

March 10, 2025

Representative Zack Fields, Co-Chair Representative Carolyn Hall, Co-Chair House Labor and Commerce Committee

Re: House Bill 25, Disposable Food Service Ware, version 34-LS0256\A

Dear Co-Chairs Fields and Hall and members of the House Labor and Commerce Committee,

The Alaska Chamber (the Chamber) writes in opposition to House Bill 25, an Act relating to disposable food service ware; and providing for an effective date.

The Alaska Chamber is the state's largest statewide business advocacy organization. Our mission is to promote a healthy business environment in Alaska. The Chamber has more than 700 members and represents businesses of all sizes and industries from across the state, representing 58,000 Alaskan workers and \$4.6 billion in wages.

HB25 would prohibit restaurants from using polystyrene foodservice containers and mandate the use of biodegradable or compostable alternatives. While the business community fully supports responsible waste reduction and improvements in recycling and recovery, HB25 takes the wrong approach by restricting businesses' ability to select the foodservice packaging that best meets their needs, while failing to consider the broader environmental and economic consequences.

All packaging materials, including compostable alternatives, leave an environmental footprint, requiring energy and resources for production, transportation, and disposal. Furthermore, the reality in Alaska is that the infrastructure needed to properly process compostable foodservice containers does not exist. Anchorage's Solid Waste Services' Curbside Compost Program and Community Compost drop-off sites do not accept compostable foodservice materials due to processing limitations. Without access to an industrial composting facility, these alternatives will likely end up in landfills, negating any intended environmental benefits.

HB 25 would impose significant financial burdens on Alaska's businesses. By requiring restaurants to use more expensive alternatives that may not perform as well—especially for hot or cold foods—this bill threatens to increase operating costs for businesses already struggling with narrow margins. The unintended consequence could be higher costs for consumers and additional strain on small businesses.

Moreover, the exemption language found within HB25 is vague and arbitrary. A regulator at the Department of Environmental Conservation does not have the expertise or ability to determine what regulations cause "undue hardship" to a restaurant. What might appear as a small financial burden in the context of this specific proposed law might be the final straw in a long line of other expensive mandates placed on the business. It is inappropriate for the government to decide what is and is not undue hardship on a business.

For these reasons, we urge you to oppose HB 25 and consider more balanced, evidence-based solutions that support both Alaska's businesses and environmental goals.

Sincerely.

Kati Capozzi
President and CEC

6