Jim Wright, 8300 Osgoode Drive, for the Garden City Conservation Society

We strongly support the recommendations for demolition recycling, with some suggestions.

On the basis of the table on page PWT-40, we point out that the refundable fee needs to be a stronger incentive. Let's look at the first and second examples on the left side of the chart. Each of those two demolished houses was a little under 2,000 square feet, so the refundable fee at $2 per square foot comes to less than **$4,000** for each. However, it cost almost **$4,700** more to achieve the higher diversion for the second house, so the incentive in these cases is to do *less* diversion and save $700.

Furthermore, the refunding would need to occur in a high-incentive way, unlike the Port Moody example in the report. It appears that a Port Moody demolisher gets back the whole refundable fee at 70% diversion, with no incentive to do better.

We suggest something like this: There is no refunded fee for diversion up to 75%. Above 75%, the refund is 4% of the fee for each incremental percent of diversion. A total refund is possible.

This is all dependent on a reliable and efficient system for measuring diversion.

Along with that, it would be great if there could be positive ways to encourage best practices, such as reuse of parts that are valuable to other homeowners. I can give an example because we want to keep the mid-seventies style of our kitchen while renovating it, and we need to replace some of the cabinet door pulls. There are no new ones of even the right size, let alone the same style, but I bet that a lot that would be just right are being wasted in demolished homes.

Getting to that level of reuse would be ideal, and it's worth aiming for as a next step. For now, at minimum, let's be sure that the incentive system of refundable deposits is calibrated so that it will be as effective as possible.