

## The Procurement Workgroup Report to the Mayor's Task Force on Peak Oil and Climate Change

September 6, 2008

### Acknowledgements:

This report was completed by the Procurement Work Team, who volunteered their time, creativity, experience and energy under very tight deadlines. They are: Geoff Glenn (co-chairman), Deborah Besinius, Ann Murphy, Thea Bremer, and Connie Wahl, all with the City of Spokane; Mary Carr, Spokane Community College; Jim Wavada (co-chair), Department of Ecology; Kathy Netteberg, and Mike Broemeling, AvistaCorp; Louise Fendrich, Greater Spokane Chamber, Tiara Schmidt, EWU student, Laura Lenney and Stephanie Noren from Gonzaga University, both of whom volunteered to help with documentation and development.

Also, special thanks to Susanne Croft for her diligence in helping Spokane grow toward a sustainable future.

### Summary:

During the second phase of development, the Procurement Work Team consolidated its original list of thirty-one action items to fifteen, combining those items which were related or would result in similar outcomes. Our recommendations center around five general themes – policy, purchaser and end-user behavior, reliable product information and resources, tracking, and enforcement – in addressing procurement as it relates to sustainability, toxicity, climate change, and fuel economies and dependency.

While the issue of adaptation facilitated a new dialogue about City of Spokane procurement practices and policy, it did not significantly change our action list. Generally speaking procurement, while touching on almost every aspect of City operations, is a subject fairly narrow in scope and there are many unquantifiable issues associated with developing and prioritizing actions. From the standpoint of the working group, without verifiable data regarding current levels of purchasing or impacts, it would be hard to assert definitive changes in City behavior. Hence, our action list reflects a broader view and can be seen as necessary steps in facilitating a more specific and refined list for future activities. Additionally, without alternative products and services in the marketplace, the City is inherently limited in its ability to change practices without recognizing the larger endemic issues in trying to identify target products or product categories for recommendation. The conclusion of the Procurement Workgroup, as most other Environmentally Preferred Purchasing (EPP) studies have found, is that the easiest approach is to establish qualitative, rather than quantitative, guidelines and reevaluate as resources and technologies become available. (See *Qualitative Measurement of Environmentally Preferable Purchasing [EPP] Among Federal Employees* at <http://www.epa.gov/epp/pubs/EPPreport-Web.pdf>)

Though the purpose of the workgroup was to look at City practice and operations, the workgroup could not help but consider various local, state and national movements as

we discussed both risks and actions. We have included definitions for environmentally preferred purchasing (EPP), zero waste, and product stewardship, etc. with the hope that the Task Force's final recommendations consider the larger context in which State and National reform is helping to shape policy and operational behavior. Legislative and agency reform will help facilitate the City's transition as it goes forward over the next decade. Additionally, the Task Force should be aware that there are other municipalities who have already developed and put into practice EPP guideline and programs (a short list is attached). This is particularly helpful in that it does not put the entire burden on the City to develop an independent system, but allows us to benefit from the experiences of other programs and provides for better collaborative efforts through regional and national networking.

*Final observations on the workgroup*

Each of the members of the workgroup brought their own very unique and distinct expertise to the process. Our representatives included private industry, City Purchasing, Hazardous and Solid Waste Management, education, energy, and environmental policy. The workgroup benefited from the diversity as each action item evolved over the course of our workgroup sessions through a process of dialogue and examination. Our major difficulties seemed to originate from our limited understanding of the intent and ideology behind some of the categories defined in the assessment tool and trying to assign implementation impacts to our action list. However, once we were able to define a benchmark, we moved fairly quickly through the ranking process, although the rankings (due to limitations previously identified) are subjective.

As a recommendation for future projects of this type, there may be some advantage in including the workgroup co-leads in the discussion and development of assessment tools. As well, staff resources to help quantify ranking may also be beneficial. This may provide better consistency throughout the process both in the workgroup and in determining overlaps.

I would like to thank all the members of the workgroup for their time, efforts and dedication to this project and specifically acknowledge Jim Wavada from the Department of Ecology for his tireless effort and invaluable contribution as both co-lead and Task Force member.

Geoffrey D. Glenn  
Hazardous Waste Coordinator  
City of Spokane, Solid Waste Management  
1225 E. Marietta  
Spokane, WA 99207  
509 625-7988  
[gglenn@spokanecity.org](mailto:gglenn@spokanecity.org)

## Mission statement

The City of Spokane is committed to developing and promoting environmentally responsible purchasing practices for goods and services. These practices should be supported by policies that encourage waste reduction, sustainability, conservation of natural resources and community well-being. These policies and practices will support efforts to ensure responsible stewardship of the environmental resources under the city's influence or control.

## Procurement Ideal Vision Statement

The City of Spokane recognizes its role as a leader in the community with regard to responsible stewardship of environmental resources through its commitment to “green” procurement of goods and services. The City’s green purchasing policy is based on a system of established priorities and precedents that help encourage a variety of localized and diverse resources.

Through a coordinated purchasing network, the City sets a positive example in evaluating its purchasing decisions based on clear impact profiles, which not only consider costs but give priority to environmentally responsible purchasing practices and waste reduction, provided that the products and services meet acceptable use and performance standards.

The City embraces both a short- and long-term vision regarding its operations and environmental responsibility through forward-looking assessments, participation in ongoing legislative and regulatory development, and active, regular reassessment of its policies and procedures.

Through an open-minded perspective regarding alternative products and processes, the City of Spokane strives to balance environmental and fiscal responsibilities in make green purchasing decisions in order to provide the best services for its citizens while encouraging zero waste industry and localized markets.

In an ideal procurement environment the city of Spokane typically:

- purchases as much as possible from local sources and maintains reasonable targets for local purchasing;
- has a good grasp of its purchasing mechanisms and controls its purchasing to achieve its goals;
- the city has an environmental impact profile available on product or service it buys on a regular basis;
- has gone paperless in its administrative operations;
- is committed to an industrial ecology that promotes zero waste policies;
- supports a purchasing system that keeps technical nutrients in a technical cycle and organic nutrients in an organic cycle;
- strictly limits the use of toxic chemicals;
- is open minded toward alternative products, processes and policies;
- routinely examines the long-run consequences and long-term (entire) life cycle (seven generations) of products it purchases;
- considers total costs as opposed to just the initial cost;
- implements appropriate new, environmentally friendly technologies as they become available;

- fully supports product stewardship efforts and the state Beyond Waste plan, moving beyond recycling and reuse to emphasize waste avoidance in its purchasing decisions;
- possesses thoroughly researched information that identifies where products originate and terminate geographically and maintains a directory and database for available services and products specifically indexed by their environmental impacts ;
- assesses the total environmental impact of a product, including the impact of shipping and the environmental impact of the composition and manufacture of the items to be purchased:
- has enacted legislation to encourage greater corporate and industrial responsibility;
- supports locally owned businesses;
- uses its purchasing power used to influence markets for recovered materials (recycling);
- is “best in class” re green purchasing.

## Procurement Risk List

1. The lack of inventory of data or metrics make it difficult, impossible or impracticable to evaluate or measure current purchasing practices.
2. The lack of an environmentally responsible purchasing (ERP) policy and/or mandates make it difficult, impossible or impracticable to select products and services based on environmental criteria.
3. Current purchasing and inventory management activities, opportunities, and compliance are difficult to evaluate due to decentralized and /or a lack of enterprise purchasing making it difficult to specify requirements, engage in consolidate purchasing practices or solicit competitive bids for alternative products or services.
4. Our current “low qualified bidder” practices do not utilize a total cost of ownership (TCO) methodology and/or allow preferential purchasing of ERP compliant products.
5. Lack of governance makes adherence to ERP policies problematic.
6. There may be negative economic impacts and/or higher costs associated with ERP practices due to limited local markets, lack of local sources, transportation, and education.
7. Our current-use practices and/or future population growth will generate greater volumes of waste and will increase disposal operations costs.
8. Our costs are driven upward by a sizeable transportation fleet and reliance on oil.
9. City of Spokane income will be negatively impacted due to an inability to provide competitive services.
10. Accessory programs and City of Spokane infrastructure will not be fully funded.

Implied: Inability to operate, provide service or maintain governance as a result of increasing temperatures (0.5 degrees Fahrenheit every 10 years) and other unquantifiable impacts to the environment and human health.

Action Summary

1. Pilot ERP program
2. Products and packaging at city venues.
3. Education/outreach waste reduce (city ops)
4. Credit card tracking
5. Purchasing system and inventory management
6. Annual ERP targets and metrics.
7. Baseline for purchasing (fuel/GHG)
8. Green incentive program and recognition
9. Networking and reform
10. Alternative bidding
11. Localized products and services
12. Mayoral "green" purchasing directive. (Prerequisite Action)
13. ERP element of performance evaluations.
14. Certified green product list
15. ERP Committee, ombudsman or coordinator

## Procurement Workgroup Action Item List

- 1 Implement pilot ERP program in Public Works division.
  - 2 Identify how city government can influence products sold and packaging used at city venues.
  - 3 City takes active role in education/inform outreach to reduce waste generated internally.
  - 4 Re-evaluate current credit card purchases tracking procedure. Develop credit card use reporting system to assess ERP purchases. Move to limited use credit cards for city employees.
  - 5 Expand and Increase use of city-wide purchasing system and inventory management to better manage ERP purchases and centralize data/reporting. Track origin and catalog of purchases for assessment and enforcement.
  - 6 Develop appropriate annual ERP targets. Measure results, including departmental compliance. Create and disseminate report results to city management and elected officials.
  - 7 Establish a baseline for purchasing goods and services that incorporates associated fuel consumption and GHG emissions as purchasing considerations.
  - 8 List best purchasing practices and reward/recognize good things those City departments are already doing. Create green purchasing incentive programs for departments.
  - 9 Maintain active city membership in Northwest Product Stewardship Council & Product Stewardship Institute. Network with state and federal agencies and other governmental entities regarding sustainability and GHG emission reduction strategies, policies and practices. Continued focused discussion with other purchasing department managers in Washington and neighboring states.
  - 10 Explore alternative bidding/award practices, develop recommendations and obtain approval to incorporate in procurement practices.
- 
- 11 Encourage local suppliers to carry "green" products or services. Identify gaps in green purchasing resources.
  - 12 Develop Mayoral "green" purchasing directive. (Prerequisite Action)
  - 13 Make evaluation of effectiveness at participating in City ERP programs a major element of manager performance evaluations.

- 14 Compile product list certified as green by an independent third party verifier. Identify gaps in local sources. Identify products and services that are subject to ERP policy, specifications and practices.
- 15 Create standing cross-functional committee for research and recommendation to ombudsman and to promote ERP program ideas and innovations from staff level or from outside of city government; (Better)

Create an office of green purchasing, distinct from ombudsman, charged with educating department heads about green purchase options, monitoring purchasing practices and enforcing ERP policies; (Best)

Identify departmental ERP coordinators with responsibility to drive ERP initiatives. One of whom would lead city ERP green team; (Good)

Rank	Action # or code	Energy or Climate Related	Action Items & Description Environmental Responsible Purchasing (ERP)	Primary Considerations										Triple Bottom Line					TOTAL IMPACT SCORE OF ACTION ITEM (top score possible: 45)	Estimated Front-end Cost	Feasibility Considerations								
				Internal City Action/Policy	External Policy	Short Term - Implement Now	Long Term	↓ Waste	↓ GHG emissions	↑ Energy efficiency (costs, usage)	↓ oil dependence	↑ productivity: people & processes	Primary Sub-total	Economy: ↑ opportunities (business, jobs)	Economy: ↓ fiscal impacts	↑ Community Well-being	Conservation of natural resources	Triple Bottom Line Sub-total			Resource Inputs	Staff	Political Will	Grant \$ available	Pay-back period	Opportunity costs	"Low-hanging fruit"		
																												Estimated Front-end Cost	Staff
1	1 (PR20)	Both	Implement pilot ERP program in Public Works division.	x	x			5	5	5	5	5	5	25	4	5	3	4	16	41	3	x		x					X
2	2 (PR07)	Both	Identify how city government can influence products sold and packaging used at city venues.		X		X	5	5	5	5	5	5	25	3	4	5	4	16	41	2								X
3	3 (PR28)	Both	City takes active role in education/inform outreach to reduce waste generated internally.	X		X		4	4	4	4	4	4	20	4	5	5	5	19	39	3	X	X						X
4	4 (PR13)	Both	Re-evaluate current credit card purchases tracking procedure. Develop credit card use reporting system to assess ERP purchases. Move to limited use credit cards for city employees.	X		X		4	4	4	4	3	19	4	5	5	5	19	38	3	X	X			X	X	X		X
5	5 (PR15)	Both	Expand and Increase use of city-wide purchasing system and inventory management to better manage ERP purchases and centralize data/reporting. Track origin and catalog of purchases for assessment and enforcement.	X		X		5	4	4	4	5	22	4	3	5	4	16	38	3	X	X			X	X	X		X
6	6 (PR 14)	Both	Develop appropriate annual ERP targets. Measure results, including departmental compliance. Create and disseminate report results to city management and elected officials.	X		X	X	4	4	3	3	3	17	4	5	5	5	19	36	2	X	X	X			X	X		X
7	7 (PR18)	Both	Establish a baseline for purchasing goods and services that incorporates associated fuel consumption and GHG emissions as purchasing considerations.	X		X		4	4	4	4	4	20	3	3	5	5	16	36	3	X	X	X	X					
8	8 (PR04)	Both	List best purchasing practices and reward/recognize good things that City departments are already doing. Create green purchasing incentive programs for departments.	X		X		4	4	3	4	4	19	4	2	5	5	16	35	1	X	X							X
9	PR-30 PR-27 PR-26	Both	Maintain active city membership in Northwest Product Stewardship Council & Product Stewardship Institute. Network with state and federal agencies and other governmental entities regarding sustainability and GHG emission reduction strategies, policies and practices. Continued focused discussion with other purchasing department managers in Washington and neighboring states.	X		X		4	4	3	4	4	19	4	2	5	5	16	35	1	X	X							X
10	10 (PR17)	Both	Explore alternative bidding/award practices, develop recommendations and obtain approval to incorporate in procurement practices.		X		X	4	3	4	4	3	18	4	2	5	5	16	34	2	X	X							



## Definitions

### Environmental Preferable Purchasing (EPP):

“products and services that have a lesser or reduced effect on human health and the environment when compared with competing products or services that serve the same purpose. This comparison may consider raw material acquisition, production, manufacturing, packaging, distribution, re-use, operation, maintenance, or disposal of the product or service” (Presidential Executive Order 13101; US EPA; generally accepted by industry).

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT? EP Purchasing directs buying choices toward products that are less harmful to the environment and safer for human health. Our purpose is to help reduce the negative effects of purchases by promoting EP products through our purchasing and contracting efforts. This effort benefits and is supported by the following groups: political subdivisions, such as schools and towns; EP organizations, including government and not-for-profit groups; state government executive branch and agencies; consumers; vendors and manufacturers.

### Environmental Responsible Purchasing (ERP):

"the use of processes, practices, materials, products, substances or energy that avoid or minimize the creation of pollutants and waste, and reduce the overall risk to the environment and human health."

The following factors may be considered in establishing the criteria: human health impacts; environmental impacts; greenhouse gas and air pollution emissions; groundwater and surface water contamination, water and energy efficiency; renewable energy sources; recycled content; durability; and ability of the product to be recycled, reused or composted at the end of its life cycle.

### Zero Waste:

"Zero Waste is a goal that is both pragmatic and visionary, to guide people to emulate sustainable natural cycles, where all discarded materials are resources for others to use. Zero Waste means designing and managing products and processes to reduce the volume and toxicity of waste and materials, conserve and recover all resources, and not burn or bury them. Implementing Zero Waste will eliminate all discharges to land, water or air that may be a threat to planetary, human, animal or plant health."

### Beyond Waste:

Beyond Waste is a waste and toxics reduction plan for Washington by Ecology's Solid Waste & Hazardous Waste programs. Eliminating waste and toxics will contribute to economic, social and environmental vitality.

About the plan

The Beyond Waste Plan, issued in November 2004, is a long-term strategy for systematically eliminating wastes and the use of toxic substances. Beyond Waste meets state law requirements for statewide solid- and hazardous-waste plans for the state of Washington.

#### Five Selected Initiatives

Based on research, it was decided that the first steps for progressing toward Beyond Waste should focus on the following five areas or initiatives:

1. Moving toward Beyond Waste with Industries
2. Reducing small volume hazardous materials and wastes
3. Establishing a recycling system for organic materials
4. Moving toward Beyond Waste through "Green Building" practices
5. Measuring progress toward Beyond Waste

In addition to these five future-directed initiatives, a number of additional recommendations are included to address pressing issues in the existing solid waste and hazardous waste management systems.

The plan consists of the [75-page summary document](#), PLUS [13 in-depth background papers](#). [Navigate to a specific section of the summary](#) or [Download a 9-page guide to the Beyond waste recommendations](#).

#### Product Stewardship:

"Product stewardship" means that producers take responsibility to manage and reduce the entire life-cycle impacts of their products and packaging, from product design to end-of-life management.

"Product stewardship program" means a program that addresses the lifecycle impacts of a product and includes the collection, transportation, reuse, and either recycling or disposal, or both, of unwanted products, including historical products and the program's fair share of orphan products. The product stewardship program is financed as well as managed or provided by the producers of those products.

#### Product stewardship program

Every producer of products and product categories identified by rules adopted by the department sold in or into the state must participate in a product stewardship program by either:

- operating, individually or collectively with other producers, a product stewardship program approved by the department;
- or entering into an agreement with a stewardship organization to operate, on the producer's behalf, a product stewardship program approved by the department.

#### Renewable energy:

Renewable energy includes hydroelectricity, biomass, biofuels, geothermal, wind, and solar. According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, in 2006 renewable energies produced about six percent of total U.S. energy. The industry grossed revenues of \$40 billion and created nearly half a million jobs.

The City of Spokane has responsibility for two types of renewable energy: Hydroelectric power at Upriver Dam, and Municipal Solid Waste Incinerator with Spokane Regional Solid Waste System.

## Resources

### Federal

EPA Environmentally Preferable Purchasing

(<http://www.epa.gov/epp/>)

#### [EPA's Comprehensive Procurement Guidelines \(CPG\)](#)

Through the CPG, EPA designates products that are or can be made with recovered materials, and recommends practices for buying these products.

(<http://www.epa.gov/cpg>)

### State and Regional

#### [California - City of Santa Monica, Environmental Programs Division \(EPD\)](#)

Santa Monica's EPD develops and implements programs to manage natural resources and hazardous materials, promote conservation and efficiency efforts, and administer and enforce many of Santa Monica's environmental laws.

(<http://santa-monica.org/epd>)

#### [City & County of San Francisco department SFEnvironment](#)

SF Environment's mission is to improve, enhance, and preserve the environment, and to promote San Francisco's long-term wellbeing by developing innovative, practical and wide-ranging environmental programs in recycling, toxics reduction, environmental justice, energy efficiency, commute alternatives, and urban forest.

(<http://www.sfenvironment.org/index.html>)

#### [Massachusetts - Operational Services Division, Environmentally Preferable Products \(EPP\) Procurement Program](#)

The primary goal of this program is to use the Commonwealth of Massachusetts's purchasing power to reduce the environmental and public health impact of state government and foster markets for environmentally preferable products.

([http://www.mass.gov/?pageID=osdsubtopic&L=3&L0=Home&L1=Buy+from+a+Contract&L2=Environmentally+Preferable+Products+\(EPP\)+Procurement+Program&sid=Aosd](http://www.mass.gov/?pageID=osdsubtopic&L=3&L0=Home&L1=Buy+from+a+Contract&L2=Environmentally+Preferable+Products+(EPP)+Procurement+Program&sid=Aosd))

#### [Minnesota - Materials Management Division, Environmentally Responsible Purchasing](#)

Minnesota's Materials Management Division is committed to helping state agencies purchase environmentally preferable products.

(<http://www.mmd.admin.state.mn.us/envir.htm>)

#### [Washington - King County, Environmental Purchasing Program](#)

King County's Environmental Purchasing Program provides a number of resources related to green purchasing. (<http://www.metrokc.gov/procure/green>)

[Washington State Department of Ecology Beyond Waste](#)

Beyond Waste is a waste and toxics reduction plan for Washington by Ecology's Solid Waste & Hazardous Waste programs. Eliminating waste and toxics will contribute to economic, social and environmental vitality. (<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/beyondwaste/>)

Product Stewardship

[Northwest Product Stewardship Council](#)

The mission of the NWPSC is to work together and with other governments, businesses and nonprofit groups to integrate product stewardship (producer responsibility) principles into the policy and economic structures of the Pacific Northwest. (<http://www.productstewardship.net/>)

[Product Stewardship Institute](#)

The Product Stewardship Institute (PSI) is a national non-profit membership-based organization located in Boston, Massachusetts. ([www.productstewardship.us/](http://www.productstewardship.us/))

Responsible Purchasing

[Responsible Purchasing Network](#)

The Responsible Purchasing Network (RPN) is a national network of procurement-related professionals dedicated to socially responsible and environmentally sustainable purchasing. (<http://www.responsiblepurchasing.org/index.php>)

Research

[Pacific Northwest Pollution Prevention Resource Center](#)

PPRC is a non-profit organization that is the Northwest's leading source of high quality, unbiased pollution prevention (P2) information. PPRC works collaboratively to promote environmental protection through pollution prevention. PPRC believes that environmental and economic vitality go hand in hand, and that both are necessary to protect the high quality of life enjoyed in our region (<http://www.pprc.org/>)

## PPO/TPC - Product Category Score Sheet

<b>Category: Office Supplies</b> <b>Sub-Category:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Chemicals <input type="checkbox"/> Consumables, Materials, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Equipment, Hard Goods, etc.  <b>Typical Products:</b>	<b>Status of Review:</b> Primary review by _____ Secondary review by _____  _____ _____ _____ <b>General Comments:</b> _____ _____	
<b>Points =      3                  2                  1                  0                  2</b>		
<b>Health &amp; Environmental Scoring</b>	Probability that products in category display characteristic	Notes
1 Product Contains Carcinogen/Reproductive Toxin/Endocrine Disrup	High Medium Low None Unk	
2 Product Has Other Human Health Effects/IIAQ incl. Asthma /Safety	High Medium Low None Unk	
3 Product Contains Persistent, Bioaccum, Toxic Ingredients (PBTs)	High Medium Low None Unk	
4 Product Creates Non-Recyclable Wastes	High Medium Low None Unk	
5 Product Use Involves Inefficient Resource Consumption	High Medium Low None Unk	
6 Product Has User Community Effects (EJ/Children/Women/Sensitives)	High Medium Low None Unk	
7 Product Use Has Air Qual/Global Enviro Effects (ozone depl/climate/smog)	High Medium Low None Unk	
8 Manufacture & Use Involve Animal Effects (Aquatic Tox, Habitat & Other)	High Medium Low None Unk	
9 Manufacture Consumes Non-Renewable Resources	High Medium Low None Unk	
10 Manufacture Involves Agrichemicals / GMOs	High Medium Low None Unk	
11 Manufacture Has Source Community Effects / Trade Issues	High Medium Low None Unk	
<b>Point Totals =</b>		<b>0</b>
<b>Comments on Health &amp; Environmental Scoring</b>		
<b>Implementation Issues</b>	Probability that products in category display characteristic	Notes
a High Annual City Purchase Amount (\$)	High Medium Low None Unk	
b High Potential For Cost Savings (\$)	High Medium Low None Unk	
c Satisfies City Policy / Ordinance Requirements	High Medium Low None Unk	
d Ease of Implementation / Existing Standards	High Medium Low None Unk	
e Potential for National Impact / Leadership	High Medium Low None Unk	
f CCSF has not Already Addressed Products in the Category	High Medium Low None Unk	
g Other Issues:	High Medium Low None Unk	
<b>Comments on Implementation Issues</b>		

## **Enviromental & Health Criteria for Scoring Targeted Product Categories**

### **1. Product Contains Carcinogen/Reproductive Toxin / Endocrine Disruptors**

- Carcinogens
- Reproductive/developmental toxins
- Endocrine disruptors

### **2. Product Has Other Human Health Effects/Indoor Air Quality incl. Asthma / Safety**

- Acute / Chronic toxicity to humans
- Neurotoxins/central nervous system (CNS) depressants
- Eye / Skin irritation
- Skin absorption potential
- Corrosivity
- Flammability
- Respiratory irritation (asthma)
- Fragrances and/or dyes
- Sensitization
- Chemical use reduction potential
- Indoor air pollutants/VOCs

### **3. Product Contains Persistent, Bioaccum, Toxic Ingredients (PBTs)**

- Biodegradability
- Persistence in the environment
- Potential to accumulate in food chain

### **4. Product Creates Non-Recyclable Wastes**

- Recyclable (in San Francisco's program)
- Creates waste (minimize)
- Readily compostable
- "Take-back" offered by manufacturer/vendor

### **5. Product Use Involves Inefficient Resource Consumption**

- Energy consumption
- Water consumption
- Other resource consumption

### **6. Product Has User Community Effects (EJ / Children / Women / Sensitives)**

- Environmental justice issues with user community
- Impacts on women and children

<p><b>7. Product Use Has Air Qual/Global Enviro Effects (ozone depl / climate/smog)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ozone-depleting chemicals</li> <li>- Greenhouse gases</li> <li>- VOCs (outdoor)</li> </ul>
<p><b>8. Manufacture &amp; Use Involve Animal Effects (Aquatic Tox, Habitat &amp; Other)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Aquatic toxicity</li> <li>- Habitat impacts</li> <li>- Emerging pollutants</li> <li>- Cruelty free</li> </ul>
<p><b>9. Manufacture Consumes Non-Renewable Resources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recycled content (post-consumer)</li> <li>- Non-renewable resources used</li> <li>- Forest impacts</li> </ul>
<p><b>10. Manufacture Involves Agrichemicals / GMOs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pesticides (potential for organic)</li> <li>- Genetically modified organisms</li> </ul>
<p><b>11. Manufacture Has Source Community Effects / Trade Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Toxic releases during manufacturing</li> <li>- Unfair working conditions/trade</li> <li>- Direct harm to local community</li> <li>- Environmental justice impacts</li> <li>- Corporate responsibility</li> <li>- Harm to manufacturing community</li> </ul>

## Implementation Issues for Selecting Targeted Product Categories

<p><b>a. High Annual City Purchase Amount (\$)</b></p> <p><b>b. High Potential For Cost Savings (\$)</b></p> <p><b>c. Satisfies City Policy / Ordinance Requirements</b></p> <p><b>d. Ease of Implementation / Existing Standards</b></p> <p><b>e. Potential for National Impact / Leadership</b></p> <p><b>f. CCSF has not Already Addressed Products in the Category</b></p> <p><b>g. Other Issues</b></p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Category I – Health and Safety Criteria**

The following health and safety criteria shall apply to the product in the concentration at which it is shipped, undiluted by any water that users must add to prepare the product for use.

The product will be rejected if it receives a health and safety score of 200 or more points.

<b>Category I – Health and Safety Criteria</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Scoring</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
<p><b>1. <u>Carcinogens, Mutagens, or Teratogens</u></b></p> <p>The product shall contain no more than 0.1% by weight of any intentionally added ingredient or known contaminant that is a known, probable, or possible human carcinogen, mutagen, or teratogen on any of the following lists: *</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• California Safe Drinking Water And Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Prop. 65), CCR Title 22, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 3, Section 12000 et seq.</li> <li>• Latest edition of the Annual Report on Carcinogens, National Toxicology Program (NTP). &lt; <a href="http://ntp-server.niehs.nih.gov">http://ntp-server.niehs.nih.gov</a>&gt;</li> <li>• International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), Group 1, 2A, or 2B. <a href="http://193.51.164.11/default.html">http://193.51.164.11/default.html</a></li> <li>• Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulated carcinogens.</li> </ul> <p>Also, the product shall contain no more than 0.1% by weight of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diethanolamine [111-42-2]</li> </ul> <p>_____</p> <p>* This criterion does not apply to Silica sand.</p>	<p>= 0.1%: 0 Points</p> <p>&gt; 0.1%: 200 Points</p>	<p>Carcinogen: Causes cancer</p> <p>Mutagen: Interferes with conception</p> <p>Teratogen: Interferes with fetal development</p> <p><i>These criteria are specified by Chapter 21F of Part I of the San Francisco Municipal Code.</i></p> <p>Diethanolamine is listed here because NTP will soon list it as a possible carcinogen.</p> <p><u>Scoring Examples:</u></p> <p>1. Inged. A - 0.01% - Carcinogen Inged. B - 10% - Non-carcinogen Inged. C - 89.99% - Non-carcinogen Score = 0 points</p> <p>2. Inged. D - 5% - Carcinogen Inged. E - 10% - Carcinogen Inged. F - 85% - Non-carcinogen Score = 200 points</p> <p>The 0.1% limit reflects the material safety data sheet (MSDS) reporting level for carcinogens.</p>

<b>Category I – Health and Safety Criteria</b>												
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Scoring</b>	<b>Remarks</b>										
<p><b>2. <u>Neurotoxins / Central Nervous System (CNS) Depressants</u></b></p> <p>The product should contain no more than 1.0% by weight of any ingredient that is listed by either EPA’s Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) or the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) as having a known or probable effect upon the human nervous system.</p> <p>This criterion does not apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ethyl alcohol [64-17-5]</li> </ul>	<p>=1.0%: 0 Points</p> <p>&gt;1.0%: 100 Points</p>	<p>Neurotoxins damage or interfere with the nervous systems of fish, animals and humans.</p> <p>U.S. EPA lists neurotoxins in its IRIS, available at: &lt;<a href="http://www.epa.gov/ngispgm3/iris/index.html">http://www.epa.gov/ngispgm3/iris/index.html</a>&gt;</p> <p>NIOSH lists neurotoxins in NIOSH Report 48, Organic Solvent Neurotoxicity (1987), available at: &lt;<a href="http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/87104_48.html">http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/87104_48.html</a>&gt;</p> <p><i>This criterion is specified by Chapter 21F of Part I of the San Francisco Municipal Code.</i></p>										
<p><b>3. <u>Eye Irritation</u></b></p> <p>The product as a whole should cause the least possible eye irritation.</p> <p>If whole product test data are unavailable, the overall eye irritation effect may be determined as the weighted average of eye irritation effects of each ingredient present above a concentration of 1.0%.</p> <p>Points will be assigned as follows:</p> <p>OPPTS 870.1000 Health Effects Test Guidelines EPA 712-C-98-189, August 1998</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><u>Eye Irritation Categories</u></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><u>Score</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>IV – “Reddening”</td> <td>0 Pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td>III – “Irritation”</td> <td>30 Pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td>II – “Sever Irritation”</td> <td>50 Pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I – “Corrosive Damage”</td> <td>100 Pts</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Eye Irritation Categories</u>	<u>Score</u>	IV – “Reddening”	0 Pts	III – “Irritation”	30 Pts	II – “Sever Irritation”	50 Pts	I – “Corrosive Damage”	100 Pts	<p>Cat IV: 0 Pts</p> <p>Cat III: 30 Pts</p> <p>Cat II: 50 Pts</p> <p>Cat I: 100 Pts</p>	<p>Eye irritation effects shall be determined by test methods specified by OPPTS 870.2400, as published in EPA 712-C-98-195, August 1998.</p> <p>Eye irritation effects levels determined via these tests shall be stated as Category I, II, III, or IV, as defined in OPPTS 870.1000, as published in EPA 712-C-98-189, August 1998.</p> <p>Both OPPTS standards are available at: &lt;<a href="http://www.epa.gov/opptsfrs/OPPTS_Harmonized/">http://www.epa.gov/opptsfrs/OPPTS_Harmonized/</a>&gt;</p> <p>The City wishes to use existing test data wherever possible. Therefore, equivalent eye irritation data from Draize tests, FDA-approved in vitro tests, or toxicological modeling may be considered in determining the eye irritation score. Tests on humans and animals shall be performed in accordance with all applicable regulations.</p>
<u>Eye Irritation Categories</u>	<u>Score</u>											
IV – “Reddening”	0 Pts											
III – “Irritation”	30 Pts											
II – “Sever Irritation”	50 Pts											
I – “Corrosive Damage”	100 Pts											

Category I – Health and Safety Criteria												
Criteria	Scoring	Remarks										
<p><b>4. <u>Skin Irritation</u></b></p> <p>The product as a whole should cause the least possible skin irritation.</p> <p>If whole product test data are unavailable, the overall skin irritation effect may be determined as the weighted average of skin irritation effects of each ingredient present above a concentration of 1.0%.</p> <p>Points will be assigned as follows:</p> <p>OPPTS 870.1000 Health Effects Test Guidelines EPA 712–C–98–189, August 1998</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Skin Irritation Categories</u></th> <th><u>Score</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>IV – “Reddening”</td> <td>0 Pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td>III – “Irritation”</td> <td>30 Pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td>II – “Severe Irritation”</td> <td>50 Pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I – “Corrosive Damage”</td> <td>100 Pts</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Skin Irritation Categories</u>	<u>Score</u>	IV – “Reddening”	0 Pts	III – “Irritation”	30 Pts	II – “Severe Irritation”	50 Pts	I – “Corrosive Damage”	100 Pts	<p>Cat IV: 0 Pts</p> <p>Cat III: 30 Pts</p> <p>Cat II: 50 Pts</p> <p>Cat I: 100 Pts</p>	<p>Skin irritation effects shall be determined by test methods specified by OPPTS 870.2500, as published in EPA 712–C–98–196, August 1998.</p> <p>Skin irritation effects levels determined via these tests shall be stated as Category I, II, III, or IV, as defined in OPPTS 870.1000, as published in EPA 712–C–98–189, August 1998.</p> <p>Both OPPTS standards are available at: &lt;<a href="http://www.epa.gov/opptsfrs/OPPTS_Harmonized/">http://www.epa.gov/opptsfrs/OPPTS_Harmonized/</a>&gt;</p> <p>The City wishes to use existing test data wherever possible. Therefore, equivalent skin irritation data from Draize tests, FDA-approved in-vitro tests, or toxicological modeling may be considered in determining the skin irritation score. Tests on humans and animals shall be performed in accordance with all applicable regulations.</p>
<u>Skin Irritation Categories</u>	<u>Score</u>											
IV – “Reddening”	0 Pts											
III – “Irritation”	30 Pts											
II – “Severe Irritation”	50 Pts											
I – “Corrosive Damage”	100 Pts											

Category I – Health and Safety Criteria		
Criteria	Scoring	Remarks
<p><b>5. <u>Exposure Route – Skin Absorbtion</u></b></p> <p>The product as a whole should have the least possible potential for skin absorbtion.</p> <p>If whole product test data are unavailable, the overall amount of skin absorbtion may be determined as the weighted average of each ingredient present above 1.0%.</p> <p>Points will be assigned for the level of skin absorbtion shown by the product or its ingredients when tested using OPPTS 870.7800:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Products or individual ingredients for which less than 1% of the test dosage is absorbed shall be designated as having a 'low potential' for skin absorbtion (0 Pts).</li> <li>• Products or individual ingredients for which 1% to 5% of the test dosage is absorbed shall be designated as having a 'moderate potential' for skin absorbtion (25 Pts).</li> <li>• Products or individual ingredients for which more than 5% of the test dosage is absorbed shall be designated as having a 'high potential' for skin absorbtion (50 Pts).</li> </ul> <p>Products containing more than 1% of the following ingredients shall be designated as having a 'high potential' for skin absorbtion (50 points):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Isopropanol [67-63-0]</li> <li>• 2-butoxyethanol [111-76-2]</li> <li>• Acetone [67-64-1]</li> <li>• 1,1,1-TCE [71-55-6]</li> <li>• MEK [78-93-3]</li> <li>• Naphthalene [91-20-3]</li> <li>• Triethanolamine [102-71-6]</li> <li>• Ethylene Glycol [107-21-1]</li> <li>• Toluene [108-88-3]</li> <li>• Diethylene glycol monobutyl ether [113-34-5]</li> <li>• Tetrachloroethylene [127-18-4]</li> <li>• Monoethanolamine [141-43-5]</li> <li>• Xylene [1330-20-7]</li> </ul>	<p>Low Potential: 0 Pts</p> <p>Moderate: 25 Pts</p> <p>High: 50 Pts</p>	<p>Although wearing gloves and goggles may protect the user from skin absorbtion, the City wishes to purchase products posing the least hazard to its employees.</p> <p>Skin absorbtion shall be determined by test methods specified by OPPTS 870.7600 for Dermal Penetration studies, as published in EPA 712-C-98-350, August 1998.</p> <p>The designations of low, moderate, and high potential for skin absorbtion have been created for this project.</p> <p>OPPTS toxicology standards are available on the internet at <a href="http://www.epa.gov/opptsfrs/OPPTS_Harmonized/">http://www.epa.gov/opptsfrs/OPPTS_Harmonized/</a></p> <p><i>This criterion is specified by Chapter 21F of Part I of the San Francisco Municipal Code.</i></p>

<b>Category I – Health and Safety Criteria</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Scoring</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
<p><b>6. <u>Corrosivity</u></b></p> <p>The product as a whole should have the lowest possible potential for corrosive action.</p> <p>Aqueous products for which a pH is measurable will receive a score according to that pH level.</p>	<p>pH between 2.5 - 11.5: 0 Pts</p> <p>pH&lt;2.5: 25 Pts</p> <p>pH&gt;11.5: 25 Pts</p>	<p>The City wishes to limit the use of mineral acids and caustics that have the potential to harm the user and the environment. Therefore, products having a pH between 2.5 and 11.5 are preferred.</p>

Category I – Health and Safety Criteria		
Criteria	Scoring	Remarks
<p><b>7. <u>Flammability</u></b></p> <p>The product should have as high a flash point as possible.</p> <p>Liquid products as a whole shall receive a score for their flash point measured by one of the indicated methods.</p> <p>If whole product test data are unavailable, the lowest flashpoint for any individual ingredient present above 5.0% shall be used to determine the flammability score.</p> <p>Liquid products will be scored according to the following OSHA classification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Class I (Flammable) liquids have flash points below 100F (37.8C).</li> <li>• Class II (Combustible) liquids have flash points at or above 100F (37.8C) and below 140F (60C).</li> <li>• Class IIIA (Combustible) liquids have flash points at or above 140F (60C) and below 200F (93.3C).</li> <li>• Class IIIB (Combustible) liquids have flash points at or above 200F (93.3C).</li> </ul>	<p>Class IIIB Flash Point &gt;200F: 0 Pts</p> <p>Class IIIA 140-200F: 20 Pts</p> <p>Class II 100-140F: 30 Pts</p> <p>Class I &lt;100F: 50 Pts</p>	<p>The City wishes to restrict the use of flammable and combustible chemicals to only those applications where they are essential for the task being done.</p> <p>As defined in OSHA Regulations (29 CFR) Hazard Communication. - 1910.1200, "Flash Point" means the minimum temperature at which a liquid gives off a vapor in sufficient concentration to ignite when tested using one of the following methods:</p> <p>(i) For liquids with a viscosity of less than 45 Saybolt Universal Seconds (SUS) at 100°F (37.8°C), that do not contain suspended solids and do not have a tendency to form a surface film under test: <b>Tagliabue Closed Tester</b> (See American National Standard Method of Test for Flash Point by Tag Closed Tester, Z11.24-1979 (ASTM D 56-79)); or alternatively:</p> <p>(ii) For liquids with a viscosity equal to or greater than 45 SUS at 100°F (37.8°C), or that contain suspended solids, or that have a tendency to form a surface film under test: <b>Pensky-Martens Closed Tester</b> (see American National Standard Method of Test for Flash Point by Pensky-Martens Closed Tester, Z11.7-1979 (ASTM D 93-79));</p> <p>or alternatively,</p> <p>(iii) Setaflash Closed Tester (see American National Standard Method of Test for Flash Point by Setaflash Closed Tester (ASTM D 3278-78)).</p> <p>Source: &lt;<a href="http://www.osha-slc.gov/OshStd_data/1910_1200.html">http://www.osha-slc.gov/OshStd_data/1910_1200.html</a>&gt;</p>

**Category II – Environmental and Community Impact Criteria**

The following criteria shall apply to the product in the concentration at which it is shipped, undiluted by any water that users must add to prepare the product for use.

The product will be rejected if it receives an environmental and community impact score of 100 or more points.

<b>Category II – Environmental and Community Impact Criteria</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Scoring</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
<p><b>8. <u>Ozone-Depleting Substances (ODS)</u></b></p> <p>The product shall contain 1.0% or less of ozone depleting compounds.</p> <p>This requirement shall apply to any substance defined in the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendment that contains any</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Class I ODSs</li> <li>• Class II ODS after its scheduled phase-out date</li> <li>• Alternatives listed as “unacceptable” under the US EPA Significant New Alternatives Policy (SNAP)</li> </ul>	<p>=1.0%: 0 Points</p> <p>&gt;1.0%: 100 Points</p>	<p>ODSs affect ozone located at the upper edge of the atmosphere. This ozone absorbs UV-B radiation, which can damage DNA in living systems. When the ozone layer is depleted, the amount of UV-B radiation that reaches the earth’s surface increases, resulting in an adverse affect on plants, animals, and plastic materials, and resulting in impacts to the health of human beings, such as skin cancers, cataracts, and suppression of immune systems.</p> <p>A list of prohibited substances as of September 1999 is in the FLIS “Non-Ozone Depleting Substances” report (9/1/99).</p> <p>Also refer to the Federal Clean Air Act, available at: &lt;<a href="http://www.epa.gov/docs/ozone/title6/sec602.html">http://www.epa.gov/docs/ozone/title6/sec602.html</a>&gt;.</p> <p>Source: Evaluation of Non-Ozone Depleting Substances as an Environmental Attribute for Inclusion in the Federal Logistics Information System (FLIS) September 1, 1999.</p>

<b>Category II – Environmental and Community Impact Criteria</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Scoring</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
<p><b>9. <u>Endocrine Modifiers</u></b></p> <p>The product should contain 1.0% or less by weight of any ingredient that is a known, probable, or possible endocrine modifier on the following list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preliminary List of Chemicals Associated With Endocrine System Effects (Illinois EPA, 2/97, with 4/98 Supplement)</li> </ul> <p>In particular, products should contain less than 1.0% of the following most commonly used ingredients:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nonylphenol ethoxylate [9016-45-9]</li> <li>• Octylphenol ethoxylate [9036-19-5]</li> <li>• Dibutyl phthalate [84-74-2]</li> </ul>	<p>=1.0%: 0 Points</p> <p>&gt;1.0%: 50 Points</p>	<p>Endocrine modifiers affect the hormone systems of fish, animals and humans.</p> <p><i>This criterion is specified by Chapter 21F of Part I of the San Francisco Municipal Code.</i></p>
<p><b>10. <u>Greenhouse Gases</u></b></p> <p>The product shall contain 1.0% or less of any gas designated by the Kyoto Protocol of December 1997 as having a greenhouse impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• carbon dioxide</li> <li>• methane</li> <li>• nitrous oxide</li> <li>• hydrofluorocarbons</li> <li>• perfluorocarbons</li> <li>• sulfur hexafluoride</li> </ul> <p>For applications where there are no products with alternative ingredients the following may be used with a score of 0 Points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carbon dioxide may be used as a propellant or as an active ingredient.</li> <li>• Sulfur hexafluoride may be used in heating, ventilating and air conditioning test applications only.</li> </ul>	<p>=1.0%: 0 Points</p> <p>&gt;1.0%: 100 Points</p>	<p>Certain gases – “greenhouse” gases – absorb solar radiation, heat the atmosphere, and, in turn, warm the Earth’s surface.</p> <p>The Kyoto Protocol (12/97) requires each signatory to reduce its emissions of six greenhouse gasses – namely, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride – 7 percent below its 1990 emissions level by the year 2012.</p> <p>Source: Evaluation of Non-Greenhouse Impact as an Environmental Attribute for Inclusion in the Federal Logistics Information System (FLIS) July 28, 1999.</p>

**Category II – Environmental and Community Impact Criteria**

Criteria	Scoring	Remarks														
<p><b>11. <u>Biodegradability</u></b></p> <p>It is desired that either the product as a whole, or each ingredient comprising 5% or more of the total, shall meet the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) definition of readily biodegradable.</p> <p>To meet the definition of readily biodegradable, independent lab results must achieve the corresponding score on one of the following tests:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th align="left">Test</th> <th align="left">Readily Biodegradable Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>DOC Die-Away Test</td> <td>60% Theoretical CO2 Evolution</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MITII Test</td> <td>60% Theoretical Oxygen Demand</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Closed Bottle Test</td> <td>60% Theoretical Oxygen Demand</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CO2 Evolution Test</td> <td>60% Theoretical CO2 Evolution</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod. OECD Screen</td> <td>70% Dissolved Organic Carbon</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Manimetric Resp.</td> <td>60% Theoretical Oxygen Demand</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>For a product to be considered readily biodegradable, these values must be met within 10 days of reaching 10% and must also be met within 28 days of the beginning of the test.</p> <p>New testing is not required for any ingredient for which sufficient information exists concerning its biodegradability, either in peer-reviewed literature or databases, or based in tests conducted according to standard procedures equivalent to those listed here.</p>	Test	Readily Biodegradable Score	DOC Die-Away Test	60% Theoretical CO2 Evolution	MITII Test	60% Theoretical Oxygen Demand	Closed Bottle Test	60% Theoretical Oxygen Demand	CO2 Evolution Test	60% Theoretical CO2 Evolution	Mod. OECD Screen	70% Dissolved Organic Carbon	Manimetric Resp.	60% Theoretical Oxygen Demand	<p align="center">Level of Biodegradability</p> <p align="center">Readily Biodegradable: 0 Pts</p> <p align="center">Nonbiodegradable : 25 Pts</p>	<p>The City and County of San Francisco wishes to protect its numerous and varied water habitats, which help support the local economy and quality of life for residents, and therefore is concerned about the environmental fate of chemicals used in its operations.</p> <p><i>These criteria are specified by Chapter 21F of Part I of the San Francisco Municipal Code.</i></p>
Test	Readily Biodegradable Score															
DOC Die-Away Test	60% Theoretical CO2 Evolution															
MITII Test	60% Theoretical Oxygen Demand															
Closed Bottle Test	60% Theoretical Oxygen Demand															
CO2 Evolution Test	60% Theoretical CO2 Evolution															
Mod. OECD Screen	70% Dissolved Organic Carbon															
Manimetric Resp.	60% Theoretical Oxygen Demand															

Category II – Environmental and Community Impact Criteria		
Criteria	Scoring	Remarks
<p><b>12. <u>Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)</u></b></p> <p>The product shall meet the VOC content requirements established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).</p> <p>VOC content of the product shall be determined in accordance with California Air Resources Board Method 310.</p> <p>Points shall be assigned for VOC ingredients contained in the product:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Product contains VOCs at lower CARB limits that will go into effect by the end of calendar year 2004: 0 Points.</li> <li>• Product contains VOCs at existing CARB limits: 15 Pts.</li> <li>• Product contains VOCs at a level that exceeds the CARB limit: 100 Pts.</li> </ul>	<p>VOC at new limits: 0 Points</p> <p>VOC at present limits: 15 Pts.</p> <p>VOC over present limits: 100 Pts.</p>	<p>VOCs are “any compound of carbon, excluding carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, carbonic acid, metallic carbides or carbonates, and ammonium carbonate, which participates in atmospheric photochemical reactions.”</p> <p>Because of their carbon content, VOCs are classified as organic. Unlike other organic compounds, however, VOCs easily vaporize into the air and are a component of photochemical reactions that cause smog.</p> <p>California Air Resources Board limits are available at: &lt;<a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov">http://www.arb.ca.gov</a>&gt;.</p> <p>Method 310 is available at: &lt;<a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov/testmeth/cptm/es_05.pdf">http://www.arb.ca.gov/testmeth/cptm/es_05.pdf</a>&gt;.</p>
<p><b>13. <u>Fragrances</u></b></p> <p>The product should contain 0.1% or less of a fragrance that is either a nonfunctional ingredient or a SARA 313 listed hazardous material.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fragrances added to natural gas or petroleum products to make it easier for users to detect the product shall be considered functional ingredients.</li> <li>• Fragrances added to groups of products to aid product identification shall be considered functional ingredients.</li> <li>• Ingredients added to give a psychological impression to product users or building occupants shall not be considered functional.</li> </ul>	<p>Nonfunctional 1 or SARA 313 Hazardous Materials:  =0.1%: 0 Points  &gt;0.1%: 25 Points (maximum)</p>	<p>The City considers that, in most cases, the addition of fragrances is superfluous to product performance, and recognizes the potential impacts on chemically sensitive people associated with some of these additives.</p>

**Category II – Environmental and Community Impact Criteria**

Criteria	Scoring	Remarks
<p><b>14. <u>Dyes</u></b></p> <p>The product should contain 0.1% or less of a coloring agent that is either a nonfunctional ingredient or a SARA 313 listed hazardous material.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Different dyes added to groups of products to aid product identification shall be considered functional ingredients.</li> <li>Dyes added to give a psychological impression to product users shall not be considered functional.</li> </ul>	<p align="center">Nonfunctional</p> <p align="center">or</p> <p align="center">SARA 313 Hazardous Materials:</p> <p align="center">=0.1%: 0 Points</p> <p align="center">&gt;0.1%: 25 Points (maximum)</p>	<p>The City considers the addition of synthetic dyes to be superfluous to product performance, and recognizes the potential hazard associated with some of these additives.</p> <p>If a chemical is added for functional reasons, the dye should be FDA-approved for food use.</p>

**Category III – Other Criteria**

The following criteria shall apply to the product in the concentration at which it is shipped, undiluted by any water that users must add to prepare the product for use.

The product will be rejected if it receives a score in this category of 35 or more points.

<b>Category III – Other Criteria</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Scoring</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
<p><b>15. <u>Available as a Concentrate</u></b></p> <p>Where possible, products should be available in a concentrated form, which is defined as either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a powder; or</li> <li>• a liquid product that is intended to be diluted by at least 8 parts water (1:8 dilution ratio) prior to use.</li> </ul>	<p>Available as a concentrate?</p> <p>Yes: 0 Pts</p> <p>No: 10 Pts</p>	<p>The City desires where feasible to have products shipped to it as concentrates.</p> <p>This criterion does not apply to products that do not contain water, and that are not to be mixed with water prior to use.</p>
<p><b>16. <u>Available in Nonaerosol Container</u></b></p> <p>Where possible, products should be available in a nonaerosol form.</p>	<p>Available as a nonaerosol</p> <p>Yes: 0 Pts</p> <p>No: 15 Pts</p>	<p>The City desires to minimize the use of propellant gasses, and to avoid the potential for waste that can occur when an aerosol nozzle stops working before all of the product leaves the can.</p>
<p><b>17. <u>Refillable / Returnable / Locally Recyclable Container and Packaging</u></b></p> <p>It is desired that the vendor shall provide for the management of all empty product containers and packaging.</p> <p>Containers and packaging will both be scored separately as follows:</p> <p>Refillable or returnable <span style="float: right;">0 pts</span></p> <p>Recyclable locally in San Francisco</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plastic Type 1 or 2 <span style="float: right;">0 pts</span></li> <li>• Glass <span style="float: right;">0 pts</span></li> <li>• Cardboard <span style="float: right;">0 pts</span></li> <li>• Metal (nonaerosol) <span style="float: right;">0 pts</span></li> </ul> <p>Not refillable, returnable or recyclable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other plastics <span style="float: right;">5 pts each</span></li> <li>• Cardboard/plastic hybrid <span style="float: right;">5 pts each</span></li> </ul> <p>Contents of container or packaging are not known: <span style="float: right;">5 pts</span></p>	<p>Container Score: <span style="float: right;">__/5</span></p> <p>Packaging Score: <span style="float: right;">__/5</span></p> <p>Combined Score: <span style="float: right;">__/10</span></p>	<p>The City desires to receive products in containers that have the least possible impact on the environment.</p> <p>To be locally recyclable, containers and packaging must be made of metal, cardboard, glass, or of a plastic marked Type 1 (PETE) or 2 (HDPE). See Chapter 21A, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code.</p>

Category III – Other Criteria		
Criteria	Scoring	Remarks
<p><b>18. <u>Recycled Content of Container and Shipping Package</u></b></p> <p>Both the product container and shipping package should maximize the use of post-consumer recycled content materials (defined as finished materials that would normally be discarded as solid waste having completed their life cycle as a consumer item).</p> <p>Container</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recycled content equals or exceeds requirements of Chapter 21A, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code: 0 pts</li> <li>Recycled content less than these requirements, or are unknown: 5 pts</li> </ul> <p>Shipping Package</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recycled content equals or exceeds requirements of Chapter 21A, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code: 0 pts</li> <li>Recycled content less than these requirements, or are unknown: 5 pts</li> </ul>	<p>Container Score: ___/5</p> <p>Packaging Score: ___/5</p> <p>Combined Score: ___/10</p>	<p>The City desires to receive products in containers that have the least possible impact on the environment.</p> <p>For desired levels of post-consumer recycled content, see the current edition of Chapter 21A, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code. At this writing the desired level is 25%.</p>