

REPORT OF THE CRANSTON GREEN BUILDING COMMISSION

November 26, 2010; revised from 11.12.10 document

INTRODUCTION

The City of Cranston Green Building Commission (Commission) was established by a Resolution of the Cranston City Council on May 24, 2010. The Commission was formed the following month with appointments from the City Council and the Mayor.

The purpose of the Commission is to study green initiatives in the City of Cranston based upon the Resolution of the City Council, sponsored by Councilman Lupino. The City Council, upon receiving the recommendations of the Green Building Commission may elect to translate certain or all of the recommendations to City Ordinances.

Five members comprise the Commission, four appointed by the City Council and one appointed by the Mayor. The Commission members are:

Member:	Representing:	Appointed By:
Gerald Cordy	Mayor	Mayor
Paula McFarland	Non-Profit Community Action	City Council
Robin Coia	Labor	City Council
Rita Holahan	Environment	City Council
Kenneth J. Filarski	Business - Specifically Construction and Building Development	City Council

The Commission met five times between August 25, 2010 and October 20, 2010. Each meeting lasted approximately one and one-half hours each and were all held at the Cranston City Hall.

The Commission and its work is not of a political bent or bias. We state this as a practical matter, recognizing that given four of the five members are appointed by the City Council. Given a potential perception, some observers may view the appointments being political considerations as a dynamic influencing the Commission's work and its recommendations. Simply put, it was, and is, not.

The Commission wishes to recognize that the City, on both the municipal side and the school department side of local government has been, and is engaged in energy savings activities. The efforts by the School Department and its energy manager are praiseworthy and have been widely recognized across the State and regionally, including prestigious recognition from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The City through its municipal side of government allocated a significant portion of the energy funds it received from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act to the School Department to continue, and add to, the energy conservation and energy efficiency work they are doing. That mutual cooperation is laudable and we hope that it serves as a platform for continued cooperation and future collaborations on energy and many other initiatives.

The Commission recognizes the work that have been done over the decades by the non profit sector including organizations such as the Community Action Programs and believes their sustained efforts in energy efficiency and conservation for the population they serve should continue and also recognized that the recommendations made here respect that work and do not attempt to create devices or programs that would duplicate the work that is already being done by others.

Similarly, the Commission recognizes the importance of our labor force and the companies that employ that labor force. We are cognizant of recommendations being put forth across the country which have

established new entities to do the work of providing materials and labor in the installation of energy projects. We do not do so here for the very simple reason that the labor force and the businesses that employ them in Rhode Island are capable and existing resources. That resource is currently underutilized in this economy. We strongly feel there is no need to reinvent the wheel or expend efforts to do something that others in our community are capable of doing in a professional and economical manner.

The Commission's recommendations do not include any initiatives that would subtract from the existing revenues of its tax base. In other words we do not propose tax breaks, tax incentives, or rebates. Rather the proposals deal with mechanisms to provide funding and financing, and proposals which further green practices and energy efficiency, conservation, and renewable energy through structures and programs which address and will achieve sustainability through a natural course of good government practices.

The Commission in its recommendations is not addressing the issue of energy service corporations, or ESCOs as they are referenced. The viability and efficacy of ESCOs are one of the many potential specific courses of action that may be undertaken by a municipality. However as the engagement of an ESCO is a complex financial instrument, which may be useful for some municipalities but not all, the question is best left to the City to be considered as a separate inquiry from our work.

Given the limited time frame available for its work, the work of the Commission is not to be considered comprehensive or all inclusive. That is to say, the Commission will endeavor to provide good and workable recommendations but will not necessarily provide all the recommendations which may be possible in a certain area or category. Following the adage, "Do not let the perfect stand in the way of the good" the Commission acknowledges that it will not be perfect and all encompassing, but it will strive to a desirable end result that its work will be good.

The Commission regards the applicability and availability of financing and funding sources as a key component of our work. To that end the recommendations are few, but attempt to establish a workable framework for an ongoing and self replenishing source of capital.

Similarly, the Commission developed only but several recommendations centered around establishing the structure and framework to encompass and address the issues of green buildings and development, energy dynamics, and sustainability which are interrelated. While sometimes considered by some as separate issues, to many they are one and the same issue, and we take that latter viewpoint. Similarly the continuum from individual buildings, the development and redevelopment of land, and the overall sustainability of the City are also interrelated. The Commission embraced a holistic approach and outlook to the issues at hand.

The Commission's recommendations emanate from our holistic perspective of sustainability which includes the green and the energy use of individual buildings, the development patterns of our neighborhoods, and that of the entire community fabric of Cranston. Our recommendations provide the financial ability and program opportunity for the municipal side of City government, the School Department side of City government, the residents of the City, and the businesses of the City to become part of, and achieve the overall sustainability of the City.

We present our initiative recommendations with the following preface:

*"If you want creativity", said Jaime Lerner, legendary mayor of the Brazilian city of Curitiba,
"take a zero off your budget.
If you want sustainability, take off two zeros."*

I. FINANCING AND FUNDING INITIATIVES

1. DEDICATE A SET PERCENTAGE OF FUNDS SAVED THROUGH ENERGY CONSERVATION AND RENEWABLE ENERGY EFFORTS TO FUND ONGOING, AND FUTURE ENERGY EFFORTS IN THE CITY – MANDATED FOR BOTH THE MUNICIPAL AND THE SCHOOL DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS OF GOVERNMENT.

The Commission recognizes that energy savings are often used to fill budgetary gaps in other programmatic areas of operation. While this is a short term solution in attempts to balance or bridge budgetary gaps, the effectiveness of extending cost savings through additional energy savings initiatives is lost. Furthermore, using savings as a sinking loan fund detracts from using savings to create greater savings.

For example, the Commission finds the efforts of the School Department exemplary in its work at energy efficiency and conservation. The School Department saved several million dollars over the past few years by implementing effective energy measures, programs, and equipment. Unfortunately those energy savings in dollars were in effect used as reduced expenditures on one side of the balance sheet to make up for some of the increases on the other side of the balance sheet. This leaves nothing to fund additional capital improvements for energy efficiency, energy conservation, or for the larger picture of renewable energy system installations.

This recommendation would mandate a set amount of previous expenditures, saved through calculated or measured actual energy savings, into a dedicated energy projects account which can not be used for any purpose other than energy efficiency and energy conservation measures, and for the installation of renewable energy systems. This is a forced savings mechanism. The exact percentages would need to be worked out by the Administration and the City Council and would need dedicated, restricted account measures locked in to avoid having this account accessed to fund budget gaps in other areas.

Here a certain portion of dollars realized through energy savings would be used to fund future, additional savings for the City. The ideal situation would be to utilize 100% of the energy savings to fund additional energy projects as these savings beget additional savings and the overall goal of complete energy savings, and therefore greater dollar savings to the City, are realized in a shorter period of time.

This initiative has: IMMEDIATE MUNICIPAL COST SAVINGS

2. ESTABLISH A RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY CONSERVATION LOAN FUND FOR CITY RESIDENTS AND BUSINESSES.

The City has a precedent and workable model in place with the Revolving Loan Fund administered by the City's Economic Development Office that can be effectively replicated for this proposed Energy Revolving Loan Fund.

The program should be established and promoted in a way so as not to be confused with the ongoing Revolving Loan Fund administered by the City's Economic Development Office. This initiative needs to be funded by a separate capital infusion, perhaps through Initiative I.-3, I.-4., and/or Initiative II.-5. described in the following initiative recommendations.

This initiative has: ADDITIONAL INCIDENTAL MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS, WITH SHORT AND LONG TERM SAVINGS FOR THE TAXPAYER.

3. *ESTABLISH A SUSTAINABLE CITY BONDING PROGRAM - A REVENUE BOND PROGRAM TO FUND ENERGY CONSERVATION PROJECTS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS FOR THE CITY (BOTH MUNICIPAL AND SCHOOL DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS OF GOVERNMENT), FOR CRANSTON CITIZENS, AND FOR CRANSTON BUSINESSES.*

This revenue bonding program will be paid back with the calculated energy savings of the applicant's project. The bond fund issue can be made available for purchase by City residents and businesses, "bonding" them to the City not only in a financial sense but also in a joint community effort toward sustainability.

As with all municipal bonding efforts, enabling legislation will have to be approved by the Rhode Island General Assembly. Because this program has implications and application for all Rhode Island cities and towns, it is recommended that the City of Cranston take the lead in initiating this project effort but request the General Assembly to pass omnibus, blanket enabling legislation for this Sustainable City Revenue Bonding for all municipalities in Rhode Island. In this way cities and towns can proceed to request voter approval for this revenue bonding mechanism at any time after the initial passage of the legislation.

For the private sector, safeguards on the loans can be established through first position liens on the properties receiving the loans, and the loans can be paid back by adding the repayment to the property tax billings. We acknowledge that the arithmetic of the cost of the bond program must be part of the equation to provide what effectively would be low interest loans for both the City itself and its residents and the businesses located here, but are confident that the numbers, when added up, will prove to be workable and attractive, and is worth the exercise in due diligence.

This initiative has: INITIAL CAPITAL COSTS OF ESTABLISHING THE BOND PROGRAM - THERE ARE LONG TERM SAVING AND REVENUE GENERATOR FOR THE CITY AND FOR CRANSTON RESIDENTS AND BUSINESSES.

4. *USE INCREASED REVENUES FROM CITY-WIDE RECYCLING TO FUND SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMS IN THE CITY.*

Currently Cranston, as other cities and towns, receives annual payments from the RI Resource and Recovery Corporation based upon the amount of recycling done in the City. Cranston is in the middle of the pack of cities and towns relative to their respective recycling efforts, and therefore the payments received. Certainly there is room for improvement. With a more aggressive recycling effort, accompanied by increased public education efforts on the personal, community, and overall ecological benefits of recycling, the revenues can and should increase. If so, the City can use the 2010 revenues as a baseline and dedicate any amounts over that baseline to an energy project account, including the Energy Revolving Loan Fund described in Initiative I.2. above.

This initiative has: COST SAVINGS BEGINNING APPROXIMATELY ONE YEAR FROM NOW, BASED UPON ADMINISTRATIVE EFFORTS TO PROMOTE THIS REVENUE GENERATOR. THE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS TO PROMOTE A MORE AGGRESSIVE RECYCLING EFFORT ARE CONSIDERED COST NEUTRAL.

5. *USE DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION, RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS, AND/OR FOR THE ENERGY REVOLVING LOAN FUND.*

The City is currently, or will soon be, revising their development impact fee structure, including that of the fee structure amounts. It is an opportune time to establish the use of development impact fees for funding for projects incorporating sustainable systems features in projects and for projects incorporating energy efficiency, energy conservation, and renewable energy systems. The development impact fee revenues can either be deposited in the proposed Energy Revolving Loan Fund or exist as a separate fund from the loan fund program.

This initiative has: IMMEDIATE COST SAVINGS ONCE THE IMPACT FEE FUNDS ARE ALLOCATED TO A SUSTAINABLE AND/OR ENERGY PROJECT. THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE FOR USING THE DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES FOR THIS PRESCRIBED USE ARE ALREADY IN PLACE.

6. *APPLY FOR THE UPCOMING KEEPSPACE GRANT PROGRAM OFFERED BY THE RI DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH IN THEIR "HEALTHY PLACES BY DESIGN" REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.*

This recommendation is presented as a generic example in the sense that should the City of Cranston aggressively adopt sustainability as guiding theme and implementation tool, there are an increasing number of funding opportunities which not only become available to the City because of that sustainability, but it furthers strengthens the City's position in other funding applications

This initiative has: NEUTRAL COST TO APPLY FOR THE GRANT AND LONG TERM SAVINGS IN TERMS OF PUBLIC HEALTH COSTS. IT MAY BE A LONG TERM REVENUE GENERATOR IN THAT IF SELECTED, THE CITY WOULD BE IN GOOD STANDING TO RECEIVE OTHER DIRECT AND RELATED FUNDING.

II. STRUCTURAL AND PROGRAM INITIATIVES

1. *ESTABLISH THAT THE RI GREEN BUILDINGS ACT WILL BE EXPANDED BY THE CITY OF CRANSTON TO INCLUDE ALL BUILDING PROJECTS OF THE CITY REGARDLESS OF SIZE.*

Currently the RI Green Buildings Act applies to all buildings of the State of Rhode Island and all political subdivisions thereof, which include cities and towns, and which receive public funding. The RI Green Buildings Act has a minimum size threshold for its applicability. Here, Cranston would go further than the RI Green Buildings Act and be the first to adopt the policy that all new construction and renovation of public buildings, and all private buildings that receive public funding in whole or in part, are subject to the provisions of the RI Green Buildings Act. This means that the buildings are to be energy efficient beyond minimal code standards, and meet certain sustainability thresholds. The thinking here is why limit the potential to save energy, which saves dollars. Apply the standard across the board and let the savings begin.

This initiative has: NEUTRAL COST TO BEGIN-SHORT AND LONG TERM COST SAVINGS

2. *ESTABLISH THAT LEE D-NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT (LEED-ND) WILL BE THE GUIDE FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT IN THE NEW ZONING ORDINANCE AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS.*

The City recently adopted a new Comprehensive Plan. Included in the plan are a number of recommendations throughout the body of its work to guide the City toward sustainability, energy efficiency, energy conservation, and renewable energy. With that legal foundation, such goals, objectives, and action items can follow in a legal and logical manner in the City's Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations so that those documents can be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Department and the City Planning Commission are already considering incorporation of Conservation Development Design as guidelines to follow in the Subdivision Regulations. We propose utilizing another set of guidelines to use as an implementation tool in both the Zoning Ordinance and the Subdivision Regulations, LEED For Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND).

LEED is an acronym standing for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design. It was established by the United States Green Building Council and the guidelines that program has developed for buildings of varying types, the commissioning of buildings, and the operations and maintenance of building have been adopted around the world. LEED-ND is the newest of their guidelines and rating systems. LEED-ND was developed as a collaborative effort by the U.S. Green Building Council, the Natural Resources Defense Council in association with state Smart Growth organizations, and the Congress for New Urbanism. LEED-ND is organized around three guiding operative themes reflected through the corresponding narrative and details in their guide book: Smart Locations and Linkages; Neighborhood Pattern and Design; and Green Buildings and Infrastructure. LEED-ND embodies most, if not all, of the how, where, and what our communities should become.

LEED-ND can readily work in concert with the contemplated Conservation Development Design Guidelines to become the "how to" guidelines for implementation of the City's new Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations. LEED-ND works in the rural areas of the City. It works for its rural village centers, the suburban areas, and our built up urban areas. It works for small parcels and for large parcels. It is, in the estimation of one Commission member, potentially the most transformative instrument and effective tool for guiding and directing community development, growth, conservation, and sustainability for buildings, land, and the enhancement of our communities for our residents and businesses.

This initiative has: NEUTRAL COST TO BEGIN - LONG TERM SAVINGS IN ADDITION TO THE ADDED VALUE OF MARKETING AND POSITIONING THE CITY TO EXISTING AND POTENTIAL RESIDENTS AND BUSINESSES.

3. *ESTABLISH AN ENERGY MANAGER POSITION FOR THE MUNICIPAL SIDE OF CITY GOVERNMENT FACILITIES SIMILAR TO THE SIMILAR POSITION EXISTING IN THE SCHOOL DEPARTMENT.*

As with the School Department position, this municipal position would be funded through the energy savings realized. The efficacy and potential economic return on this action are already proven through the proven results from the School Department.

This initiative has: INITIAL COST OF PERSONNEL HIRING – INITIAL COSTS ARE REPAID BY SHORT AND LONG TERM SAVINGS IN ENERGY COSTS.

4. *ESTABLISH A CITY TREE PROGRAM WHEREBY THE CITY AND THE RECIPIENTS OF THE TREES, RESIDENTS AND BUSINESSES WILL SHARE THE COSTS OF THE TREE AND PLANTING 50-50.*

The program will reduce the heat island effect, improve aesthetics, and reduce greenhouse gas levels. From a recent article in the Cranston Herald the City of Cranston and the City of Warwick have been discussing potential areas of joint efforts and cost sharing. One point to this initiative item is that the article reported that the City of Warwick has a municipal tree farm pointing to one potential source of both municipal and inter-municipal sustainability.

This initiative has: PROBABLE INITIAL COST - LONG TERM COST SAVINGS TO CITY'S OPERATIONAL BUDGET OF TREE MAINTENANCE.

5. *EXPAND THE LED STREET LIGHTING PROGRAM TO THE ENTIRE INVENTORY OF STREET LIGHTS IN THE CITY.*

The program's expansion depends on establishing a new LED rate by the Public Utilities Commission (PUC). The idea is not for Cranston to go this alone as the program has statewide implications. The PUC staff, the RI League of Cities and Towns, the City of Providence, and the RI General Assembly could, and should be partners in this LED street light rate establishment effort.

This initiative has: INITIAL COST - SHORT AND LONG TERM COST SAVINGS.

6. *INCORPORATE ADDITIONAL SCORING POINTS IN BIDS AND REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS FOR BIDDERS AND PROPOSERS WHO DEMONSTRATE THE SUBSTANTIAL INCORPORATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF GREEN PRODUCTS AND SUSTAINABLE PRACTICES IN THEIR BUSINESSES.*

This recommendation simply carries forward the theme and practice of the City promoting and achieving sustainability. The intent is to encourage businesses to embrace and practice sustainable policies and procedures. References for what constitutes green products and sustainable practices are available from a number of sources including product references in the International Green Construction Code which is adopted by the State of Rhode Island Building Commission; Green Guard; Green Globes; Green Advance, among others.

This initiative has: NEUTRAL COST.

7. *FULLY ADOPT GREEN PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS IN THE CITY'S MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS PROGRAM PROTOCOL.*

Operations and maintenance costs comprise the majority of the total life cycle cost of a building or facility. While certain of our recommendations address some of the operational costs of buildings as to the cost of energy, this recommendation is to take this overall cost category to its companion step of further operations and maintenance costs of buildings. The City Purchasing Department in consultation with other City departments can feasibly roll this recommendation into its purchases over time as cleaning and replacement products, among others, are needed to be procured. Many school departments across the country are leading the way in this effort as they are learning that improved building air and material quality resulting from using sustainable products in proper maintenance protocols are improving student and worker health, as one example are contributing to not only lower or neutral costs, but also to other lower operational costs such as decreased health costs, and improved student and worker performance. Cranston does not have to invent the wheel on this. Information and guidance on practices, products, and study results are readily available.

This initiative has: NEUTRAL COST

8. *TAKE THE LEAD IN ESTABLISHING A SUSTAINABLE CITIES CONSORTIUM AND COLLABORATION WITH THE CITIES OF PROVIDENCE AND WARWICK FOR COORDINATED JOINT PROJECTS, PRACTICES, AND FUNDING APPLICATIONS.*

Cranston, Warwick, and Providence are the three largest cities in Rhode Island comprising approximately 30% - 33% of the State's population in a concentrated urban area. There is no reason why the City of Cranston should not take the lead in organizing a sustainable cities coalition, which can serve as the springboard and testing ground for statewide sustainability efforts. The collaborative effort can also lead to increased successes in Federal funding for integrated and collaborative projects in a coming era most likely to see diminished opportunities for Federal funds. The City should do just that.

This initiative has: INITIAL NEUTRAL COST – LONG TERM POTENTIAL SAVINGS

Re: Report of the Cranston Green Building Commission

From: Kenneth Filarski <kjfilarski@yahoo.com>

[View Contact](#)

To: "Cordy, Gerald" <GCordy@CranstonRI.org>; Paula McFarland <pmcfarland@ricaa.org>; Robin Melfi <RMelfi@NELLMCT.COM>; Rita Holahan <rlholahan@cox.net>

Cc: Anthony Lupino [External] <TLupino@Cox.net>; John Lanni <john.lanni@yahoo.com>; "Pezzullo, Jason" <jpezzullo@CranstonRI.org>

Jerry,

Thank you very much for the time and effort you have devoted to reviewing the draft report and to the Commission from the beginning to now. Our work is all the better because of your insight and information as to the current activities of the City.

I will forward your comments as an appendix to the report forwarded to the Council, and note your document and the meeting proceedings in the cover correspondence.

Please see my comments below.

Sincerely,

Ken

Kenneth J. Filarski FAIA, AICP, LEED-AP BD+C, CFM, CEFPI
FILARSKI/architecture . planning . research

From: "Cordy, Gerald" <GCordy@CranstonRI.org>

To: Kenneth Filarski <kjfilarski@yahoo.com>; Paula McFarland <pmcfarland@ricaa.org>; Robin Melfi <RMelfi@NELLMCT.COM>; Rita Holahan <rlholahan@cox.net>

Cc: Anthony Lupino [External] <TLupino@Cox.net>; John Lanni <john.lanni@yahoo.com>; "Pezzullo, Jason" <jpezzullo@CranstonRI.org>

Sent: Wed, November 17, 2010 3:01:42 PM

Subject: RE: Report of the Cranston Green Building Commission

Ken:

My comments listed below need not necessarily be incorporated into the

prepared statement but, I do feel a need to make sure they are part of the record in so much as the administration was involved in the evolution of the report. My comments should in no way be construed to appear we are against any of the recommendations, only that certain considerations need to be addressed. Please see my comments below:

Section 1, #4 – The rebate from RIRRC varies greatly from year to year based upon the value of the materials. For several years there was no rebate. RIRRC is changing to a single stream facility and may not have any rebate until those costs are covered. Additionally, the Administration has been utilizing the rebate to offset the increased cost of trash/recycling/yard waste pick up from year to year. Regarding increased recycling the Public Works Department and the Administration are discussing ways to increase recycling volume without increased costs. To that end the City has had meetings with Waste Zero and Recycle Bank to discuss options available. Both Companies have a public outreach and education program.

The observation as to the workings is appropriate, and one you pointed out at the Commission meetings. The wording of the recommendation is to use the "Increased Revenues". Now how that increased revenues is defined is another matter as the context of recycling and reimbursement may well be changing, but we do not know as of yet if indeed it will, and if it does how it will change. One point of this recommendation is that this is an area to look at for new dollars (even though they are relative smaller amounts in the overall scale of things) which can be applied to energy saving projects which will save more money. If this turns out not to be a viable source, so be it.

(comment in red typeface by Kenneth J. Filarski)

Section 2, #1 – As we all know, the RI Green Buildings Act exempts buildings < 5000 Ft². Some projects of less than 5,000 Ft² may not be a neutral cost to apply the requirement. Rather than requiring it to apply to every project, projects under 5000 Ft² should be evaluated based upon the additional cost and expected savings. Added costs for any building will first come in the design stage. With fewer professionals available to perform this complex work, the price can expected to be greater. The next consideration is the availability of building inspectors and engineers working for the City who are qualified in LEED standards who would be

tasked to oversee this work. The City has the potential to educate at least one current building inspector and pay for this credential (materials, test prep, certification maintenance). As this constitutes a change of their job description, grade levels and pay schedule. Being the first to adopt these criteria for all buildings regardless of size is not necessarily beneficial (except for bragging rights).

As part of the discussion as to the potential adoption and implementation of this consideration should be given to the fact that the State Building Commission received considerable funds from the US Department of Energy to train building officials regarding the new energy code. They have conducted a series of workshops to date. The inquiry should be made to the SBC if they would provide the training funds for this as it is an extension of the Green Buildings Act. The other way to approach this is to have the design professional, architect and/or engineer, provide the necessary certification for the construction documents themselves. The State Building Code already has a provision wherein the design professional has to provide certification as to construction administration in the normal course of a project and this requirement would apply here as well.

(comment in red typeface by Kenneth J. Filarski)

Section 2, #6 - Company may not own or maintain the building they work from and may otherwise be qualified. Points should be considered in the qualification and experience section of the proposal based upon the projects they have completed that are sustainable.

This recommendation does not deal with owning or maintaining the building the offeror/bidder works from, but rather the incorporation of practices, procedures, products, and experience in sustainability. The sustainability of the facility they work out of may be a consideration, as are other considerations. The City could put the burden on the offeror/bidder as to provide information that would meet the criteria established by the City, as they do with other Request For Proposal and Bidding information requirements.

(comment in red typeface by Kenneth J. Filarski)

Section 2, #7- Information and guidance on practices and products need to be evaluated to determine their appropriateness to our specific application and use. Further, they would need to be monitored long term to document the true versus the perceived cost benefits. This may not necessarily be a neutral cost.

Your comment is one of good business practice in the private or public sector which should be applied as a matter of course to any practices and products used over time by the entity purchasing those items. In other words it should be done now with any products or practices regardless of whether they are considered sustainable, so-called green or not.

(comment in red typeface by Kenneth J. Filarski)

Gerald Cordy
City of Cranston, Rhode Island
401-780-3167
gcordy@cranstonri.org