



## Single Use Bag Ban Ordinance

- ° 24 cities in San Mateo and Santa Clara County
- 552,931,362 plastic bags used per year in study area
  - Bans the distribution of plastic carry-out bags
    - Minimum charge of 10 cents per paper bag
      - ° Includes all retail except restaurants
- Does not include protective bags for produce or meat
  - Intent is to reduce litter and plastic use
    - Encourages use of reusable bags
- Environmental Impact Report (EIR) studies possible environmental issues with the ordinance
  - Comments on the EIR are due by August 6<sup>th</sup>

www.smchealth.org/bagban

Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts		
Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
AIR QUALITY		
Impact AQ-1 Evaluates emissions	Mitigation is not required as the	The impact would be beneficial wit
from the manufacture of paper,	ordinance will substantially reduce	hout mitigation
plastic and reusable bags	the number of bags produced.	-
Impact AQ-2 Evaluates emissions	Mitigation is not required as the	The impact would be less than
due to the transportation of paper,	slight increase in truck trips is not	significant without mitigation
plastic and reusable bags	expected to exceed BAAQMD	
	thresholds.	
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
Impact BIO-1 Evaluates the impa	Mitigation is not required as the	The impact would be beneficial wit
ct of litter entering coastal and bay	number of single use bags will be	hout mitigation
waterways	reduced, thus it is anticipated there	
	will be an 8 to 12 percent reduction	
	of litter entering the environment.	
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS		
Impact GHG-1 Evaluates the	Mitigation is not required as	The impact would be less than
creation of methane and other GHG	emissions would not exceed	significant without mitigation
when paper bags decompose	established thresholds.	
Impact GHG-2 Evaluates conflict	Mitigation is not required as the	The impact would be less than
s with policies/regulations that	ordinance does not conflict with	significant without mitigation
reduce emissions of GHS	existing policies or regulations.	
HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY		
Impact HWQ-1 Evaluates	Mitigation is not required as the	The impact wou <mark>ld be beneficial</mark> wit
impacts to stormdrains	reduction in the use of single use	hout mitigation
	bags will reduce litter by 8 to 12	
	percent.	
Impact HWQ-2 Evaluates increas	Mitigation is not required as bag	The impact would be less than
e use of chemicals associated with	manufactures are required to	significant with <mark>out miti</mark> gation
the production of paper and	comply with a myriad of	
reusable bags and degradation of	requirements designed to protect	
water bodies	water bodies and the environment.	
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS		
Impact U-1 Evaluates the	Mitigation is not required as	The impact would be less than
increased use of water due to the w	water use would increase negligibly	significant without mitigation
ashing of reusable bags	and there are sufficient water	
	supplies available to meet the	
	needs, even in drought conditions.	
Impact U-2 Evaluates the increase	Mitigation is not required as the	The impact would be less than
in wastewater disposal requirement	increase is negligible and would	significant without mitigation
s due to washing of bags	remain within current capacity to	
	treat waste water in the Study Area.	
Impact U-3 Evaluates increase in	Mitigation is not required as	The impact would be less than
solid waste associated with the	projected increase would remain	significant without mitigation
increase in use of paper bags	within the capacity of the regional	
	landfills.	