

**Illinois Green Government Coordinating Council
Green Cleaning Schools Act – Guidelines Development**

**Committee Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 27, 2007 from 10:00am to 12:00pm**

* * * *Minutes amended and approved by the committee on Dec. 4, 2007* * * *

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chicago	Springfield
Rod Bashir – SEIU Local 1 Mark Bishop – Healthy Schools Campaign Suzanne Carlson – CPS John Carroll – Reliable Solutions Jamie Caston - Lt. Governor’s Office Jordan Cutler – Governor’s Office Eva Detloff – IL School Nurses Association Dave Dorl – IL Federation of Teachers Anne Evans – CNT/Children’s Env’t. Health Center Kathy Gingrich – IL Federation of Teachers Ed Grotte – Flossmoor School District 161 Coletta Hines-Newell – IL School Nutrition Assoc. Kerry Lofton – Lt. Governor’s Office Carlos Perez – IL Network of Charter Schools Dan Persky - Lt. Governor’s Office Randy Roth – Buckeye International Jim Sheffer – SIPC Kate Tomford – Lt. Governor’s Office Jon Zirkle – Lt. Governor’s Office	Carolyn Brown Hodge – Lt. Governor’s Office Holly Copeland – Lt. Governor’s Office Michael Hickey – Lincoln Land Comm. College Susan Hilton – IASB / School Mgmt. Alliance Larry Pfeiffer – IARSS / Regional Offices of Ed. Carol Pinkerton – CMS
	Phone
	Steve Ashkin – Ashkin Group Bill Balek – ISSA Ingrid Dykes – MSC Direct Vince Fagan – United Supply Chris Grissom – IL Correctional Industries Andy Hackman – CSPA Becky Lockart – IEPA Gary Miller – WMRC / DNR Claris Olson – Healthy Schools Campaign Ken Runkle – Illinois DPH Lillian de Santiago – Respiratory Health Assoc. Bill Thompson – IASBO

2. Approval of Nov. 7 Meeting Minutes

Kate Tomford opened the discussion about approving and/or correcting the November 7th, 2007 meeting’s minutes.

Susan Hilton: I’d like to add to the records that we take issue with including mention of IPM in the guidelines in any way.

Steve Ashkin: We’re reviewing minutes and I don’t have problems with taking out IPM, but I don’t think it was mentioned at the last meeting.

Susan Hilton: I did bring up concerns about IPM at the last meeting, and I would like this to be noted in the minutes.

Gary Miller: I’ll vouch for this; concerns about IPM were discussed at the last meeting.

Kate Tomford: Does anyone else have corrections to the Nov. 7th minutes? (No more objections.) With the additions of Susan Hilton’s comments (which can be further discussed later), I move to approve the Nov. 7th minutes. Motion 2nd by Rod Bashir. Motion passes, and minutes are approved.

3. Discussion of Guidelines Sections

Kate Tomford facilitated a first review of the rough draft guidelines (*listed as item #30 on the website*). The focus of today's discussion will be the Requirements section, and in particular, the points that have not been covered during any subcommittee or whole committee meetings yet.

a. Cleaning Equipment

Kate Tomford: We included cleaning equipment purchases in the Requirements section, using the specifications that Steve Ashkin and Bill Balek put together. These are listed on pages 7-8 of the document. Schools may use cleaning equipment already possession as of May 9, 2008, but once existing cleaning equipment becomes exhausted, schools are required to purchase new equipment according to the specifications that guidelines that Bill Balek and Steve Ashkin put together after the last Product Policy meeting. I'd like to take comments about cleaning equipment being included in the required section, as well as purchasing language.

Susan Hilton: At last meeting, I don't remember discussion about equipment being included. Also, paper wasn't included originally. This seems to be an expansion of the intent of the legislation, which concerns me.

Kate Tomford: These items weren't discussed last meeting, but were discussed by the Product Policy subcommittee. There was a note about paper products in the handout from Bill Balek at the last meeting, but we hadn't yet covered cleaning equipment then. We haven't had a chance to discuss this yet with the whole committee, but these items have been discussed in subcommittee.

Bill Balek: It was my intent to recommend that paper and cleaning equipment be placed under recommended (section 6); I asked participants if they felt contrary.

Susan Hilton: We wouldn't mind if these items were moved to the recommended section.

Kate Tomford: Is including these items in the required section too restrictive?

Bill Balek: There were challenges in New York because paper and equipment were included in the required section of the guidelines. The statute can be interpreted as only referring to chemical products not including paper and cleaning equipment.

Jim Sheffer: Kate, what was your thinking for paper and cleaning equipment should be included there?

Kate Tomford: The guidelines should be as beneficial as possible to all occupants of the building.

Jim Sheffer: I agree, but contesting may delay the whole program. There could be additional legislation later, but I don't want a 6 or 8-month delay. If you don't think keeping it (cleaning equipment and paper) will cause a delay, okay, let's keep it in.

Kate Tomford: I am more confident about the legislation applying to paper products, and less sure about equipment. There are a wide variety of products that fit under product standards that are cost competitive. Paper seems reasonable to include as a required product. I am comfortable with including paper products.

Jim Sheffer: We should include them because schools have a way out if products are cost prohibitive.

Kate Tomford: Right. Also, the lifetime of this equipment is longer (another way out), and there will likely be more variety and more competitive pricing in a few years once equipment wears out.

Steve Ashkin: When we put these guidelines together, so you all know, these standards mirror USGBC and other program standards. Standards here are a good step forward, but they are hardly restrictive. There are hundreds of pieces of equipment on the market that meet these standards. From the environmental perspective, we feel these standards may not be restrictive enough. Regardless of where we go, there is no barrier on availability and cost based on what we've found across the country.

Bill Balek: I think we can correct the wording and make it clearer. There is a good variety of cleaning equipment to choose from that meets the standards. I would have no problem with equipment being included in the required section from this perspective.

Kate Tomford: This seems to be an issue of interpreting the statute. Dan, what's your take on the reading of the law?

Dan Persky: The law says environmentally friendly products; paper is a product that should be included; equipment is arguable. Again, cost prohibitive objections provide a way out. Let's leave everything in for now, and see what the public comment period generates, which starts next week. See then if people object.

Kate Tomford: We can certainly lessen restrictions after the comment period, but we probably can't make the guidelines more restrictive at that point.

Bill Balek: I agree.

Vince Fagan: Bill, I remember we had a discussion at the last meeting at the State Building, and I questioned whether the act included just chemicals or paper or what. I asked if the guidelines were going to include equipment, and the consensus was yes.

Steve Ashkin: Bill, when you talk about technical corrections to the document, what you have written is that the products have to be Green Seal or Environmental Choice certified.

Bill Balek: If you keep them in the required section, I think you should at least separate them out for the sake of clarity. Paper products should be included if environmentally sensitive, certified by Green Seal or Environmental Choice, or meet EPA's Comprehensive Procurement Guidelines. The EPA Comprehensive Procurement program does not certify.

Steve Ashkin: Listing this certification requirement will get strong objections from the paper industry.

Bill Balek: Changing the term could defer the attacks. I want to suggest a technical correction regarding language stating that chemical products need to be certified. Technically EPA's program does not certify. In the paragraph before, let's reword to say products that are "certified and/or recognized" for accuracy.

Kate Tomford: Is this accurate for the EPA's Comprehensive Procurement Guidelines?

Bill Balek: No – paper products meet guidelines by EPA. We need to separate these products out. The Comprehensive Procurement Guidelines are out there for reference.

Kate Tomford: All the products that we qualified under the three certification/recognition systems should be on a matrix for schools to see. If qualified paper products don't appear on a certified/recognized list, it will be more challenging us to create the matrix.

Steve Ashkin: In my opinion, this is not a huge issue. There are only a few major paper companies out there. They've gone through similar circumstances like this before. Georgia Pacific and others could easily give the state a list of products that meet the procurement guidelines.

b. Paper Products

Kate Tomford: Since the discussion seems to be going this direction, let's turn to the next item on the agenda: paper products. The consensus on equipment was to leave it in Requirements, at least for the public comment period. On paper, we've already clarified that the EPA's Comprehensive Procurement Guidelines don't certify or recognize, so we'll change the language related to that detail. Are there any other comments paper products?

Steve Ashkin: I don't know if this belongs in the document, but on paper products/hand towels, I have two suggestions. First, we should encourage touch-free dispensers in schools (which prevents cross contamination of germs). Second, we should encourage dispensers from a source reduction perspective – for environmental and budgetary reasons.

Kate Tomford: Could you please explain what you mean by source reduction dispensers?

Steve Ashkin: If you provide folded individual towels, people tend to grab wads. With rolls of paper, people take less paper.

Jim Sheffer: For example, McDonalds has changed dispensers to make it easier to grab one towel at a time rather than a stack.

Steve Ashkin: We should insert language from both a health and environmental resource perspective.

Dan Persky: Should we include this in the equipment section on pp. 7 & 8?

Steve Ashkin: We see dispensers as part of paper purchasing process; paper distributors also sell the dispensers or even provide them free of charge.

Claris Olson: We could insert a reference section in the document that explains this issue in more detail.

Jim Sheffer: I think we should include paper dispensers as part of the guidelines. It's an integral aspect of how you choose paper products.

Susan Hilton: We would oppose this addition. The guidelines are getting bigger and bigger and bigger. Even with the opt-out policy, it takes schools money and time and paperwork to opt out, which is money taken away from education.

Steve Ashkin: All these items are integral to creating safe, healthy schools. I encourage us to include them.

Kathy Gingrich: Can we use Health/Life Safety funds to pay for paper dispensers?

Susan Hilton: Those funds are for very specific safety issues. We can't ask schools to take money out of that fund for this purpose.

Kate Tomford: This issue of cross contamination is a health and safety issue, though.

Susan Hilton: Health/Life Safety funds are stretched already. They need to use these for school safety causes. Money is very tight in schools these days.

Vince Fagan: Steve, what language do you think should be inserted for dispensers?

Steve Ashkin: I don't want to spend a lot of time today on wording. If committee is in agreement, we can work on that later. I understand money is a problem, but schools don't usually pay for dispensers themselves. They are installed for free by paper distributors. These dispensers reduce consumption by 30%, which saves schools money. I am sensitive to saving schools money. I hope we'll include dispensers in the guidelines.

Vince Fagan: I can say that touch-free dispensers clearly do reduce paper consumption as compared to dispensers for folded towels. We provide new schools with free dispensers, although this isn't necessarily true for all IL schools. The automated dispensers are much more expensive and we don't give those for free. But you will reduce cross contamination and save resources.

Jim Sheffer: So are dispensers going in the required or recommended section?

Kate Tomford: I think we were discussing putting them in the required section.

Jim Sheffer: With touch-free dispensers, from a business perspective, it never takes more than 18 months to recover your costs. And again, schools can opt out for cost reasons.

Kate Tomford: Dispensers would be in a similar position to equipment – schools don't have to buy the green equipment until existing equipment wears out.

Jim Sheffer: Right – These guidelines are applying to future changes, not throwing out what you have if it still works.

Vince Fagan: These dispensers have a long life – replacement is not an urgent issue. They last a long time.

Kate Tomford: This would only be applicable to schools doing an overhaul or renovations or having other reasons to change; otherwise, this shouldn't be a big problem for a while.

Bill Thompson: I've had problems with the infrared automated dispensers. They don't work that well, and if there is a problem, they can be difficult to fix. Dispensers with hand cranks work better than the touch-less kind.

Jim Sheffer: But touch-less as an option; some other models do work well.

Kate Tomford: We might be talking about two different characteristics here: touch-less and source reduction. Do we want to require or recommend both?

Vince Fagan: With folded towel, people grab a glob up to 10 towels at a time; roll dispensers discourage this. Touch-free is best because it has the double benefit of source reduction and preventing the spread of germs.

Thompson: But there can be lots of problems with automated ones over time.

Steve Ashkin: Personally, I have had issues with automated dispensers, too. Towels might be a better option in some cases.

Thompson: You have to crank anyways when they break, so wasting paper becomes an issue, and people end up touching the dispenser.

Steve Ashkin: You can work with distributors to fine-tune the dispenser – adjust the length and tension so that people can easily tear off the right amount with it jamming.

Thompson: But in the real world, they have problems.

Bill Balek: Maybe there is some middle ground. We could put in language about specifics, but have a disclaimer follow for more finessing (e.g., “where feasible…”).

Thompson: I like adding “where feasible” to the language.

Jim Sheffer: With this much discussion about paper towels, I can’t wait to get to toilet paper!

Geoff Potter: The paper categories aren’t mentioned in the document. It makes sense to include which paper products we’re talking about when we refer to them in the document.

Kate Tomford: Let’s finish on the point about where should we put paper dispensers – p.7, 2nd paragraph?

Dan Persky: Paper would be included in the approved products list.

Jim Sheffer: Or it could go on p.17, under restrooms.

Kate Tomford: That’s the only mention of touch-free dispensers, but the issue does not necessarily apply only to restrooms. The language should be broader so we don’t restrict them to restrooms.

Geoff Potter: Let’s drop “in restrooms.”

Kate Tomford: We still need to reach agreement on whether dispensers are in recommended or required.

Bill Balek: If they’re under required, it’s prudent to reference “where feasible” for paper resource reduction to be used.

Kate Tomford: If we create a reference for paper, it would be inconsistent because we haven’t done that more broadly for the other categories. We could include additional reference material later in the document.

Susan Hilton: So will it be recommended or required?

Kate Tomford: We’ll put it in the Recommendations section, with a reference earlier in the document.

c. School Exemption Process

Kate Tomford: I think we have some agreement on paper products, so let’s move on to the school exemption process. This is on p.8 of the draft document.

Dan Persky: We need time for this discussion on this section. We weren’t sure exactly the direction we should take. We tried first to look to NY and had lots of concerns about their exemption process. We tried to keep it simple. Our rule – according to the IL law – is that if it costs more, you can get out of it. Based on that, we put in a procedure where schools provide the price of the actual product they’re using for a particular cleaning purpose, give 3 other comparable green products’ prices, and if they can show that all of the green products have higher prices, they get the exemption. The Council has no compliance role here; their only role is to ensure that the documents are correctly filled out. If that’s true, the school gets exempted.

Kate Tomford: According to the wording of the law, the school just has to *notify* the Council – this is not an application process that requires approval.

Dan Persky: There is an annual renewal policy in the law, so we can’t change that aspect. That said, do people think this is a fair system for schools to report to the Council?

Kate Tomford: Also, to clarify, the notification is done by product category. Schools are not completely exempt from green cleaning; they have to apply by product category, but they can choose to opt out of all categories.

Susan Hilton: I have a possible clarification: the language says individual schools will report, but it’s usually the district that would make these decisions. Each school district should get exemptions, not individual schools.

Dan Persky: This is actually a detail determined by the law, which says school – not district. The district could apply, but it would just have to list all the schools in the district. This is a minor technicality. School districts can act on behalf of all of their schools if they just list them all.

Becky Lockart: What if the Council doesn't approve an exemption?

Dan Persky: This is where the law is unclear. As long as the information provided in an exemption request is accurate, we can't really do anything to stop them.

Jim Sheffer: Do schools submit this documentation to the ROE or to the Council?

Kate Tomford: The Council.

Larry Pfeiffer: We have discussed that the ROE would have some regulatory oversight in this process.

Dan Persky: The Council would have to tell the ROE which schools have given notification.

Susan Hilton: Where is this exemption process noted in the Act?

Kate Tomford: It is in section 10, paragraph 2.

Becky Lockart: If the ROEs are doing inspections, they'll need to know which schools have submitted the proper documentation.

Kate Tomford: Yes, we have talked about how the ROEs can incorporate green cleaning enforcement into their existing inspection process. If this is possible, the Council will communicate the list of exempt schools to the ROEs.

Kathy Gingrich: Will you have an online form for schools to submit their notification?

Kate Tomford: Yes.

Kathy Gingrich: Will you have a box to check to indicate all schools in district?

Kate Tomford: We could set that up.

Gary Miller: On a procedural basis, how would schools acquire information on different product prices? Would they have to go through the process of requesting quotes? Would they have to put out quotes or bids just to get prices?

Dan Persky: Those are possible methods, but we don't plan to specify this – it's up to the schools.

Jim Sheffer: Schools can look at state contracts for pricing information or look at procurement quotes.

Comment: Schools would have to do this for each product?

Dan Persky: For each product category, not for each product.

Steve Ashkin: Above a certain threshold, schools have to go out for bid. This is not something new for schools.

Comment: Especially in small districts, the districts do the purchasing. We still need an option for districts that do purchasing independently.

Dan Persky: We have that option in the language – a district can notify and list all of its member schools, or individual schools can notify.

Gary Miller: Are there cases where cleaning services are contracted out?

Jim Sheffer, Eva Detloff: Yes.

Jim Sheffer: Whether contracted or in-house, these green cleaning practices will be required.

Kate Tomford: The law says that these practices are tied to schools (which we are taking to mean school buildings), regardless of who does the cleaning. Contractors would still have to comply with this exemption requirement.

Gary Miller: Make sure this policy is clear for contractors – I don't think the text says that right now.

Kate Tomford: I agree, this should be very clear.

Jim Sheffer: I think distributors will be able to provide schools with help in complying.

Kathy Gingrich: If a school has a three-year cleaning contract, can a school just submit this contract as an explanation of why they are opting out?

Jim Sheffer: There is the opt-out option, but schools still have to show that they have reviewed prices.

Dan Persky: All state spending is subject to annual appropriations (by state policy), so schools generally have to renew or at least review contract on an annual basis. They can ask their contractor to review the products they use, and if the contractor says the price would increase, this qualifies as a way to opt out each year.

Steve Ashkin: We deal with this question a lot. There is no cost premium. In places where green cleaners do cost more, both suppliers and building owners can sit down and decide how they want to handle the situation. They could choose to opt out because of cost, or they could choose another option. With the option of opting out, this shouldn't be a problem.

Jim Sheffer: To make a point, CPS – the largest school customer in the state – has just approached us, and they are planning to convert to green cleaning very soon.

John Carroll: From the viewpoint of the chemical producing industry, you are fooling yourself if you think green cleaners don't cost more money. Whether distributors are passing that additional cost on to schools, that depends and may not be the case. But they are costly to produce and to certify. There's a cost to being green. Green floor coatings, for example, are definitely more costly. Whether all suppliers are passing this on or margins in bidding are kept low, that can vary. Schools will either be spending more money on green or in the costs associated with opting out. There is a cost associated with opting out – paper, staff time, etc.

Steve Ashkin: I respect your opinion, John, but I don't necessarily agree. Five years ago, I would agree with cost differences and product effectiveness comparisons. Today, green glass cleaners and others are now quite cost competitive. Floor coatings I can agree are more expensive. In 2007/2008, though, this generalization isn't that true.

Jim Sheffer: In no case has going green cost our schools more money.

Larry Pfeiffer: In the language used to describe the opting out concerns, what about including language about human training costs? Is that included or was that figured in? What training costs can we expect will change due to green cleaners?

Dan Persky: The law refers to green clean policies, and we wanted the exemption process to be as simple and easy as possible. I doubt most schools are going to want to calculate everything for implementation. They could, but do they really want to put in that effort just to get an exemption that's already pretty easy to do? The subcommittee that discussed this felt that getting more specific would create complication.

Kathy Gingrich: I represent custodians in a school district that went green last year, and I had to go to disciplinary hearings for custodians that didn't follow procedures correctly. Training is a problem and it's very necessary. Janitors can't always figure out the proper use of these products on their own.

Dan Persky: The Outreach committee hasn't made its recommendations yet, but it will be addressing this issue of training. This is certainly a concern that we're working through.

Vince Fagan: I can say that training is sorely needed. Training for green products is very necessary. Often there is no training for standard products to begin with. Training policies need to be in place for this to work effectively.

Steve Ashkin: The point has to be made that training is important, but this should be a concern regardless of whether the products are green or traditional. This should not be required just for green cleaning. A poor job on training was a problem before green cleaning. The problem is not for green cleaning specifically. This concern should not be tied to new green cleaning policies.

Ed Grotte: My school went green last year, and our green cleaning distributor came in and trained our people how to use them properly. They didn't charge anything for the training. We went to a metered system, which is idiot proof. You can't mess up. It cost us \$10 for metered dispensers.

Jim Sheffer: In the past buying products that required dilution was difficult, because people didn't understand the dilution procedures. But now, many distributors are willing to provide training.

Ed Grotte: That's right. I recommend finding distributors that train for free.

Kate Tomford: The Outreach committee will talk about this. They're dealing with training right now.

Jim Sheffer: I hope the training materials include specifics and inform staff about the pH scale, principles of disinfection, etc.

Susan Hilton: Human cost is important to figure in, and it sounds like we're pursuing options that will require more training.

Kate Tomford: How much extra time do you anticipate would need to be dedicated to training?

Susan Hilton: The time for training is taken out of the workday, so there is a cost per hour for training on use of greening products.

Kate Tomford: Is this training time requirement different than training required for standard cleaning products?

Susan Hilton: If a janitor has used the same product for 20 yrs, it's going to take time and deliberation to adjust to something new.

Bill Balek: Sometimes there are different requirements for product use, but it shouldn't be much of a change. Maybe more dwell time, but incremental training is going to be nominal. Besides, there are at least 300 distributors in IL, and many or most of them provide the training at no cost.

Susan Hilton: That's great if they do provide training, but for schools who can't get a distributor who provides training, human cost is a problem.

Vince Fagan: This is going to be of minimal consideration.

Kathy Gingrich: Employees get paid for training, sometimes at a rate of time and a half or double and maybe after normal hours.

Ed Grotte: We've trained people during breaks and at other opportunities when we're not asking people to stay over.

Kathy Gingrich: If you're training during breaks, you should be paying people for their time.

Bill Balek: Often times you're applying product while receiving training, combining work tasks and training.

Coletta Hines-Newell: It shouldn't matter about the type of product being used. Training is part of the process for any cleaning.

Becky Lockhart: OSHA requires training anyways.

Kathy Gingrich: If schools are already budgeting for training, that's great. But if not, we should include training language in the exemption.

Susan Hilton: Overtime pay should be included for schools without a distributor that provides training.

Steve Ashkin: I support including info about the cost of training. Some schools do zero training. It would be great to know which schools don't train at all and which ones do. We need to identify which schools do versus don't.

Susan Hilton: Yes, this option should be part of the exemption.

Larry Pfeiffer: I apologize for starting all this discussion on human costs.

Kate Tomford: Do you see human costs as an incremental calculation? Schools would report that they pay X for training now, and under green cleaning, they would have to pay Y?

Larry Pfeiffer: Can anyone attest to the labor costs as a proportion of total cleaning costs?

Jim Sheffer: Labor is generally 85 to 90% of the cost. Training could actually reduce your labor costs over time.

Vince Fagan: Turnover in our industry is up 300%. Training has been shown as one of the most effective ways to reduce turnover, clear up staff frustrations, etc.

Kate Tomford: Should the exemption be specific to increased training time, or should it account for increased time to perform all of the functions of green cleaning?

Steve Ashkin: Keep it to training; otherwise, we'll pick apart everything and the guidelines will become unmanageable. It could provide an easy out by expanding the exemption, but getting schools to examine how they train currently and comparing what they will do for green cleaning is important.

Dan Persky: Are there any other conflicts with this section?

Eva Detloff: On page 5, I'm wondering about the line that says "no further action is required." How would we ever know that a school is not following the guidelines unless we get the exemption notification from them?

Kate Tomford: Well, a school isn't forced to comply according to the law. We can perform inspections, but the enforcement details are still being determined.

Geoff Potter: Can we require schools to report on their green cleaning implementation?

Dan Persky: The law is silent on reporting, so it is unclear if we can require it – although we could make it voluntary.

Mark Bishop: The ROEs don't need a legislative mandate to update their Health/Life safety requirements.

Larry Pfeiffer: That's something we'd have to check with ISBE.

Gary Miller: Looking over NY materials, they did a survey. The feedback they received from schools was very valuable. We need to be able to gather data in a similar way.

Dan Persky: We can certainly ask schools to voluntarily report or provide feedback.

Kate Tomford: The survey was a requirement in NY's law – they completed it to comply with the law.

Dan Persky: This is something we can figure out in the sub-committee still. The question here is: what are we allowed to require?

Jim Sheffer: I don't think we reached an end on the discussion about the exemption.

Kate Tomford: Was the consensus to add language about baseline training costs language and new training costs under green cleaning?

Geoff Potter: I think the language in this whole section has to specify that the opt-out is by category.

Kathy Gingrich: I think it's fair that we tell the costs.

Geoff Potter: Wouldn't the costs be about the same amount of time for hearings as training?

Kathy Gingrich: No, actually the hearings are probably more time.

Geoff Potter: It seems the costs might cancel out in the end.

Kathy Gingrich: The bottom line is that this is just one more unfunded mandate.

Dan Persky: In general, we're trying to make this as easy as possible for schools while still following the law as it's written.

Kathy Gingrich: As long as schools have super hero secretaries who can calculate product costs...

d. Other Issues

Kate Tomford: Are there any last comments? Let's move on to any other items in the draft that people think we should review today.

Larry Pfeiffer: On p.15, where language says "people with special needs" – is this an educational term?

Kate Tomford: The term was used in the State of Pennsylvania document. We can change it if necessary.

Jim Sheffer: I think we should change the wording to "vulnerable populations." This is consistent with the LEED-EB language and other major publications' terminology.

Eva Detloff: Can or should we define vulnerable populations?

Dan Persky: Yes, we can define the term.

Eva Detloff: On p.12, about disinfectants and sanitizers: this is a huge issue, and as a school nurse, I think it's very important that people know how to choose the correct ones. Can the explanation here be expanded? The first dot-point is especially unclear.

Kate Tomford: Does anyone have more material on disinfectants and sanitizers to help us expand?

Bill Balek: I think Steve did a good job describing these issues in his "Green Cleaning for Dummies" book in the toxic versus non-toxic discussion.

Jim Sheffer: We could also look to language from Environmental Choice.

Eva Detloff: One more sentence could make it more helpful – something along the lines of the information in Green Cleaning for Dummies could be helpful to insert.

Kate Tomford: We'll take a look at that again. We agreed among the Product Policy subcommittee members that the guidelines would not call out specific ingredients as bad or good.

Steve Ashkin: The info in the book is intended for non-technical people. We're not going to be able to be really specific and still helpful to non-technical people, so I think we need to keep things general.

Bill Balek: You could reference the EPA website to help answer peoples' technical questions. Also, I have another suggestion: on p.10 – carpet cleaners – this was already addressed in the required section. Let's delete reference to them in this section.

Jim Sheffer: How about we call it "carpet care"?

Kate Tomford: I agree we shouldn't mention this twice. It could be confusing to readers to see it under Requirements and again under Recommendations.

Bill Balek: Yes, the double mention could confuse purchasers.

Steve Ashkin: These recommendations are based on a Pennsylvania document, and I don't recall – Claris, do you know – does the HSC Quick & Easy Guide have similar recommendation for selecting

products like this? If so, does it make sense to reference the HSC document or the Pennsylvania manual? HSC is a local IL organization.

Clariss Olson: Yes, the language is very similar. We could add in that it's EPA approved. There probably are some sentences we need to add in. For example, pH concerns should also address the high end of the spectrum (pH of 12-14), which is relevant if we're talking bleaches and ammonias.

Steve Ashkin: My question was different. I think it would make sense for Illinois legislation to reference an Illinois document, not necessarily the Pennsylvania document. I wrote both documents, and they are basically the same.

Kate Tomford: Clariss, do you have a word document of the Healthy Schools Campaign literature?

Clariss Olson: I can copy and paste the text, but I don't have something in Word.

Jim Sheffer: On page 17, in the restrooms section, I think we should make a point about personal protection, something like "i.e. wear gloves."

Suzanne Carlson: What about a best practice on teachers bringing in their own products? This can provide some grounds for inconsistency in policies, because teachers may bring in products that don't meet the guidelines.

Vince Fagan: On page 12, I have a suggestion: can we change "refinishing" to "stripping" in the first bullet under floor finishes? It's the last sentence in durability. Refinishing could be inter as stripping and recoating.

Bill Balek: On page 16, after floor stripping, in the first bullet: "Notify occupants beforehand" – let's change that to "schedule to do so while no one is in the building."

Comment: Even in the summer, we have summer school students. Does the whole school have to be empty?

Bill Balek: We could change it to say that we "prefer" the building to be empty.

Kate Tomford: We'll edit the wording to say that if it's not possible to perform the work when the building is empty, then notify occupants before proceeding.

Comment: What about air fresheners – products that teachers bring in themselves, such as spray fragrances and plug-in air fresheners?

Kathy Gingrich: Didn't we address this somewhere in the guidelines – to keep outside chemicals out?

Kate Tomford: I think the guidelines are still unclear on air fresheners; we haven't addressed those.

Eva Detloff: Many products that have fragrances. We should get a professional to provide recommendations that address fragrance. This is a big concern.

Kate Tomford: Where would we add it?

Eva Detloff: Maybe in best practices or in the products section.

Jim Sheffer: In old buildings, we're going to have circumstances where schools will kick and scream because it's nearly impossible to get rid of odors even with proper cleaning.

Steve Ashkin: I'm thrilled when teachers bring in their own products, so this is a tough issue. Especially for schools strapped for money, teachers may feel obligated to bring in their own products. We have to be very careful. We should note that schools should have a policy on what's acceptable in the school.

Jim Sheffer: I agree that we need to be careful. Teachers probably don't know about proper use of some products, such as how to read the Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS).

Kate Tomford: Technically, teachers shouldn't bring in cleaners that don't meet our guidelines.

Comment: We had originally talked about putting cleaning fact sheets in classrooms. This is still needed.

Bill Balek: Cleaning product storage and accessibility to children are also important safety issues. How would we address this?

Ed Grotte: At Flossmoor, I give out a bottle of green cleaning product to each teacher and tell them that as your product runs out, see a janitor to get a refill. Paperwork about the product is also left in the room with the product.

Bill Balek: My concern is that colored bottles are an attractive nuisance for children.

Ed Grotte: We keep the bottles stored in a clothing locker or closet within the classroom.

Lilliana de Santiago: This is a problem in the city with air fresheners and people with asthma. Strong odors trigger respiratory problems. Most of the ones that teachers bring in themselves are probably not approved by the school. There should be an approval procedure.

Dave Dorl: We also have products that we give to teachers, and we don't allow teachers to bring in their own. There is such a diversity of products out there, making it dangerous if products are mixed unknowingly through residues on desks, etc. Chemical reactions could happen if teachers' products conflict with those that custodians use.

Kathy Gingrich: I think we would encourage this policy of teachers not bringing in chemicals. Schools need to have a consistent policy.

Dave Dorl: One more comment: Carpet cleaners is mentioned in the recommended section. Will it be eliminated since already mentioned in the required section?

Kate Tomford: Yes.

Claris Olson: I'm willing to put together a fact sheet for teachers.

Eva Detloff: Yes, and I'll work on that with Claris. I was hoping the Product Policy subcommittee would work on fragrances/air fresheners.

Kate Tomford: Dan and I will take a shot at language on air fresheners in the best practices section.

Mark Bishop: What about the language concerning non-certified products? The school must seek this alternative certification, so it says. Is it the school or the district? There's not a lot of clarity in this section.

Dan Persky: We can change it to include both (either/or) to say school/district. Whichever level wants it is how we wrote it. I assume the manufacturer would want to apply, not the school. The law is silent about its relationship with the Freedom of Info Act. Green Seal and Environmental Choice don't tell who flunks. I strongly believe we wouldn't have to reveal this info, but I'm not sure.

Jim Sheffer: How many times did someone go to a 3rd party in New York?

Dan Persky: None, or actually one manufacturer did but it didn't work out for them.

Jim Sheffer: It was the largest chemical company in the world who tried for alternative certification.

Kate Tomford: Mark, were you asking whether we will include the specific numbers – the lab results – that the manufacturer has to attain in order to get qualification?

Mark Bishop: Just in general, the requirements in this section were unclear to me – if I were a school, I wouldn't know how to read this.

Dan Persky: We won't have that level of detail in the guidelines – “give us the results of these equations” – but we'll have that in the supplement on the website.

Kate Tomford: I think we should have a form online that manufacturers can fill out for qualification.

Dan Persky: The policy should follow Green Seal or Environmental Choice.

Dave Dorl: What labs will we certify and list?

Kate Tomford: We have looked into accreditation programs, but we don't have a definite answer yet. We could either list an accreditation, or list labs that meet that standard.

John Carroll: I'm not sure that any labs do all the tests you're going to want done.

Kate Tomford: It's fine if multiple labs are used, as long as each one is certified.

Kathy Gingrich: Why is this provision for alternative certification even in here?

Kate Tomford: There were some concerns about limiting the options to certified products because of the time and cost required to get certification.

Kathy Gingrich: Couldn't someone just make up lab reports?

Kate Tomford: No, they'll have to submit test results from a lab or labs on our accredited list.

Dave Dorl: Are credited labs going to be listed on the website?

Kate Tomford: Yes.

Comment: How will this list of approved labs be determined?

Dan Persky: We're not sure. We're figuring that out.

Steve Ashkin: I strongly discourage listing names of specific labs – there are so many, and they're all over the country. It would be better to say: these are the credentials that approved labs must have.

Bill Balek: I think we should combine these ideas: list some labs specifically and provide the credentials for others (or say “or other similar labs that meet X-Y-Z criteria”).

Steve Ashkin: I disagree. Naming names could be politically messy, it’s more work for the state to maintain, and it’s not inclusive of all options.

Bill Balek: That’s fine – I have no major objections to this.

Kate Tomford: Perhaps we could list websites with approved labs.

Comment: What about referring people to US EPA lab criteria? I’m not sure if they approve certain labs.

Kate Tomford: The standard I’ve seen is an ISO/IEC set of criteria.

Comment: That might work, if it’s kept general. Still, this might be difficult.

Steve Ashkin: The point of this is not for the state to come up with yet another standard and another document. We simply need to show that we are serious about requiring product testing, even if we don’t make people use Environmental Choice or Green Seal. Manufacturers have enough money and resources to be able to locate appropriate labs.

John Carroll: I hope you realize Environmental Choice and Green Seal don’t really do testing themselves. They contract out their testing.

Dan Persky: We need to wrap up this meeting because it’s almost noon.

Carol Pinkerton: One more point on page 1: it was the intent of the Procurement subcommittee to include vendors/suppliers on the website.

Kate Tomford: Yes, this would be part of the matrix of qualified products, which is listed there.

Larry Pfeiffer: Have we made mention of model procurement language for schools?

Kate Tomford: No, that’s not on the list currently, but we can add it. I’ll work with Carol to get procurement language on the website.

4. Next Steps

- If you have additional revisions, please email them directly to Kate.
- Kate will post the revised draft on Friday this week.
- This committee will meet again next **Tuesday, December 4th at 10:00am** at the same Chicago and Springfield locations and with the same dial-in for those joining by phone.
- The purpose of next week’s meeting is to approve the draft guidelines for public comment. If we have extra time, we will start to address some of the outreach questions.
- The draft guidelines will be posted for public comment on Friday, December 7th, and the public comment period will close on January 8th.
- We have three dates set for public comment meetings:
 - Wednesday, December 12, 10:30am-12:30pm, Springfield, Stratton Building, Capital Development Board Boardroom.
 - Monday, December 17, 1:30pm-3:30pm, Chicago, Thompson Center, Room 2-025.
 - Tuesday, January 8, 10:30am-12:30pm, Chicago, Thompson Center, Room 2-025.
- If anyone downstate wishes to attend a remote videoconference site, we can arrange that. People can also join by phone or by videoconference in the Lt. Governor’s Chicago office for the 12/12/07 meeting and in the Lt. Governor’s Springfield office for the 12/17/07 and 1/8/08 meetings.