



Deconstruction Advisory Group

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2015

Time: 2:30 pm – 4:30 pm

Committee Members present: Bryce Jacobson, Shane Endicott, Joe Connell, Scott Yelton, Preston Browning, Barbara Kerr, Brandon Spencer-Harlte, Jeff Fish, Maryhelen Kincaid, Mary Jaren Kelley, Ben Gates, Nancy Thorington, Kristin Cooper, Sara Badiali

Absent: James Ray Arnold, Caroline Dao, Alando Simpson, Sandra Lefrancois

Staff: Shawn Wood, Madeline Kovacs, Liz Hormann

Guests: Stan Seals

Welcome and Introductions

Shawn Wood began the meeting with introductions of meeting attendees including Deconstruction Advisory Group (DAG) Members, new members, and guests.

Updates

On June 3, 2015 City Council unanimously passed the Voluntary Incentive-based Deconstruction Program Resolution. However, the City Council modified the resolution to accommodate an accelerated timeline for reporting progress on the deconstruction pilot and recommendations for next steps for a possible deconstruction program. BPS and the DAG are to report back to Council in January 2016, instead of September 2016. BPS has cautioned that due to the accelerated timeline, information learned from the deconstruction incentive pilot program will be limited in January 2016, but all pertinent information from the completed pilots will be included in the report to City Council.

There were no further updates from DAG members.

Discussion: Deconstruction Incentive Pilot Program

An in-depth discussion about the proposed Deconstruction Incentive Pilot Program included a general overview, program goals, assumptions, pilot process, and application criteria. The main points from the discussion are summarized below, according to topic. Comments are not attributed to specific Advisory Group members or guests.



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

Overview

The timeline is to start the incentive pilot program in September, advertise the grants in August, and only use half the allotted \$50,000 by December 31, 2015.

- Who will or can apply for the deconstruction grants?
 - Anyone with a CCB License – builder, deconstruction company, owner, etc.
 - The idea is to keep the barrier to entry as low and as easy as possible.

Program Goals

The goals for the incentive pilot program outlined for discussion were:

- Learn about: measurement, compliance, cost, duration, innovation
 - Leverage exposure of projects to promote deconstruction and the people doing it
 - Easy to apply/ demonstrate results
 - Increase the number of deconstructions
 - Build capacity within the industry and encourage new players
-
- It will be important to measure the waste diversion by volume, but also calculate the monetary value of reclaimed material.
 - Develop a clear mission statement for the incentive pilot program. This is not a grant program to just give taxpayer money away, but instead need to state the clear goals of the program, the deliverables, and what we (and the community) is gaining from this grant program.
 - Outreach and awareness should be elevated as a clear goal.
 - From a business perspective, the customers (public) need more information about deconstruction so they can choose that option.
 - Accurate facts and figures in reporting. Should be honest in reporting the salvage numbers from pilot projects. Sometimes not everything from a deconstruction is used and we should be reporting that information.
 - Include reporting back to the deconstruction industry as a goal of the program; i.e. lessons learned, and make available to the industry to learn from.
 - Who is the intended audience for reporting and outreach?
 - Should identify the types of audiences, public, builders, deconstruction companies, City Council.
 - Make sure reporting and information speaks to these audiences.
 - Goals are two-fold, to measure and quantify results; and to build capacity (training).

Assumptions

The following were the current assumptions discussed by the DAG members:

- Maximum award amount of \$5,000
- Only projects that take down a single-family residential building would qualify
- Distribute \$25,000 by December 31 (remaining \$25K after December)
- Begin advertising in August, accept applications in September



- Check to align the language with Title 24 – to make sure the definition of single-family residential is consistent across City work.
- Is there a benefit, if interest is high, to spend the whole \$50,000 before the end of December and then asking for more money to complete the pilot project?
 - Should wait to gauge interest in grant.
- City Council did not put any stipulations on dispersal dates/ timing. Ideally the City's deconstruction training would be available on the first day of the grant program, it is actually more feasible that it won't be available until a later date. Therefore, one reason to use the other \$25,000 after December is to wait for this training.
- What is the correct amount for an incentive?
 - \$5,000 for full deconstruction and \$3,000 for partial deconstruction project are too high.
 - Should make sure that the award amount does not exceed the actual cost of the project.
 - We can do more projects if the award is less per project.
 - Action Item: to make a matrix, based on square footage of project to determine the cost incentive tipping point. What is the appropriate incentive amount based on size of project?
- Important to remember that applying for a grant, reporting for the grant, and doing the required outreach and education for the grant will add time and money, so the incentive also goes to pay for that.
- Incentives for partial deconstruction vs. full deconstruction?
 - The full deconstruction is where we see the real diversion rates and learn the most valuable lessons.
 - On the other hand, to get new companies involved and trained through partial deconstruction grants.
 - Should lower the incentive rates for partial deconstruction.
 - Group wants to go for gold, go for the full deconstruction projects.
- What are the program benefits for the community? Does this program just benefit industry players?
 - The community and neighbors have concerns about dust in the air, ground contamination, and other nuisances from mechanical demolition.
 - Deconstruction provides many of these health and pollution benefits as compared to mechanical demolition.
 - However, some hazardous material is not known when starting deconstruction or mechanical demolition, but the hope is that when deconstructing by hand, these hazards are spotted earlier.
 - Additionally this grant pilot program includes requirements for outreach with the community, so there is community benefit built in.



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

- Language of Deconstruction vs. Demolition
 - What we are trying to do is reduce use of mechanical demolition.
- Grant incentive must be tied to a specific deconstruction project.
 - Can go to buying equipment, but must be tied to an existing project.

Pilot Process

Discussion on the Deconstruction Grant Process Diagram.

- The goal is to keep the review process quick, so projects keep moving.
- Is there value in having the land owner/ building owner come out for the pre-deconstruction meeting even if using a seasoned deconstruction company?
 - This would be a great education/ outreach mechanism
- Considering the demolition permit:
 - There is a 35 day waiting period after applying for a demolition permit.
 - Could fill out application during this time (or right after applying for demolition permit).
 - This gives some leeway for review of grant applications, but still don't want to make any projects wait.
- Select projects on a rolling basis?
 - But in the beginning the selection committee doesn't have anything to compare the first applicants to, does this make it unfair?
 - Should we create a hard deadline with a couple week application period, to create a batch of applicants?
 - Might put too much pressure on existing project timelines.
 - It was brought up that anytime within the 35 day waiting period after the demo permit application, the builder can make the choice at the last minute to demolish if they didn't get the grant for deconstruction.
 - Counterpoint is that a longer selection process puts too much pressure on the builder or deconstruction company. Should be a short selection window.
- Selection committee process should not be too time consuming.
 - Proposal to do project scoring and selection via email (excel spreadsheet) and phone conversation.
 - Might be onerous on the committee if they have to meet every week.
- Feedback for grant applications.
 - Will we provide feedback as to why a grant application wasn't selected?
 - Can an applicant re-submit an application, if it was first denied?
- Outreach and advertising for the deconstruction grants.
 - How are people finding out about this?
 - Make sure outreach reaches current deconstruction players, but also want to bring new players into the field.



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

- Standards for the grant deconstructions.
 - There should be a set of standards, laid out for all applicants that they agree to meet these standards in the project.
 - Training will help cover this.
 - But before training, include these standards in the application material.
 - Action Item: Find other training opportunities, and standards.
 - Building Material Reuse Association
 - Ask on the application the certifications or trainings or experience they have with deconstruction.
- City is developing a deconstruction training, but there are other opportunities for trainings, Earth Advantage, Institute for Self-Reliance, etc.
 - Communicate about all these options for training.
 - Make sure trainings include hands-on experience.

Application Criteria

The application has specific basic information and must-meet checklist, and then additional narrative and criteria that is weighted. These are the weighted criteria:

- Narrative
 - Innovation
 - Salvage Goal
 - Equity/ Community
 - Experience with Deconstruction (including training)
 - Program/ Project Promotion
- Innovation: should it be weighted high or low?
 - Innovation is less important than salvage goal – if we know what we are trying to get people to do, and the people who ARE more innovative will be able to get it done quicker and more efficiently.
 - Weighting innovation higher will hurt applications of people new to deconstruction – these people are just starting out, so unfair to ask for a lot of innovation.
 - Mayor’s office has an innovation fund – look at this for an example.
 - Proposal: innovation could be taken out of the weighted criteria, and instead be a narrative piece, to be able to tell the story.
 - What is our definition of innovation?
 - Innovation will come as more people are involved in deconstruction – this will be a byproduct of the grant process, so maybe doesn’t need to be in the criteria.
 - If one of the main goals of the grant program is increasing salvage numbers, shouldn’t that be weighted higher?
 - Likewise community outreach is a program goal, so equity/community should be weighted higher.



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

- Training requirement.
 - Should just have a check-box, are you certified or working with someone who is certified?
 - Can we call it an “orientation” instead of “training” – required for the grant and more manageable than a full training?
- Can we capture the question on the application: If you don’t get the grant, will you still use deconstruction on the project?

Action Items and Next Steps:

- Matrix of incentive amounts based on project size – what incentive amount is sufficient?
- Identify and list available training programs (online, in person, etc.)
- Develop (research) a list of standards for deconstruction projects
- Item for future discussion: An exemption for historic properties?
- There is not a demolition representative at the DAG meetings – should find a representative to come to meetings, as this is an impact to their industry. A useful perspective to the committee.