Denver Waste No More Task Force

Meeting #5: Consider and Finalize Recommendation ‘Concepts’ Prior to August Public Outreach
July 13, 2023
## Introductions - Task Force Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ballot Sponsors</strong></td>
<td>Ean Thomas Tafoya, GreenLatinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vann Fussell, Compost Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor</strong></td>
<td>Luis Ponce, SEIU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-family building resident</strong></td>
<td>Marguerite Harden, Resident &amp; HOA Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Events</strong></td>
<td>Andrea Furness, Classic Events Co. Renee Ortiz, Eventful Productions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial &amp; Multi-Family Buildings</strong></td>
<td>Jessy Aghababian, Unico Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Waste Producers</strong></td>
<td>Holly Adinoff, Sullivan Scrap Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small business</strong></td>
<td>Chris Chiari, Patterson Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Haulers &amp; Processors</strong></td>
<td>Erwin Galvan, Waste Management Recycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Industry</strong></td>
<td>JW Houser, Taylor Morrison/Home Builders Assoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Advocate</strong></td>
<td>Ryan J Call, Eco-Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-Sector</strong></td>
<td>Joshua Jackson, NAACP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Council Members</strong></td>
<td>Jolon Clark, District 7 → Sarah Parady, At Large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where We Are & June Recap
## Draft Work Plan

| Meeting 1 - March | - Intros + clarify purpose/scope |
| Meeting 2 - April | - Review relevant **context**; ID where we can/can’t **account** for external realities  
- Discuss **timelines** + overall **requirements**  
- Set up **workgroups** |
| Meeting 3 - May  | - How do we ensure **under-resourced** communities/ buildings are able to comply with / benefit from the ordinance?  
- What other **supports** could be made available to help buildings comply? |
| Meeting 4 - June | - Consider **draft recommendations and enforcement mechanisms** – e.g., phasing, what’s required of whom, exemptions  
- Look-ahead to public engagement process; adjust Task Force timeline as needed |
| Meeting 5 - July | - Discuss principles for universal **signage**, effective messaging and community buy-in  
Confirm **overall proposals thus far**, e.g., timelines, communication protocols, materials requirements, funding, enforcement strategies  
- Provide input for public engagement process |
| Meeting 6 - Sept | - Incorporate public input + finalize recommendations |
What’s happened since June meeting?

- Signage/education work group
- C&D work group
- Organics group discussions on 6/27 and 7/7
- Updating and drafting new recommendations
- 6/29 Task Force briefing on proposed recommendations
- Starting to schedule August outreach meetings
Reminder: Timeline from Passage to Compliance

Note: This timeline doesn’t assume specific months in case the timeline to passage by City Council doesn’t end in December 2023.

- **Months 1-3**
  - City staff work with marketing vendor to develop communications campaign to regulated entities, businesses, and residents.
  - City staff work with technology consultant to build online reporting portal.
  - CPD staff revise C&D permit requirements as needed.
  - City staff determine staffing and budget needs for full implementation, i.e., outreach, inspections, etc.

- **Months 4-6**
  - City staff work with marketing vendor to develop communications campaign to regulated entities, businesses, and residents.
  - City staff work with technology consultant to build online reporting portal.
  - City staff submit budget requests for the following fiscal year. *FY 2024 requests are already submitted*

- **Months 7-9**
  - Communications campaign and educational outreach efforts launch.
  - Online reporting portal needs to go live 3 months prior to first compliance deadline.

- **Months 10-12**
  - Communications campaign and educational outreach efforts continue.
  - City staff monitor online reporting portal for progress

- **Compliance Date 1**
  - City staff will pursue reporting requirements and respond to complaints following TF’s guidance re: graduated process, such as: outreach (30 days to comply), warning (30 days to comply), first fine (30 days to comply), etc.
  - Communications campaign and educational outreach efforts continue.

- **Any regulated entity that does not have its diversion plan filed by this date is out of compliance.**
- **Any regulated entity that does not have recycling and compost receptacles as specified in the ordinance on this date is out of compliance.**
Finalize Recommendations
Survey Results

- **15 responses** (60% of TF members).

- A majority of respondents felt comfortable or had no strong opinion on all 12 proposed recommendations.

- Over 80% of respondents felt comfortable with 8 (of the 12) proposed recommendations as is, or with minor tweaks.

- 4 recommendations received the bulk of the feedback and are where we’ll focus today.

100% of responders felt comfortable with 4 proposed recommendations as is or with minor tweaks:

- Rec. 1: Clarify Annual Diversion Plan Requirements
- Rec. 3: Clarify Education Requirements in Ordinance
- Rec. 4: Education Best Practices
- Rec. 5: Definitions

93.3% of responders (14/15) felt comfortable with 2 proposed recommendations as is or with minor tweaks:

- Rec. 2: Create Financial Support Programs
- Rec. 9: C&D Definitions and Roles

80% of responders (13/15) felt comfortable with 2 proposed recommendations as is or with minor tweaks:

- Rec. 11: C&D Compliance
- Rec. 12: Enforcement
Recommendations for Review Today

Recommendations that responders were most comfortable with:

- Rec. 1: Clarify Annual Diversion Plan Requirements
- Rec. 2: Create Financial Support Programs
- Rec. 3: Clarify Education Requirements in Ordinance
- Rec. 4: Education Best Practices
- Rec. 5: Definitions
- Rec. 9: C&D Definitions and Roles
- Rec. 11: C&D Compliance
- Rec. 12: Enforcement

Recommendations that we’ll focus on today:

- Recs. 6 and 7: Compliance Timeline for Residential and Non-Residential Buildings
- Rec. 8 Compliance Timeline for Special Events
- Rec. 10 C&D Phasing
Before we proceed…

Are folks comfortable focusing today's discussion on the four recommendations with remaining material concerns/suggestions?

*We assume you have listened to the 6/29 briefing and/or read all of the recommendations.
Recommendation 6:
Compliance Timeline for Residential Buildings

Summary
- Revise the compliance dates for multi-family residential buildings, as follows, keeping the respective categories based on number of units:
  - For the first group of buildings covered, a comply-by date of "12 months from adoption of rules, but no later than January 1, 2025."
  - For the second group of buildings covered, a comply-by date of "18 months from adoption of rules, but no later than June 1, 2025."
  - For the final group of buildings covered, a comply-by date of "24 months from the adoption of rules, but no later than January 1, 2026."

Equity
- **Score:** 5 (Moderate)
- **Description:** This recommendation only impacts the compliance dates as written in the Ordinance. Although the timeline will benefit under-resourced buildings and businesses, this is not an additional benefit distinguished from all covered entities.

What we heard...
- In alignment of the intentions of the voters, which is to require recycling and composting in multi-family residential buildings within a realistic timeframe from Ordinance passage, a compliance deadline of "and no later than" ensures a sense of urgency while providing time for both covered entities and CCD to plan for successful adoption citywide.
Recommendation 7: Compliance Timeline for Non-Residential Buildings

Summary

- Revise the compliance dates for non-residential buildings, as follows, keeping the respective categories based on square footage:
  - For the first group of buildings covered, a comply-by date of "12 months from adoption of rules, but no later than January 1, 2025."
  - For the second group of buildings covered, a comply-by date of "18 months from adoption of rules, but no later than June 1, 2025."
  - For the third group of buildings covered, a comply-by date of "24 months from adoption of rules, but no later than January 1, 2026."

Equity

- Score: 5 (Moderate)
- Description: This recommendation only impacts the compliance dates as written in the Ordinance. Although the timeline will benefit under-resourced buildings and businesses, this is not an additional benefit distinguished from all covered entities.

What we heard...

- In alignment of the intentions of the voters, which is to require recycling and composting in non-residential buildings within a realistic timeframe from Ordinance passage, a compliance deadline of "and no later than" ensures a sense of urgency while providing time for both covered entities and CCD to plan for successful adoption citywide.
What we heard from the survey about Proposed Recommendations 6 and 7

- “recycling should be included right away but composting could have a phased approach”
- “I have concerns that we still have not defined the term "access"... Pending the definition of access - I do think that large buildings should be offered opportunity to phase in the program.”
- “I think there needs to be a slower phase-in for compost to account for the developing infrastructure, especially concerning front-of-house.”
- “The timelines seem long, but I understand the need for implementing largest buildings first.”
- “Still have reservations about timing changes”
- “I think making the two (res/non-res) timelines the same deadlines makes sense. However, I thought we closed the last meeting agreeing that CCD would provide more of an analysis and justification for the new timeline.”
- “I would like to hear how CCD came to the first deadline (X) as 12 months/January 1, 2025 and if it could be shorter since regulated entities have known that this regulation has been coming for a while.”
- “interested to discuss non-residential sq footage vs. occupancy.”
Recommendation 8: Compliance Timeline for Special Events

Summary

• Revise the compliance dates for permitted special events, as follows, to allow for phased implementation:
  • Events over 10,000 attendees "12 months from adoption of rules, but no later than January 1, 2025."
  • Events over 3,000 attendees "24 months from adoption of rules, but no later than January 1, 2026."
  • For events over 350 attendees, a comply-by date of "36 months from adoption of rules, but no later than January 1, 2027."
• Note: Events held in venues are covered under the regulation for non-residential buildings

Equity

• **Score:** 5 (Moderate)
• **Description:** Providing smaller events more time to comply will result in lower costs because the market is expected to adjust over time. This also will reduce the burden on education for event operators because their staff and patrons will already be familiar with waste sorting processes by the time they are required to comply. Additionally, this lessens burden and costs for both city and permittees given that there is not yet a viable path to compliance.

What we heard...

• Request for phased implementation
• Unique challenges with night and weekend hauler pick-ups as it is, even without WNM compliance considerations
• Inability for all events to comply due to market constraints
• Event types that do not fit into permitted events or buildings/venues do not have current requirements for any waste hauling
What we heard from the survey about Proposed Recommendation 8

- “There is no reason that a small event shouldn't have recycling. I do not think we need to phase in the recycling part. I think we only need to phase in the compost part.”
- “Curious if the team discussed the opportunity to learn from the smaller events first to have better [best practices] for the large events.”
- “I had a recommendation about keeping the timelines at 12, 18 and 24 months like the other divisions but heard this addressed in the discussion. I see that it makes sense to keep this one as-is.”
- “I believe large events over 3,000 should all comply [by] 2024”
- “I don't think events with less than 350 are "de minimus" - and make a suggestion to reduce this number to 100 or exceptions where food and or beverages are not being provided to attendees.”
- “such a slow rollout for compliance. There ARE resources out there for large and small events to be in compliance, RIGHT NOW, and still be profitable, successful events.”
- “What is the plan for actually verifying event attendee size?”
- “if households and businesses of all stripes across the city & county of Denver are in compliance by 2026, why give events another year? These events are comprised of the same people who will be composting at home and at work, across the city and county.”
Recommendation 10: C&D Phasing

**Summary**

- Phase in compliance by the percent of materials diverted per project over a 5-year period:
  - Year 1-3: 50% Diversion
  - Year 4-5: 65% Diversion
  - After 5: 80% Diversion

- Change the effective date to 180 days after rulemaking, but no later than January 1, 2025, to mirror the rest of the WNM recommendations. The effective date would apply only to the first phase, allowing the same amount of time between phases.

**Equity**

- Score: 6
- Description: This recommendation reduces complexity and provides time for the C&D market to mature, both of which will benefit all contractors, but will be especially beneficial for under-resourced contractors.

**What we heard...**

- Phasing will allow time to receive more stakeholder buy-in, gather data, and allow time for end markets to develop, while still meeting citywide diversion goals.
- 100% will not be achievable without full deconstruction/certified deconstruction contractors.
What we heard from the survey about Proposed Recommendation 10

- “I have some concerns making these percentages mandatory because the market is currently not there to accept all these materials... They shouldn't be penalized if the market is not there in 4-5, or 6 plus years. So there may need to be language added about them having the resources available to take all this material.”

- “Could this potentially create a snafu between the buildings and event venues sectors?”

- “Concerns that about the length of timing”

- “I would prefer to see a 5 year rollout not a 6 year rollout. All measures should be enforce by 1/1/2030 no later.”

- “The language of ‘performance requirements’ and ‘Waste Diversion Goal’ could introduce confusion around if it's a mandate or a goal.”
Wrap Up & Confirm the Current Set of DRAFT Recommendations...
August Public Input
Outreach Tasks: City Staff

City staff will...

1) Schedule focus groups with affordable housing residents, non-English speaking communities, small businesses, event permit holders
2) Utilize social media, press release, and earned media to direct folks to the draft recommendations and online public comment form
3) Host a virtual public meeting to be recorded + posted online
Outreach Tasks: TF Members

We need your help! Everyone please take a moment to sign up!
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/12-pXCVhLcqwJUb_qAZq38YC_f1Q-uW3DtmZuiuZz0-A/edit#gid=0

City staff will...
1) Provide you with text for e-mail outreach
2) Provide you with a PowerPoint presentation
3) Do our best to provide at least one staff person to join you
4) Incorporate your notes into the summary
How public input will be tracked and considered (by staff and Task Force)

**By September 5**
- Comments submitted online will be grouped by subject/recommendation and summarized.
- Notes from public meetings will be summarized for the TF.
- Staff will add margin comments about the public input to the recommendation rubrics for all to review and add comments.

**At the September 7* meeting**
- Task Force members discuss the comments and determine if any recommendations need to be adjusted and how, and if any new recommendations are needed.
- To extent possible, TF members will finalize recommendations and empower staff to begin drafting the ordinance revision.
- If needed, a work group may meet to address issues and finalize any remaining recommendations.

**Future date TBD**
- City staff will share the draft ordinance with the Task Force before it is submitted to City Council.
- City staff will adjust the draft as needed based on Task Force feedback.

*September 7 is aggressive, so staff suggest moving this meeting to September 14. This will give time to circulate the feedback and possibly record another pre-meeting briefing.
Next Steps
Next Steps + Action Items

Make any final edits* to the Draft Recommendations – by Friday, 7/21 (*any material, substantive edits will need approval from full Task Force prior to 8/1)

Task Force to engage networks in August
❖ Please sign up to host outreach meetings!

Task Force meets September 7 (or 14), 2-5 pm
❖ Location: TBD
❖ Focus: integrate public input into final recommendations
❖ Clarify next steps (i.e., staff to draft Task Force report and proposed language for ordinance and rules & regs – for Task Force final review)
Appendix: Results/Comments on the other recommendations
Recommendation 1: Clarify Annual Diversion Plan Requirements

Summary

• Clarify that a simple “no change” submittal satisfies the annual diversion plan requirement, after a complete plan is submitted in each entity’s compliance Year 1.
• Maintain the requirement to update the account on an annual basis and within 30 days from when (a) the entity’s point of contact changes and/or (b) significant system changes occur, such as a change in hauler.

Equity

• **Score: 5 (medium)**
• **Description:** The primary benefit of this recommendation is reduced administrative burden compared to the ordinance as written. This will be a significant benefit for under-resourced businesses, but will not necessarily lead to new job creation.

What we heard...

• The clarification will reduce the administrative burden of the annual diversion plan submittal process for the city and regulated entities, enabling both to focus on outcomes rather than process.
Proposed Recommendation 1: Clarify Annual Diversion Plan Requirements
15 responses

- 100%

I'm comfortable proceeding with this recommendation as proposed or with minor tweaks
- I don't feel strongly one way or the other
- I have concerns and/or specific suggestions to improve the recommendation

Execution suggestion vs ordinance language: City provides a sample of a diversion plan for entities to follow.

I'd like to see an example of what all will be included in the Annual Diversion Plan.

Have we thought how are we going to monitor if the entity is complying? Even with the submission of an annual form, how does the auditing part look like?

Very comfortable with the recommendation.

I'd also like to see clear guidelines for businesses that are not able to obtain recycling and/or composting services - and how they comply.

I'd like to see something that shows that single stream recycling isn't the only plan businesses can do. Example - The Federal Mint recycles all scraps of metal. Based on a businesses waste stream major recycling might include pallets, plastic films and packaging styrofoam.
Recommendation 2: Create Financial Support Programs

Summary

- Financial support programs are needed for successful implementation of WNM. Examples of programs the City should create include:
  - Equity priority grant program
  - Household affordability program
  - Financial incentives

Equity

- **Score:** 6 (medium)
- **Description:** The majority of the recommendation is focused on financial supports for buildings that serve under-resourced residents, and under-resourced businesses, but the financial incentive program suggestions could be open to any regulated or impacted entity.

What we heard...

- Recycling and composting services are more expensive than trash services, so the TF expects that the cost of compliance will be higher than current costs.
- Providing financial supports will enable regulated entities to focus on results, i.e., a higher diversion rate, rather than merely complying with the access requirements.
What we heard from the survey about the Task Force’s comfort level with this Recommendation...

To carry out the financial support program and ensure that it reached those in highest need it will take a focused effort by the City. I would suggest that there’s language to allow people to share services where spacing or financial issues are an issue. In commercial districts where businesses don’t have a lot of room they can share a landfill dumpster with a neighboring business, for instance. The city should provide a template for the people sharing a service would both sign.

This recommendation is crucial to the success of WNM.

Under Incentive Programs, Purchasing Equipment, add sortation equipment and smart trash cans, or innovative advance technologies

We have to make sure workers get to see the Denver subsidies improving their bottom line. If they're going to be required to do more work this should be reflected in their hourly wage (either directly or as a differential).

I'd like to know what you consider as "small non-profits" - any additional cost can put a burden on non-profits of any size - specifically, I am hoping that small counts as less than $5 million in annual revenue. Also, I would like to see additional for profit businesses added that can prove a hardship - many restaurants are still in significant debt from the pandemic and every penny counts for them to stay in business.

These grants could assist with costs associated with implementation - like building up secure areas for additional storage bins - but should avoid subsidizing the cost of waste disposal for extended periods of time. We are talking about shifts of disposal so long term funding private waste disposal seems counterproductive.
Recommendation 3: Clarify Education Requirements in the Ordinance

**Summary**
The Task Force recommends that Denver clarify certain aspects of the Education section (Sec. 48-134) of the ordinance as written:
1. Education strategies in annual plan
2. Affected building types
3. Responsible party
4. Information and instructions

**Equity**
- **Score:** 5 (medium)
- **Description:** This recommendation would benefit the City and any entity regulated under WNM, but does not necessarily benefit any group in particular. However, by clarifying the ordinance, successful implementation is enhanced by showing layers of responsibilities for laying out communication between responsible parties.

**What we heard...**
- Clarifying the ordinance language will help to eliminate confusion and allow for more successful implementation and compliance.
- **Some of this is inherent/assumed but should be explicit to reduce discrepancy.**
What we heard from the survey about the Task Force’s comfort level with this Recommendation...

Proposed Recommendation 3: Clarify Education Requirements in the Ordinance
15 responses

No concerns

Education should be in the annual plan* - annual review of waste disposal practices for all staff.

I'm comfortable proceeding with this recommendation as proposed or with minor tweaks

I don't feel strongly one way or the other

I have concerns and/or specific suggestions to improve the recommendation
Recommendation 4: Education Best Practices

Summary

The Task Force recommends that Denver provide support for education and outreach. Denver should also outreach directly and follow best practices to maximize efforts. See recommendations below.

1. Develop a compliance guidebook/resource hub
2. Emphasize the "WHY"
3. Create consistency among languages, etc.
4. Culturally-specific and competent

Equity

• **Score:** 7 (high)
• **Description:** The recommendations in this list would benefit the City and any entity regulated under WNM and includes recommendations for creating greater equity and cultural competence in outreach material. There is also potential for the recommended work to be contracted out to community groups, which could increase jobs in under-resourced communities.

What we heard...

• Higher diversion cannot be achieved without proper and successful education.
• Regulated entities and the public need know how and what to divert.
• The City has the opportunity to develop materials that are consistent and culturally competent.
What we heard from the survey about the Task Force’s comfort level with this Recommendation...

Proposed Recommendation 4: Education Best Practices

15 responses

I'm comfortable proceeding with this recommendation as proposed or with minor tweaks
I don't feel strongly one way or the other
I have concerns and/or specific suggestions to improve the recommendation

100%

I think it's King County or maybe it's a municipality in CA that has an editable pdf that businesses can download and easily edit the recycling/compost signage to make sense to their own business. I think the resource hub should have easily editable signs with a library of standard recycling/compost items that the business owner can delete/edit. For example, a coffee shop could delete items like beer bottles and include coffee cups on their signs but a bar can keep bottles/cans and delete taco food stand bowls, etc. Someone at Boulder County PACE might know which entity offers customizable templates to their business community.

Align messaging with local agencies/nonprofits that are already messaging these groups about recycling, such as Recycle Colorado, Eco-cycle, etc.

No concerns

This area needs to be flexible. Gather feedback from Responsible Parties and refine Signage/Edu/Comms every year.

Within the "Why?", understanding the benefit of compost use.

I think a clarification between Public and Workforce education could be useful.

Education at businesses is an HR item and should come from private and NGO sectors. It should not be role of city to educate or provide full spectrum education.

I like the idea of a "resource hub" with downloadable, printable guidelines and signage for use for businesses of all kinds, as well as for events, in multiple languages.
**Recommendation 5: Definitions**

### Summary
- The WNM Ordinance should include a definitions section for all identified terms of art (e.g. responsible party).
- Additional terms/key words will be defined in Rules & Regs (e.g. recyclable).
- Where possible, tie WNM Ordinance definitions to established, relevant definitions in the CCD code.
- The WNM Task Force will be provided an opportunity to review definitions prior to submittal to Council.

### Equity
- **Score:** 5 (Moderate)
- **Description:** Defining terms of art in the WNM Ordinance, and other terms/key words within Rules & Regs, provides transparency and consistency. Ultimately, having definitions makes the WNM Ordinance more accessible and user-friendly, though it doesn't significantly improve equity outcomes.

### What we heard...
- Defining terms of art and other key words will be critical for providing clarity to covered entities and regulators.
- Utilizing existing city definitions where applicable, will align the WNM Ordinance with established CCD requirements and processes, which will **streamline requirements for many regulated entities**.
What we heard from the survey about the Task Force’s comfort level with this Recommendation...

No comments
# Recommendation 9: C&D Definitions and Roles

## Summary
- Clarify **permit types** and respective **exemptions**
- Clarify **reuse and recycling**
- Define **readily recyclable**
- Move **list of materials** to Rules
- Assign to CPD or CASR, not DOTI
- **Strike** "loss of license" and **consider** deposit systems and fines.
- Create **exemptions** for projects deemed unsafe structures or subject to DFD orders, clarify hazardous materials (asbestos, lead) are exempt, etc.

## Equity
- **Score**: 0
- **Description**: Each criteria in the equity analysis was determined to be “not applicable” because this recommendation only seeks to clarify terminology in the ordinance.

## What we heard...
- There are separate permits in the city for construction and demolition.
- Reuse should also be a priority for C+D diversion.
- Including the materials in the Rules will not remove any of the existing materials but allow the city flexibility if end markets are strained or if new materials should be added.
- Deposit systems are a best practice with C+D ordinances.
I think that construction and then demo should have very separate requirements in the C&D program. Demolition requires a lot of planning, many more regulatory agencies pending the building type, location, age, etc. New construction- it is much easier to have bins on a construction site for recycling steel, drywall, etc. Most construction projects have been doing this type of thing for a long time - LEED buildings pushed this out a long time ago.

I think y'all should hire Anna Perks as an advisor for this specific crucial piece of WNM. she has done so much work to ensure that the C&D aspect of WNM is properly addressed, researched and fleshed out. there was by far the most ignorance around this topic among the group.
### Recommendation 11: C&D Compliance

#### Summary
- To meet the diversion goals per phase, a **minimum** of three material types need to be reused or recycled.
- Allow the city to impose a **deposit fee** at the time of permit which would be fully refundable at the end of project when the contractor submits documentation confirming the diversion rate was achieved.
- Include ability for the city to **fine** for non-compliance at a job site.
- An **exemption** process will be necessary.

#### Equity
- **Score:** 5
- **Description:** The imposition of a fee at the point of permit could create a hardship for under-capitalized businesses, but there are ways to mitigate that. The resulting higher diversion rate will benefit climate-vulnerable communities and create demand for new jobs.
  - Consider using non-returned deposit funds for equity-based projects (i.e., affordable housing).
  - Consider an exemption process for projects that are part of a defined group that meets certain criteria (i.e., affordable housing).

#### What we heard...
- Include an exemption process upon permit application for projects that will not have multiple material types in order to receive a full deposit return.
- For non-exempt projects, consider a reduced deposit return based on a percentage for the attempts at recycling/reusing. Consider waivers that contractors can use if their “readily recyclable” material was rejected by the processor.
- Deposit amounts should be high enough to prevent landfilling at large projects and reassessed to be meaningful overtime.

---
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What we heard from the survey about the Task Force’s comfort level with this Recommendation...

Proposed Recommendation 11: C&D Compliance
15 responses

- 80%: I'm comfortable proceeding with this recommendation as proposed or with minor tweaks
- 13.3%: I don't feel strongly one way or the other
- 6.7%: I have concerns and/or specific suggestions to improve the recommendation

Change header to read "...C&D Compliance Standards." Clarify the first bullet in first column by stating, for instance, "To meet diversion goals during Phase In Period, a minimum of 3 material types..."

Need more info about structure of program

I don't have specific recommendations, but would like to hear more from the task force members involved in C&D about how we got to this recommendation.
**Recommendation 12: Enforcement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>What we heard...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • WNM language does not specify how the provisions will be enforced.  
• Addition of enforcement provisions to the ordinance, rules, and/or CASR workplan for WNM will give responsible parties an understanding of potential consequences for non-compliance.  
• The Task Force identified several compliance and enforcement tools that Denver should have in its toolbox, including but not limited to; technology that encourages compliance, financial incentives, recognition for early adopters, education-first enforcement, guidance resources, and process navigation for parties responsible under the ordinance. | • Score: 6  
• Description:  
  • Generally, clarity and transparency around enforcement reduces a barrier to understanding city processes.  
  • Specifically, education-based tools and a desire to avoid loss of licensed privileges/a person’s livelihood do create more equitable outcomes.  
  • Education-based compliance and enforcement programs encourage the creation of jobs that specialize in helping responsible parties achieve compliance. | • The goal of compliance and enforcement tools is not to generate revenue or seek compliance via punitive means.  
• There are proactive tools that have been utilized by the City in other contexts to encourage compliance.  
• Where entities are evading compliance, enforcement should follow a hierarchy of preferred action that includes education and support first. Any monetary penalties should be reserved for egregious violations and follow a graduated scale.  
• Parties should not be at risk of losing a license/livelihood for non-compliance, especially if parties are making good faith efforts to comply. |
What we heard from the survey about the Task Force’s comfort level with this Recommendation…

Perhaps there could still be language to say after 5 consecutive violations a contractor's license could be one thing that could be taken away.

The city will need to invest in the resources and people to be able "teach" organizations not in compliance by offering suggestions, resources (grants), teaming them up with other companies, etc. The city will need to visit these buildings, talk with the owners/operators, etc to see their challenges and offer helpful suggestions for compliance. This should be a very hands on program - ie not just sending out a document about how to comply.

Will this include a way to file complaints for non-compliance?

I really like this recommendation - education and support should absolutely be a priority over licenses or businesses being at risk. Education will be key!

Need more info

We’ve discussed exemptions and waivers, especially for NEST communities. Is that already in the recommendations elsewhere, or does it fit in here?