

*the center for a new*  
**American dream**

[newdream.org](http://newdream.org)

# Cleaning Products Working Group

Resolving Traditional Challenges;  
Moving Ahead

---

*the center for a new*  
**American dream**

[newdream.org](http://newdream.org)

## Scot Case

Director of Procurement Strategies

Center for a New American Dream  
505 Penn Street, Suite 306  
Reading, PA 19601  
[scot@newdream.org](mailto:scot@newdream.org)

---



## Who Are We?

---

The Center for a New American Dream is a non-profit organization helping Americans consume responsibly to protect the environment, enhance quality of life and promote social justice.

[www.newdream.org](http://www.newdream.org)

[www.newdream.org/procure](http://www.newdream.org/procure)

---



## From Massachusetts RFR

---

### **Multi-State Approach**

This procurement has been designed in consultation with various state and local governments across the country for the purpose of establishing a set of minimum criteria that they and others can use in drafting their contract bids. This effort was coordinated by the Center for a New American Dream and included the participation of Massachusetts; Minnesota; Missouri; Washington; King County, Washington; Phoenix, Arizona; Santa Monica, California; Seattle, Washington; and the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. Additional information on this working group is available from Marcia Deegler at 617 720-3356 or Scot Case at 610-373-7703.

--Massachusetts' RFR#GRO16, page 7.

---



## Original 2001 Problems

---

- Buying “green” was too much work, took too much time, and was way too difficult.
  - There were not enough people buying environmentally preferable cleaning products.
- 



## Original 2001 Solution

---

- With EPA funding and support, CNAD hosted a conference call.
    - ✓October 2001
    - ✓Five speakers and more than 120 participants
    - ✓Discussed several successful strategies
    - ✓Provided lots of information and access to additional resources
  - Several **big related problems** arose during the discussion.
-



## New Problems

---

- There were too many sets of competing standards and purchasing criteria.
  - Additional standards/criteria are counter productive if the goal is to maximize environmental protection.
  - Manufacturers saw EPP as a moving target and were not responding to RFPs.
- 



## New Solution

---

With EPA funding and support, CNAD worked with the innovative pioneers to reach consensus on a single set of environmental criteria that could be used nationally.

**Goal:** Make it easier for purchasers to identify and buy “green” cleaners.

---



## Work Group Members

---

- Center for a New American Dream (facilitator)
  - King County, Washington
  - Massachusetts
  - Minnesota
  - Missouri
  - Pacific Northwest National Laboratories
  - Phoenix, Arizona
  - Santa Monica, California
  - Seattle, Washington
  - Washington State
- 



## Initial Challenges

---

- Everyone thought their criteria/standard was best.\*
- Everyone thought their region faced unique environmental and human health concerns.\*
- Everyone thought local laws required them to stick with their own criteria/standards.\*
- Several participants had contracts due to expire in the very near future.

\*Note: The first three challenges eventually proved false. The last meant some participants had to act before the group reached complete consensus.

---



## Initial Areas of Agreement

---

- Everyone agreed national criteria are important.
- Everyone agreed nation-wide consensus was vital for success.
- Everyone agreed no existing standard or criteria would meet everyone's needs.\*

\*Later, by unanimous consent, this thought was completely abandoned, but it was a necessary starting point for the work group members.

---



## Work Group Member Needs

---

- Protecting human health & the environment
  - Addressing local needs
  - Promoting local manufacturers & suppliers
  - Including small suppliers
  - Ensuring adequate competition
  - Maintaining strict standards
  - Ensuring constant improvement in environmental criteria
-





## Debated Attributes

Attribute	General Consensus	To Move Further
Product Safety	Product safety is a key concern for consumers. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals.	Product safety is a key concern for consumers. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals.
Chemical Safety	Chemical safety is a key concern for consumers. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals.	Chemical safety is a key concern for consumers. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals.
Endocrine Disruptors	Endocrine disruptors are a key concern for consumers. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals.	Endocrine disruptors are a key concern for consumers. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals.
IAQ	Indoor air quality is a key concern for consumers. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals.	Indoor air quality is a key concern for consumers. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals.
Phosphates	Phosphates are a key concern for consumers. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals.	Phosphates are a key concern for consumers. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals.
Concentrates	Concentrates are a key concern for consumers. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals.	Concentrates are a key concern for consumers. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals. The EPA has been successful in banning many toxic chemicals.



## Lots and Lots of Debates

- Developing list of prohibited chemicals vs. relying on standard test methodologies.
- Requiring third-party certification vs. allowing self-certification.
- Green Seal vs. developing completely independent criteria
- What about endocrine disruptors, stricter IAQ, animal testing, astmagens, pH requirements, problems relying on MSDS data, phosphates, concentrates...
- Lots and lots and lots more...



## Information Resolved Debates

One example that took at least four phone calls to resolve—whether to rely on California Prop65's, Massachusetts' TURA, or other lists of chemicals to avoid or instead rely on a series of performance standards.

- TURA list includes \_\_\_ chemicals, but less than 1.7% would ever appear in cleaning products. Of those that would appear, all would be restricted by the other criteria.
- Prop65 list also includes lots of chemicals unlikely to appear in cleaning products, including caffeine and nicotine.



## Developed Independent Spec

The image shows a technical specification document for a cleaning product. The document is titled "2017 Cleaning Product - 2017 Cleaning Product" and includes sections for "Scope", "References", "Definitions", and "Performance Requirements". The "Performance Requirements" section is the most detailed, listing various chemical and physical properties, testing methods, and safety information. The document is presented as a collage of overlapping pages, suggesting it is a multi-page document.



## Addressed Concerns About Green Seal

---

- Added product categories not covered by GS-37.
  - Included mandatory and desirable attributes.
  - Did not require Green Seal certification.
  - Developed independent verification process.
- 



## Massachusetts RFR

---



- Issued October 2002.
  - Work Group members agreed to the environmental criteria.
  - Forty (40) pages long.
  - Available at:  
[www.newdream.org/procure/cleaners.html](http://www.newdream.org/procure/cleaners.html)
-



## Massachusetts RFR

•Covers approximately 90 to 95% of cleaning product needs:

- General Purpose\*
- Bathroom\*
- Glass\*
- Carpet
- Disinfectants
- Floor care
- Hand soaps

\* Green Seal certification is available for these products.



## Mandatory Criteria

Criteria	Requirement	Compliance
Acute Toxicity	...	...
Chronic Toxicity	...	...
Corrosivity	...	...
Flammability	...	...
Explosive	...	...
Smog	...	...
Ozone Depletion	...	...
Global Warming Potential	...	...
Volatility	...	...
Residue	...	...
Stability	...	...
Compatibility	...	...
Labeling	...	...
Training	...	...
Packaging	...	...

•12 mandatory environmental

- Toxicity
- Carcinogens & Reproductive Toxins
- Skin & eye irritation
- Skin sensitization
- Combustability
- Smog, Ozone, & IAQ
- Aquatic Toxicity
- Eutrophication
- Aquatic Biodegradability
- Concentrates
- Fragrances
- Prohibited Ingredients

•3 additional mandatory

- Training
- Packaging
- Labeling





## Current Status of Massachusetts RFR

---

- Issued October 2002.
  - 16 bidders with products from 11 manufacturers.
  - Of the 11 manufacturers:
    - 4 have been disqualified
    - 3 passed completely
    - 4 still being evaluated pending additional information from the manufacturers
  - Products are currently being tested for effectiveness by TURI.
  - Anticipated award mid-March 2003.
- 



## After Mass. Awards Contracts

---

- Center will host another nation-wide conference call.
  - Center will post updated information to website – [www.newdream.org/procure](http://www.newdream.org/procure)
  - As others use the contract, the web information will be updated.
-



## Identifying Products

---

### Products Meeting the Consensus Criteria Will Be Identified on Center's Website—

- (1) Green Seal Certification -- automatically qualifies and will be designated on the website as "Green Seal Certified product."
  - (2) Approved by a government purchaser using the Massachusetts RFR criteria -- will be listed on website as "Approved for use by \_\_\_\_\_, which used the consensus-based green cleaning criteria."
  - (3) Certified by an independent (non-Green Seal) laboratory -- will be listed on website as "An independent laboratory verifies this product meets the consensus-based green cleaning criteria."
  - (4) Self-certified by manufacturer -- listed as "The manufacturer claims its product meets the consensus-based green cleaning criteria."
- 



## Overall Benefits

---

### IT'S FINALLY EASY!!

- One set of criteria.
  - One set of necessary documentation.
  - Nationwide list of acceptable products will be developed.
  - Manufacturers not dealing with confusing and potentially conflicting environmental requirements.
-

*the center for a new*  
**American dream**

*newdream.org*

# Questions and Answers

Comments Too!

---