

Furnishing Government Employees with a Sustainable Future

A strategy to improve quality of life, reduce pollution and cut expenditure by up to 80% through better management of government furniture assets

A white paper from The Refinishing Touch

March 2009

Executive Summary

As stewards of the nation's resources, the US Federal Government has a responsibility to ensure its practices are as environmentally sustainable as possible. Since all expenditure is funded through taxation, there is an additional responsibility: US citizens trust and require their government to spend wisely, in order to ensure that as much money as possible can be invested to create societal benefits.

How does the government live up to these responsibilities? On paper, extremely well. There are statutory requirements in place with the creation of many government procurement rules to ensure that its resource use follows environmental best practices, and is never wasteful.

In practice, however, the story is different. Lack of adequate management systems means that the rules can be unenforceable, and there is little support for reuse and repair of certain assets.

This white paper focuses on the challenge of managing furniture assets across federal government bodies. This is not a trivial issue: the US Federal Government arguably owns the largest inventory of furniture assets in the world.

At a time when the economy is in recession, governments must be innovative to make best use of the funds and resources at their disposal, and to demonstrate a solid commitment to environmental sustainability initiatives.

As this paper shows, there is a strategy that can save the US government 40-80% of its current expenditure on furniture assets. That saving can then be used for more value-creating activities. Crucially, these additional funds can be generated without needing to increase taxation or making spending cuts elsewhere.

And, most importantly, generating that revenue requires no compromise. It meets the US Federal Government's own standards for environmental best practices, and provides the high quality assets that government employees deserve for their work and accommodation.

The furniture procurement rulebook

The US Government has been far-sighted in drafting rules to ensure green procurement. As far back as 1990, the Pollution Prevention Act found that:

“Source reduction is fundamentally different and more desirable than waste management and pollution control. The Environmental Protection Agency needs to address the historical lack of attention to source reduction.”¹

More recently, Presidential Executive Order 12343 Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy and Transportation Management of 2007 made the Heads of Agencies directly responsible for implementing sustainable practices. Their goals should be to ensure that their agencies reduce the quantity of toxic and hazardous chemicals and materials acquired, used or disposed of by the agency; to divert solid waste as far as possible; and to maintain cost-effective waste prevention and recycling programs in their facilities.²

USC Title 40 attempts to ensure that environmentally sustainable best practices are followed for government procurement. It makes specific reference to furniture assets, stating:

A department or agency of the Federal Government may not use amounts provided by law to purchase furniture if the Administrator of General Services determines that requirements can reasonably be met by transferring excess furniture, including rehabilitated furniture, from other departments or agencies pursuant to this subtitle.³

A common thread running through all these requirements is that if an asset can be rehabilitated, that is preferable to sending it for waste disposal and replacing it with something new. Refurbishment reduces solid waste, and lowers the pollution and carbon emissions associated with transporting the new and old assets, and with manufacturing the new. In principle, government organizations should be deeply committed to rehabilitating existing furniture assets, both from a cost point of view and from the point of view of ensuring sustainability and lowering environmental impact.

Evidence, however, suggests that in practice, these rules and guidelines are not being adhered to. Some US federal agencies are known to spend over 100 times more on new furniture acquisition than on furniture repair⁴. Given that the number of government employees and premises is not rising in line with this massive expenditure on new furniture, the majority of the new furniture purchases must be replacing existing assets, many of which could have been rehabilitated. While these rules may have been successful in promoting the need for sustainable government and introducing many sustainable procurement practices, current practices means that the management and procurement of furniture is currently not achieving environmental sustainability.

¹ Pollution Prevention Act 1990, §13101 (a) (4)

² Executive Order: Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy and Transportation Management, January 24, 2007, The White House.

³ USC Title 40, § 528. Utilization of excess furniture

⁴ 'Fact Sheet - Furniture Renovation Efficiencies'

Furniture asset management: the challenge

USC Title 40 is difficult to enforce due to the challenge of managing furniture assets. The sheer volume of inventory is daunting: every federal employee requires several pieces of furniture, whether they are desks, bookcases and chairs in an office; or desks, nightstands and headboards for military personnel.

It is difficult to know about the condition, location and availability of a particular piece of furniture for people who do not use it, or walk past it in the course of their work. There is no consistent registry that is available that documents all the furniture the Federal Government owns, so that existing furniture can be allocated where it is most needed.

As a result, the Administrator of General Services has limited ability to meet its responsibility under Title 40 to determine whether existing assets can be reused or rehabilitated before new ones are procured.

Until the late 1980s, furniture was actively managed using asset codes. Since then, furniture has become unmanaged, and its costs have become uncontrolled as a result. Inconsistencies in how furniture is procured may mean that it becomes an invisible cost, hidden in the construction budget for new offices, buildings or dormitories. For renovations and upkeep of existing facilities, the cost of furniture can be incorporated in the operations and maintenance budget. When surplus funds are available departments frequently acquire furniture to spend and secure budgets. But without a single line item covering all furniture assets, few departments have a clear view of how much they are spending. As a result, it is impossible for them to have confidence that their expenditure on furniture is optimal.

The end result of this lack of management is that there is no "corporate" view of the inventory. Furniture is seen as a number of piecemeal procurements, each with a value measured in hundreds of dollars. Combined, these assets sum to billions of dollars across all federal agencies and departments. Because there is no structured information about how this money is spent and how these assets are managed, there are missed opportunities to reuse resources and divert waste.

Often there is no consistent timeframe or a realistic plan for replacing furniture assets, which results in ad-hoc replacements being made as funds become available. This makes it difficult to ensure furniture management consistently meets the standards required for functionality, comfort and safety.

Because furniture is not actively managed, it is impossible for federal agencies and departments to meet their statutory obligations under the 1990 Pollution Prevention Act, the 2007 Executive Order cited above, and USC Title 40.

Myths about furniture refurbishment

Many agencies and departments will hesitate to refurbish furniture because they believe they will need to send it away for refinishing, leaving them to struggle without it in the meantime. That is no longer true. Today's refinishing practices are incomparable to the destructive practices that used toxic chemicals to strip and burn. These outdated practices created the problem of how to handle, manage and dispose of chemically complex substances such as ethylene dichloride, methyl ethyl ketone and toluene diisocyanate.

This has all changed. Refinishing specialists have carried out comprehensive research to produce modern processes, materials and tools that use low levels of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) with sustainable waterborne and clean technologies. Processes and materials are sensitive to the environment. By-products are not hazardous and are free from harmful and controlled chemicals.

This means that refinishing can now be performed on site, with minimal disruption, without requiring any special licenses, and in full compliance with local, state and federal fire codes.

Some agencies believe that the quality of refinished work is inferior to that of new furniture. In fact, existing furniture can be restored to a higher quality than the new furniture that many agencies are forced to buy due to limited budgets. Many organizations regularly dispose of high quality furniture assets simply because they appear to be poor condition, replacing them with low-quality system furniture. This is a false economy, because the new furniture will only have a fraction of the lifespan of the original.

There is also a myth about how long furniture should be expected to last. Because businesses are able to capitalize furniture investments over a seven year period, many in the private sector believe that furniture should be replaced every seven years.

Indeed, that tax ruling was originally created to stimulate the US economy. Now that the vast majority of furniture is imported from Asia, that tax break is instead helping to support manufacturing operations overseas. The mindset that furniture should be replaced every seven years has spilled over into government, with the result that US tax dollars are being spent needlessly buying furniture sourced from overseas.

In order for furniture refinishing to become more widely accepted, it is essential that its benefits are communicated and adopted - throughout government departments and agencies.

How furniture refinishing works

Furniture refinishing is neither risky nor unproven. For over thirty years, hotels and universities have depended on new technologies that enable smarter, faster, and greener furniture refinishing to cost-effectively improve the quality of accommodation offered to their guests and students.

The process is quick and easy. Best practice in the hospitality industry, for example, sees a specialist contractor take up a block of rooms for refinishing in the morning and return them to the hotel fully renovated by the end of the same business day. The new technology has no requirement to transport furniture, close down a section of the hotel, or lose the use of the guest rooms for more than a few hours. The refinishing contractor can commit to returning rooms to their original set-up, so the hotel is able to outsource the entire activity with confidence.

This new technology allows refinishing to include:

- ❑ All surfaces cleaned with suitable water based solvent to remove oils, grease, wax, films and dirt to ensure good adhesion of finishing materials
- ❑ All surfaces sanded to smoothness using a combination of sandpaper and abrasive pads to remove loose, flaking or damaged coatings utilizing a system good up to 99% filtration
- ❑ All gouges and deep scratches filled to match stains
- ❑ All surfaces sealed and finished to match color sample provided, meeting UV breakdown and fade parameters
- ❑ All surfaces color blended and toned to accomplish a uniform effect
- ❑ All minor repair work such as loose and broken joints repaired
- ❑ All surfaces top coated using high-density waterborne lacquers

The process can also include the adaptation of furniture, such as converting obsolete hotel armoires, no longer large enough to accommodate modern televisions, into chests of drawers. Professional on-site furniture refurbishment companies take special care to ensure there is no damage to floors or ceilings, use HEPA-rated dustless sanding techniques, and guarantee to use nonflammable, odor free and environmentally safe materials.

The resulting furnishings will be higher quality, more consistently styled and a better fit for purpose than new acquisitions, all at a fraction of the cost of new furniture. Professional refinishing companies will also provide the same warranties as those that come with newly-purchased furniture, and which either replace or supplement any existing warranties on the original furniture.

The US Government has a history of learning from the best innovations of the private sector, but so far this kind of furniture refurbishment has been the almost exclusive preserve of the private sector, as demonstrated by its widespread adoption by the hospitality industry. Hundreds of thousands of rooms are refinished across the hospitality industry every month. Leading brands such as Hilton, Marriott, Intercontinental Group (ICG), Starwood and the Wyndham have made a commitment to sustainable refinishing which enables them to simultaneously preserve their brand reputation, furniture assets, and the environment.

Furniture refurbishment: the cost-benefit analysis

By refurbishing instead of replacing, government organizations can save 40-80% of their current expenditure on furniture. The following pages contain five cost-benefit analyses demonstrating the kind of savings that can be made across various government organizations.

These examples show that depending on the quantity and type of furniture that needs renewing, savings can be as high as 72% on a replacement bill of \$1,023,232 or even 84% on a replacement bill of \$1,104,448.

These analyses focus primarily on cost savings, but it is also important to note the significantly reduced impact on the environment. It is not just freight costs that are avoided; so is the high carbon footprint associated with transporting new furniture assets, which are usually sourced from Asia; and landfill waste is reduced because existing assets are preserved and their lifetime extended.

The Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 explicitly states that:

The Congress hereby declares it to be the national policy of the United States that pollution should be prevented or reduced at the source whenever feasible; pollution that cannot be prevented should be recycled in an environmentally safe manner, whenever feasible; pollution that cannot be prevented or recycled should be treated in an environmentally safe manner whenever feasible; and disposal or other release into the environment should be employed only as a last resort and should be conducted in an environmentally safe manner.⁵

In addition, the Act states that the US government will, through the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA):

• coordinate source reduction activities in each Agency Office and coordinate with appropriate offices to promote source reduction practices in other Federal agencies.⁶

It is clear that refinishing existing furniture onsite significantly reduces levels of transportation, sourcing of new materials and the disposal of existing furniture assets in landfills; thus complying both with the letter and the spirit of the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990.

Government agencies can demonstrate their commitment to the environment, and the tax payer, by cutting resource consumption, limiting environmental impact and considering cost-effective ways of procuring furniture assets.

The following analyses demonstrate the potential savings that can be made across key agencies, both military and non-military.

⁵ Pollution Prevention Act 1990

⁶ Pollution Prevention Act 1990

Fort Jackson

Qty	Item	New furniture		Furniture refinishing	
		Unit Cost	Extension	Unit Cost	Extension
138	Dressers	\$ 358.20	\$ 49,431.60	\$ 71.64	\$ 9,886.32
276	Mirror	\$ 85.65	\$ 23,639.40	\$ 17.13	\$ 4,727.88
138	Double Headboards	\$ 111.80	\$ 15,428.40	\$ 22.36	\$ 3,085.68
138	Nightstands	\$ 182.40	\$ 25,171.20	\$ 36.48	\$ 5,034.24
138	Television Stands-1Drawer	\$ 180.80	\$ 24,950.40	\$ 36.16	\$ 4,990.08
138	Lounge Chairs	\$ 598.00	\$ 82,524.00	\$ 206.20	\$ 28,455.60
138	Living Room-Desks	\$ 356.90	\$ 49,252.20	\$ 71.38	\$ 9,850.44
138	Living Room-Television Stands-2 Shelves	\$ 174.45	\$ 24,074.10	\$ 34.89	\$ 4,814.82
138	Coffee Tables	\$ 152.25	\$ 21,010.50	\$ 30.45	\$ 4,202.10
138	2 Position Arm Chairs	\$ 479.80	\$ 66,212.40	\$ 95.96	\$ 13,242.48
276	Bar Stools	\$ 289.00	\$ 79,764.00	\$ 95.14	\$ 26,258.64
138	Lounge Chairs	\$ 598.00	\$ 82,524.00	\$ 206.20	\$ 28,455.60
138	Ottomans	\$ 357.00	\$ 49,266.00	\$ 102.04	\$ 14,081.52
138	Loveseats	\$ 899.00	\$ 124,062.00	\$ 442.00	\$ 60,996.00
136	Kitchen Units	\$ 12,950.00	\$ 1,761,200.00	\$ 3,997.91	\$ 543,715.76
136	Bathroom Units	\$ 309.55	\$ 42,098.80	\$ 61.91	\$ 8,419.76
		Sub Total	\$ 2,520,609.00	Sub Total	\$ 770,216.92
		+ Shipping	\$ 5,628.80		
		+ Installation	\$ 4,925.20		
		+8% Sales Tax	\$ 201,648.72		
		Total Cost	\$ 2,732,811.72	Total Cost	\$ 770,216.92

This represents a saving of 72% over the cost of new furniture.

Potter Steward Courthouse

Qty	Item	New furniture		Furniture refinishing	
		Unit Cost	Extension	Unit Cost	Extension
11	U Shaped Desk	\$ 1,378.30	\$ 15,161.30	\$ 363.66	\$ 4,000.26
1	Bookcase	\$ 288.55	\$ 288.55	\$ 97.71	\$ 97.71
2	Overhead Unit for Desk	\$ 1,175.00	\$ 2,350.00	\$ 343.66	\$ 687.32
28	Traditional Arm Chair	\$ 375.00	\$ 10,500.00	\$ 164.28	\$ 4,599.84
		Sub Total	\$ 28,299.85	Sub Total	\$ 9,385.13
		+ Shipping	\$ 5,628.80		
		+ Installation	\$ 4,925.20		
		+8% Sales Tax	\$ 2,263.98		
		Total Cost	\$ 41,117.83	Total Cost	\$ 9,385.13

This represents a saving of 77% over the cost of new furniture.

NAS Pensacola

Qty	Item	New furniture		Furniture refinishing	
		Unit Cost	Extension	Unit Cost	Extension
174	Study Chair	\$ 395.00	\$ 68,730.00	\$ 119.58	\$ 20,806.92
541	Arm Chair	\$ 248.00	\$ 134,168.00	\$ 73.68	\$ 39,860.88
2,240	Two Position Chair	\$ 289.00	\$ 647,360.00	\$ 79.60	\$ 178,304.00
8	Sofa-3 Loose Seat/Back Cushions	\$ 1,017.00	\$ 8,136.00	\$ 339.00	\$ 2,712.00
95	Lounge Chair	\$ 492.00	\$ 46,740.00	\$ 164.30	\$ 15,608.50
66	Meefing Chair	\$ 492.90	\$ 32,531.40	\$ 164.30	\$ 10,843.80
		Sub Total	\$ 937,665.40	Sub Total	\$ 268,136.10
		+ Shipping	\$ 5,628.80		
		+ Installation	\$ 4,925.20		
		+8% Sales Tax	\$ 75,013.23		
		Total Cost	\$ 1,023,232.63	Total Cost	\$ 268,136.10

This represents a saving of 74% over the cost of new furniture.

US House of Representatives

Qty	Item	New furniture		Furniture refinishing	
		Unit Cost	Extension	Unit Cost	Extension
365	Desk/Cannon D-5N (Large)	\$ 2,417.00	\$ 882,205.00	\$ 406.44	\$ 148,350.60
188	Desk/Cannon D-5N (Small)	\$ 695.00	\$ 130,660.00	\$ 110.00	\$ 20,680.00
		Sub Total	\$ 1,012,865.00	Sub Total	\$ 169,030.60
		+ Shipping	\$ 5,628.80		
		+ Installation	\$ 4,925.20		
		+8% Sales Tax	\$ 81,029.20		
		Total Cost	\$ 1,104,448.20	Total Cost	\$ 169,030.60

This represents a saving of 84% over the cost of new furniture

Maxwell Airforce Base

Qty.	Item	New furniture		Furniture refinishing	
		Unit Cost	Total	Unit Cost	Total
40	Desk	\$ 543.75	\$ 21,750.00	\$ 59.40	\$ 2,376.00
260	Night Table	\$ 157.50	\$ 40,950.00	\$ 29.75	\$ 7,735.00
130	Desk Chair	\$ 137.00	\$ 17,810.00	\$ 52.80	\$ 6,864.00
40	Headboard	\$ 111.00	\$ 4,440.00	\$ 19.20	\$ 768.00
90	Headboard	\$ 188.00	\$ 16,920.00	\$ 19.20	\$ 1,728.00
90	Desk	\$ 780.00	\$ 70,200.00	\$ 90.60	\$ 8,154.00
90	Desk Carrel	\$ 145.00	\$ 13,050.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 4,050.00
79	Desk	\$ 176.00	\$ 13,904.00	\$ 59.40	\$ 4,692.60
158	Night Table	\$ 173.00	\$ 27,334.00	\$ 29.75	\$ 4,700.50
52	Arm Chair	\$ 181.00	\$ 9,412.00	\$ 93.50	\$ 4,862.00
62	Desk Chair	\$ 161.00	\$ 9,982.00	\$ 89.90	\$ 5,573.80
79	Headboard	\$ 111.00	\$ 8,769.00	\$ 19.20	\$ 1,516.80
80	Armoire	\$ 898.00	\$ 71,840.00	\$ 62.40	\$ 4,992.00
	<i>Subtotal</i>		<u>\$ 326,361.00</u>		<u>\$ 58,012.70</u>
		+ Shipping	\$ 5,628.80		
		+ Installation	\$ 4,925.20		
		+8% Sales Tax	\$ 26,108.88		
	Total Cost		<u>\$ 363,023.88</u>		<u>\$ 58,012.70</u>

This represents a saving of 84% over the cost of new furniture

Finding the furniture in the budgets

If such savings are possible, why are they not being made? One reason is that lack of published numbers and distinct details of budget or line items for furniture which limits visibility of overall costs. As a result, the expense of new furniture is often invisible.

Where substantial furnishing projects exist, the funding request could appear under operations & maintenance, procurement, family housing, military construction, or other procurement. Rarely is the word -furniture used explicitly in the budgets, although some exceptions indicate the scale of savings that could be made:

- The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) requested \$120,000,000 in FY2008 for a headquarters consolidation program at the St. Elizabeths West Campus in Washington, DC. This was to be spent on information technology, physical security, furniture. The DHS also requested \$6,000,000 for basic tenant improvements at the Nebraska Avenue Complex (NAC), a facility that is currently owned by the General Services Administration but which the DHS will take over as its headquarters. That sum is likely to include a substantial allocation for furnishings.⁷ If we conservatively estimate that a third of both sums is intended for new furniture, savings of over \$29,000,000 would be possible if furniture refinishing were used instead.⁸
- In the courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services, up to \$27,817,000 was allocated in FY2008 for space alteration projects and for furniture and furnishings related to new space alteration and construction projects.⁹ Even if only a third of that sum were allocated to furniture, the Federal Government could save \$6,490,633 by refinishing existing furniture instead of buying new.¹⁰
- The Marine Corp has requested \$66,200,000 for its FY2009 budget for collateral equipment/furniture required to outfit the USMC Barracks 2.0 initiative.¹¹ Even if only half of that sum was to be spent on furniture, cost savings of \$23,170,000 could be made if existing furniture were to be refinished, instead of new furniture being bought.¹²

Throughout the budget, there are many more projects which could include significant investments in furniture, but which are not explicitly detailed as such.

⁷ The Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, Department of Homeland Security, p444

⁸ Assuming furniture refinishing costs 30% of the cost of buying new furniture

⁹ The Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, Judicial Branch, p45

¹⁰ Assuming furniture refinishing costs 30% of the cost of buying new furniture

¹¹ Office of the Secretary of Defense Operation and Maintenance Overview, February 2008, http://www.defenselink.mil/comptroller/defbudget/fy2009/fy2009_overview.pdf

¹² Assuming furniture refinishing costs 30% of the cost of buying new furniture

It is possible to estimate the potential impact on the entire US Federal Government inventory of refinishing furniture instead of replacing it. An estimate can be made based on the following conservative assumptions:

1. Most furniture assets are replaced on a cycle no longer than 10 years.
2. Each government employee utilizes furniture assets worth at least \$1,500 that qualify for refinishing. At the lowest point on the scale, this could consist of a soldier's bedroom furniture, rising to a midlevel employee's office or conference room furniture, and at the top end, the furnishings for a judge's chamber.
3. Refinishing most furniture assets can be performed at an average cost of one-third the cost of replacement.

Using these assumptions, the following cost savings can be estimated:

MILITARY and WORKFORCE HEADCOUNT

Active Duty Troops	1,404,686	¹³
Civilian Support	671,916	¹⁴
Federal Workforce	2,687,894	¹⁵
TOTAL	4,764,496	

REPLACEMENT COST OF FURNITURE ASSETS PER PERSON

Federal Workforce	4,764,496
Per Person Cost	\$ 1,500
TOTAL	\$ 7,146,744,000

REPLACEMENT COST PER YEAR ON 10 YEAR CYCLE

Replacement Cost	\$ 7,146,744,000
Per Year Replacement	10%
TOTAL	\$ 714,674,400

REFINISHING COST OF THE ASSETS SCHEDULED FOR REPLACEMENT

Furniture to be Replaced	\$ 714,674,400
Refinishing Cost Rate	30%
TOTAL	\$ 214,402,320

ANNUAL COST SAVINGS TO BUDGETS AND TAXPAYERS

Furniture Replacement	\$ 714,674,400
Furniture Refinishing	\$ 214,402,320
TOTAL SAVING	\$ 500,272,080

¹³ Armed forces strength figures for October 31, 2008, DoD personnel & procurement statistics, <http://siadapp.dmdc.osd.mil/personnel/MILITARY/ms0.pdf>

¹⁴ Figure for Total Paid Direct Hire Employment taken from civilian employment statistics, September 2008, DoD personnel & procurement statistics, <http://siadapp.dmdc.osd.mil/personnel/CIVILIAN/fy2008/september2008/september2008.pdf>

¹⁵ Total civilian employment, Federal Employment Statistics, January 2008, US Office of Personnel Management, <http://www.opm.gov/feddata/html/2008/january/table1.asp>

Conclusion

Providing a good quality work environment is essential if government employees are to perform to the best of their abilities.

At the same time, the US Federal Government has a responsibility as the steward of the nation's resources to ensure that all procurement is environmentally sustainable, and that resources are not wasted.

It also has a responsibility to ensure that tax dollars are spent wisely, so that resources are available as far as possible to deliver societal benefits.

By refinishing furniture instead of replacing it, it is possible to:

- ❑ Improve furniture assets for federal employees.
- ❑ Cut environmental costs, and reduce the environmental impact of day-to-day government activities.
- ❑ Save up to 80% on furniture costs.

In order to achieve these returns, the US Federal Government must:

- ❑ Ensure that budget-holders are aware of the benefits and process for refinishing furniture, and are aware of companies with a proven track record that have GSA contracts to deliver refinishing services.
- ❑ Ensure that budget-holders are aware of their responsibility to ensure environmentally sound procurement practices are followed, even for one-off furniture acquisitions.
- ❑ Plan to implement more robust furniture inventory tracking to ensure that the Administrator of General Services is able to meet its responsibility under Title 40 to determine whether existing assets can be reused or rehabilitated before new ones are procured.

As the estimates here demonstrate, federal government departments and agencies can make significant savings on their operations and maintenance or construction budgets by opting to refurbish their furniture assets instead of replacing them. Even using conservative assumptions, the return on investment for the US taxpayer could be in excess of \$400,000,000 (four hundred million dollars) per year and with a refinishing cost of only \$214m instead of a \$714m replacement cost, this represents a three fold reduction in expenditure on furniture assets.

About The Refinishing Touch

The Refinishing Touch is a commercial refinishing and reupholstering company. Since 1977, the Refinishing Touch has been dedicated to closed loop recycling and pollution prevention. The company has recycled over 1.5 million units of furniture nationwide.

The company was presented with the Evergreen Award by the GSA National Furniture Center, part of the White House Closing the Circle Award Program. The Evergreen Award recognizes efforts in government contractors' efforts in recycling, affirmative procurement and waste reduction and aims to set an example for other GSA National Furniture Center business partners to follow.

The Refinishing Touch has a GSA contract to supply refinishing services to US government departments and agencies under GSA contractor number GS-29F-0002M.

www.therefinishingtouch.com