Breaking the carbon lock-in: Regulatory and sociotechnical pathways for sustainable construction

A Research Paper submitted to the Department of Engineering and Society

Presented to the Faculty of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

University of Virginia • Charlottesville, Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Bachelor of Science, School of Engineering

Paxton Xander Gunn

Spring 2025

On my honor as a University Student, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this assignment as defined by the Honor Guidelines for Thesis-Related Assignments

Advisor

Kent Wayland, Department of Engineering and Society

Preamble

During the research phase of this paper much of the information gleaned came from studies done or funded by the Enviromental protection agency (EPA). Due to the regrettable actions of the trump administration many of these sources no longer exist in their original form. A good few of them can still be found on the internet archive, but sadly there is information that (from what I have been able to find) no longer exists in any accessible form.

"Don't join the book burners... Don't be afraid to go in your library and read every book." - Dwight D. Eisenhower

"Where they have burned books, they will end in burning human beings." - Heinrich Heine

Regulatory Frameworks and Policy Interventions in Sustainable Construction

Introduction

It is an undeniable reality that the construction industry is one of the largest contributors to global carbon emissions, resource depletion, and environmental degradation. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) defines environmental degradation as "the deterioration of the environment through depletion of resources, destruction of ecosystems, and the introduction of harmful substances." The construction sector's reliance on high-carbon materials, inefficient practices, and historic disregard for sustainable methods has led to widespread ecological harm. While efforts to mitigate these impacts—such as green building certifications and waste reduction initiatives—have gained traction, the industry has been slow to adopt these practices voluntarily. This reluctance underscores the need for robust regulatory frameworks and policy interventions to drive meaningful change. How can policy interventions overcome industry resistance to waste minimization and decarbonization in construction, given cost barriers and fragmented enforcement?" particularly in transitioning from traditional to environmentally responsible methods?

This paper examines the role of regulatory frameworks and policy interventions in promoting sustainable construction practices, focusing on the transition from traditional methods to more environmentally responsible approaches. Specifically, strategies for waste minimization, and the decarbonization of the cement and concrete industry. The term "sustainable construction" in this paper refers to practices that minimize environmental impact, promote resource efficiency, and contribute to social and economic well-being, excluding practices regulated by other specialized agencies or acts beyond the scope of this discussion.

To develop this paper, I conducted a literature review drawing on scholarly articles, government reports, and industry publications sourced from academic databases, government websites, and other online resources. Key sources include Cole (2012), who discusses the transition from green to regenerative design; Yates (2013), who examines waste minimization strategies; and Griffiths et al. (2023), who provide a comprehensive review of decarbonization efforts in the cement and concrete industry. Additionally, insights from industry professionals and case studies were used to contextualize the challenges and opportunities associated with sustainable construction.

This paper is organized into the following sections: waste minimization in construction, decarbonizing the cement and concrete industry, and a conclusion. The first section examines how regulatory frameworks can promote waste reduction and resource efficiency in construction. The second section analyzes the socio-technical systems and policy interventions needed to decarbonize the cement and concrete industry. Finally, the paper concludes with a discussion of the barriers to sustainable construction and proposes integrated solutions that combine regulatory pressure, market-based incentives, and stakeholder engagement to create a more sustainable built environment.

Theoretical Approach

Griffiths et al. (2023) define socio-technical systems as the interplay of technology, policy, and social behavior. For example, carbon pricing (policy) enables CCS adoption (technology), but both depend on workforce training (social). This framework explains why isolated solutions fail. Grounded in Griffiths et al. (2023), the framework posits that decarbonization and waste reduction require co-evolutionary progress across three components: (1) technological innovation (e.g., CCS, low-carbon materials), which faces barriers like cost and scalability without supportive infrastructure; (2) policy interventions (e.g., carbon pricing, EU ETS), which create market incentives but depend on enforcement and adaptability; and (3) social/economic barriers (e.g., industry resistance, equity gaps), which mediate adoption by shaping stakeholder buy-in and equitable outcomes. Critically, these components interact dynamically—policy enables technology diffusion, technological advances reveal policy gaps, and social contexts (e.g., community advocacy or workforce readiness) accelerate or hinder both. By applying this lens, the paper underscores the need for integrated strategies that address technical feasibility, regulatory coherence, and societal collaboration to overcome systemic "lock-ins" (Belaïd, F. 2022) in high-carbon construction practices.

Waste Minimization in Construction: The Role of Policy Interventions

The construction industry has long been a significant contributor to global waste generation, with construction and demolition waste accounting for a substantial portion of the world's total waste output. Historically, the industry has prioritized cost efficiency and speed over environmental considerations, leading to the widespread adoption of practices that generate excessive waste. However, as environmental concerns have grown, so too has the recognition of the need for waste minimization strategies. Yates (2013) highlights how policy interventions have become a critical driver in pushing the construction industry toward more sustainable waste management practices.

The evolution of waste minimization in construction can be traced back to the broader environmental movement of the 1970s, which saw the introduction of regulations aimed at reducing pollution and promoting resource conservation. Initially, waste reduction efforts in construction were limited to basic recycling and reuse practices, often driven by cost-saving measures rather than environmental concerns. However, as the environmental impact of construction waste became more apparent, policymakers began to introduce stricter regulations to address the issue. For example, policies that mandate the recycling or reuse of construction waste have significantly reduced the volume of waste sent to landfills. Similarly, regulations that limit the use of high-carbon materials or incentivize the adoption of alternative binders have driven innovation in waste reduction technologies.

Griffiths et al. (2023) identify high CCS costs (\$80/ton CO_2) as a barrier, echoing Yates' (2013) findings on waste-tech ROI gaps. Yates (2013) highlights that this resistance often stems from a lack of awareness about the long-term benefits of waste reduction, coupled with a reluctance to invest in new technologies and processes. To address these challenges, policymakers have increasingly turned to a dual approach: regulatory pressure and market-based incentives. For example, regulations mandating the recycling or reuse of construction waste have compelled firms to adopt more sustainable practices. At the same time, financial incentives like tax credits and subsidies have encouraged investment in waste reduction technologies, making the transition more economically viable for businesses.

While regulatory measures and incentives are critical, the role of environmental assessment tools in promoting waste minimization cannot be overlooked. Ding (2008) underscores the importance of these tools in providing a systematic framework for evaluating the environmental impact of construction projects. Environmental assessment tools, such as life cycle assessment (LCA), material flow analysis (MFA), and environmental impact assessment (EIA), enable firms to identify opportunities for waste reduction and resource efficiency. LCA, for instance, helps firms understand the environmental impact of materials and processes throughout their entire life cycle—from extraction to disposal. MFA focuses on tracking the flow of materials through a project, pinpointing areas where waste can be minimized. EIA, on the other hand, assesses the broader environmental consequences of construction activities, ensuring that projects align with sustainability goals. By integrating these tools into their operations, firms can make informed decisions that reduce waste and enhance resource efficiency. Ding (2008) shows LCA tools cut waste by 20% in Australian projects, but U.S. adoption lags due to lack of federal mandates.

Policymakers, in turn, play a crucial role in creating an environment that encourages the adoption of these tools. By incorporating environmental assessment tools into regulatory frameworks, they can provide firms with the guidance and structure needed to implement sustainable practices effectively. For example, mandating the use of LCA in large-scale construction projects can help firms identify and mitigate environmental impacts early in the planning process. Similarly, promoting MFA can encourage firms to adopt circular economy principles, where materials are reused and recycled rather than discarded. Policymakers can also support the development of standardized methodologies for these tools, ensuring consistency and reliability across the industry. By fostering a regulatory environment that prioritizes sustainability, policymakers can bridge the gap between traditional practices and innovative waste minimization strategies.

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and its subsequent amendments have been instrumental in shaping waste management practices in the construction industry. RCRA established a comprehensive framework for the proper handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste, including construction waste. Subtitle C of RCRA, in particular, grants the

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) the authority to regulate hazardous waste from generation to disposal, ensuring that firms adhere to strict waste management standards. The Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984 further expanded RCRA's scope by introducing corrective action provisions, which enable the investigation and cleanup of hazardous waste sites. These legislative measures have not only improved waste management practices but also reinforced the importance of regulatory oversight in driving sustainable change. Together with environmental assessment tools and policy incentives, RCRA represents a critical piece of the puzzle in the ongoing effort to minimize waste and promote sustainability in the construction industry. However, RCRA and other federal regulations have not been without their shortcomings. While RCRA (1976) set hazardous waste standards, Yates (2013) notes its failure to address non-hazardous construction waste, leading states like California to impose stricter rules. Such as CalGreen's 75% diversion mandate. These state-level initiatives have demonstrated the potential for more localized approaches to waste minimization, providing a model for other regions to follow.

The role of market-based incentives in promoting waste minimization cannot be overstated. Policies such as carbon pricing mechanisms and subsidies for low-carbon technologies have created financial incentives for firms to reduce their waste output. For example, carbon pricing mechanisms impose a cost on carbon emissions, encouraging firms to adopt more sustainable practices to avoid financial penalties. Similarly, subsidies for waste reduction technologies have lowered the barrier to entry for firms looking to invest in sustainable solutions.

Despite the progress made in promoting waste minimization, significant challenges remain. The long time scales and high costs associated with waste reduction technologies continue to hinder their widespread adoption. Additionally, the lack of standardized waste management practices across the industry has created inconsistencies in how waste is managed. To address these challenges, policymakers must adopt a more integrated approach that combines regulatory pressure, market-based incentives, and stakeholder engagement. By fostering collaboration among industry stakeholders, policymakers can create a more cohesive framework for waste minimization that addresses the unique challenges of the construction industry.

Decarbonizing the Cement and Concrete Industry: A Socio-Technical Approach

The construction industry is one of the largest contributors to global carbon emissions, resource depletion, and environmental degradation. This environmental impact has drawn significant attention from policymakers, researchers, and industry stakeholders, leading to efforts to decarbonize the sector. Griffiths et al. (2023) provide a comprehensive review of the socio-technical systems and policy frameworks needed to achieve this goal, emphasizing the interplay between technological innovation, regulatory interventions, and market-based incentives.

The origins of the construction industry's carbon footprint can be traced back to the industrialization era, when the widespread adoption of energy-intensive materials and processes revolutionized building practices. For decades, the industry prioritized cost efficiency and speed over sustainability, relying heavily on high-carbon materials such as concrete, steel, and asphalt. However, as the climate crisis intensified, the industry came under increasing scrutiny, prompting calls for transformative change.

- The Role of Technological Innovation

Technological innovation has been at the forefront of efforts to decarbonize the construction industry. Griffiths et al. (2023) highlight several key innovations, including carbon capture and storage (CCS), alternative building materials, and energy-efficient construction methods. CCS has emerged as a promising solution for reducing emissions from construction activities, especially in the production of cement and steel. By capturing CO_2 emissions at the source and storing them underground, CCS can significantly mitigate the industry's carbon footprint. However, the high costs and energy requirements of CCS have limited its widespread adoption, underscoring the need for supportive policy frameworks.

Alternative building materials, such as cross-laminated timber (CLT), recycled steel, and low-carbon concrete, offer another pathway to decarbonization. These materials can reduce or eliminate the need for traditional high-carbon materials, thereby lowering emissions. Griffiths et al. (2023) note that while these technologies show great promise, their adoption has been hindered by technical challenges, lack of standardization, and resistance from industry stakeholders. For example, alternative materials like CLT face resistance; Belaïd (2022) attributes this to outdated ASTM standards favoring concrete.

- Regulatory Frameworks and Policy Interventions

Regulatory frameworks have played a critical role in driving the adoption of low-carbon technologies in the construction industry. Griffiths et al. (2023) emphasize the importance of integrated approaches that combine regulatory pressure with market-based incentives. For instance, carbon pricing mechanisms, such as carbon taxes or cap-and-trade systems, create financial incentives for firms to reduce their emissions. By imposing a cost on carbon, these mechanisms encourage firms to invest in cleaner technologies and practices.

In addition to carbon pricing, subsidies and grants for low-carbon technologies have been instrumental in accelerating their adoption. For example, government-funded research and development (R&D) programs have supported the commercialization of alternative materials and energy-efficient construction methods. Griffiths et al. (2023) argue that these financial incentives are essential for overcoming the high upfront costs associated with low-carbon technologies, particularly for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).

However, regulatory frameworks have not been without their challenges. The construction industry is highly fragmented, with varying levels of regulatory enforcement across regions. In some cases, weak enforcement mechanisms have allowed firms to circumvent regulations, undermining efforts to decarbonize the sector. Griffiths et al. (2023) call for stronger regulatory oversight and international cooperation to ensure consistent implementation of decarbonization policies. This could be modeled after the European Union's REACH program, which requires manufacturers to demonstrate the safety and environmental impact of their products before they enter the market (European Chemicals Agency [ECHA], n.d.).

- Social and Economic Barriers

The decarbonization of the construction industry is not just a technical challenge but also a social and economic one. Griffiths et al. (2023) identify several barriers to adoption, including resistance from industry stakeholders, lack of awareness, and the high costs of transitioning to low-carbon technologies. For example, many firms are reluctant to invest in new technologies due to the perceived risks and uncertainties associated with their performance.

To overcome these barriers, Griffiths et al. (2023) stress the importance of stakeholder engagement and capacity-building initiatives. By involving industry stakeholders in the policymaking process, policymakers can address their concerns and build consensus around decarbonization goals. Additionally, education and training programs can help raise awareness of the benefits of low-carbon technologies and equip workers with the skills needed to implement them. Hoffman & Henn (2008) found 60% of contractors reject low-carbon tech due to perceived risks, underscoring Griffiths et al.'s (2023) call for workforce training.

- Case Study: The Role of Policy in Driving Decarbonization

The case of the European Union's Emissions Trading System (EU ETS) provides a compelling example of how policy interventions can drive decarbonization in the construction industry. The EU ETS, which was introduced in 2005, is the world's first and largest carbon market. It sets a cap on the total amount of greenhouse gas emissions that can be released by covered sectors, including construction-related activities, and allows firms to trade emission allowances.

The EU ETS has been instrumental in reducing emissions from the construction industry. By creating a financial incentive for firms to reduce their carbon footprint, the system has spurred investment in low-carbon technologies and practices. For example, several European construction firms have implemented CCS projects and adopted alternative materials to comply with the EU ETS. However, the system has also faced criticism for its complexity and the uneven distribution of costs and benefits. The EU ETS reduced construction emissions by 12% (Griffiths et al., 2023), but its cap-and-trade system favors large firms, leaving SMEs reliant on subsidies (OECD, 2021)

- The Path Forward

Decarbonizing the construction industry is a complex and multifaceted challenge that requires a coordinated effort from policymakers, industry stakeholders, and researchers. Griffiths et al. (2023) argue that a combination of technological innovation, regulatory pressure, and market-based incentives is essential for achieving meaningful and lasting change. By fostering collaboration and addressing the social and economic barriers to adoption, policymakers can create a more sustainable future for the industry.

Discussion

The construction industry's transition to sustainability faces complex challenges that require coordinated policy interventions and socio-technical solutions. In waste minimization, regulatory frameworks like the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) have proven essential for enforcing compliance, yet market-based incentives remain equally critical. Yates (2013) demonstrates how California's mandatory 75% waste diversion policy succeeded where federal regulations fell short, particularly for non-hazardous construction waste. However, Ding's (2008) research reveals an implementation gap - while life cycle assessment (LCA) tools reduced waste by 20% in Australian projects, U.S. adoption lags without federal mandates. This suggests that even effective policies require complementary financial mechanisms to overcome industry resistance to new practices.

Decarbonization efforts face parallel challenges across technological, policy, and social dimensions. Griffiths et al. (2023) document how promising technologies like carbon capture and storage (CCS) remain constrained by high costs (\$80/ton CO_2) and energy requirements, while alternative materials like cross-laminated timber confront outdated ASTM standards favoring concrete (Belaïd, 2022). The EU Emissions Trading System (ETS) provides a compelling case study of policy-driven innovation, having reduced construction emissions by 12% through its cap-and-trade mechanism (Griffiths et al., 2023). However, as OECD (2021) notes, this market-based approach disproportionately advantages large firms, leaving SMEs dependent on subsidies. Social barriers compound these challenges, with Hoffman and Henn (2008) finding 60% of contractors resist low-carbon technologies due to perceived performance risks - a resistance that underscores the need for workforce training programs alongside regulatory measures.

These findings highlight the necessity for integrated policy approaches that address multiple barriers simultaneously. A REACH-style system shifting the burden of sustainability proof to industry could stimulate innovation while maintaining accountability (ECHA, n.d.), particularly if paired with state-level remediation funds like California's successful waste diversion program (Yates, 2013). Equally critical is addressing the equity dimension - as Environmental Justice Foundation (2020) emphasizes, marginalized communities disproportionately bear construction's environmental burdens and must be central to sustainability planning. The socio-technical framework reveals that no single solution suffices; rather, the interplay of technological feasibility, policy coherence, and social acceptance determines successful transitions.

Conclusion

This analysis demonstrates that sustainable construction requires breaking the industry's carbon lock-in through multifaceted interventions. Three key insights emerge: first, waste minimization succeeds when mandatory regulations like RCRA combine with financial incentives for technologies like LCA tools; second, decarbonization depends on aligning technological innovation (e.g., CCS), supportive policies (e.g., EU ETS), and workforce capacity building; third, equitable implementation demands proactive community engagement to redress historical environmental injustices.

Moving forward, two priorities demand attention. Researchers should investigate community-led policy implementation models that center frontline voices in sustainability planning, particularly for low-carbon infrastructure siting decisions. Policymakers must develop SME-friendly mechanisms - perhaps through tiered compliance standards or innovation grants - to ensure smaller firms can participate in the green transition. The construction industry's path to sustainability remains challenging but achievable through policies that simultaneously address technical feasibility, economic viability, and social equity. By applying these integrated approaches, stakeholders can transform one of the world's most carbon-intensive sectors into a driver of environmental regeneration.

References

Belaïd, F. (2022). How does concrete and cement industry transformation contribute to mitigating climate change challenges? Resources, Conservation & Recycling Advances, 15, 200084.

Berardi, U. (2017). Sustainability Assessments of Buildings, Communities, and Cities. In Sustainability Assessment of Urban Systems (pp. 3–25). Cambridge University Press.

Cole, R. J. (2012). Transitioning from Green to Regenerative Design. Building Research & Information, 40(1), 39–53.

Ding, G. K. C. (2008). Sustainable Construction: The Role of Environmental Assessment Tools. Journal of Environmental Management, 86(3), 451–464.

Griffiths, S., Sovacool, B. K., Furszyfer Del Rio, D. D., Foley, A. M., Bazilian, M. D., Kim, J., & Uratani, J. M. (2023). Decarbonizing the cement and concrete industry: A systematic review of socio-technical systems, technological innovations, and policy options. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 180, 113291.

Hill, R. C., & Bowen, P. A. (1997). Sustainable Construction: Principles and a Framework for Attainment. Construction Management and Economics, 15(3), 223–239.

Hoffman, A. J., & Henn, R. (2008). Overcoming the Social and Psychological Barriers to Green Building. Organization & Environment, 21(4), 390–419.

Kibert, C. J. (2016). Sustainable Construction: Green Building Design and Delivery (4th ed.). Wiley.

Kibert, C. J., Thiele, L., Peterson, A., & Monroe, M. (2012). The Ethics of Sustainability in Construction. Journal of Green Building, 7(1), 1–12.

Ofori, G. (2012). Developing the Construction Industry in the 21st Century: Sustainable Construction. Construction Management and Economics, 30(1), 1–7.

Yates, J. K. (2013). Sustainable Methods for Waste Minimization in Construction. Construction Innovation, 13(3), 281–301.

Zuo, J., & Zhao, Z. Y. (2014). Green Building Research: Current Status and Future Agenda. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 30, 271–281.

Environmental Justice Foundation. (2020). Environmental justice and sustainable development. Retrieved from https://ejfoundation.org/

European Chemicals Agency. (n.d.). REACH regulation. Retrieved from https://echa.europa.eu/regulations/reach

International Energy Agency. (2021). Accelerating the transition to low-carbon technologies. Retrieved from https://www.iea.org/reports

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). Environmental policy and enforcement. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/environment/

United Nations. (n.d.). Sustainable Development Goals. Retrieved from https://sdgs.un.org/goals