



Minutes

Greater Syracuse Property Development Corporation
2014 DECONSTRUCTION PILOT PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
Wednesday, July 30, 2014 8:00 A.M.
333 W. Washington Street, Suite 130
Syracuse, NY 13202

Committee Members Present: Vito Sciscioli, Dwight L. Hicks, Brenda Griffin, Katelyn Wright, Andrew Erickson

Committee Members participating via teleconference: Mark Lichtenstein

Others Present: Kevin Stack, Josh Stack, Dan Hoosac

I. Call to order

Vito Sciscioli called the meeting to order at 8:07 AM.

II. Roll Call

Mr. Sciscioli noted that all members of the committee were present except for Mr. Lichtenstein, participating via teleconference.

III. Proof of Notice

Mr. Sciscioli noted that proper notice of the meeting had been posted.

IV. New Business

Ms. Wright noted that this was the first meeting of this steering committee, which the board of directors voted to create on June 25, 2014. This committee, including both board members and other volunteers, is considered a committee of the corporation and is only authorized to advise the board of directors. In addition, the Land Bank has retained Northeast Green Building Consulting, LLC, (represented by Kevin and Josh Stack) to provide technical assistance in administering this pilot program.

Ms. Wright indicated that the first item of business was to review four bids received in response to the first of two requests for proposals included in the 2014 Deconstruction Pilot Program. Mr. Sciscioli asked if the summary tables distributed represented the scoring matrix included in the RFP and Ms. Wright explained that the summary tables were meant to distill the large amount of data received from the various contractors, but that the committee should, together, go through the scoring table and assign values to the various contractors based on their relative merit in each category. The committee proceeded to discuss each line of the scoring matrix and compare the contractors' responses relative to each rating factor. The points table developed is included on the next page:

	Points Possible	1st Point, LLC & The Reuse People	Hope 4 Us Housing, Inc.	Ultraclean, Inc.	ReClaim Syracuse, LLC
Cost	30	10	10	30	12
Appropriateness of Diversion Plan and % Diverted	25	15	20	20	22
Safety Plan	15	15	13	15	13
Knowledge of Applicable Regulations	10	5	7	10	7
Economic and Workforce Development	20	10	15	10	12
Total	100	55	65	85	66

The Committee reviewed the various proposals and discussed their relative merit in the above categories in order to assign points and compare each respondent's overall plan.

Cost:

Contractors were required to submit a budget for each property and permitted to submit a reduced price for the whole bundle of properties. 1st Point, LLC was the only contractor to submit a bundled price. 1st Point's bundled price was comparable to Hope 4 Us Housing's collective price for all three. It appeared that 1st Point's individual prices were so much higher because they planned to contract with The Reuse People to provide training on their first two houses deconstructed. ReClaim Syracuse's bids were slightly lower and Ultraclean's prices were significantly lower than any other bidder.

Some contractors included only heavy equipment rental and equipment costs directly attributable to these specific jobs in their equipment line and others included start-up costs such as the purchase of basic tools and equipment that would be used on numerous future jobs and should be amortized over several years as overhead costs.

Discussing all contractors' proposed costs Northeast Green Building Consulting stressed the importance of including a contingency line and planning for acceptable responses to various unexpected conditions discovered once work has begun within the contract.

Diversion Plan:

Ultraclean and 1st Point provided the most specific materials inventories and plans for diversion of various waste streams. Ultraclean plans to donate much material to the Habitat for Humanity ReStore and is developing strategies for online marketing of materials and a hierarchy of marketing strategies. 1st Point proposed a more limited hierarchy of strategies to dispose of diverted and included donation as one of those possible strategies, as well. Both entities would have to identify interim storage facilities if materials couldn't be sold directly off the site.

ReClaim Syracuse and Hope 4 Us lacked the detailed materials inventory, but each planned to reuse the materials themselves. ReClaim proposed to divert 100% and Hope 4 Us did not include a diversion rate for every structure. It was unclear how other materials not of use to these two entities would be recycled or disposed of. Hope 4 Us would utilize much of the material for the construction of 'reclaimed wood' furniture which they plan to sell and ReClaim would utilize much of the material in ongoing renovations that they are undertaking. Hope 4 Us possesses warehousing space to store these materials. Concern was expressed about the ability to track materials to their end-use if they are warehoused for an extended period of time.

Safety Plan:

Ultraclean and 1st Point/Reuse People scored the highest in this category. The safety plan presented by Ultraclean addressed all applicable regulations and their references spoke highly of their job-site organization and safety compliance. The Reuse People's safety manual is specifically designed for deconstruction. Hope 4 Us and ReClaim developed an adequate plan, but possessed less experience managing these conditions in the field. Ultraclean's plan to panelize and drop the structures to the ground for disassembly was the safest method proposed.

Knowledge of Applicable Regulations:

Josh and Kevin Stack indicated that they'd checked Ultraclean's references and were quite impressed with the positive reviews from customers having used them locally for selective demolition work. Deconstruction jobs are governed by the same regulations as demolition jobs, with which ultraclean has extensive experience.

It seemed that The Reuse People would be training the construction management team from 1st Point on their first two jobs, as well as the crew, and that they would employ that training independently on the third house. The other two respondents have some experience with deconstruction.

Economic and Workforce Development:

Hope 4 Us Housing, Inc. proposed to employ graduates of their CDBG-funded deconstruction training program, but to also sub out a large portion of the labor to an experienced contractor. ReClaim Syracuse proposed to sub out their labor to Hope 4 Us and thereby to create the same jobs. 1st Point proposed to hire on two full deconstruction crews, previously having received no deconstruction training, and for The Reuse People to train them on the first two job sites. Ultraclean plans to utilize existing employees experienced in selective demolition and to bring on at least two temporary workers from Syracuse Pavilion, a prisoner reentry program, and to provide them with on-the-job training. While this will result in less job-creation, it does address the RFP's question about workforce development and this ratio of trainees to experienced workers is less likely to cause delays in the project or prompt concerns about job-site safety.

1st Point, LLC is a certified MBE and Brenda Griffin reported that Hope 4 Us's MBE status is pending. ReClaim Syracuse would sub work out to Hope 4 Us. Ultraclean is not an M/WBE.

No respondents identified local businesses that might utilize materials by repurposing them into new products except Hope 4 Us, which planned to reuse the materials themselves. ReClaim and 1st Point described a desire to see materials reused in local building renovation projects. Hope 4 Us hopes to create jobs in furniture production. None of these projected job creation numbers.

Other factors of note:

Ms. Wright noted that of all the various proposals ReClaim's appeared to be the most collaborative and included a number of local contractors with experience in deconstruction. Others noted that might prompt concerns about coordination. Several participants also noted that several other deconstruction contractors had expressed interest in bidding on the next round of houses to be bid out.

Ultimately the committee concluded that Ultraclean's proposal was the most competitive and highest rated proposal and that the committee would recommend the Greater Syracuse Property Development Corporation contact with Ultraclean, adding a contingency line to the price bid to arrive at a not to exceed amount, for the first three deconstruction projects.

V. Discussion

Ms. Wright indicated that she also wished to review the overall financial outlook for the 2014 Pilot Program and ensure that the committee was comfortable proceeding before issuing the next request for proposals. She presented a budget summary (attached) and indicated that some values included represent averages from Round 1 of the project, but serve as a projection of total program costs.

She noted that the Land Bank's hope is that by increasing the volume of deconstructions in 2015 the cost will be driven down. She also noted that the plan is to inventory and abate all demolition/deconstruction candidates over the winter so that they're lined up and ready for demolition or deconstruction in the spring and that those structures most appropriate for deconstruction will be identified and abated much earlier in the year. She noted that at this rate of spending the County funds restricted to deconstruction would likely fund the 'delta' or increased cost of 10 projects and that the base amount is being funded from the Attorney General's grant funds for demolition. She explained that the production benchmarks in that grant agreement are driving the completion timelines for these projects – three by September 30 and three more by December 31 this year.

Given the higher than expected costs of deconstruction she asked whether the committee thought it wise to proceed with bidding out the next three jobs. All agreed that it seemed appropriate given the financial outlook presented.

VI. Adjourn

All agreed unanimously to adjourn at 9:23 AM.