



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

Deconstruction Advisory Group

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2015

Time: 2:30 pm – 4:30 pm

Committee Members present: Bryce Jacobson, Shane Endicott, Joe Connell, Scott Yelton, Preston Browning, James Ray Arnold, Brandon Spencer-Hartle, Jeff Fish, Kristin Wells, Nancy Thorington, Kristin Cooper, Matthew Robinson, Barbara Kerr

Absent: Caroline Dao, Alando Simpson, Ben Gates

Staff: Shawn Wood, Alisa Kane, Madeline Kovacs

Guests: Heather Robinson (phone), Rachel Loftin, Vic Remmers, Bruce Howard

Welcome and Introductions

Shawn Wood began the meeting with an overview of the Deconstruction Advisory Group (DAG's) timeline, and goals for remaining meetings before recommendations are presented to City Council, at the hearing on June 3rd. Shawn then gave an overview of a draft program matrix, to be rolled out in three phases. The DAG then considered which elements of the matrix to present to Council, and provided feedback.

Next Steps

The next DAG meeting will be held on May 13th, from 2:30 – 4:30 pm in the same room (7A, 1900 SW 4th). Preliminary recommendations may be refined at a final meeting, on May 20th, if needed.

Summary of DAG purpose

The Deconstruction Advisory Group has been charged with advising Bureau of Planning & Sustainability (BPS) on options to increase deconstruction activities, to provide BPS with diverse input from a range of stakeholders, and to share any expertise critical to making deconstruction a success in Portland. BPS will bring a resolution and recommendations for next steps to City Council on June 3rd. There will also be the option for public testimony concerning recommendations.



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

Concurrent projects to the Deconstruction Advisory Group include:

1. The creation of a web-based deconstruction calculator to assist contractors and others in determining carbon and energy impacts of deconstruction versus demolition.
2. Deconstruction training for City contractors, preparing them to successfully bid on and complete the removal of city-owned structures. The first training is scheduled for May 29th & 30th.

Summary of discussion

Main points of discussion surrounding the proposed deconstruction program matrix are summarized below. Comments are not attributed to specific Advisory Group members.

Clarifications:

- Remove mention of Title 24 at least from Phase I. BPS will handle the small number of projects during the pilot phase that would have required a Title 24 notification
 - BPS will ensure that necessary documentation is in place for Phase I and BDS workload should not be impacted
 - For Phase II, BPS may need to include Title 24 if deconstruction is treated as more mainstream, and if the program relies on the public for enforcement
- Returning to Council in a year could also be an opportunity to introduce code specifics

Potential Changes:

- The jump between Phase I and Phase II right now is considerable, whereas the jump between II and III is merely a change in requirement percentage
 - Potential to alter requirement structure (currently 25%)?
 - 25% of what? Does this exclude concrete, what/when are we measuring?
 - House types, sizes, etc. vary widely, hard to include all in one matrix
 - Another option is incentives & requirements for partial and full deconstruction, with clear specifications about what each of these processes is, and categories of materials
 - By components is simpler, making this approach more palatable to industry
 - Soft/partial strip can occur first, with determination if full is worthwhile/possible
 - This could also evolve, transitioning to a smaller incentive for partial, larger for full
- Increased reliance on training and certification, other qualification standards for quality control and determination of what should be a soft or hard salvage job (outside the code)?



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

- This is one of the major benefits of maintaining a certified list
- Architects, engineers etc. go to school, and we rely on their expertise. This is an increasingly expert field
- The City contractor training scheduled for May 29-30th could serve as a model for future training
- Video series could be targeted both towards training professionals and public education – videos may be much more effective than written policies in achieving consistency and shared understanding
- Even those not yet involved at all would become aware they are making a choice not to deconstruct
- Can we require on-site sorting instead of solely at facilities?
 - Easier for neighbors and passers-by to help enforce
 - Can we also encourage selling off-site? May be an industry waiting to happen
- Industry education and training needs to be better identified in the program rollout
 - Even deconstruction advocates are still learning, a year is short in this industry
 - There is a big cliff at Phase II: Avoid a dramatic switch from all carrot to all stick
 - We want there to be fluidity between phases: Don't roll out a policy where we ask people to operate one way for two years, and then completely change course
 - We also need to work on this consistently until 2017, keeping up momentum
 - Voluntary Phase I is necessary to educate and gain industry champions
- Transitions between Phases I/II and II/III could be good opportunities to report back to Council on what's working/ not working
 - On June 3rd, Council will be most comfortable knowing at least what Phase II is intended to look like, while there will likely be refinement prior to Phase III
 - Nuances in structure age (see other cities)
 - Council appreciates reports, yearly may be a good timeline for this project
- To what degree are environmental and human health protections within our scope? Is our focus simply waste reduction, or are co-benefits like hazardous materials equally important?
 - Larger % of lead/asbestos is typically discovered with deconstruction
 - Training contractors to identify and deal with hazardous materials is an important feature of deconstruction
 - Bird-dogging can have negative effects, including actually encouraging someone who would have deconstructed to demolish when hazardous materials are discovered



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

- From a purely environmental standpoint, preventing more hazardous materials from remaining unabated and ending up in our landfill or polluting our neighborhoods is even better than salvaging materials (clearly both is optimal)
- With typical demolitions, we often have no idea what hazards may exist, and risk of exposure is simply passed on to employees at sorting and/or landfill facilities
- OSHA regulations coupled with deconstruction will already ensure that environmental benefits are much better than with typical demolitions
- Abatement companies typically come back at no extra cost when they miss things, so this is usually a fixed abatement cost
- Inspections and haz mat regulation needs to also be clarified at DEQ/ state level
 - OR SB 705 will convene a rulemaking group: Place to address concerns?
- Neither BPS or BDS have staff trained, are operating within jurisdictional constraints
- Be careful of a potential bait-and-switch while attempting to get volunteers for the pilot
 - We don't want people to unwittingly be opening themselves to increased liabilities by participating in our program
- Who receives the incentives (owner or contractor)?
 - Owners may feel short-changed if all benefits go to contractor and they never hear
- Danger of bottlenecking and flooding the market?
 - Not if we are able to educate people, and practices change steadily over two years

Other Main Points

- Can we make a video that addresses hazardous materials as part of deconstruction?
 - Construction companies would benefit greatly
 - Homebuilders trying to get CCB to make videos on haz mat – opportunity for collaboration? Would CCB consider offering a course?
- More regulation than we need can create a backlash
- Potential for co-benefits is huge, but education about their importance is also necessary
- The city needs a marketing and education campaign: Why deconstruction?
 - Reputation matters. Participating in trainings and pilots may be great publicity
 - National organizations have been making the case well
 - The housing construction market is tight, any perceived added costs make the need to explain payoffs and reasons to do it paramount
- Consider how to make this easier for people who already want to/ are doing this
 - When people start witnessing these practices in action, they may just follow suit