charging infrastructure; some of those charging stations may be located in Saskatoon if the application is successful. Partnerships with / support from local municipalities would strengthen the proposal. FCL has also expressed interest in conducting further research on and exploring the business case for electric buses and transit charging infrastructure.
University of Saskatchewan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to collaborate with different academic, operational, and governing bodies at USask, as per the Memorandum of Understanding between USask and the City of Saskatoon. • USask is interested in learning about / exploring projects with good business cases. <p>Building Retrofits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USask has a lot of experience to offer. • USask interested in learning about Energy Performance Contracts. City could probably share lessons learned there. • District cooling system – working with partners to explore what that might look like.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural gas – interested in exploring opportunities for a biogas plant (slow pyrolysis reactor). Interested in water conservation and have funded some opportunities through the USask Sustainability Revolving Fund. <p>EVs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interested in learning from the City if the City conducts research on a community or corporate EV Strategy. <p>Organics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interested in exploring more opportunities to divert organic waste.
Nutrien	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nutrien is interested in working together, even if the specific ways of collaborating aren't known at this time. Nutrien may be interested in participating in a Community of Practice where they could share learnings regarding the technical aspects of their headquarters, which is targeting LEED Gold Certification. Currently reporting through the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures. <p>Solar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interested in offsetting the energy use of their headquarters with solar; exploring solar pilots or experiments; and meeting with Saskatoon Light and Power / the City regarding solar opportunities. <p>Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interested in talking further about supporting educational opportunities. For example, they could explore supporting Student Action for a Sustainable Future or something similar that engages students to look for opportunities to innovate in schools and homes. Nutrien is doing internal engagement as well – looking to employees for ideas. Interested in communicating and measuring savings to articulate the measurable value that is unlocked with particular sustainable projects.
Saskatoon and Region Homebuilders' Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wants to play a leadership role in conversations connecting to the NBC and relating to the building industry. See Housing Matters position paper on the LEC Plan: https://saskatoonhomebuilders.com/isl/uploads/2019/09/Housing-Matters-Key-Industry-Issues-LECPan09.2019.pdf Let's move ahead with a taskforce to get PACE financing happening in our province. We need to be shovel ready if and when the province unlocks this potential, and we can lead this. SRHBA is the source of professional development in its field, there is no other organization that offers the certification and professional development to become a

	<p>CPHB. SRHBA is more than happy to step up and provide education and/or hire the expertise to offer those opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For builders, SRHBA could engage their members on what is desirable – i.e. cutting the red tape. • SRHBA will be taking steps to ensure that only certified professionals are used when incentives are created and when/if PACE financing becomes available. The Certified Professional Home Builder Program is the only professional certification in the residential construction sector (they are also launching an equivalent program to certify professional renovators) and should be tapped into to ensure quality work and standards, and to ensure items are in writing, which protects everyone involved and ensures tax revenues are collected. • Educating about PACE will be really important because homeowners aren't talking about this yet. There is an opportunity for SRHBA and the City to align messages, and potentially for home builders to disseminate that information. • Still a lot of noise in the community about why LEC might not be a good thing. SRHBA is supportive if we can remove the mandating language and stay in line with the National Building Code.
Business Improvement Districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want to learn more about PACE. • EVs could be an easy move for businesses. Need to better understand how private business could support EVs or create EV infrastructure on their land. • How buildings are built and retrofitted is important to BIDs (e.g. any new City requirements should not detract businesses from starting or staying in the established BID areas). • Retrofits will require a lot of engagement with the community; they're a challenge for many jurisdictions. • Building retrofits – do a one pager to share. Include info on “here are things you can do today – give this consideration, and here's why.” • Could the City provide succinct bullet points to communicate to businesses or media? Synopsis would be good. • BIDS and members want to hear details in easy to consume manner straight from the City, rather than rely on the media.

3 Evaluation

For a preliminary stage of engagement lasting only three weeks, a significant number of meetings have taken place. These meetings represent a strong first step in meeting the engagement goals for the project. Participants had opportunities to verify their meeting minutes, as well as a draft of this report. The meetings to date represent positive steps in relationship building for the project. However, continued evaluation will be necessary to determine how successful Administration is in following up on issues relating to the LEC Plan and future engagement that were raised during the meetings.

Continuing engagement and communications regarding the LEC Plan will be essential to fully meet the engagement goals and to ensure that this engagement aligns with the engagement principles outlined in the new Engagement Policy, particularly inclusivity and transparency. It will be important that additional businesses, organizations, members of industry, professional associations, and institutions, as well as members of the public have opportunities to ask questions about the LEC Plan, share their concerns, and let us know how they would like to be engaged moving forward towards implementation.

4 Engagement Summary

A total of fourteen participants representing 10 organizations met with the Administration over a two week period regarding the Low Emissions Community Plan. The following table outlines these meetings and their relationship to the engagement goals.

Table 7: Engagement Summary

Engagement Goal	Engagement Activity/Component	Date(s)
Identification of potential priorities.	Meeting with Federated Co-operatives Limited, Sustainability Unit	September 16 th
Identification of areas of concern that may need some deeper engagement.	Meeting with Saskatoon & Region Home Builders' Association	September 19 th
A thorough understanding of how stakeholders could be impacted by the LEC Plan.	Meeting with Nutrien	September 19 th
An understanding of stakeholder aspirations and concerns.	Meeting with University of Saskatchewan	September 20 th
An understanding of stakeholder ideas to meet LEC Plan targets.	Meeting with North Saskatoon Business Association (NSBA)	September 24 th
An understanding of ways that stakeholders would like to work together to begin implementing the LEC Plan.	Meeting with the Greater Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce	September 25 th
Working together to find solutions to make sure that future engagement opportunities are accessible to stakeholders.	Meeting with Business Improvement Districts: Riversdale BID, Broadway BID, Downtown BID, and Sutherland BID	September 25 th
	Meeting with Federated Co-operatives Limited, Energy Business Unit	September 30 th

4.1.1 Identifying Potential Priorities

Business associations tended to prioritize education / communications as well as incentives. The SRHBA was very clear about the importance of not getting ahead of the National Building Code, avoiding mandatory requirements, and focusing on innovative incentives. The University of Saskatchewan and other larger organizations with capacity expressed interest in aspects of the plan that complement what they are already doing. These organizations were interested in playing leadership roles, but also in receiving support from the City.

Table 8: Potential Priorities

Communication & education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need for clarity regarding the Plan, particularly that it is a high level roadmap and that additional engagement will be done before implementing action items. More information about specific costs and impacts was identified as a need by some stakeholders.
City putting its own operations first & alignment with other City projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates benefits of plan, makes it less of a hypothetical. There is a need to make sure that the plan is consistent with other City projects and priorities.
Innovative incentives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Associations representing businesses and the building industry were supportive of innovative incentives and the removal of mandatory actions. The PACE program was particularly popular.
PACE financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several stakeholders were interested in learning more about PACE. Clear communication was identified as important in implementation. Also need to make sure the City is ready to move on this once the potential is unlocked (i.e. once Provincial legislation is passed).
Building retrofits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some stakeholders were interested in City support and collaboration to meet upcoming changes to the National Building Code. The SRHBA wants to be a leader on this priority. The University of Saskatchewan has conducted building retrofits on some of their own facilities and could share those learnings. Stakeholders emphasized using education and incentives rather than mandating retrofits. Some stakeholders noted that this topic would need additional engagement.
Electric vehicle projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FCL is currently researching EV projects and is interested in collaboration. There were some concerns about overcoming challenges, such as cost barriers, for EV projects in Saskatchewan without appropriate supports.
Solar projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There may be opportunities to work with Nutrien. Some other organizations expressed interest in continued conversations.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FCL also sees solar and renewables as part of the whole EV + energy picture.
Preparing for changes to the National Building Code	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was emphasized that the City not get ahead of the National Building Code, but rather, work with the SRHBA and industry to support businesses/organizations as they prepare for changes to that code.
Water conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USask shared interests in district cooling technologies, which may have the added benefit of water conservation.
Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USask would like to learn more about organics diversion opportunities. FCL encourages harmonization between jurisdictions in the area of waste management. Businesses are interested in staying up to date on any waste decisions or opportunities that might impact businesses (Note: this is currently being addressed through ICI Waste Engagement).
Other areas of interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SRHBA drew attention to the importance of insulation as an important step that should come before solar panels. In addition to EVs, FCL is interested in other alternative fuels (such as renewable diesel) and renewable natural gas. These areas of interest were identified as important in ensuring that other priorities can be successful within the context of Saskatchewan.

4.1.2 Areas of Concern

The following areas of concern were identified during the meetings. These are areas that may need additional engagement or research.

Table 9: Areas of Concern

Unknown costs & impacts (particularly on small and medium sized businesses)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some stakeholders felt it was difficult to provide feedback on the Plan when they didn't know the cost or impacts of the various action items. Some were particularly concerned with the language around mandating. Feedback indicated that many businesses want to make sure they receive enough notice and time before implementation so that they can adapt their business plans. Additional impacts identified by professional associations and larger organizations included the potential for the LEC Actions to add administrative costs/burdens to businesses and builders. The BIDs were concerned about potential impacts that could uniquely affect the Business Improvement Districts and make it more difficult for businesses within their areas.
Alignment with other jurisdictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several stakeholders expressed concerns about alignment with other jurisdictions.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For smaller businesses, concerns included: not being able to compete with businesses that did not have the same costs, and businesses moving to neighbouring communities with less regulation or costs. SRHBA identified a risk that, if the LEC Actions lead to higher home prices in the city, home buyers will look to neighbouring jurisdictions with more affordable homes. Larger organizations who operate in several municipalities and provinces were concerned about the administrative costs and complexities of differing regulations between jurisdictions.
Alignment with the National Building Code	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback indicated that the City should not be regulating above and beyond what the National Building Code is mandating; incentive programs in advance of energy code changes were considered a beneficial approach. The project team has indicated that they will clarify the wording in the LEC Plan.
Alignment with other City projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some stakeholders noted places where the LEC Plan could connect or conflict with other ongoing City projects and priorities (i.e. incentivising infill, supporting green space, developing a civic centre in the core).
Need for Conversations with Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders identified that more work is needed between Administration and utilities to determine impacts and opportunities, as well as to clarify whether there will be changes to rates.

4.1.3 Understanding Impacts on Stakeholders

Generally, stakeholders do not fully understand how they will be impacted by the LEC Plan. Business associations were primarily concerned with unknown costs and time frames, as well as language in the plan around mandatory requirements which they felt indicated that approving the plan would equal signing off on actions that would have unknown impacts on them. The SRHBA was also concerned about the mandating language and emphasised that the City needs to make sure the plan is in alignment with the National Building Code. They also emphasised the need to collaborate with professionals and professional associations on relevant aspects of the plan. Clarifying some of the language in the plan will help to address this, as will communicating more clearly about ongoing and future opportunities to engage before aspects of the plan are implemented. Larger institutions and organizations with capacity were interested in ways that the City could support some of their interests and in how they could potentially support the City's objectives. There is some potential for collaboration in research, grants, and implementation that could make it easier for the City and those stakeholders to each reach their sustainability goals.

4.1.4 Understanding Stakeholder Aspirations and Concerns

For a summary of concerns, see Table 9: Areas of Concern that may need additional research or engagement. Generally, primary concerns related to the impacts that the plan could have, particularly related to unknown costs for businesses and organizations. This was especially the case for the business associations representing small and medium businesses. Other areas of concern were how the plan aligns with existing codes and other jurisdictions, as well as other City projects. Business associations saw opportunities for the plan and the City to support businesses and organizations

make the changes that are expected to be needed. Conversations with professional associations and larger organizations with capacity such as SRHBA, Nutrien, the University of Saskatchewan, and Federated Coop indicate some potential opportunities to work together.

4.1.5 Understanding Stakeholder Ideas to Meet LEC Plan Targets

Preliminary engagement drew attention to some of the work that stakeholders are already doing or are interested in pursuing. For example, making sure that the LEC Plan doesn't get ahead of the National Building code could create opportunities for the City to work with stakeholders, particularly the SRHBA to prepare for change. The SRHBA and larger organizations suggested some opportunities to work together and build on the work that stakeholders are already doing to meet LEC Plan targets. More specific details regarding opportunities will need to be presented to organizations before partnerships can be built. Nearly all of the stakeholders were interested in working with the City on issues related to communications and education.

4.1.6 Understanding How Stakeholders Want to Work Together

Stakeholders want to be kept in the loop moving forward and to be able to provide input into what implementation looks like. Better communications and education regarding the LEC Plan are needed, and some stakeholders are interested in assisting the City with this. Opportunities for engagement will also be important. Stakeholders indicated that they want the City to let them know about opportunities for engagement and working together, but that these offers need to be significant and to have an impact. Stakeholders also noted that it will be important for the City to engage the right stakeholders at appropriate levels of influence, and that this will differ for the various Actions outlined in the LEC Plan.

Several stakeholders indicated a preference for incentives and supports rather than mandatory requirements.

4.1.7 Making Sure Future Engagement Opportunities are Accessible to Stakeholders

Not all participants were asked about how they would like to be engaged moving forward, but those who did identified the importance of early engagement (with clear communications), feedback loops, and being able to influence a clear and specific outcome. This is all in alignment with our new engagement policy and procedures, as well as the principles of engagement that we want to make sure we employ moving forward. Stakeholders indicated the need for ongoing engagement regarding implementing the plan and that the City should work to build off of existing relationships.

4.2 Data Limitations

This preliminary stage of engagement has been an important first step and has provided the project team with opportunities related to clarifying aspects of the LEC Plan and for moving forward. The primary limitation of the engagement to date is the limited scope. This is directly related to the short time frame for engagement prior to this interim report and will be addressed by continuing engagement with a broader and more inclusive approach in Stage 1B and Stage 2. The following are additional data limitations that should be considered.

- The short time frame meant that some stakeholders did not all have opportunities to fully read the LEC Plan, affecting their ability to understand how the plan could impact them.

- Meetings were conducted by the project team. While this means that stakeholders could receive answers directly from the project team, the project team also has an interest in the success of the LEC Plan that can shape the way that they asked and answered questions.
- Because of the short time frame, meetings were not all conducted by the same members of the project team. This resulted in differences in how questions were asked and how meeting minutes were prepared.
- The Engagement Consultant was not present at the meetings, so the analysis provided in this report is based on the validated meeting minutes alone. As a result, nuances in how information was communicated (such as pauses, tone of voice, answering or not answering questions) that can provide significant context have been missed.
- Some stakeholders had more than one meeting, allowing for a deeper engagement than those who only met with the project team once.
- Some stakeholders had more time to review their meeting minutes and the engagement report. Because of the tight timeframe, not all stakeholders had the opportunity to see how their feedback would be incorporated into this report.
- Additional meetings that were not organized by Administration and the portions of meetings that were led by other project teams, are not included in this report.
- Not all stakeholders provided feedback or validation on their minutes and the report. Timeframes were clearly communicated with stakeholders so information has still been included. While the project team is fairly confident that all inquiries were captured in the minutes and report it cannot be confirmed that they were captured within the intended context.
- The small sample size limits the effectiveness of thematic analysis, and that analysis should be seen as very preliminary. Themes and comments do not represent the views of all stakeholders who have been engaged to date.
- The data only includes perspectives from some business and professional associations, the University of Saskatchewan, Nutrien, and Federated Co-operatives Limited. Additional engagement with more diverse groups of stakeholders is still required for this to be an inclusive engagement.

4.3 Consideration of Results

Given the short time frame between the preliminary engagement meetings and reporting, the effects of engagement on the project are still to be determined. Outlined below are statements made by the project team during engagement meetings that indicate how they intend to use results as well as items for which additional follow-up are required. It will be important that the findings of continuing engagement with additional stakeholders also be considered. Results from this stage of engagement as well as stage 1B will inform how we engage on various action items from the LEC plan moving forward into stage 2.

The following table outlines statements made by the project team during meetings related to how they will consider results.

Table 10: Project Team Statements

Steps	Project Team Statements
Clarifying the Plan to align with the National Building Code	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We won't be mandating any renovations unless it's in line with what's required by provincial and national requirements • The intent of the LEC is not to be ahead of the code, but to work with partners to prepare for code changes. • The City can do some revisions of the LEC Plan to provide clarity (and maybe do a press release as well) specific to: The City is not getting ahead of the code. And the City won't mandate renovations. Rather, the City wants to work with partners to prepare for code, support sustainable renovations, and work towards improving energy efficiency in buildings. • Also add language that: the industry is asking for PACE, which is why we want it as a City – we're supporting what our industry is asking for. • We hear your concern about alignment with the National Building Code, and have heard that from other stakeholders as well. In response to this, we plan to amend language in the plan to make it clear that the City's role is not to write a new code, but actually to work within the National Building Code framework and to work with organizations, the public, and industry to understand how the changes might impact various stakeholders, and how we can prepare for a new code. We will work together to plan and prepare for what we expect is coming. • We still want to achieve targets in the LEC Plan – but need to stay within existing processes.
PACE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If PACE comes on board by next spring, what things could we be doing together to get ourselves set up to roll out a program? Can we prep for PACE like it's already a done deal and start working with SRHBA to start preparing for that? What might a program look like? How to trouble shoot, if necessary?
Incentives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We're starting to see some writing on the wall in terms of where things are heading. So let's get prepared with things like incentives, training, etc. • Will look more deeply into what incentives might look like. • Some actions are directly done by the City, other actions are not, but we will play a role in facilitating and incentivising.
Internal follow-ups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A next step is to meet with Building Standards (re: energy code discussions). • We will inquire as to why a message from the Mayor is part of a plan and to understand the intention behind it.

Will work with other jurisdictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will work in alignment with the Province and therefore hope to stay aligned with other jurisdictions. • We will continue to engage with other municipalities on how our actions can be rolled out. We are also very interested in continuing to work with the City of Regina as we move forward on issues that affect the whole province.
Will work with the utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regards to potential revenue impacts to SL&P when energy savings are realized - it's a complicated model and we'll need to work together to understand the impacts of short term efficiencies on longer term capital. We are starting to work with the utilities to understand the impacts of conservation and impacts to the utility so that the full picture is provided to Council. We continue to work closely with the utilities to ensure the comprehensive picture is brought forward and decisions are made with full information.
Education & communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can the City and SRHBA co-create an information package on buildings and/or renovations? The package would be geared towards home owners. Collaborative marketing/education. • The City will develop additional education pieces such as a backgrounder, video(s), comprehensive webpage, and others, and collaborate on messaging with stakeholders like the Chamber. • The City will send information about Student Action for a Sustainable Future to Nutrien.
Clarifying the Plan is a plan and we will continue to engage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEC is a roadmap, not a bylaw and not an approved plan. • The Plan has not received a rubber stamp and Council has not committed to funding each action in the Plan. We will leverage partnerships, grants, etc. to further this work; with the intent to maximize co-benefits and leverage partnerships as much as possible. • We hope to dig into the specific sectors and actions so that we can provide more substance with regards to the actions and impacts. We can work together to make the actions lead to benefits. • Current status for the LEC Plan is for Admin to continue to engage. • The City is planning to continue developing business cases and continue engagement on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Building retrofit programs ○ PACE financing – The City will work to implement PACE financing for solar and building efficiency upgrades, pending required changes to Provincial legislation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Solar opportunities – The City has no plans to supply solar panels to businesses or residents. The City (SL&P) might invest in utility-scale solar. ○ Waste Diversion – The City will continue engagement around both alignment with business and other partners on reduction strategies, as well as an ICI diversion policy.
Clarifying costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are providing business cases and opportunities for partnerships as we go forward and have funding requests as part of the budget package. We don't expect that any immediate funding will result in property tax increases beyond what has already been communicated by City. • We are looking for those opportunities that either have external funding or can be paid back with savings. We understand that these are the types of opportunities that make most sense since there will be less impacts to tax payers. • We are considering more than the financial bottom line as Council just passed a Triple Bottom Line Policy.
Opportunities to work together	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Let's continue to enhance that relationship (between SRHBA and the City) and build on those successes. • The team indicated that they would keep those they met with informed and provide updates after City Council budget deliberations.
Developing Communities of Practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We hope to build Communities of Practice around certain topics in the LEC Plan – how can we learn from other leaders in our community? • The City is looking into potentially developing an EV Community of Practice – to share research and stories.
Next steps for EVs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City is looking at investing in an electric bus and charging station pilot. • Will connect appropriate stakeholders with Saskatoon Transit leads.
Next steps for solar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solar opportunities – will schedule a second meeting with Saskatoon Light and Power to look more closely at solar opportunities • After feasibility study, SL&P may be looking for partnerships. • SL&P will look into the servicing plan for the new Nutrien headquarters to calculate load. SL&P look for numbers and send back to Nutrien.
Clarifying what is meant by high traffic areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will get back to stakeholders and clarify in the Plan what is meant by a “high traffic” area (re: Action 19).

5 Next Steps

This report outlined preliminary engagement that was done as part of a larger engagement process. Engagement with stakeholders regarding the LEC Plan will continue in Stages 1B and 2 (outlined in the Section 1.5 Summary of Engagement Strategy).

The next steps for engagement are to work to clearly communicate the LEC Plan and to engage with diverse groups of stakeholders about the Plan and how they would like to be engaged as we move towards implementing various action items.

Some next steps for the project team have been outlined in Section 4.3 Consideration of results. The project team is actively looking into opportunities for partnership with private, professional, institutional, and non-profit sectors. They are also researching how the LEC Plan can align with the Province and other jurisdictions.