Date of Hearing: April 29, 2025

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY AND TOXIC MATERIALS
Damon Connolly, Chair
AB 823 (Boerner) – As Amended April 24, 2025

SUBJECT: Solid waste: plastic microbeads: plastic glitter

SUMMARY: Prohibits a person from selling non-rinse-off, personal care products and cleaning products containing plastic microbeads that are used as an abrasive to clean, exfoliate, or polish; and personal care products containing plastic glitter. Specifically, **this bill**:

1) Defines "cleaning product" as having the same meaning as "designated product" under the Cleaning Product Right to Know Act of 2017.

2) Prohibits, on and after January 1, 2029, a person from selling, offering for sale, distributing, or offering for promotional purposes in the state any of the following:

   a) A personal care product containing plastic microbeads that are used as an abrasive to clean, exfoliate, or polish in a non-rinse-off product;

   b) A cleaning product containing plastic microbeads that are used as an abrasive to clean, exfoliate, or polish; and,

   c) A personal care product containing plastic glitter.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Establishes the Plastic Microbeads Nuisance Prevention Law, which prohibits, on or after January 1, 2020, persons from selling or offering for promotional purposes any personal care product containing plastic microbeads that are used to exfoliate or cleanse in a rinse-off product, including but not limited to, toothpaste; defines "plastic microbead" as an intentionally added solid plastic particle measuring 5 millimeters or less in every dimension; establishes enforcement provisions, including that a person who violates the Plastic Microbeads Nuisance Prevention Law is liable for a civil penalty not to exceed $2,500 per day for each violation, as provided. (Public Resources Code (PRC) § 42360, et seq.)

2) Defines, under the Cleaning Product Right to Know Act of 2017, "designated product" to mean a finished product that is an air care product, automotive product, general cleaning product, or a polish or floor maintenance product used primarily for janitorial, domestic, or institutional cleaning purposes. (Health and Safety Code (HSC) § 108952(f))

3) Requires, on or before December 31, 2024, the Ocean Protection Council (OPC) to adopt and implement a Statewide Microplastics Strategy related to microplastic materials that pose an emerging concern for ocean health; requires the OPC to work with the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), and other interested entities in the development of the Strategy; specifies that the goal of the Strategy is to increase understanding of the scale and risks of microplastics on the marine environment and to identify proposed solutions to address the impacts of microplastics. (PRC § 35635(b))

4) Requires the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to adopt regulations to establish a process to identify and prioritize chemicals and chemical ingredients that may be considered chemicals of concern; establish a process to evaluate chemicals of concern, and their potential alternatives, to determine how best to limit exposure or reduce the level of hazard posed by a chemical of concern; and, specify the range of potential regulatory responses that DTSC may take after the alternatives analysis is completed. (HSC § 25252, et. seq.)

5) Requires the State Water Board to adopt a definition of microplastics in drinking water by July 1, 2020; adopt a standard methodology to test drinking water for microplastics; and, adopt testing and reporting requirements. (HSC § 116376)

6) Requires OEHHA to study the health effects of microplastics in drinking and bottled water, in order to evaluate toxicity characteristics and levels of microplastics in water that are not anticipated to cause or contribute to adverse health effects, or to identify data gaps that would need to be addressed to establish those levels; and authorizes the State Water Board to request that OEHHA prepare and publish a public health goal for microplastics in drinking water. (HSC § 116376.2)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown.

COMMENTS:

Need for the bill: According to the author:

> "The plastic pollution crisis is with us every day—not just in faraway places. This isn't just an environmental issue. It is a public health emergency. Tiny microplastics—so small they are invisible to the naked eye—have infiltrated our waterways, soil, food, and bodies. Plastic microbeads are present in many everyday items. They are used in our makeup, our cleaning supplies, and our paints. As a result, our bodies are filled with microplastics. They are in our lungs, bloodstream, placental tissue, breast milk, reproductive organs, and even brains. It's time to put an end to these unnecessary and dangerous microplastics. With AB 823, we have a chance to protect our oceans, our communities, and our health."

Microplastics: California's 2022 Statewide Microplastics Strategy (Strategy)—developed via a multi-stakeholder, science-informed process facilitated by the OPC—provides an overview of microplastics and microplastics pollution. According to research reviewed in the Strategy, plastics are ubiquitous in both Californians' daily lives and in the environment. Worldwide, an estimated 11 million metric tons of plastic enter the ocean each year, and without any intervention, this amount is anticipated to triple by 2040. Plastics are recognized globally as the most harmful and persistent fraction of marine litter, accounting for at least 85% of total marine waste.

According to the Strategy, microplastics fall into two general categories: primary microplastics manufactured at a small size (e.g., preproduction plastic pellets used in manufacturing or microbeads in personal care products), or secondary microplastics that result from the breakdown of larger plastics into pieces of ever-decreasing size, with those less than 5

millimeters in size known as microplastics. As a pollutant, microplastics are extraordinarily complex, with a range of polymer types (polymers are large molecules made by linking together a series of smaller molecules, similar to building blocks), sizes, shapes, and associated chemicals. Because of their small size and mobility in the environment, microplastics have been found nearly everywhere scientists have looked, from pristine mountain streams to agricultural soil; in marine organisms, including mammals, fish, mollusks, and crustaceans; and even in a range of human tissues. In California, microplastics have been observed in Monterey Bay, San Francisco Bay, the Greater Farallones National Marine Sanctuary, Lake Tahoe, and in Southern California waterways.

Microbeads: Microbeads are commonly understood to be a specific subset of microplastics that are added to products to confer abrasive or exfoliating properties. Numerous states and countries, recognizing that there are alternatives to intentionally added plastic microbeads, have instituted plastic microbead bans. California was among the first states to implement such a ban, with the enactment of the Plastic Microbeads Nuisance Prevention Law, in 2015 (AB 888, Bloom, Chapter 594). This law prohibits the sale of rinse-off, personal care products that contain plastic microbeads used to exfoliate or cleanse ("personal care product" is defined as an "article intended to be rubbed, poured, sprinkled, or sprayed on, introduced to, or otherwise applied to, the human body…for cleansing, beautifying, promoting attractiveness, or altering the appearance…" (PRC § 42361(b)(1))).

According to the 2023 report, *Microplastics occurrence, health effects, and mitigation policies: An evidence review for the California State Legislature,* produced by the California State Policy Evidence Consortium (2023 CalSPEC Report; CalSPEC is an independent program administered by the University of California Center Sacramento), microbeads have been in use for quite some time. Bans across state and national governments emerged relatively recently, beginning around 2015. The 2023 CalSPEC Report states:

> "During the 1990s and early 2000s, cosmetic and hygiene companies began using solid plastic microbeads as a cleaner or soft exfoliant in facewash, shower gel, and toothpaste (Dauvergne, 2018). Household and industrial cleaning agents also use microbeads…As a result, unprecedented amounts of microbeads funneled into wastewater treatment plants and subsequently made their way into rivers, lakes, and oceans (Dauvergne, 2018). In 2014, research led by the Province of Ontario's Ministry of Environment and Climate Change in Canada, found significant quantities of microplastics in water samples from Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, with microbeads comprising 14% of total litter (Ontario Government, 2021)…Government actions addressing microbeads began in 2014–15 at the subnational level (Illinois and the Province of Ontario), which motivated national action by Canada and the United States. Other national and subnational jurisdictions followed suit with Argentina being one of the latest national governments to take action."

Describing the national ban in the United States, the 2023 CalSPEC Report states: "With industry support…the United States Congress passed H.R. 1321, the 'Microbead-Free Waters Act' in 2015, which bans manufacturing, packaging, and distribution of rinse-off cosmetics containing synthetic plastic microbeads. It applies both to cosmetics and nonprescription products (i.e., over the counter drugs, such as toothpaste)." Most countries with plastic microbead bans apply the prohibition to microbeads in cosmetics or personal care products; a few countries have also banned plastic microbeads in cleaning products.

Alternatives: Plastic microbead bans have been spurred on, at least in part, by the availability of alternatives for plastic microbeads, coupled with evidence of harms associated with microplastics. As stated in the 2021 study, "Evaluating alternatives to plastic microbeads in cosmetics," published in *Nature Sustainability:*

> "While emerging scientific evidence of environmental release and harm has been the cause of the regulatory restrictions on the use of plastic microbeads, the availability of alternative materials has played a critical role in bringing these regulations about. There is a plethora of alternatives such as crushed walnut shells, oats, sugar and jojoba seeds already in the market, many of which were used in the recent past before plastic microbeads were introduced and are still in use today in [personal care and cosmetic products]."

In addition to prohibiting the sale of non-rinse-off, personal care products and cleaning products containing plastic microbeads, this bill also bans the sale of personal care products containing plastic glitter. Alternatives to plastic glitter are available on the market, and scientists are continuing to innovate. In a 2022 study, "Large-scale fabrication of structurally coloured cellulose nanocrystal films and effect pigments," published in *Nature Materials*, researchers from the University of Cambridge describe the development of an alternative to plastic glitter, intended for use in the cosmetics industry. In an interview with the University of Cambridge, the study's senior author states:

> "Conventional pigments, like your everyday glitter, are not produced sustainably…They get into the soil, the ocean and contribute to an overall level of pollution. Consumers are starting to realise that while glitters are fun, they also have real environmental harms."

In a description of the study's findings, the University of Cambridge states:

> "The glitter is made from cellulose nanocrystals, which can bend light in such a way to create vivid colours through a process called structural colour. The same phenomenon produces some of the brightest colours in nature—such as those of butterfly wings and peacock feathers—and results in hues that do not fade, even after a century.
>
> Using self-assembly techniques that allow the cellulose to produce intensely-coloured films, the researchers say their materials could be used to replace the plastic glitter particles and tiny mineral effect pigments which are widely used in cosmetics."

Microplastics and human health: Much remains unknown about the impacts of microplastics on human health. As noted above, microplastics pollution is extraordinarily complex, comprised of a range of polymer types, sizes, shapes, and associated chemicals. The 2023 CalSPEC Report notes that studying the impacts of microplastics can be challenging for multiple reasons, including "inconsistent and uncoordinated analytic methods and contamination introduced during the research process…" The report also notes that the "concentration and character" of microplastics can be highly variable, both spatially and temporally.

Despite these challenges, converging lines of evidence—including the presence of microplastics in drinking water and in the foods humans eat; the occurrence of microplastics in multiple types of human tissue, including brain, blood, and placenta; evidence of adverse health outcomes in non-human animals following microplastics exposures; and the ability of microplastics to absorb

toxic chemicals—have, in combination, prompted concerns that microplastic pollution poses a serious human health risk.

The 2023 CalSPEC Report examined evidence concerning the human health effects of microplastics by conducting a rapid systematic review of evidence from peer-reviewed literature. The authors acknowledge several limitations to their review, including that CalSPEC found no studies examining the effects of microplastics exposure on human health, during a comprehensive search in July 2022. As a result, CalSPEC evaluated mammalian rodent studies of microplastics exposures, and concluded the following, based on this review:

> "Based on the available evidence from experimental studies in rodents, CalSPEC concludes that microplastics are suspected to promote deleterious human health effects in the reproductive and digestive systems. Although respiratory tract studies were not evaluated as rigorously, CalSPEC concludes that respiratory harms from microplastics are also likely suspected. CalSPEC recognizes that these conclusions are likely an underestimation of the true harm of microplastic exposure given the limitations outlined above."

In March 2024, a study in the *New England Journal of Medicine* provided the first evidence of a potential link between microplastics and human health, although the authors acknowledge that additional studies are needed and that other factors not addressed in the study, such as socioeconomic status, could have contributed to the study's outcomes. A summary of the study's findings by *Scientific American* states the following:

> "A study of more than 200 people undergoing surgery found that nearly 60% had microplastics or even smaller nanoplastics in a main artery. Those who did were 4.5 times more likely to experience a heart attack, a stroke or death in the approximately 34 months after the surgery than were those whose arteries were plastic-free…The team tracked 257 people undergoing a surgical procedure that reduces stroke risk by removing plaque from an artery in the neck.
>
> The researchers put the excised plaques under an electron microscope. They saw jagged blobs—evidence of microplastics—intermingled with cells and other waste products in samples from 150 of the participants. Chemical analyses revealed that the bulk of the particles were composed of either polyethylene, which is the most used plastic in the world and is often found in food packaging, shopping bags and medical tubing, or polyvinyl chloride, known more commonly as PVC or vinyl."

State action on microplastics pollution: In addition to enacting a ban on intentionally added plastic microbeads used in rinse-off cosmetics, the Legislature has advanced numerous additional bills aimed at addressing the complex problem of microplastics pollution. These include SB 1264 (Portantino, Chapter 609, Statutes of 2018), which required the OPC to adopt and implement a Statewide Microplastics Strategy that increases understanding of the scale and risks of microplastics pollution in the marine environment and identifies proposed solutions. Released in February 2022, the Strategy provides a multi-year roadmap designed to help California assume a national and global leadership role in managing microplastics pollution.

Developed through collaboration among partner agencies and research institutions, the Strategy outlines recommended actions, organized into two basic categories (or "tracks"): 1) management

actions that California can begin implementing immediately; and, 2) research priorities to inform future actions. This bill is consistent with the following recommendation from the Strategy:

> "Expand the statewide microbead ban enacted by Assembly Bill 888 (Bloom, 2015) to include microplastics that are intentionally added to specific consumer products, such as cosmetics, household and industrial detergents, and cleaning products by 2023."

Additional state action on microplastics pollution is currently underway via the Safer Consumer Products Program (also known as "Green Chemistry"), administered by DTSC. Created in 2013, the Safer Consumer Products Program aims to advance the development, design, and use of products that are chemically safer for people and the environment. Under this program, DTSC identifies chemicals to be added to a list of candidate chemicals, which have known hazard traits and/or environmental or toxicological risks. Through a formal regulatory process, DTSC may then designate "priority products," identified based on whether they contain one or more candidate chemicals that have the potential to harm people or the environment. If a candidate chemical is identified as part of a designated priority product, it becomes a "chemical of concern." Once identified, DTSC works to analyze alternatives to those chemicals and to encourage producers to use less toxic alternatives.

In 2023, DTSC proposed adding microplastics to the candidate chemicals list and identified specific considerations when evaluating products containing microplastics, including "the potential for the product to release microplastics to the environment during the use or end-of-life stages of the product's life cycle." DTSC also included "products that contain or generate microplastics" in its 2024-2026 "Three-Year Priority Product Work Plan," along with the following update:

> "In our 2021-2023 Work Plan, we identified the potential for products to generate release of microplastics to the environment during their use phase or end-of-life as one of the Work Plan's five 'priorities and considerations for implementation.' Because microplastics were not Candidate Chemicals, we were unable to regulate products that contain or generate them as Priority Products. We have since proposed regulations that would add microplastics to the Candidate Chemicals List. This rulemaking would allow us to propose Priority Products based on their potential to release microplastics and expose humans or environmental receptors, if we found that such exposures could contribute to or cause harm…
>
> Given the concerns about human exposures and environmental release, we have initiated preliminary screening research on products that can release microplastics concurrently with our work to add microplastics to our Candidate Chemicals List."

European Union (EU) regulation: In January 2018, the EU stated its intention to restrict the use of microplastics and commenced a "consultation" that ran until September 2020. A final opinion was submitted to the European Commission in February 2021, and the first draft regulation was issued in August 2022. After completion of the regulatory process, which involved scientific experts and numerous stakeholders, a final regulation was adopted in September 2023 (Commission Regulation (EU) 2023/2055) to regulate synthetic polymer microparticles as substances on their own and in mixtures under Regulation (EC) 1907/2006, Registration, Evaluation, Authorization, and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH). The regulation generally bans microplastics as a substance on their own and where the microparticles are present "to confer a sought-after characteristic, in mixtures in a concentration equal or greater than 0.01% by

weight." The microplastics regulation includes staged implementation for various product types, ranging from 2023 to 2035.

The REACH microparticle regulations are a detailed, comprehensive, and complex regulatory system involving significant reporting, multiple levels of testing, and approvals for regulated materials adopted after a multi-year regulatory process. The EU continues to offer guidance documents to guide implementation and compliance due to the complexity of the regulations. Last month, the EU released an Explanatory Guide, which includes a "Narrative," a "Questions and Answers" document, and an Appendix that includes various decision trees for compliance options and examples of borderline cases and specific products. The regulations allow the use of certain "biodegradable" polymers if they meet one of a variety of testing protocols based on their intended use and the finished products they are added to. When a manufacturer wishes to use a polymer under the claim that it is biodegradable—and therefore can be excluded from regulation under REACH—the manufacturer must "provide, without delay, information proving that those polymers are degradable" to regulators and comply with the testing and regulatory framework established by the regulations.

This bill: AB 823 prohibits a person from selling, offering for sale, distributing, or offering for promotional purposes any of the following: non-rinse-off, personal care products and cleaning products containing plastic microbeads that are used as an abrasive to clean, exfoliate, or polish; and personal care products containing plastic glitter. This bill expands the state's existing ban on plastic microbeads; is aligned with a recommendation in the California 2022 Statewide Microplastics Strategy; and proposes to ban specified types of intentionally-added microplastics, for which there are alternatives.

Arguments in support: Writing on a prior version of AB 823, a coalition of environmental and public health organizations states:

> "Microplastic contamination is a burgeoning public and environmental health issue that poses serious threats to animal and human health. Microplastics enter the human body through nasal, dermal, and oral routes to contaminate multiple organs. When wildlife consume microplastics, these tiny plastic bits can block and damage organs and leach potentially harmful chemicals. Microplastics, and the toxic chemicals they convey, can transfer up the food chain. This can be particularly harmful for human populations that catch and consume fish and seafood from our various waterways.
>
> Animal and cell-based studies have shown microplastics and nanoplastics can cause genotoxicity, decreased cell viability (cytotoxicity), oxidative stress induction, metabolism disruption, DNA damage, inflammation, and immunological response. Women, in particular, may face higher plastic-related toxicity risk, due to higher aggregate exposure to plastics at home and even in feminine care products. Microplastics have been found in the placenta and breast milk, and have also been found in fecal samples from infants, including in the first bowel movement, highlighting that babies are exposed to microplastics within the womb, at a concentration ten times higher than adults…
>
> We must take urgent action to prevent further harm from microplastics. AB 823 ensures California remains at the forefront of tackling plastic pollution while safeguarding human health and the environment for future generations."

Arguments in opposition: Writing on a prior version of AB 823, a coalition of organizations representing the industry and business sectors writes, in an opposed-unless-amended position:

> "…we are respectfully opposed unless amended to AB 823, which would ban plastic microbeads from cosmetic and cleaning products by 2030, and because of how the legislation is currently drafted, would also bring microplastics into scope. All our organizations, and their member companies, are concerned with the impacts of microplastic pollution on our environment and public health. We believe there is an opportunity to eliminate intentionally added microplastics from cleaning products and personal care products, if afforded the opportunity and pathway necessary to innovate and to provide quality products that improve the lives of Californians. Unfortunately, AB 823, as currently drafted, would unnecessarily ban a significant number of cosmetic and cleaning products in 2030. For this reason, we are opposed unless amended.
>
> **Amendment Request**
>
> In response to conversations with the author and sponsors of AB 823, we have suggested deleting section 42362(c), the ban on non-abrasive microbeads in cosmetic and cleaning products. With this amendment, AB 823 would still ban abrasive microbeads from leave-on cosmetics and cleaning products, making California the first state in the nation to ban abrasive plastic microbeads from cleaning products. Additionally, we believe it more clearly captures the author's intent—to ban the use of solid plastic microbeads, as the industry and consumers understand them to be, rather than complex polymers which provide a myriad of benefits to consumers and are not the materials found in the human body.
>
> If the above amendment is not made to AB 823, we must revert to our original amendment requests…"

Related legislation:

1) AB 2214 (Bauer-Kahan, McKinnor, 2024). Would have required the OPC to lead an interagency coordination group to recommend statutory changes and adopt a workplan to implement recommendations from the 2022 Statewide Microplastics Strategy. This bill was vetoed by Governor Gavin Newsom.

2) SB 1147 (Portantino, Chapter 881, Statutes of 2024). Requires OEHHA to study the health effects of microplastics in drinking water and bottled water, and authorizes the State Water Board, after OEHHA's study is complete, to request that OEHHA develop a public health goal for microplastics in drinking water.

3) AB 234 (Bauer-Kahan, 2023). Would have prohibited a synthetic polymer microparticle, as defined, from being placed on the market; specified multiple effective dates for restrictions, depending upon product type; and established exemptions on the basis of biodegradability, determined using specified tests and pass criteria. This bill was held in the Assembly Natural Resources Committee.

4) AB 1628 (McKinnor, 2023). Would have required that all new washing machines sold or offered for sale in the state for residential or state use contain a microfiber filtration system by January 1, 2029. This bill was vetoed by Governor Gavin Newsom.

5) AB 2787 (Quirk, 2022). Would have prohibited a person from selling, distributing, or offering for promotional purposes specified products that contain intentionally added microplastics. This bill was held on the Assembly Floor.

6) AB 1724 (Stone, 2022). Would have required all state-owned washing machines to contain a microfiber filtration system with a mesh size of 100 microns or smaller. This bill was held on the suspense file in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

7) AB 622 (Friedman, 2021). Would have required, on or before January 1, 2024, that all washing machines sold as new in California contain a microfiber filtration system with a mesh size of 100 microns or smaller. This bill was held in the Assembly Environmental Safety and Toxic Materials Committee.

8) AB 802 (Bloom, 2021). Would have required the State Water Board to identify the best available control technology for filtering microfibers from an industrial, institutional, or commercial laundry facility. This bill was held in the Assembly Environmental Safety and Toxic Materials Committee.

9) AB 1952 (Stone, 2020). Would have required the Department of General Services, in coordination with the California Environmental Protection Agency, to implement a one-year pilot program to assess the efficacy of microfiber filtration systems for 10 state-owned laundry facilities and report the results to the Legislature on or before January 1, 2023. This bill was held in the Assembly Accountability and Administrative Review Committee.

10) AB 2297 (Bloom, 2020). Would have required the State Water Board to identify the best available control technology for filtering microfibers from an industrial, institutional, or commercial laundry facility. This bill was held in the Assembly Environmental Safety and Toxic Materials Committee.

11) AB 3232 (Friedman, 2020). Would have required, on or before January 1, 2023, that all washing machines sold commercially in California contain a microfiber filtration system with a 90% or greater filtration rate. This bill was held in the Assembly Environmental Safety and Toxic Materials Committee.

12) AB 129 (Bloom, 2019). Would have required the State Water Board to take specified actions relating to microfiber pollution on or before July 1, 2020, and would have required the State Water Board to identify best practices for clothing manufacturers to reduce the amount of microfibers released into the environment. This bill was held in the Assembly Environmental Safety and Toxic Materials Committee.

13) SB 1263 (Portantino, Chapter 609, Statutes of 2018). Requires the OPC to adopt and implement a Statewide Microplastics Strategy that increases understanding of the scale and risks of microplastics pollution in the marine environment and identifies proposed solutions.

14) AB 888 (Bloom, Chapter 594, Statutes of 2015). Prohibits the sale of personal care products that contain plastic microbeads on and after January 1, 2020.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

350 Bay Area Action
350 Sacramento
5 Gyres Science to Solutions
7th Generation Advisors
Active San Gabriel Valley
Algalita Marine Research and Education
Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments
American College of Ob-gyn's District IX
Azul
Ban Single Use Plastic
Black Women for Wellness Action Project
Breast Cancer Over Time
Breast Cancer Prevention Partners
California Black Health Network
California Domestic Workers Coalition
California Environmental Voters
California Nurses for Environmental Health and Justice
California Product Stewardship Council
Californians Against Waste
California Public Interest Research Group
Catholic Charities of Stockton
Center for Environmental Health
Chicobag Company
Clean Water Action
Cleanearth4kids.org
Climate Action California
Coastal Corridor Alliance
Community Water Center
Courage California
Credo Beauty
Defend Our Health
Del Norte Solid Waste Management Authority
Dr. Bronner's
East Bay Municipal Utility District
Ecology Center
Environmental Working Group
Erin Brockovich Foundation
Facts Families Advocating for Chemical and Toxics Safety
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Friends of The Earth
Green Science Policy Institute
Innersense Organic Beauty
Integrated Resource Management
Intelligent Nutrients
Just the Goods
Just Transition Alliance
Last Plastic Straw
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Los Angeles Waterkeeper

Mamavation
Monterey Bay Aquarium
National Resources Defense Council
National Stewardship Action Council
Naturepedic
Northern California Recycling Association
Oakland Recycles
Pacoima Beautiful
Physicians for Social Responsibility - Los Angeles
Physicians for Social Responsibility - San Francisco Bay
Plastic Free Future
Plastic Pollution Coalition
Regen Monterey
ReThink Waste
Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority
San Francisco Bay Area Chapter Physicians for Social Responsibility
San Francisco Baykeeper
Save Our Shores
Save the Albatross Coalition
Save the Bay
Social Eco Education
Sierra Club California
SkinOwl
So Cal 350 Climate Action
South Bayside Waste Management Authority
Surfrider Foundation
Sustainable Rossmoor
US Green Building Council, California
Zero Waste Marin
Zero Waste San Diego
Zero Waste Sonoma

Opposition

American Chemistry Council
American Planning Association, California Chapter
Cal Chamber
California Grocers Association
California Retailers Associaiton
Personal Care Products Council
Western Plant Health Association

Analysis Prepared by: Naomi Ondrasek / E.S. & T.M. / (916) 319-3965