

Montalvo, Barbara

From: Breno Donatti <bdonatti@winfieldcoffee.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2025 1:19 PM
To: Hughes, Sheila; Camporeale, Karen
Cc: BOR_AllReps; Kagan, Leah; Michael Moore; Jackie Wetenhall
Subject: Re: FW: LR31.091 Public Hearing

Dear Representative Camporeale,

Thank you for your extensive and thoughtful response. I sincerely appreciate the engagement. That said, as a small business owner operating on the front lines of consumer behavior, product procurement, and waste handling, I remain strongly opposed to this ordinance in its current form—not because I don't care about sustainability, but precisely because I do.

Below are a few critical clarifications and respectfully offered rebuttals.

1. Carbon Footprint and Broader Pollution

You cite the broader environmental impact of plastics and reference microplastics and fossil fuels. These concerns are valid, but I must stress: banning a material because of theoretical end-of-life risks while forcing a shift to substitutes that have demonstrably higher lifecycle damage (in carbon, water, and deforestation impact) is a flawed tradeoff.

- The Danish EPA found paper cups **must be reused 43 times** to offset their carbon and energy impact vs. plastic. **In foodservice, that's impossible.**
- Alternatives like PLA and bagasse generate more greenhouse gases per use unless captured in a perfect compost loop—one that still doesn't exist in Stamford.

The real solution is not substitution, but circularity. Without a functioning, closed-loop composting or recycling system for every cup handed out, you're creating a worse problem in the name of optics.

2. Composting Reality vs. Idealism

Your response relies on the future availability of composting. But we're not legislating for a compostable utopia—we're legislating for right now.

- Compostables are not being composted unless separated perfectly by customers, collected in special hauls, and processed industrially.
- Even if Stamford is "investing," businesses today still have no access to routine, affordable pickup for food-soiled compostables.
- Testing cups at the Katrina site is not equivalent to scaling that across every bodega, restaurant, and café in the city.

This ordinance demands immediate compliance with an infrastructure that doesn't yet exist, transferring costs and logistics to already-overburdened local businesses while achieving no immediate environmental benefit.

3. "We Will Help Businesses" – Well-Meaning, but Not Guaranteed

I commend the formation of a committee and the offer to “work with us,” but these are non-binding assurances. Meanwhile, my cost to switch compostable cups will rise by \$8,000–\$12,000 annually at one location. Multiply that across our company and it’s a six-figure shift.

Your assertion that consumers will pay more for “sustainable packaging” is based on aspirational surveys. I operate in a real-world market where a \$1 ticket increase can tank loyalty. There’s a gap between what customers say and what they’ll pay.

Even with grants or programs, price volatility, supply chain reliability, and durability of compostables are unproven at scale in Stamford.

4. Litter Is Behavioral – Not Material-Specific

You note that plastics “never biodegrade.” But this argument misplaces blame. A plastic cup properly recycled is better than a paper cup littered or a compostable cup sent to landfill.

Let’s focus on waste stream management and enforcement of proper disposal, rather than outlawing materials wholesale. We have the wrong lever.

5. Global Examples – The Real Lessons

The examples of success (EU, Seattle, etc.) that you cite were not due to bans alone. They were backed by:

- Massive investment in pickup infrastructure
- Reusable systems mandated alongside bans
- Consumer education campaigns over years

Stamford has yet to lay that foundation. Premature bans will erode public trust and cause resistance to the next, more critical phase of environmental planning.

6. My Ask: Pause, Align, Build, Then Act

I ask that we delay enforcement until:

- A citywide compost collection service is active and affordable
- A vetted list of cost-neutral, durable, PFAS-free alternatives is provided
- Grants are disbursed, not just discussed
- Impact reports from small businesses are transparently published

Let's not legislate ambition before infrastructure.

I'd be honored to contribute as a member of your committee, sharing hands-on insight and helping design a sustainable path that works—for both the planet and the small businesses that keep Stamford vibrant.

Sincerely,

Breno Donatti

CEO & Founder, Winfield Street Coffee

breno@winfieldcoffee.com

203-343-7948

On Tue, Apr 29, 2025 at 9:56 AM, Sheila Hughes <SHughes@StamfordCT.gov> wrote:

See below email.

Sheila Hughes

Office Support Specialist

Board of Representatives

203.977.4025

she/her

From: Camporeale, Karen <KCamporeale@StamfordCT.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2025 9:43 AM

To: Campbell, Bonnie Kim (Board of Reps) <BKCampbell@StamfordCT.gov>; Hughes, Sheila <SHughes@StamfordCT.gov>

Subject: Fwd: LR31.091 Public Hearing

Sheila, can you please distribute this to whoever got the letter from this gentleman. He emailed me again. Here are his responses and mine. I'm also adding Bonnie because she's asking me for this

information. Please confirm that anyone that got his letter is getting my letter. Thank you. Bonnie see below.

Best,

Karen

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Camporeale, Karen" <KCamporeale@stamfordct.gov>

Date: April 28, 2025 at 9:52:23 PM EDT

To: Breno Donatti < >

Subject: Re: RE: LR31.091 Public Hearing

1. Carbon Footprint and Pollution – A Misguided Tradeoff

Your Claim: Plastics have a lower carbon footprint per use compared to alternatives like paper and bioplastics.

My Response: While it's true that some plastics may have a lower carbon footprint per single use, this perspective overlooks the broader environmental impact of plastics. Plastics are derived from fossil fuels and are associated with **significant** greenhouse gas emissions throughout their lifecycle. Moreover, plastics contribute to long-term pollution, persisting in the environment for centuries and breaking down into microplastics that contaminate ecosystems and enter the food chain. Plus, significant health risks.

Supporting Evidence:

- A study by the University of California, Santa Barbara, highlights that plastics' durability leads to accumulation in the environment, causing harm to wildlife and ecosystems.
- The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) emphasizes that the environmental costs of plastic pollution, including ecosystem degradation and health impacts, outweigh the benefits of their lower production emissions.
- Multiple studies in the legislative record talking about the effects on human health.

2. Recycling vs. Composting – Misrepresented Realities

Your Claim: Plastics are more recyclable than compostables, and composting infrastructure is lacking.

My Response: While plastics are technically recyclable, the reality is that only about 5-9% of plastics are actually recycled in the U.S., with the rest ending up in landfills or the environment. Compostable materials, on the other hand, offer a more sustainable end-of-life solution, especially when supported by appropriate infrastructure. Investing in composting facilities can enhance waste management and reduce reliance on landfills. Stamford IS investing in these. We already have composting available at the Katrina site. We have tested compostable and biodegradable cups, clamshells, flatware, cartons etc and it all went through the compost machine perfectly. Additionally, there are several others on order to be placed at various locations around the city. I am also advocating for pick up as we reduce plastic and increase compost. You maintain threat we are putting the cart before the horse, but the truth is the opposite. The city and its taxpayers are paying to haul plastic on the other hand the city can make money on compost. Ive spoken to a very large chain 6-0 plus stores that states that at hey are saving money by sending as much to compost as possible.

Supporting Evidence:

- The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) reports low recycling rates for plastics, indicating systemic challenges in plastic waste management.
 - A report by the Institute for Local Self-Reliance advocates for community-scale composting as a viable solution to manage organic and compostable waste effectively.
 - City of Stamford composting exists and is growing
-

3. Economic Hardships on Small Businesses – Immediate and Severe

Your Claim: Compostable alternatives are significantly more expensive, burdening small businesses.

My Response: While some compostable products may have higher upfront costs, they can lead to long-term savings through reduced waste disposal fees, improved brand loyalty, and eligibility for sustainability grants. Consumer demand for environmentally responsible businesses is growing, and adopting compostable packaging can be a competitive advantage. [Examples of+1HS Ecolife, LLC+1HS Ecolife, LLC](#)

Additionally, we are starting a committee /group where we will look to help you cost out items that are affordable. If we cannot find comparable affordable items, we will work with you. This is very much a work in process with some non-negotiables but many negotiables. We are going to work with you to the extent that we can knowing that what we have now is not sustainable.

Supporting Evidence:

- A study by Fanalp highlights that 74% of consumers are willing to pay more for products with sustainable packaging, suggesting potential for increased revenue. fanalp.com
 - The Slap Dash Mom blog discusses how sustainable packaging can lead to cost savings in materials, transportation, and waste management over time. [Slap Dash Mom](#)
 - we are going to be sourcing and offering up affordable alternatives. In addition, reusables and "skipping the stuff" will SAVE YOU MONEY.
-

4. Litter and Material Composition – Missing the Nuance

Your Claim: Littering behavior, not material type, is the primary issue; compostables also persist when littered.

My Response: Material composition significantly influences environmental impact. Compostable materials are designed to break down into non-toxic components, reducing long-term pollution. In contrast, plastics degrade into microplastics, which are persistent pollutants with harmful effects on wildlife and human health. You can also switch to biodegradable

Supporting Evidence:

- Research published in the journal *Environmental Science & Technology* indicates that microplastics are pervasive in marine environments, stemming largely from plastic litter.
 - The Composting Council Research & Education Foundation notes that certified compostable products break down effectively in composting systems, mitigating environmental harm.
-

5. Global Examples – Oversimplified Analysis

Your Claim: Plastic bans have led to increased emissions and unintended consequences.

My Response: The success of plastic bans depends on comprehensive policy design and implementation. When combined with public education, infrastructure development, and support for alternatives, such bans have effectively reduced plastic pollution without significant negative trade-offs. We are not inacting an ordinance and walking away. I've brought in two environmental groups that will help educate inform and source

Supporting Evidence:

- The European Union's directive on single-use plastics has spurred innovation in sustainable alternatives and increased investment in waste management infrastructure.
 - Stamford's own plastic and Styrofoam ban has led to a lot less pollution.
-

6. The Path Forward – Practical Sustainability, Not Symbolic Policy

Your Claim: Banning plastics without proper infrastructure is premature and symbolic.

My Response: Proactive policies drive the development of necessary infrastructure and market readiness. By setting clear goals and timelines, Stamford can stimulate investment in composting facilities and sustainable product development, leading to systemic change. We already have a composting facility that can handle this waste and more are under contract and on the way

Supporting Evidence:

- The city of Seattle's comprehensive approach to waste reduction, including bans and infrastructure investment, has resulted in increased composting rates and decreased landfill use.
 - The Ellen MacArthur Foundation emphasizes that systemic change towards a circular economy requires coordinated policy measures to be effective.
 - Stamford already has invested plus the less plastic pickup will allow for more composting pickup
 - there are large companies in Stamford sending their composting out and saving money on hauling waste.
-

In closing, transitioning from single-use plastics to compostable and biodegradable alternatives is a multifaceted endeavor that, when approached thoughtfully, offers substantial environmental and economic benefits. Our city can join other municipalities and can lead the way in sustainable waste management and environmental stewardship without killing your/our businesses.

You and businesses like you are important to our city. I know this is scary, but the alternative is scarier. We are going to help businesses through the transition.

Please send in the items that you are worried about so we can understand your fears and help by either changing the ordinance or help you source items.

Respectfully,

Karen

203 912 7684

From: Breno Donatti <bdonatti@winfieldcoffee.com>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2025 8:08 PM
To: Camporeale, Karen <KCamporeale@StamfordCT.gov>
Subject: Fwd: RE: LR31.091 Public Hearing

Dear Representative Camporeale,

Thank you for your thoughtful review of the input submitted regarding the proposed ban on single-use plastics. I appreciate the commitment to public dialogue and the recognition of valid concerns raised by small businesses like mine. However, after reviewing your responses, I respectfully submit that the ordinance as proposed remains scientifically unsound, environmentally counterproductive, economically harmful, and ultimately misaligned with the goal of true sustainability.

1. Carbon Footprint and Pollution – A Misguided Tradeoff

You acknowledged that plastics emit less carbon upfront, but stated that their “pollution impacts” outweigh that benefit. However, the very life cycle assessments (LCAs) you reference (e.g., Danish EPA, UK Environment Agency) quantify that the net environmental harm of alternatives like paper and bioplastics can be 2 to 10 times greater than plastics unless reused 5 to 40 times — a level of reuse that simply does not occur in real-world food and beverage environments.

Moreover, plastic pollution challenges are better addressed through improved waste management, not forcing a shift to products whose production demands massively more energy, water, and deforestation. Banning one material without a full systems approach (recycling reform, litter control, public education) only shifts the environmental burden elsewhere.

2. Recycling vs Composting – Misrepresented Realities

While it’s true that only about 5-9% of plastics are recycled nationally, banning recyclable materials without building a robust composting infrastructure first is a classic “cart before the horse” problem. Compostable cups, even when available, require specific conditions (industrial composting at 140°F, 60% humidity) rarely met in municipal settings—meaning most “compostable” products today end up in the landfill where they behave just like plastic.

In Stamford, there is currently no widespread, easily accessible, and enforced composting infrastructure capable of handling food-soiled compostable cups at scale. Transitioning businesses to materials that cannot be processed is environmentally irresponsible.

3. Economic Hardships on Small Businesses – Immediate and Severe

While you acknowledged short-term economic burdens, the suggestion that businesses can simply “offset” costs over time through reusable incentives ignores market realities:

- Compostable alternatives cost 2-4x more now — and prices are still rising.
- Businesses like mine operate on tight margins (~3–6%). A sudden doubling or tripling of packaging costs cannot be absorbed without price increases to customers, job losses, or cutbacks.
- Stamford consumers have a price elasticity threshold — force higher costs, and you drive sales out of small local shops to national chains with better economies of scale.

Small businesses are the lifeblood of Stamford. Burdening us with major cost hikes without practical infrastructure support is both unfair and shortsighted.

4. Litter and Material Composition – Missing the Nuance

You noted that plastic “never biodegrades,” but failed to recognize that littering behavior is a far larger determinant of pollution than material composition.

- In well-managed waste systems, plastics are collected, recycled, or landfilled safely.
- Compostables, when littered, do not disappear in the wild at meaningful speeds without industrial composting — they persist and create microtrash too.

The focus should be on proper disposal, recycling investment, and litter prevention, not attacking a material that—when properly handled—has lower net impact.

5. Global Examples – Oversimplified Analysis

You dismissed global failures of plastic bans by saying “poor design” was the issue. But that is exactly the point—bans are extremely hard to design correctly.

- Ireland, California, and others increased emissions after bans due to unintended shifts toward heavier single-use alternatives (thicker bags, thicker cups).
- Without guaranteed reusables adoption (which no mandate ensures), bans frequently backfire environmentally.

6. The Path Forward – Practical Sustainability, Not Symbolic Policy

If the Board truly wishes to advance Stamford's sustainability leadership, I urge you to pause this ordinance and focus instead on:

- Expanding and investing in true industrial composting capacity first.
- Launching public education campaigns on litter prevention and proper recycling.
- Providing financial incentives for businesses to transition voluntarily.
- Allowing recyclable plastics certified under closed-loop systems to continue being used.

Conclusion

The proposed ordinance is, at best, an aspirational but premature move. It risks creating greater environmental damage, harming Stamford's small business community, and undermining public support for future, more effective environmental initiatives.

I urge you to reconsider or table this ordinance until real waste management improvements are in place.

I would be happy to meet, participate in a working session, or help draft a more effective, balanced plan.

Sincerely,
Breno Donatti
CEO & Founder, Winfield Street Coffee
breno@winfieldcoffee.com

On Mon, Apr 28, 2025 at 7:22 PM, Sheila Hughes <SHughes@StamfordCT.gov> wrote:

Please see the below from Rep. Camporeale.

From: Camporeale, Karen <KCamporeale@StamfordCT.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2025 1:21 PM
To: Hughes, Sheila <SHughes@StamfordCT.gov>
Subject: Re: LR31.091 Public Hearing

Sheila, Please send this to whomever you sent the letter to and also send it to Leah. Below answers each portion of the letter sent;

1. Scientific Evidence Shows Substitutes Are Worse for the Environment

Claim: Life Cycle Analyses (LCAs) show paper cups, bioplastics, and compostables have *higher carbon footprints* than plastic.

Partially True, but missing important context:

- Some LCAs (like the Danish EPA study in 2018) did conclude that **if you only measure carbon footprint** and **single-use** scenarios, *some* paper and compostable alternatives use more energy and water.
- However, these studies *also* say plastic pollution creates **major external environmental costs**: microplastic pollution, marine damage, human health risks — which LCAs often **underestimate** or ignore.
- Real-world environmental *harm* from plastics (especially microplastics and chemicals like PFAS) can outweigh the carbon footprint advantage of plastics.

Bottom Line: Plastic may *emit less carbon* upfront, but its **pollution impacts** make it environmentally worse overall. Most scientific organizations today advocate for reducing plastic even if alternatives aren't perfect.

2. Recycling Infrastructure Supports Plastic More Than Alternatives

Claim: Plastic recycling works better than composting PLA.

Technically True, but very misleading:

- Only **5–9%** of plastic is actually recycled in the U.S. today. ([EPA data](#)).
- Most polypropylene (PP) and PET plastic **cups** are **not actually recycled** because they are contaminated or because many local programs don't accept them.
- Compostable cups *can* be composted at specialized facilities, but access is limited. (This is a real issue but stamford has and will have additional composting sites.)

Bottom Line: Neither plastics nor compostables are properly handled by current infrastructure, but plastics cause permanent pollution if not dealt with, while compostables biodegrade more easily.

3. Unintended Consequences for Small Businesses and Consumers

Claim: Paper and compostable products are 2–4x more expensive and less durable.

Mostly True:

- Compostable cups can cost **2–3x more** than plastic cups, especially if certified compostable (BPI certified, PFAS-free). They will need to switch to PFAS free material anyway as the state will likely be imposing a PFAS free law by 2026/2027 so all material will need to be certified PFAS free even without the ban in Stamford
- They sometimes leak or lose strength with ice. I think this is a small price to pay and there are plastic like compostables
- Some businesses report increased costs and operational adjustments.
- what the retailer does not consider is the money that will be saved by this ordinance ie skip the stuff and reusables.

Bottom Line: There are **real short-term economic burdens** for small businesses. However, longer-term costs can be offset by shifting to reusables or through government incentives.

4. The Real Problem is Littering, Not Material

Claim: Target littering, not materials.

True, but incomplete:

- Yes, **littering behavior** is a huge problem.
- However, **the material matters too**: plastic litter **never biodegrades**; it fragments into microplastics that last centuries and harm ecosystems and health.
- Paper and compostable materials **break down faster** and are less toxic.

Bottom Line: Behavior *and* material both matter. Best policies address both simultaneously (e.g., reducing single-use items *and* promoting better disposal).

5. Global Examples Show These Bans Don't Work

Claim: Plastic bans in places like Ireland, UK, Canada led to worse environmental outcomes.

Incorrect and Misleading:

- Some early bans (especially on **plastic bags**) had **unintended side effects**, like more paper bag usage (higher carbon footprint) — if not paired with **reusable bag programs**.

- However, **overall**, plastic bans have been **effective** in reducing visible litter, ocean pollution, and microplastics.
- Emissions increases usually happen when people switch to heavy **single-use alternatives** (like thick paper bags) instead of true reusables.

Bottom Line: Poorly designed bans can have side effects, but **smartly designed bans**, with public education and incentives for reusables, *work well*. Many global cities report major pollution reduction.

Summary:

Claim Section	Verdict	Quick Comment
Substitutes worse for environment	Partially true	Plastics lower carbon upfront, but more pollution harm
Recycling better for plastic	Technically true, but recycling rates are very low	
Costs for small businesses	Mostly true	Transition costs are real but manageable
Focus on littering not material	Half-true	Need both better behavior and better materials
Plastic bans don't work	Misleading	Depends on how bans are designed and enforced

Overall:

This letter raises **some valid concerns**, especially about costs to small businesses. But it **overemphasizes the downsides** of the ordinance and **understates the severe environmental and health impacts** of continuing single-use plastic.

In short: **the bigger scientific and policy consensus supports reducing single-use plastics**, despite challenges in making alternatives perfect.

From: Hughes, Sheila <SHughes@StamfordCT.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2025 11:34 AM
To: Hughes, Sheila <SHughes@StamfordCT.gov>
Subject: FW: LR31.091 Public Hearing

Please see the below emails.

Sheila Hughes

Office Support Specialist
Board of Representatives
203.977.4025
she/her

From: Kagan, Leah <LKagan@StamfordCT.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2025 11:28 AM
To: Staley, Angelina <ASTaley@StamfordCT.gov>; Montalvo, Barbara <BMontalvo@StamfordCT.gov>; Hughes, Sheila <SHughes@StamfordCT.gov>
Cc: Breno Donatti <bdonatti@winfieldcoffee.com>; Jackie Wetenhall <retail@stamford-downtown.com>
Subject: LR31.091 Public Hearing
Importance: High

Hello,

In advance of the upcoming Legislative and Rules Committee Public Hearing on LR31.091 can you please include the email below on the record from business owner Breno Donatti.

Best,
Leah

From: Jackie Wetenhall <retail@stamford-downtown.com>
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2025 2:17 PM
To: Kagan, Leah <LKagan@StamfordCT.gov>
Cc: Michael Moore <moore@stamford-downtown.com>; Breno Donatti <bdonatti@winfieldcoffee.com>
Subject: FW: Reminder: Public Hearing via Zoom on proposed ban of single use plastic product in food establishments
Importance: High

Good Afternoon Leah:

This is a well thought out e-mail from Breno Donatti, owner of Winfield's coffee house next store to the Ferguson Library. Can it be send to the Board of Representatives for consideration? Breno, will be on a plane on Tuesday evening, so he'll not be able to be on the call.

All the Best, Jackie

Jacqueline R. Wetenhall
Vice President & Director Retail Development
Stamford Downtown
5 Landmark Square, Suite 110
Stamford, CT 06901
Ph (203) 348-5285 Fax (203) 348-6857
retail@stamford-downtown.com
Click on www.stamford-downtown.com for the latest!

On Fri, Apr 25, 2025 at 10:23 AM, Breno Donatti <bdonatti@winfieldcoffee.com> wrote:

Jackie,

I will be on a plane during the time of this meeting but would like to submit my input for consideration. Would you be able to send the message below to the board for consideration?

Subject: Opposition to Single-Use Plastic Cup Ban – Practical, Environmental, and Scientific Concerns

Dear Board of Representatives,

As a concerned business owner and environmentally conscious citizen, I urge you to reconsider the proposed ban on single-use plastic cups. While the intent to reduce environmental impact is admirable, the actual outcomes of such bans often run counter to their goals—causing more harm than good both ecologically and economically.

1. Scientific Evidence Shows Substitutes Are Worse for the Environment

Numerous life cycle analyses (LCAs) from reputable institutions such as the Danish Environmental Protection Agency and the University of Michigan have concluded that common alternatives—paper cups, bioplastics, and compostable PLA—carry a significantly higher carbon footprint, energy usage, and water consumption than traditional recyclable polypropylene or PET plastic cups. A paper cup must be used at least 3–5 times to equal the carbon footprint of a single-use plastic one—an unrealistic expectation in most coffee shop settings.

2. Recycling Infrastructure Supports Plastic More Than Alternatives

Unlike PLA and “compostable” cups, which are rarely processed in municipal composting facilities, traditional recyclable plastics have a functioning, albeit imperfect, recycling infrastructure. By banning plastic and shifting to materials that cannot be processed at scale, the burden is simply being transferred, not removed.

3. Unintended Consequences for Small Businesses and Consumers

Bans like this disproportionately affect small businesses like mine. We’ve built efficient, customer-friendly systems around recyclable plastic cups that support fast service and cost-effective operations. Paper-based or compostable substitutes are 2 to 4 times more expensive, more fragile, and cause leaks with iced beverages. These lead to increased waste due to spills, customer dissatisfaction, and higher resource consumption to clean and replace drinks—ironically, increasing our net environmental footprint.

4. The Real Problem is Littering, Not Material

Policy should target behavior, not material. A plastic cup in a proper recycling bin poses far less environmental risk than a paper cup littered on the street. Educational campaigns, improved recycling access, and anti-littering enforcement would yield far greater results than material bans.

5. Global Examples Show These Bans Don’t Work

Ireland, the UK, and parts of Canada have already rolled out plastic bans with disappointing results: emissions increased, consumer confusion grew, and enforcement was uneven. In many cases, carbon and water use went up—not down.

I respectfully propose:

- Instead of an outright ban, incentivize closed-loop recycling programs and allow certified recyclable plastics under regulated guidelines.
- Support grant programs to help small businesses invest in cup-return systems or in-store reusable initiatives.
- Promote public education over blanket bans.

Let's be solution-focused, not symbolic. I would welcome the opportunity to contribute to a working group or provide testimony on this matter.

Sincerely,
Breno Donatti
CEO & Founder, Winfield Street Coffee
breno@winfieldcoffee.com

[Breno Donatti](#)
[@winfieldstreetcoffee](#)
www.winfieldcoffee.com

From: Jackie Wetenhall <retail@stamford-downtown.com>
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2025 8:59 AM
To: Breno Donatti <bdonatti@winfieldcoffee.com>
Subject: Reminder: Public Hearing via Zoom on proposed ban of single use plastic product in food establishments

Good Morning Restaurant Owners:

Important reminder, please attend via Zoom, so we can hear from Restaurant Owners & Managers. The Board of Representatives is conducting a Public Hearing on Tuesday, April 29th at 7pm. The hearing (before the vote) is for input from restaurants owners on the impact this ordinance will have on your business. The proposed ordinance seeks to ban the sale, provision and distribution of single use plastic products in food and beverage establishments. See details on the attachment.

Tuesday, April 29, 2025
7:00 p.m.

This meeting will be held remotely. The meeting can be accessed by computer, tablet or smartphone at <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89805417184> or at www.zoom.com – Webinar ID: - 898 0541 7184 or by telephone at 1 646 558 8656 – Webinar ID: 898 0541 7184

Please contact me at (203) 348-5285 if you have any questions.

All the Best, Jackie

[Jacqueline R. Wetenhall](#)

Vice President & Director Retail Development
Stamford Downtown
5 Landmark Square, Suite 110
Stamford, CT 06901
Ph (203) 348-5285 Fax (203) 348-6857
retail@stamford-downtown.com
Click on www.stamford-downtown.com for the latest!

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.