

	Organization/Affiliation	Comment	Response
1	American Chemistry Council	Not supportive of proposal in current form	Comment acknowledged.
2		Ordinance imposes mandate without any consideration of functionality or cost	The County understands that some businesses may have specific challenges related to costs or performance of alternative materials, so the ordinance allows for waivers in these circumstances on a case by case basis, as well as a more general waiver that may be granted by the Director of Public Works if a particular product type is identified as having no suitable alternative.
3		Ordinance assumes that some containers are easily "recyclable" and that "compostable" containers are readily available in terms of cost and performance	See response to comment #2.
4		Ordinance does not address issue of whether infrastructure is sufficient to accept and process alternative materials	Jurisdictions throughout the State are in the process of aligning and developing organics collection and processing systems to comply with the requirements set out in SB1383. While implementation of those requirements as well as of the ordinance is ongoing, the ordinance is well-timed to produce synergy with efforts related to SB1383.
5		Plastic containers are efficient in terms of minimizing air emissions, energy used, and reducing waterborne waste from manufacturing process.	Comment acknowledged.
6		Proposal abandons idea of plastic recycling when there are opportunities to grow and encourage local recycling markets and economic development	The ordinance solely applies to plastic food service ware which the UCLA study found is not recycled due to contamination and other issues. The County has programs in place to encourage local recycling markets, and supports plastics recycling.
7		Need uniform, statewide recycling and waste reduction policy that modernizes existing infrastructure, provides appropriate funding, ensures end-use markets and provides businesses with regulatory certainty. County should wait until either SB54 becomes law or initiative measure is voted on, and that County participate in statewide effort before considering any new local ordinances.	The County agrees that additional funding for recycling infrastructure is needed and supports statewide efforts to create such funding and infrastructure.
8		Instead of creating ban, consider framing issue in terms of transitioning to more circular economy.	Switching to compostable and fiber based options will help support a circular economy by ensuring that food service ware can be turned into compost and soil amendments that are valuable products for food producers.
9		Support "Five Actions for Sustainable Change" - increase recycling access, collection, and education for all materials.	Comment acknowledged.
10		Encourage County to work closely with industry to increase plastic recycling rate, e.g. Houston Recycling Collaboration.	Comment acknowledged, and the County welcomes partnership with industry.
11	Athens Services	Attached outreach and education materials created for Athens, and link to "What Goes Where Guide"	Comment acknowledged.
12		UCLA report is not accurate - Athens and other haulers are able to sort 1,2, and 5 plastics and sell to market.	Comment acknowledged, and will be communicated to the report authors.
13		The acceptance of Compostable products should be based on the local infrastructure and market (just as they do for recycling in the plastic pollution act). Bioplastics may be certified but are not acceptable at facilities and will cause contamination to organics stream.	Definition is being revised based on stakeholder feedback.

	Organization/Affiliation	Comment	Response
14	Athens Services (cont'd)	There are acceptable compostable items that are not certified compostable such as napkins, wood utensils and stirrers, wood plates, etc.	See response to comment #13.
15		Complaint based enforcement is not adequate, there needs to be a more robust process to identify when businesses are not in compliance.	This approach is based on the County's previous experience with the plastic bag ban. The County has the option to implement a more robust compliance program if the complaint based approach is determined to be inadequate.
16	California Restaurant Association - LA Chapter	Express strong opposition for proposed provisions which look to ban use of polystyrene food packaging, single use plastic food service products, and mandate reusable food ware to all food service facilities.	Comment acknowledged. Note that the ordinance's mandate for reusable food ware is limited solely to full service restaurants.
17		Share concerns about litter and want to encourage recycling and reduce food waste, and support packaging mandates that require food packaging materials to be recyclable or compostable.	Comment acknowledged.
18		EPS and plastic food containers are among the most efficient for keeping food fresh, and providing insulation at economical price and should not be banned.	Comment acknowledged.
19		Banning EPS and plastic food ware will not only limit options for business to choose appropriate material for their needs, but will prove challenging because of supply chain issues resulting from pandemic.	See response to comment #2.
20		The cost of foods, including food service ware has increased while supply has decreased, and alternative packaging can often be as high as 2-3 times more expensive.	See response to comment #2.
21		Switching to alternative materials that are less structurally effective will compromise the quality of the food, and can become a potential safety hazard.	See response to comment #2.
22		Strongly oppose any potential ban on disposable food ware for dine-in customers. As restaurants recover from the pandemic, now is not the time for dramatic shifts in service models.	The County understands that some businesses may face challenges with costs as well as space and other constraints related to the requirement of reusables for dine-in customers, so the ordinance includes a waiver process to accommodate these situations.
23		Ban of disposables for dine-in would result in unintended, negative environmental consequences because of increases in water and energy use.	Comment acknowledged. Life cycle analyses cited by UCLA note that reusables are beneficial as compared to disposables across most environmental impact categories.
24		Restaurants often lease their space so cannot change their physical footprint. Small restaurants who don't have dishwashers and can't add machines will be forced to hire additional labor to wash dishes, and will have to deal with storage of reusables.	See response to comment #22.
25		Restaurants need help from local government to survive and CRA urges County to consider measures to help restaurants recover.	Comment acknowledged.

	Organization/Affiliation	Comment	Response
26	Californians Against Waste	Express strong support for the proposed ordinance. The ordinance establishes proper measures to reduce the use of single use plastics and is a major step towards combatting ongoing issues with plastic waste.	Comment acknowledged.
27		Consider expanding reuse for dine-in requirement to all food facilities	While the County notes that reusables have been found to have lower environmental impacts in general as compared to disposable options, the County recognizes that some businesses would face greater challenges than others in shifting their operations to reusables based on their current business model. The County wants to ensure that we have adequate resources and capacity to support the full range of transitions that will be required by the draft ordinance.
28		Establish a funding mechanism for ordinance implementation using fees collected through enforcement. Departments will need to build capacity.	Comment acknowledged. If the ordinance is adopted by the Board of Supervisors, the County will develop an implementation plan that includes education and outreach, and that seeks to identify financial resources to support businesses.
29		Specify that recyclable items must be able to be recycled in local facilities, and that facilities may not include transformation (incineration, pyrolysis, distillation), or any form of chemical recycling.	Definition of recycling excludes incineration. Since single-use plastics are not considered recyclable according to draft ordinance, further limiting the definition to specific technologies is not necessary.
30		Include a requirement that all food facilities accept a customer-provided reusable or refillable foodware item (unless dirty, unsanitary, etc.).	While not included in the proposed ordinance at this time, this recommendation can be considered in future revisions or updates of the ordinance as directed by the Board.
31		Coalition letter: American Chemistry Council CA Chamber of Commerce CA Manufacturers and Technology Association CA Retailers Association Dart Container LA Chamber of Commerce LA County Business Federation Valley Industry and Commerce Association	Proposal will add costs to small businesses when County is still working on composting infrastructure and the ordinance will not be beneficial until there are adequate composting facilities and collection available.
32	Ordinance will unfairly harm most vulnerable small businesses and add new costs to food and goods while inflation is rising.		See response to comment #2.
33	Proposal eliminates choice, only options allowed are costly. Real cost increase of switching will be significant - compostable forks are three to four times more expensive than traditional plastic forks.		See response to comment #2.
34	UCLA study indicates that businesses can pass costs onto customers, however does not take into account how new costs would further impact rising inflation, increasing cost of food, supply chain challenges, and labor costs increases.		See response to comment #2.
35	Many businesses are small and don't have space or employees to meet what is required, such as adding dishwashing. Other restaurants do a majority of to-go orders, and ordinance will impact cost and quality.		See response to comment #22.
36	Without adequate composting facilities, how will compostable materials be managed? And if landfilled, is it worth the increase in costs and additional struggles for small businesses if it does not advance the County's sustainability goals		See response to comment #4.

	Organization/Affiliation	Comment	Response
37	Coalition letter (cont'd)	It is also unknown whether there is ample supply to meet the requirements of ordinance. Maui banned disposable plastic food ware but delayed it because of supply chain issues and lack of available alternatives.	See response to comment #2.
38		Proposal significantly reduces or eliminates recycling of plastic even though there are many types of plastic products that can and are being recycled in the County.	See response to comment #6.
39		Has the County conducted an analysis as to the types of food service materials that are accepted by local haulers in curbside programs, are being processed and marketed to viable end users that are creating new food service packaging? Recommend that there is confirmation that there is collection/processing infrastructure in place to manage materials.	See response to comment #4.
40		Oregon Department of Environmental Quality found that compostable food service ware can have larger environmental impacts than non-compostable items because of increased energy used which increases greenhouse gas emissions.	See response to comment #13. The goal of the cited study was to evaluate the use of labels such as "recyclable" and "compostable" to determine the most environmentally beneficial products. As such, the cited study does not distinguish between types of food service ware labeled as compostable (e.g. whether the product is certified, whether it is composed of bioplastic or fiber-based, whether it may contain fluorinated compounds, etc.), resulting in the highly variable impacts they report. In addition, the study acknowledges that key potential benefits of compostable materials could not be included in their assessment such as increasing diversion of food waste and sequestering of carbon through increased compost usage.
41		Many compostable products are not fully compostable and degrade value of compost.	See response to comment #13.
42		Urge County to pause this proposal and address factors that will increase burden on small businesses especially when there is not adequate infrastructure to manage proposed mandates.	Comment acknowledged.
43		Propose working together to address infrastructure challenges, and develop policy such as requirement of post-consumer recyclable materials for single use plastic food ware as an alternative which will create a market and new green jobs.	Comment acknowledged. The County welcomes partnership in addressing these issues.
44		Courtney Torres Consulting	The UCLA Luskin report is 2 years old now, can we see the update?
45	What is compost infrastructure in LA County right now?		Please see the Los Angeles County Countywide Organic Waste Management Plan 2020 Annual Report for the County's most recent assessment of compost infrastructure.
46	What is the cost difference between compostables and current plastic options?		The range of potential cost differences is discussed in the UCLA report. This is highly dependent on the particular item and particular materials of both the compostable item as well as the item it would be replacing.
47	Can we get a list of product suppliers and their capacity?		See response to comment #28.
48	Can you provide examples of local jurisdictions referenced in UCLA report?		Appendices B and C of the UCLA report contain examples of local jurisdictions that have adopted policies limiting the use of single use plastics.
49	We are still in a pandemic situation, what has changed per the UCLA report?		Per the UCLA report, the pandemic has caused an increase in plastic waste both through increased PPE and medical waste, and likely as a result of increased home deliveries.

	Organization/Affiliation	Comment	Response
50	Courtney Torres Consulting (cont'd)	Re: compostable certifications, how will this be determined?	The ordinance includes definitions of what is considered compostable, including third party certifications that product manufacturers can obtain.
51		How do we ensure food ware is being composted?	See response to comments #13 and #28.
52		Re: reusables in full-service restaurants, are there public health concerns or has this been addressed?	There are well-established public health guidelines for restaurants to use their own reusable service ware, and those would be followed here.
53		Re: written records requirement, do we have models or examples of how this works in other places?	This is a standard requirement in many County ordinances, however ordinance is being revised to allow for digital records.
54	East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice	Consider including definitions of "single-use" and "microplastics" so that there is a shared understanding.	The ordinance will contain a definition of single-use, though not a technical definition for microplastics since there are no provisions that specifically address microplastics. The County will note this comment for inclusion in information in educational and outreach materials developed during the implementation phase if the ordinance is adopted.
55		Consider reusable foodware pilot programs for take-out/to-go to ultimately transition food facilities to use reusables instead of single-use plastics of disposable options.	Comment acknowledged, and the County will note this suggestion during the implementation phase if the ordinance is adopted.
56		The County should have focus groups with BIPOC and low-income communities, street vendors and locally-owned small businesses to help shape reusable pilot programs, based on reuse models implemented in other areas, and to determine where pilot programs should be launched.	See response to comment #55.
57		County should develop market landscape analysis of BIPOC, locally owned small businesses that offer reusable foodware to be included in directory or toolkit to incentivize local innovation.	See response to comment #55.
58		Develop educational materials, technical assistance and support programs for small businesses to support transition to reusable dine-in foodware, including directory/toolkit for small businesses that is multilingual and easily accessible, and one-time up-front funding for infrastructure, staffing, reusables, utilities based on eligibility criteria.	See response to comment #28.
59		Consider sliding scale on enforcement fees based on revenue/size of business.	Comment acknowledged. The County will have flexibility on how and when to issue violations and fines and will take this suggestion under consideration.
60		Consider passing fees on to plastic manufacturers and plastic feedstock facilities instead of businesses and customers.	Comment acknowledged.
61		How will funds from violation fines be used? Can they be used to help locally-owned, small businesses transition to reusables (ex. Infrastructure, employees, programs to cut or discount water/electricity bills)?	See response to comment #28.
62		Can the County provide more information on what the non-punitive enforcement approach will look like?	See response to comment #28.

	Organization/Affiliation	Comment	Response
63	Foodservice Packaging Institute	FPI fully supports policies and programs that result in more recycling/composting of foodservice packaging.	Comment acknowledged.
64		FPI opposes restrictions that limit the use of any foodservice packaging. Packaging should compete on its own merits of performance, suitability, price, and impact on environment. Free market approach allows businesses to determine most effective product that fits their business model.	Comment acknowledged.
65		FPI opposes prohibition on foam polystyrene food service ware, which will will impact restaurant and retail supply chains. Limiting choice, material access, and potential increased costs will hamper recovery and operations of businesses.	Comment acknowledged.
66		FPI opposes reusables for dine-in requirements. Studies show sanitary benefit of single use items as compared to reusables.	See response to comment #52.
67		Mandating reusables may lead to increased use of energy, water and chemicals to wash and dry items.	See response to comment #23.
68		There are staff and operational considerations for restaurants related to reusables, including storage, breakage/theft, and staffing to collect and wash.	See response to comment #22.
69		FPI has several groups to bring together supply chain to develop and promote economically viable and sustainable recovery solutions for foodservice packaging (Paper Recovery Alliance, Plastic Recovery Group, Paper Cup Alliance, Foam Recycling Coalition).	Comment acknowledged.
70		Important to make sure recyclables and compostables will actually be recycled or composted.	Comment acknowledged.
71		FPI encourages expansion of infrastructure to improve recovery of all foodservice packaging.	Comment acknowledged.
72		Welcome the opportunity to work with County and local recyclers/composters to ensure that products can and will be recycled/composted.	Comment acknowledged. The County welcomes partnership in addressing these issues.
73	Go2Zero Strategies	Few faciities in the County are accepting compostable food service ware in the organics bin. It is impossible to verify if a product is PLA and plastic free, which leads to customer confusion and frustration. Need to make it clear that these items are rarely composted and continue to be disposed just like plastics.	See response to comment #13.
74	Jack in the Box	With the challenges regarding the supply chain, looking to do things from a sustainability standpoint at this time will create much more panic, especially for organizations that have a heavy footprint in LA County.	See response to comment #2.
75		Understand that this study was being looked at prior to COVID and was on hold early on due to COVID, but the supply chain challenges are still here and do not show any end in sight. Ask the team to seriously take this into consideration when looking to adopt the ordinance.	Comment acknowledged.
76		What's the time-frame for ordinance to go into effect and what 'grace period' will be given?	"Brick and mortar" food facilities and retail establishments will have <del>about</del> a year after ordinance adoption to achieve compliance. Food trucks will have 18 months, and temporary food facilities will have two years.

	Organization/Affiliation	Comment	Response
77	Little Rock Town Council	Because of this program I have a mountain of reusable bags. Maybe recycled paper or biodegradable bags would be better.	Comment acknowledged.
78	Los Angeles County Business Federation	BizFed shares concerns on environmental impacts of single-use plastics in landfills, support efforts to increase recycling and limit non-compostable items entering environment.	Comment acknowledged.
79		Expanded polystyrene foam and plastic food containers are the most efficient for keeping food fresh, providing insulation at an affordable price and should not be banned.	Comment acknowledged.
80		Transitioning to compostable food service ware is not viable given the impacts of the pandemic, compliance costs, supply chain issues, especially when many restaurants have high overhead and thin profit margins.	See response to comments #2.
81		Removing single use plastics for indoor dining fails to consider land use limitations. Many restaurants lease their space and don't have dishwashers to accommodate reusables, or the costs of the machines and utilities make this option unviable.	See response to comment #22.
82		Ask that sustainability office consider the economic impacts of the ordinance on small businesses before presenting it to the County, and if the office moves forward to make recommendations that would relieve the financial burden of compliance.	Comment acknowledged.
83	NatureWorks LLC	Will end of life programs that LA County pursue have any bearing on and/or be in conflict with the City of Los Angeles?	Since the proposed ordinance only applies to unincorporated portions of Los Angeles County, it should not have an impact on programs within the City of Los Angeles.
84		Successful use of Certified Compostables will contribute to the diversion of more food and compostable packaging waste in closed venues. Success here requires this resulting two component waste stream to be accepted by commercial composters. How is the latter being addressed?	See response to comment #13.
85		A comment from the initial call noted composters will only accept or require products that meet OMRI/NOP and/or are certified organic. Many commercial composters (ie based in the NW/Midwest/NE/SE/etc.) generate two if not more forms of resulting end compost - certified and also "non-certified" organic compost. Will LA County be enlisting commercial composters that can generate multiple end use compost formats?	See response to comment #13.
86	Neighborhood Council Sustainability Alliance	Strongly in support of ordinance, as are many other people in LA County. It will reduce the enormous plastic pollution as well as the overall waste going to landfill. It is long overdue.	Comment acknowledged.
87	Newlight Technologies	Expressing support for LA County's policy leadership and the recommended ordinance.	Comment acknowledged.
88		Supports proposal to define "compostable" as meeting rigorous certification standards.	See response to comment #13.
89		Replacing single use plastics with compostable products presents numerous benefits including compliance with SB1383, reducing non-compostable and non-recyclable solid waste, and decreasing litter.	Comment acknowledged.

	Organization/Affiliation	Comment	Response
90	Pacoima Beautiful	Glad that there is movement on this topic.	Comment acknowledged.
91		Will unincorporated areas feel singled out because the ordinance only applies to them?	The County only has jurisdiction over unincorporated areas on this issue, so that is why the applicability of the ordinance is limited.
92		Is this a pilot which is intended to expand to the entire County eventually?	See response to comment #91.
93		France has moved to ban plastic packaging for the majority of fruits and vegetables. Could the County eventually do this?	See response to comment #30.
94	Paddle Out Plastic	Appreciate County tackling this issue. Need to address problem at the source. Org recruits paddlers to clean up SoCal waterways which is sorted, counted, etc. Nearly all litter is various forms of plastic, and stream seems to be increasing.	Comment acknowledged.
95		Strongly support ban on sale/rental of EPS. One third of litter retrieved from water in 2021 was polystyrene, and had to leave behind a lot because many were tiny bits that couldn't be retrieved [included pictures in e-mail].	Comment acknowledged.
96		Durability of product is related to environment in which its used - cheap EPS boogie boards and kick boards become single-use when used at the beach. Consider developing design standards for products such as boogie boards to ensure that they are reusable many times, and consider attaching a deposit to the purchase.	Comment acknowledged, and the County will note this suggestion for future work.
97		Consider expanding prohibition from retail sale and rental to include use at LA County facilities, including harbors, beaches, and parks.	See response to comment #30.
98		Consider applying polystyrene prohibition to all food service ware including meat trays, etc. if this is not already included	This is included in the current draft provisions.
99		Consider expanding application of prohibition to foam fabric - we find full sheets of this as well as ripped pieces in the water.	Comment acknowledged, and the County will note this suggestion for future work.
100		Consider applying prohibition on polystyrene to street vendors if that is not already the intention	The County is currently undergoing a review of its permitting program for street vendors, and will note this suggestion for that process.
101		Consider including retail establishments to requirements for compostable/recyclable food service ware.	See response to comment #30.
102		Strongly support single use plastic items not being considered recyclable	Comment acknowledged.
103		Reusable food service ware for dine-in requirement is important since org has seen restaurants use disposables to avoid dishwashing. Consider extending this to all food facilities as well as to programs like Meals on Wheels.	See response to comment #27.
104		Consider requiring certification of compliance when renewing business licenses, funding compliance accountability through fines, and providing incentives to jump start compliance.	See response to comment #28.



	Organization/Affiliation	Comment	Response
105	Paddle Out Plastic (cont'd)	Concerned that exemption for articles packaged off premises will lead to circumvention of ordinance requirements	See response to comment #30.
106		Food facilities in health facilities such as nursing homes and hospital cafes and cafeterias should not be exempt	The draft ordinance provisions would currently be applicable to these types of facilities.
107		Re: exemptions where there are no appropriate compostable or recyclable alternatives, consider adding "or reusable." With this exemption available, plastic bottles should be added to the list of prohibited food and beverage ware, e.g. water is available in recyclable aluminum cans and Coca Cola recently announced moving to reusable beverage containers	See response to comment #30.
108		Consider attaching a fee to the use of non-recyclable items that continue to be used as an incentive to move to reusables.	See response to comment #30.
109		Re: waiver related to dishwashing facilities, this should only be granted if there are no reasonably accessible facilities offering dishwashing or reusable food service ware to restaurants.	See response to comment #30.
110		Consider shortening time for compliance - plastic problem is growing every day, as do GHG emissions, and expansion of plastic production facilities in already impacted communities.	Comment acknowledged. The County believes the timeline in the ordinance is necessary to give the ordinance the best chance of successful implementation, as it will allow the County time to do education and outreach as well as to allow businesses to understand and align with the requirements.
111		Re: enforcement, this is where well-meaning ordinances fail and compliance timeline can essentially be extended for years.	See response to comment #15.
112		Important to prioritize education, including to offset disinformation and misinformation, for example perpetuating myth that reusables are not sanitary. Public also deserves to understand why ordinance is vital.	Comment acknowledged, and the County will note this suggestion for development of an implementation plan if the ordinance is adopted.
113		Consider offering a sticker for facilities indicating that they have switched to compostables and reusables	See response to comment #112.
114		Consider adding a prohibition on sale, distribution and use of balloons, if not entirely, at least at beaches, harbors, parks, and other outdoor venues and county events.	See response to comment #30.
115		Increase availability of public water refill stations	See response to comment #30.
116		Consider prohibiting non-compostable produce bags and distribution of plastic bags by all retailers, and require fees for paper and other bags. Consider pairing this with education and distribution of reusable bags, focusing on disadvantaged communities.	See response to comment #30.
117		Need to take bold action now to encourage reuse before more expansion of plastic production.	Comment acknowledged.
118	Public - Bessie Politis, REHS	FDA food code currently prohibits the use of reusables for TCS foods. The language within your motion uses reusables as an alternate to single use which is not a solution based on current code. While there is work on going to adjust the law, operators in the food industry would not have this as a viable alternative.	The ordinance requirements are limited to dine-in customers at full service restaurants. There are well-established guidelines for restaurants to use their own reusable service ware, and those would be followed here.

	Organization/Affiliation	Comment	Response
119	Public - Bessie Politis, REHS (cont'd)	There are not enough companies producing alternate materials for single use, creating a monopoly for companies currently selling alternate single use items.	Comment acknowledged.
120		Businesses are struggling enough during this pandemic. For the Board to bring this matter up now is not only insensitive, it exhibits a lack of empathy for the added burden food operators will now have to add to their already heavy load.	See response to comment #2.
121		Recyclable trust by consumers should be your first concern. Consumers do not trust that the efforts made to recycle are being done in an environmentally trustworthy manner by the County. County owned buildings, County occupied buildings do not have strong recycling programs. You must set by example to gain the by in of businesses.	The Board of Supervisors recently adopted a single use plastics reduction policy for County facilities, which includes provisions for waste-free events, that is in the process of being implemented.
122	Public - Elinor Crescenzi	Compostable is still disposable and involves excess waste. Switching from plastics to compostables is a step in the right direction, but not as good as reusables when made of appropriate materials.	Comment acknowledged.
123		Move towards purchase of reusables for to-go options. Restaurants should be required to provide reusable to-go options and utensils, and charge for them to incentivize customers to bring their own containers and utensils. This will also promote the normalization of reusables.	See response to comment #30.
124		Exemptions to reusables requirement for full service restaurants should only be on a highly temporary basis and should be difficult to obtain. Business should have to demonstrate why they cannot wash reusables using 3-bin system or contract with a dishwashing service.	See response to comment #30.
125		Re: reusable requirement, County could develop temporary systems for rental or loan to businesses under construction or other common reasons for not being able to wash dishes.	See response to comment #30.
126		Support substantial education and support services for compliance, however proposed fines are not adequate as a deterrent for businesses who have ignored other communications, education, and support opportunities. This could be seen as preferable over managing a reusable system in cost-benefit analysis. Consider much more serious consequences such as business closures - should treat environmental health issues similar to how we would deal with public health issues. Plastics are also a public health issue.	See response to comment #15.
127		Consider a solid and well-funded program to bring all unincorporated businesses into compliance which can serve as a model pilot program for incorporated municipalities. Consider using a lottery system to create cohorts to focus resources and attention on each business.	See response to comment #112.

	Organization/Affiliation	Comment	Response
128	Public - Dyanne DiRosario	When RecycLA program was rolled out, engagement did not include landlords or housing representatives. If this ordinance will impact tenants' trash, please bring in landlords or housing stakeholders to the program has a chance to succeed.	Comment acknowledged.
129	Public - Tim Mellin	Can you add wording to eliminate plastic grocery bags at stores?	See response to comment #30.
130		Need to make sure ordinance is enforceable	Comment acknowledged.
131	Reusable LA Coalition Letter: Heal the Bay	Strongly support the LA County effort to pass an ordinance to limit single-use plastics in unincorporated areas. Excited to see County taking initiative on this issue which is not only polluting essential ecosystems but also impacting vulnerable communities.	Comment acknowledged.
132	Adventures in Waste 5 Gyres Institute SoCal 350 Clean Water Fund	Strongly support plastic items being excluded from "recyclable" definition, however definition should expressly exclude incineration or any form of chemical recycling [letter proposes specific language for definition].	See response to comment #29.
133	The Bay Foundation Upstream Solutions Resilient Palisades Oceanic Global	Current definition of "compostable" is insufficient to guarantee that products can actually be collected and processed in LA County. Should be modeled after recyclable definition and exclude bioplastics [see suggested language].	See response to comment #13.
134	LA Waterkeeper Plastic Pollution Coalition r.Cup LLC The Last Plastic Straw	Strongly support "reuse for dine-in" requirement, but recommend that it is expanded to apply to all food facilities. This requirement has been enacted in nine other jurisdictions with no exclusions for fast casual and fast food facilities.	See response to comment #27.
135	Break Free From Plastic Surfrider Foundation - LA Chapter AltaPasa Green Circle Story of Stuff	ReThink Disposable has worked with 260 restaurants in California to help them transition to reuse for onsite dining, and have demonstrated overwhelming success in achieving net cost savings, waste reduction, and greenhouse gas emissions reductions.	Comment acknowledged.
136	Climate Reality LA Throop Unitarian Universalist Church Oceana Sierra Club - Angeles Chapter Habits of Waste Neighborhood Council Sustainability Alliance	Since start of pandemic, many food facilities have changed internal policies to no longer accept customer-provided reusable foodware, even though allowed by State and County DPH, often due to misinformation. Urge County to add requirement that would require food facilities to accept customer reusables [see suggested language].	See response to comment #30.
137	Amigos de los Rios Surfrider Foundation - South Bay Chapter	It would be in the best interest of all Angelenos for LA County and City to coordinate efforts. Strongly encourage County to coordinate with City on any CEQA related processes or assessments.	Comment acknowledged.
138	The Nature Conservancy	TNC supports the draft ordinance that would reduce or eliminate single use plastics food service ware and ensure disposables are actually recyclable in practice or compostable.	Comment acknowledged.
139		TNC emphasizes and supports the following key finding from the UCLA report that replacing single use plastics with reusable products would result in net environmental and economic benefits.	Comment acknowledged.

	Organization/Affiliation	Comment	Response
140	The Nature Conservancy (cont'd)	TNC commends the County for engaging stakeholders from environmental and environmental justice organizations, plastics industry, restaurant industry, waste industry, academic institutions, and local jurisdictions.	Comment acknowledged.
141		Recommend continuing engagement of diverse stakeholders throughout process to hear from different voices and address concerns as they arise.	Comment acknowledged, and the County will note this suggestion for development of an implementation plan if the ordinance is adopted.
142		Draft ordinance is complementary to statewide efforts to address single-use plastic pollution. TNC is supporting the California Plastic Pollution Reduction and Recycling Act. Coordinated local and state action is critical to stop plastic pollution.	Comment acknowledged.
143	Upstream	Strongly support County's effort to pass an ordinance to limit single-use plastics.	Comment acknowledged.
144		Upstream is a member of ReusableLA Coalition and has signed on to their letter, but would like to emphasize potential cost savings for restaurant sector and waste savings for local government as a reason why County should prioritize reuse for on-site dining policy for all restaurants and implement as soon as possible.	Comment acknowledged.
145		Limiting the reuse requirement to full-service restaurants would have a very small impact. Expanding it to include all food service restaurants would provide significant cost and waste benefits.	See response to comment #27.
146		Reusable San Mateo County did waste and cost assessment for Redwood City [assessment is attached to letter], which reviewed all 244 restaurants in City. Assessment found largest users of disposables are fast food restaurants and café/bakery/snack facilities.	Comment acknowledged.
147		Assessment found that policy would not save full service restaurants money, but would save fast food restaurants over \$8k per year, fast casual \$4600/yr, and café/bakery/snack businesses \$4300/year. These are net cost savings after accounting for purchase of reusables and dishwashing and operational changes.	Comment acknowledged.
148		Waste savings from this policy approach are greater than any other proposed policy. In Redwood City analysis, average waste reduction per restaurant per year would be 1600 lbs.	Comment acknowledged.
149		According to County Restaurant and Retail Food Inspection reports, there are over 26,000 restaurants in County. Using Redwood City estimates, waste reduction would be 41,600,000 lbs per year, and net cost savings would be \$132,990,000 per year.	Comment acknowledged.
150		This requirement has been enacted in nine other California jurisdictions with no exclusions for fast food and fast casual, including McDonalds in Berkeley.	Comment acknowledged.
151		ReThink Disposable has worked with 260 restaurants in California to help them transition to reuse for onsite dining, and have demonstrated overwhelming success in achieving net cost savings, waste reduction, and greenhouse gas emissions reductions.	Comment acknowledged.