Building Materials Salvage

Environmental and business development opportunity



About the project

Building type: single family home, one story
Square feet: 1200
Year built: 1935
Construction: wood frame, exterior brick veneer, concrete foundation
Salvage method: hybrid (partially mechanized) deconstruction
Location: Ballard neighborhood, Seattle
Project completed: September 2007
This building was slated for demolition in order to make way for a new pocket park in Ballard.

Seattle Parks contacted Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) to see if SPU would be interested in using the building as a salvage case study.

Approach

SPU approached the Seattle Conservation Corps (SCC), a city service that trains youth in trade skills, to conduct the deconstruction. SCC in turn contacted a 501c3 (not for profit) deconstruction contractor. This allowed the value of the salvaged materials to be characterized as a charitable donation by the building owner—a substantial tax benefit. This approach was later abandoned.

As a result, SPU contacted a salvage consultant who evaluated the property's salvage potential and provided an estimate of time and labor required using different deconstruction techniques. The consultant estimated that manual deconstruction would require approximately nine days for a crew of five, versus three to four days for a crew of four for a hybrid, or partially mechanized approach. In addition, the consultant would train SCC staff in salvage and deconstruction skills. Contracts were signed with both SCC and Re-Use Consulting.

To receive a demolition permit, the project was required to apply for a Master Use Permit to convert the land from residential zoning to public open space. Seattle has a "no net loss" Project participants

Owner:

Seattle Parks Department www.seattle.gov/parks Salvage consultant: Re-Use Consulting http://reuseconsulting.com Deconstruction:

Re-Use Consulting, Seattle Conservation Corps www.seattle.gov/parks/scc

Hauler:

Allied Waste

www.rabanco.com

Recycler:

Allied Waste; Seattle Recycling + Disposal Stations

www.seattle.gov/util **Pilot project funding:** Seattle Public Utilities www.seattle.gov/util

Ballard Hybrid Deconstruction Traininc

were diverted from the landfill

neighborhood

pocket park in Seattle's

A 1935 single

mechanized deconstruction methods, a total of 15-20 tons of materials

family home was dismantled to make way for a small

Ballard neighborhood.

Utilizing

Resources

City Green Building, in Seattle's Department of Planning and Development, provides resources, education and technical assistance towards improving the environmental performance of buildings in Seattle. Materials salvage resources include a Green Home Remodel guide on Salvage & Reuse, sample deconstruction specifications and how to information on salvaging windows, doors and flooring. www.seattle.gov/dpd/GreenBuilding

King County GreenTools provides an online directory of recycling and salvage services for construction materials, lists recycling rates for local companies handling construction and demolition materials, and has additional deconstruction case studies. www.greentools.us

Seattle Dept. of Planning + Development Client Assistance Memos (CAMs)

CAM 336: Reuse of Building Materials CAM 337: Demolition Permits CAM 1302: Building Material Salvage + Recycling www.seattle.gov/dpd/publications/

WA Dept. of Ecology: Demolition Debris

Describes the solid waste and hazardous waste elements of demolition debris. www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/hwtr/demodebris/

For more information

Seattle Public Utilities Joel Banslaben joel.banslaben@seattle.gov (206) 684-3936

Seattle Public Utilities

www.seattle.gov/util

This information available in other formats upon request.

Building Materials Salvage

Ballard Hybrid Deconstruction Training Case Study

housing law that requires either an approved building permit or a change of land use prior to granting a demolition permit.

Once the permit was issued, the structure was analyzed to identify hazardous materials; lead and asbestos were abated.

Salvage began by extracting interior, non-structural materials from the house. The deconstruction crew then began a *hybrid deconstruction* process, cutting the house into sections and removing the panelized elements using an outreach forklift and tractor. The panels were placed on the ground and the materials separated for reuse and recycling. The SCC deconstruction crew consisted of five laborers and two site supervisors split into two teams, one for panelizing and one for disassembling materials. Lumber and structural timbers, interior doors, kitchen cabinets, a fireplace mantle, sinks and a tub were salvaged. Unusable wood, porcelain (toilets), and metal was recycled.

Schedule

Week 1: Interior salvage; roof and main floor removed Week 2: Structural basement timbers salvaged Weeks 3+4: Deconstruction complete; concrete crushed for basement backfill; site cleaned.

Lessons learned

Space constraints dictated the need for a street use permit to place bins in the public right of way, adding expense to the project. Permitting processes and training the deconstruction workforce extended the project schedule. The crew's unfamiliarity with deconstruction practices likely contributed to a few minor injuries on site. In addition, the house had been vacant and boarded up, causing damage to doors and frames and reducing the value of the salvaged materials. More diligent materials tracking and identifying roles and responsibilities would have minimized mistakes (a load of recyclable wood likely ended up as demolition waste, and the asphalt shingles were not weighed). Also, recycling rates were reduced by contamination—mixing good wood with painted and/or treated wood. The project attracted media attention, which in turn was helpful in raising awareness about salvage on projects; for example, staff at Sound Transit saw coverage of the project, leading to the Capitol Hill Redevelopment project in this Case Study series. In a private sector context, such coverage is essentially free advertising and positive public relations for the firms involved.

Materials analysis*

| Material | Tons |
|---------------------------------------------|------|
| Nood (recycled) | 3.75 |
| Metal (recycled) | 0.25 |
| Commingled demo waste** (recycled) | 0.09 |
| Commingled demo waste** (disposed) | 4.41 |
| Concrete (crushed and used as fill on site) | |
| Tons diverted from landfill*** | 4.09 |
| Total diversion rate: 48% | |

ware an evaluated from this table

* Salvaged materials tonnages are excluded from this table, due to lack of data.

** Recycling rate at Allied Waste's 3rd + Lander facility in September 2007 was 2%.

*** Concrete foundation was crushed and used on site; these tonnages are not reflected in the diversion from landfill.

Project costs

| SPU contribution: deconstruction | \$18000.00 |
|------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Parks contribution: training | \$23200.00 |
| Parks contribution: consultant costs | \$3000.00 |
| Parks contribution: recycling + disposal | \$2300.00 |
| Total project cost | \$46,500.00 |