



Draft Criteria for Comparing Categories of Products
Purchased by the City and County of San Francisco
(Sorted and Unsorted Versions)

Showing ratings of criteria's importance to attendees at the 12/16/05 public meeting on
Precautionary Purchasing Ordinance – Targeted Product Categories

Table 1: Criteria presented by category

Criteria	Votes (295)
1. Human Health Criteria (from SF's Environmentally Preferable Purchasing (EPP) Pilot Project)	61 Total
▪ Carcinogens	12
▪ Reproductive/developmental toxins	11
▪ Acute toxicity to humans	4
▪ Chronic toxicity to humans	3
▪ Neurotoxins/central nervous system (CNS) depressants	2
▪ Eye irritation	1
▪ Skin irritation	2
▪ Skin absorption potential	0
▪ Respiratory irritation (asthma)	5
▪ Corrosivity	2
▪ Flammability	3
▪ Fragrances and/or dyes	1
<i>Additions from Public Meeting 12/16/05:</i>	
▪ Impacts on women and children	8
▪ Sensitization	1
▪ Endocrine disruptors	6
▪ PBTS	0
2. Environmental Issues (from EPP Pilot Project)	52 Total (including 1 vote for the category itself)
▪ Aquatic toxicity	2
▪ Ozone-depleting chemicals	2
▪ Endocrine modifiers	6
▪ Indoor air pollutants/VOCs	6
▪ Greenhouse gases	14
▪ Biodegradability	3
▪ Persistence in the environment	4
▪ Potential to accumulate in food chain	13
<i>Additions from Public Meeting 12/16/05:</i>	
▪ Habitat impacts	1
3. Other Toxic Chemical Issues	30 Total



Criteria	Votes (295)
▪ Inadequate chemical ingredient safety testing	3
▪ Chemical use reduction potential	3
▪ Pesticides (potential for organic)	10
▪ Hazardous or universal waste	1
▪ Toxic releases during manufacturing	2
▪ Aerosol packaging (increases exposure)	
<i>Additions from Public Meeting 12/16/05:</i>	
▪ Genetically modified organisms	9
▪ Emerging pollutants	2
4. Solid Waste Issues (of Products and Packaging)	41 Total (including 1 vote for the category itself)
▪ Recycled content (post-consumer)	7
▪ Recyclable (in San Francisco's program)	13
▪ Creates waste (minimize)	5
▪ Readily compostable	6
▪ "Take-back" offered by manufacturer/vendor	9
5. Natural Resource Issues	35 Total (including 1 vote for the category itself)
▪ Energy consumption	9
▪ Distance traveled (transportation impacts)	0
▪ Water consumption	1
▪ Non-renewable resources used	10
▪ Forest impacts	10
<i>Additions from Public Meeting 12/16/05:</i>	
▪ Purchase locally	4
6. Other Issues to Consider	35 Total
▪ "Unfair" working conditions/trade	5
▪ San Francisco can be "market leader"	6
▪ Ease of implementation (independent certification programs or specifications exist)	4
▪ Direct harm to local community	3
▪ Environmental justice impacts	10
▪ Alternative reduces maintenance costs	0
▪ Alternative helps City meet environmental policy goals	1
▪ Alternative qualifies for "green" building credits	0
▪ Alternatives available at reasonable price	0
▪ No new equipment or training required	0



Criteria	Votes (295)
<i>Additions from Public Meeting 12/16/05:</i>	
▪ Ease of finding products	0
▪ Past practices/interia	1
▪ Perceptions on quality	0
▪ Pass through vendor issues	0
▪ Supply chain impact	4
▪ Cost accounting method	1
▪ Amount of \$\$ city spends	0
▪ Quantity purchased	0
7. Other Criteria Added by the Participants on 12/16/05	41 Total
▪ Corporate responsibility	10
▪ Local & small business vendors	8
▪ Cross-criteria linkages	4
▪ Lifecycle analysis	8
▪ Harm to manufacturing community	4
▪ Cruelty free	6
▪ Changes with far-reaching outcomes	0
▪ Fit into existing ordinances	1
▪ Focus	0

Table 2: Criteria sorted by number of votes

Criteria	Votes (295 total)
<i>TOTAL VOTES BY CATEGORY (see</i>	
1. Human Health Criteria (from SF's Environmentally Preferable Purchasing (EPP) Pilot Project)	61 Total
2. Environmental Issues (from EPP Pilot Project)	52 Total (including 1 vote for the category itself)
4. Solid Waste Issues (of Products and Packaging)	41 Total (including 1 vote for the category itself)
7. Other Criteria Added by the Participants on 12/16/05	41 Total
5. Natural Resource Issues	35 Total (including 1 vote for the category itself)
6. Other Issues to Consider	35 Total
3. Other Toxic Chemical Issues	30 Total
<i>VOTES ON INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA</i>	
▪ Greenhouse gases	14



Criteria	Votes (295 total)
▪ Potential to accumulate in food chain	13
▪ Recyclable (in San Francisco’s program)	13
▪ Carcinogens	12
▪ Reproductive/developmental toxins	11
▪ Pesticides (potential for organic)	10
▪ Non-renewable resources used	10
▪ Forest impacts	10
▪ Environmental justice impacts	10
▪ Corporate responsibility	10
▪ Genetically modified organisms	9
▪ “Take-back” offered by manufacturer/vendor	9
▪ Energy consumption	9
▪ Impacts on women and children	8
▪ Local & small business vendors	8
▪ Lifecycle analysis	8
▪ Recycled content (post-consumer)	7
▪ Endocrine disruptors	6
▪ Endocrine modifiers	6
▪ Indoor air pollutants/VOCs	6
▪ Readily compostable	6
▪ San Francisco can be “market leader”	6
▪ Cruelty free	6
▪ Respiratory irritation (asthma)	5
▪ Creates waste (minimize)	5
▪ “Unfair” working conditions/trade	5
▪ Acute toxicity to humans	4
▪ Persistence in the environment	4
▪ Purchase locally	4
▪ Ease of implementation (independent certification programs or specifications exist)	4
▪ Supply chain impact	4
▪ Cross-criteria linkages	4
▪ Harm to manufacturing community	4
▪ Chronic toxicity to humans	3
▪ Flammability	3
▪ Biodegradability	3
▪ Inadequate chemical ingredient safety testing	3
▪ Chemical use reduction potential	3
▪ Direct harm to local community	3
▪ Neurotoxins/central nervous system (CNS) depressants	2
▪ Skin irritation	2
▪ Corrosivity	2



Criteria	Votes (295 total)
▪ Aquatic toxicity	2
▪ Ozone-depleting chemicals	2
▪ Toxic releases during manufacturing	2
▪ Emerging pollutants	2
▪ Eye irritation	1
▪ Fragrances and/or dyes	1
▪ Sensitization	1
▪ Habitat impacts	1
▪ Hazardous or universal waste	1
▪ Water consumption	1
▪ Alternative helps City meet environmental policy goals	1
▪ Past practices/interia	1
▪ Cost accounting method	1
▪ Fit into existing ordinances	1
▪ Skin absorption potential	0
▪ PBTS	0
▪ Distance traveled (transportation impacts)	0
▪ Alternative reduces maintenance costs	0
▪ Alternative qualifies for “green” building credits	0
▪ Alternatives available at reasonable price	0
▪ No new equipment or training required	0
▪ Ease of finding products	0
▪ Perceptions on quality	0
▪ Pass through vendor issues	0
▪ Amount of \$\$ city spends	0
▪ Quantity purchased	0
▪ Changes with far-reaching outcomes	0
▪ Focus	0
▪ Aerosol packaging (increases exposure)	