CHAPTER: SUSTAINABLE PURCHASING POLICY

KC Hoppel

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 Overview

Collectively, institutions spend billions of dollars on goods and services annually. Each purchasing decision represents an opportunity for institutions to choose environmentally and socially preferable products and services and support companies with strong commitments to sustainability. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) notes that environmentally preferable products are “products or services that have a lesser or reduced effect on human health and the environment when compared with competing products or services that serve the same purpose” (US EPA, 2018). This comparison applies to raw materials, manufacturing, packaging, distribution, use, reuse, operation, maintenance, and disposal. By following sustainable procurement guidelines, institutions can meet their needs for goods and services in a way that achieves value for money on a whole life basis. This could generate benefits not only to the organization, but also to society and the economy as a whole, all whilst minimizing damage to the environment. These purchasing decisions should aim for products that minimize water consumption, energy use, greenhouse gas (notably carbon dioxide) emissions, efficient natural resource use, waste minimization, and fair and ethical trade practices.

Higher education is in a unique position to influence and benefit from sustainable purchasing decisions, all while supporting the triple bottom line of economic prosperity, environmental health, and social equity. Institutions benefit from sustainable procurement by receiving more efficient and long-lasting products, protecting and enhancing the local and global environment, supporting innovative technologies, creating a diverse supply chain, and gaining a competitive edge as a leading institution. By employing Life Cycle Analyses (LCAs), altering the guidelines for the vendors and contractors with which it does business, and favoring third-party certified environmentally and socially preferable products, universities can help maximize the net social benefits for their campus and wider society.

To help elucidate the need for a sustainable purchasing policy, while ensuring the University does not incur a significant increase in purchasing costs, a few cost-benefit analyses were performed comparing the products, services, and materials the University currently purchases with alternative, more environmentally preferable ones. A few of the products that were considered include office supplies, furniture, and cleaning supplies.

1.2 History of Sustainable Purchasing

1.2.1 General Sustainability Efforts

Chapman University maintains its commitment to a “campus culture that promotes a sustainable future” in its Sustainability Policy, which was implemented in 2014. The University notes that this commitment is instrumental to Chapman’s mission to educate ethical and informed global citizens. The policy “calls upon all constituencies of the University to carefully evaluate short- and long-term social, economic, and environmental impacts of decisions before acting.” The University has proven this commitment in various efforts such as installing water refill stations to limit single-use water bottles, outfitting landscape with native plants to conserve water, and adding occupancy and motion detectors in buildings to increase energy efficiency. However, the University has no mechanism to ensure this sustainable decision-making process occurs. One of the surest ways to guarantee this change is to enact a University-wide sustainable purchasing policy that ensures consistency between departments.
1.2.2 Procurement

The last Environmental Audit done on campus that considered procurement was in 2013. This audit looked at office supplies, inter- and inner-office electronic systems, furniture reuse, and cleaning supplies. The 2013 Audit found that Chapman has increased its office paper up to 30% post-consumer recycled content (PCC), implemented a furniture reuse program between departments, installed double-sided printing as the default setting on most printers, implemented “Blue Cleaning” initiatives to reduce chemical use in cleaning supplies, and increased its recycling efforts throughout campus to reduce the need to buy more (2013 Chapman University Environmental Audit).

The 2013 Audit also included in its campus survey a few questions surrounding a sustainable purchasing policy, which the majority (64%) of faculty and staff believed was necessary to have on campus. In its “Future Recommendations”, the 2013 Audit noted to focus on implementing a sustainable purchasing policy on-campus moving forward. Therefore, as many other institutions of higher education (including a few of Chapman’s aspirational schools such as Seattle University and Tufts University, as well as a few of the University’s peer institutions such as Loyola Marymount University and the University of San Diego) have already done, Chapman University needs to enact a sustainable purchasing policy to be consistent and help achieve its sustainability goals.

1.3 Current Status of Sustainable Purchasing

1.3.1 Sustainable Procurement

Chapman University does not currently have a sustainable purchasing policy, nor does the current purchasing policy consider any sort of environmental costs when procuring products, or services (Appendix 2 & 3). The main goal of this chapter of the audit is to show the benefits of enacting a campus-wide sustainable purchasing policy that every department must follow when purchasing any goods, services, or materials used on-campus. This policy would require the acquisition of products that are more environmentally preferable, have life-cycle information available, and preferably third-party verified such as Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) for wood/paper products, Green Label certified for carpets, Green Seal for paints and adhesives, and to have all other products the university buys contain Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) reports from the companies that are clear, accurate, relevant, transparent, and robust.

1.3.2 Office Supply Purchases

Current office supplies for the University are purchased through Office Solutions, one of the largest independent office products and services dealers in the country. The company provides recycling services in its “commitment to environmental sustainability” that includes white paper, colored paper, toners, electronics, batteries, and cardboard (Office Solutions, 2018). The website also includes multiple common misconceptions about paper manufacturing that prove it can be used responsibly as part of home and office sustainability efforts (Paper Because, 2018). A few of these misconceptions include the fact that making paper doesn’t only destroy forests, but also plants millions of trees daily, and that making paper doesn’t consume as much energy and fossil fuels as it once did—as many pulp manufactures have switched to alternative energy sources (Paper Because, 2018).

Chapman University has a general purchasing order form that each department uses to request the order of supplies, which is ultimately approved by Chapman’s Purchasing Department (Appendix 1). Products that are recycled with at least 10% post-consumer content (PCC) are indicated with a green recycling logo, which make up 21% of the total Office Solutions products the University purchases. Additionally, the University does purchase supplies that are well above 10% PCC, shown in Appendix 4.
To determine the true environmental impacts from Chapman’s office paper, a cost-benefit analysis was performed between the currently purchased Office Solutions 30% PCC recycled office paper, and two more environmentally-friendly options: 50% PCC and 100% PCC Forest Stewardship Council certified recycled paper. Appendix 5 shows that after 10 years, the discounted present value of purchasing the 50% post-consumer content paper is about $2,000 more costly, while Appendix 6 proves that the 100% PCC paper is over $10,000 less costly than the 30% post-consumer content Office Solutions paper Chapman currently orders when the products’ whole life-cycle costs and environmental factors are taken into account. These environmental costs included the amount of water used to manufacture the paper, the waste created as a result of the paper manufacturing and disposal, the amount of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions released into the atmosphere during manufacturing, the amount of energy used in acquisition and manufacturing, as well as the amount of wood cut down during acquisition. These were ultimately monetized to determine the cost from each environmental impact. The annual cost to actually purchase the respective office paper amounts was also included, which was received from Chapman’s Procurement Administrator, Adey Oyenuga. These initial costs were between 20% and 60% greater (respectively for the 50% PCC and 100% PCC) on average than the current 30% PCC purchased through Office Solutions. The only true benefit associated with paper acquisition, manufacturing, transportation, and disposal is the carbon that is sequestered from the uncut trees in the 50% and 100% PCC, compared to the 30% PCC paper. The other benefits shown in Appendix 5 and 6 are the reduced costs from the currently purchased 30% PCC office paper.

This analysis only looked at office paper at three various levels of post-consumer content; however, additional cost-benefit analyses should be conducted that include whole life-cycle costs and benefits of various office products such as notepads, folders, Post-It notes, and alternative office papers to get a more holistic view of office supply purchases.

1.3.3 Furniture Purchases

According to Chapman’s Purchasing Department, furniture is purchased from multiple vendors including Office Solutions, Pivot, Huntington Business Interiors, Folio Furniture, and Campus Loft. Furniture is typically purchased for new faculty and staff or acquired from Facilities Management storage for items that are of good condition. However, as noted in chapters 2 and 3 of the Audit, new dormitories are currently being built where Facilities Management storage used to be, therefore, reuse will be used less in the future. As a result, sustainable purchasing of furniture is of greater importance to the University, and as such, a cost-benefit analysis was performed comparing the current most frequently purchased Herman Miller office chair to a more environmentally-friendly alternative, as well as a used chair from Facilities Management storage. Herman Miller, one of Chapman’s most popular vendors, has over 20 Cradle to Cradle certified products. This certification system guides designers and manufacturers through a “continual improvement process” that looks at a product through five categories: material health, material reutilization, renewable energy and carbon management, water stewardship, and social fairness (C2CCertified, 2018). The Cradle to Cradle certified Aeron chair was compared against the Celle chair, which—although not Cradle to Cradle certified—is GreenGuard certified (an alternative sustainability certification). Both chairs have Environmental Product Declarations that were utilized in the cost-benefit analysis to determine the discounted net benefits of the products, which included the costs associated with carbon emissions, energy demand, water use, and waste in the manufacturing and disposal of both products. Additionally, the products’ initial costs, maintenance, and refurbishing costs were also considered.

Appendix 7 shows that over 12 years, the discounted cost of purchasing a Cradle to Cradle certified Herman Miller office chair is almost identical to the currently purchased Celle chair, when environmental factors and maintenance are taken into account. However, the net benefit of utilizing the pre-used office chair from Facilities Management storage greatly exceeds the cost of purchasing the
other two Herman Miller alternatives (by over $2,000), as the only true costs were refurbishing and maintenance costs (Appendix 8).

1.3.4 Cleaning Supplies

On-campus custodial services are currently provided by Aramark. At Chapman, Aramark practices “Blue Cleaning”, which uses chemical-free cleaning to safely clean and disinfect Chapman’s campus with Electronically Activated Water (Aramark, 2018). It claims that the technology creates a non-toxic solution that kills bacteria in half the time required by traditional chemicals and cuts ingredient costs by 25%. The Orbio system uses tap water, a small amount of salt, and electricity to create an effective multi-surface cleaning solution on-site (Orbio Technologies, 2018). This solution can be used in floor scrubbing machines, automated carpet cleaning equipment, spray-and-wipe cleaning, touchless cleaners and more. The main benefits of the solution are cleaner surfaces without chemical residue, it’s safer for staff to use, more convenient than waiting for a chemical shipment, and there is less packaging waste. However, the Electronically-Activated Water (EAW) technology requires electricity to power the Orbio system, which uses energy from the grid, ultimately leading to emissions from power plants, as well as water to produce the cleaning solution. To better understand how much energy and water the system uses at Chapman, both were tracked over a three-day period using two different data loggers: the Kill-A-Watt electricity monitor and the Arrow Water Meter. The results from these meters were then compared against a life-cycle analysis report performed by a third-party environmental consulting firm to determine how the Orbio system compares to modern green cleaning products (Orbio Life-Cycle Analysis, 2011). Ultimately, when initial cost, maintenance, annual purchase, energy, emissions, and water use are taken into account, the Orbio system is much more cost-effective—after a 10-year period (Appendix 9).

1.3.5 Campus Survey Analysis

In order to understand the current knowledge and attitudes toward sustainable purchasing at Chapman, the 2018 Chapman Environmental Audit Survey was sent out to the entire campus community.

Out of all the faculty and staff that participated in the survey, 66% indicated that they share a responsibility of purchasing in their respective department. The average rate of change for new office supplies was every month, with 58% of the faculty and staff indicating that they made purchases every 6 weeks. The following graphs (Figures 1.1 & 1.2) demonstrate the general interest and willingness to purchase environmentally-friendly office supplies.
In addition to the number of faculty and staff that completed the survey, 542 students participated in the survey as well. The following graph (Figure 1.3) shows the general interest in implementing a sustainable purchasing policy on-campus.

*Figure 1.1. Percentage of faculty and staff (n=97) that personally believe it is important to have environmentally-friendly office supplies.*

*Figure 1.2. Percentage of faculty and staff (n=97) that would be willing to buy more environmentally-friendly office supplies at a similar or lower cost.*

*Figure 1.3. Percentage of undergraduate and graduate student (n=542) that believe a sustainable purchasing policy should be implemented on-campus.*
1.4 Concluding Assessments about Sustainable Purchasing

1.4.1 Areas of Progress
Chapman has made significant progress in environmental sustainability by installing water refill stations to limit single-use water bottles, outfitting landscape with native plants to conserve water, and adding occupancy/motion detectors in buildings to increase energy efficiency. In terms of procurement, the University has increased the percentage of recycled office paper to 30% post-consumer content (PCC), required purchasing orders to be sent electronically to reduce paper usage and storage space, and increased the initiatives by Aramark to reduce chemical use to provide consistent “Blue Cleaning” services to improve campus sustainability.

1.4.2 Areas in Which to Improve
Chapman can increase sustainable purchasing choices by implementing a sustainable purchasing policy—embedded into its existing Purchasing Policy. This sustainable purchasing policy could include prioritizing products that are third-party certified, such as Forest Stewardship Council, Green Seal, Green Label, and Energy Star to name a few. Additionally, using Life Cycle cost information and cost-benefit analyses to determine what products, services, and materials should be purchased on-campus would help ensure the most socially optimal choices are made for the University. One of the easiest ways to do this is by contracting more sustainable items for the purchase order forms with Office Solutions, including core items and non-core items alike. A central piece of this process is making sure that employees of the University are well aware of their purchasing options. By adding an additional option to choose more environmentally-preferable products such as 50% post-consumer recycled content office paper instead of the minimum 30% PCC paper on the Office Solutions requisition form (Appendix 1), the University can make strides toward achieving its sustainability goals.

1.4.3 Existing Gaps in Knowledge
This audit attempted to survey each college on campus, as well as the major departments, to get a general sense of procurement practices. Due to the unique structure of each department and school, there is no specific person who makes all purchasing decisions. Therefore, various faculty and staff, as well as student employees are involved, creating various barriers to efficient, more sustainable purchasing decisions. Additionally, not all cost breakdowns from purchasing orders are readily available because of this heterogeneity. More detailed reporting for records of purchases in each department needs to occur to help the Purchasing Department organize campus-wide purchasing records. With this knowledge, Chapman can better assess its spending and keep track of any improvements regarding sustainable procurement.

1.5 Recommendations
The main recommendation of this chapter of the audit is to create a campus-wide sustainable purchasing policy consistent with the University’s sustainability goals that is similar to the following:

Potential Chapman University Sustainable Purchasing Policy
Consistent with Chapman’s sustainability goals, the purpose of these guidelines is to support and facilitate the purchase of products, services and materials that minimize the harmful effects to the environment from their raw material acquisition, production, transportation, use, and disposition. It is
Chapman’s goal to purchase and use Environmentally Preferable Products (and services) whenever they can be acquired at similar total value (taking into account quality and Life Cycle information).

Guidelines:
1. All Chapman University personnel should purchase Environmentally Preferable Products (and services) whenever they can be acquired at similar total value (taking into account quality and Life Cycle information).
2. The University Purchasing Department will seek to secure contracts with suppliers that are environmental leaders in their respective markets whenever feasible.
3. Where such criteria are available, Chapman should procure Environmentally Preferable Products and services using criteria that have been established by governmental, or other widely-recognized authorities (e.g., Energy Star, EPA Eco Purchasing Guidelines, Green Seal, and Forest Stewardship Council).

Responsibilities of the Procurement Department
Chapman University is committed to actions designed to make efficient use of energy, water and other resources, and to protect the environment. It is the responsibility of the Procurement Department, in conjunction with all University departments, to promote the development and use of Environmentally Preferable Products (including services) through the following activities:
- Review contracts, bids, and specifications for goods and services to ensure that, whenever practicable and economical, they are amended to provide for the use of Environmentally Preferable Products.
- Consult with all departments to identify new Environmentally Preferable Products and services, as well as improvements/changes in industry standards that may impact the environment.
- Require the use of recycled materials and products by incorporating them in bid specifications where practicable.
- Purchase from suppliers that provide Environmentally Preferable Products and services, or suppliers that are environmentally conscious in their daily operations.
- Seek new suppliers and encourage existing suppliers to review the manner in which their goods are packaged. Work with suppliers in the areas of reduction and reuse of packaging materials.
- Use cost-benefit analysis and Life Cycle Cost to arrive at the correct sourcing decision – one that remains economically practical, reflects effective purchasing practices, satisfies the requirements of the user department, and supports the University’s sustainability goals.
- Make suppliers aware of Chapman’s Sustainable Procurement Guidelines.
- Develop tools to track goals, assist in identifying and financially evaluating green products and services, make it easier to measure achievement of goals, and integrate green purchasing into everyday decisions.
- Utilize the Sustainable Procurement Checklist for use in University purchasing.
- Participate in training for implementing and improving the procurement of environmentally friendly products.

Sustainable Procurement Checklist:
The following questions can help guide both Purchasing and departmental customers in minimizing the adverse environmental effects of their purchases.
First, determine if the product or service is truly necessary. The product with the least environmental impact will usually be the one that is not purchased at all. If a purchase is necessary, consider asking the supplier about the following (while considering product performance, cost, and availability):

---
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1. **Waste reduction**: Is the product reusable and/or technically recyclable? Is the product compostable? Will the product biodegrade over time?

2. **Packaging**: Is minimal packaging used? Is the packaging reusable and/or recyclable? Are recycled materials used to produce the packaging (what percent post-consumer waste)? Is the packaging compostable?

3. **Material source**: Are recycled materials used in the product (if so, what percentage)? If wood is used, how was it harvested? Is it Forest Stewardship Council certified?

4. **Energy efficiency**: Is the product energy efficient compared to competitive products? Are Energy Star rated products available? Can the product run on renewable fuels? Does the product require less energy to manufacture than competing products?

5. **Water efficiency**: Does the product require less water to manufacture than competing products?

6. **Minimizing Transportation**: Can the required products be obtained from local sources or can they be supplied by existing suppliers who already have delivery routes on campus?

7. **Supplier environmental record**: Is the company producing the product in compliance with all environmental laws and regulations? Can the company verify all environmental claims? Does the manufacturer/supplier have a company sustainability policy? Has the company conducted an environmental or waste audit? Has an environmental life-cycle analysis of the product (and its packaging) been conducted by a certified testing organization, such as Green Seal?

Environmentally Preferable Purchasing (EPP) Resources

a. EPA’s Comprehensive Procurement Guidelines (http://www.epa.gov/cpg/)

b. EPA’s EPP WebSite (www.epa.gov/oppt/epp)

c. EPPNet (www.erc.org/eppnet.html)

d. Green Seal (www.greenseal.org)

e. Energy Star (www.energystar.gov)


Additionally, Appendix 10 shows an example of a sustainable purchasing policy from the University of California, Santa Cruz, which utilizes multiple drop-down menus that provide vendors, purchasing officers, and stakeholders with a plethora of information to help them in their sustainable purchasing decisions. A few of these “menus” include what green purchasing is, how and when to purchase products sustainably, and a lengthy appendix to various useful links. A similar system could be implemented by Chapman University for ease of use (UCSC Green Purchasing Guide, 2018).

**Additional Recommendations**

1.5.1 **Low Cost/Effort**

- Increase the number of "green products" purchased through Office Solutions. One of the initial steps to implementing a University-wide sustainable purchasing policy should be to increase the number of items purchased through Office Solutions that are produced with at least 10% post-consumer recycled content (i.e. “green products”) from 20% to 30% of the total Purchasing Order Form (Appendix 1). This can be done by replacing a few of the current standard non-core items such as paper pads, envelopes, and Post-It notes with those that come from higher recycled content. The prices for these are slightly higher than the standard items, but with the current global increase in demand for more environmentally-friendly products, supply will soon increase, leading to price decreases. Therefore, as the price is likely to decrease in the near future, price breaks for these products should be discussed with Office Solutions for the next bidding process.
• Purchase more environmentally-friendly products that are similar or lower price. By expanding the purchasing options currently pursued by the University, more sustainable products and materials can be acquired at similar total value (when taking Life Cycle cost into account).

• Prioritize reusable furniture, buy used furniture, and buy furniture that is built to last. The most sustainable piece of furniture is an existing one. As other chapters of the Audit demonstrate, there are many great, high-quality pieces in Facilities Management storage that need only freshening up to give them a second life. The University should prioritize utilizing these pieces in outfitting any new construction projects. Additionally, the University should prioritize purchasing high quality used, and/or modular furniture as modular systems offer flexibility for new office arrangements, and can easily be repaired, extending the pieces’ useful life, and therefore decreasing future expenses. Herman Miller offers many products that are Cradle to Cradle certified, which should be prioritized. All of these decisions can be made while maintaining the campus’ high quality and design standards.

1.5.2 Medium Cost/Effort
• Implement a sustainable purchasing policy on campus. Many Universities, such as Tufts and Stanford University, have implemented sustainable procurement policies aimed at prioritizing more environmentally-friendly products and materials when they can be acquired at similar total value to those currently purchased. These purchasing policies are fairly extensive in hopes of guiding the Procurement Department throughout this change in their purchasing decisions. 74% of the Chapman faculty, staff, and students that participated in the 2018 Environmental Audit Survey believe that the University needs such a policy. The “Potential Chapman University Sustainable Purchasing Policy” including the guidelines and procurement checklist that are shown at the beginning of this Recommendations section of the chapter should be utilized in developing Chapman’s own sustainable purchasing policy.

• Purchase more environmentally-friendly products that are 0-5% greater in cost than the standard, currently purchased items. A third of the Chapman faculty and staff that participated in the 2018 Environmental Audit Survey and make purchasing decisions in their respective department or school noted that they would be willing to purchase more environmentally-friendly office supplies that were 0-5% greater in cost than the currently purchased products.

1.5.3 High Cost/Effort
• Purchase more environmentally-friendly products that are 5-10% greater cost. Although many environmentally-preferable products are at a greater cost than more standard items, when life-cycle information is included, the socially optimal choice is often the more environmentally-friendly as it takes into consideration the negative externalities imposed by the manufacturing, processing, transportation, and disposal of the products on the wider community. A few of the cost-benefit analyses that were completed prove this to be true. Additionally, more environmentally-friendly options are often better quality and will therefore last longer and require less maintenance, reducing costs in the long run. Therefore, if budgets allow, more environmentally-preferable alternatives that are of 5-10% greater initial cost should be prioritized.

1.5.4 Future Areas of Research
Additional ideas for future research that did not fit the scope of this audit but would be in the best interest for the University include a more comprehensive breakdown of spending for specific departments and their more environmentally-preferable alternatives. Cost-benefit analyses that include
Life Cycle cost should be utilized for these comparisons to ensure the most efficient use of University resources (i.e. capital) is undertaken when procuring all goods, materials, and services on-campus.

Further ideas of research involve considering vendors that follow fair and ethical trade practices as another important aspect of sustainable procurement. Research in this area would increase the comprehensiveness of this chapter, by including the social component of the triple bottom line of sustainability: environmental stewardship, economic viability, and social equity.

1.6 Contacts

Adey Oyenuga, Procurement Administrator, Purchasing Department, Chapman University (oyenuga@chapman.edu)

Carlos Chavez-Garcia, Chapman University Custodial Services, Aramark (ChavezGarciaCarlos@aramark.com)

Cindy Graves, Department Business Manager, Facilities Management, Chapman University (cgraves@chapman.edu)

Ken Gordon, Account Executive, Office Solutions (kgordon@officesolutions.com)

Mackenzie Crigger, Energy Conservation and Sustainability Manager, Facilities Management, Chapman University (crigger@chapman.edu, 714-997-6658 ext. 7370)
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### 1.8 Appendices

#### 1.8.1 Appendix 1

---

**Chapman University**

**OFFICE SUPPLY REQUISITION**

*Submit Order Form to Chapman Univ. Purchasing*

**Chapman University is a Green Campus - Order Recycled products when possible**

**Requester:**

**Date:**

**Dept #:**

**Ext:**

**Rev. 1/2015**

### Batteries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>U/M</th>
<th>Product #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BX</td>
<td>EVE</td>
<td>EN95</td>
<td>Batteries, D alkaline 12/bx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BX</td>
<td>EVE</td>
<td>EN90</td>
<td>Batteries, C alkaline 12/bx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BX</td>
<td>EVE</td>
<td>EN91</td>
<td>Batteries, AA alkaline 24/bx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BX</td>
<td>EVE</td>
<td>EN22</td>
<td>Batteries, 9V alkaline 12/bx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BX</td>
<td>EVE</td>
<td>EN92</td>
<td>Batteries, AAA alkaline 24/bx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correction Supplies / Crayons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>U/M</th>
<th>Product #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>WOC 12WE</td>
<td>Correction fluid, multi-purp. white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>75602</td>
<td>Correction tape, 1/16 single, wht. 2/pk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Labels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>U/M</th>
<th>Product #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BX</td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>5366</td>
<td>Label, file folder, laser, white, 15C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Binders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>U/M</th>
<th>Product Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BX</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>51010</td>
<td>Label, laser printer, 1x2, 75 sheets, clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BX</td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>5960</td>
<td>Label, laser, 1x2, 75 sheets, clear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paper / Pads / Post-It Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>U/M</th>
<th>Product Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>80101</td>
<td>Label, P/5, adrs. 2.5, 8X11, we (Ave 5260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BX</td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>5960</td>
<td>Label, laser, 1x2, 75 sheets, clear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>U/M</th>
<th>Product Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>11202</td>
<td>Paper, copy, 8.5X11, 20# wht. Recycled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>11212</td>
<td>Paper, copy, 8.5X11, 20# blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>11201</td>
<td>Paper, copy, 8.5X11, 20# canary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>11205</td>
<td>Paper, copy, 8.5X11, 20# goldernrod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>11203</td>
<td>Paper, copy, 8.5X11, 20# green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>11212</td>
<td>Paper, copy, 8.5X11, 20# orchid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>11204</td>
<td>Paper, copy, 8.5X11, 20# pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>HAM</td>
<td>103311</td>
<td>Paper, copy, 8.5X11, 20# salmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DZ</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>22000</td>
<td>Pad, 8.5X11, padded, glue top, canary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DZ</td>
<td>HAM</td>
<td>22000</td>
<td>Pad, 8.5X11, perf. canary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DZ</td>
<td>HAM</td>
<td>10630</td>
<td>Pad, 8.5X11, perf. white</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Calendars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>U/M</th>
<th>Product Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>35715</td>
<td>Paper, adding machine, 2.25&quot; x 12/pk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>35600</td>
<td>Pad, easel, 27X34.5, w/clear front &amp; back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Index cards, 3x5, lined, white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>35662</td>
<td>Post-it note pads, 1x1, yellow, 12/pk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>35668</td>
<td>Post-it note pads, 3X5, yellow, 12/pk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Clips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>U/M</th>
<th>Product Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>35672</td>
<td>Post-it note pad, 3X5, yellow, 12/pk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DZ</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>10220</td>
<td>Clips, binder, small, 12/bx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DZ</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>10210</td>
<td>Clips, binder, medium, 12/bx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DZ</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>10220</td>
<td>Clips, binder, large, 12/bx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sheet Protectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>U/M</th>
<th>Product Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BX</td>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>21129</td>
<td>Protector, sh/tb load, 11X8.5, 50/bx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Additional Items**

Symbol indicates items that are recycled with at least 10% post-consumer waste.