



June 13, 2023

Federal Trade Commission
Office of the Secretary
600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Suite CC-5610 (Annex F)
Washington, DC 20580

Re: Green Guides—Recycling Workshop, 16 CFR part 260, Project No. P954501

Truth in Advertising, Inc. (“TINA.org”) welcomes the opportunity to submit the following in conjunction with the Federal Trade Commission’s (“Commission,” “Agency” or “FTC”) March 7, 2023 request for comments relating to its May 23 recycling workshop, Talking Trash at the FTC: Recyclable Claims and the Green Guides, held as part of its review of the Guides for the Use of Environmental Marketing Claims (“Green Guides” or “Guides”).¹

Consumer demand for greener products and services is on the rise with a majority of U.S. consumers preferring environmentally friendly products, and nearly two-thirds of them willing to pay more for such products.² At the same time, it is incredibly difficult for consumers to verify the accuracy of eco-friendly marketing claims. As such, consumers are generally at the mercy of brands’ marketing representations when seeking environmentally friendly products. And brands, eager to capitalize on the demand for such products, are taking advantage of the informational asymmetry that exists between companies and consumers to engage in greenwashing especially when it comes to unqualified recyclable claims, which cause harm not only to consumers and honest competitors, but to the environment as well.

As explained in more detail below, there is a disconnect between how U.S. consumers perceive recyclable claims made by brands and how these companies market and interpret such claims. And as a result of this dichotomy, consumers seeking sustainable products are continually misled into purchasing nonrecyclable products that end up in landfills based on theoretical “recyclable” marketing assertions made by companies – theoretical representations that clearly violate FTC law.

INTEREST OF COMMENTER

TINA.org is a nonpartisan, nonprofit consumer advocacy organization whose mission is to combat deceptive advertising and consumer fraud; promote understanding of the serious harms commercial dishonesty inflicts; and work with consumers, businesses, independent experts, synergy organizations, self-regulatory bodies and government

agencies to advance countermeasures that effectively prevent and stop deception in the economy. At the center of TINA.org’s efforts is its website, www.tina.org, which provides information about common deceptive advertising techniques, consumer protection laws, and alerts about specific deceptive marketing campaigns—such as nationally advertised “Built in the USA” vans manufactured abroad;³ pillows and essential oils falsely marketed as being able to treat chronic diseases;⁴ and a delivery meal kit service that falsely advertises free meals.⁵

The website functions as a clearinghouse, receiving consumer complaints about suspicious practices, which TINA.org investigates and, when appropriate, takes up with businesses and regulatory authorities. The website is also a repository of information relating to consumer protection lawsuits and regulatory actions. Through its collaborative approach and attention to emerging issues and complexities, TINA.org has become a trusted source of expertise on matters relating to consumer fraud, and has testified before Congress on issues related to consumer protection, deceptive marketing and economic justice.⁶

TINA.org regularly draws on its expertise to advocate for consumer interests before the FTC and other governmental bodies and appears as *amicus curiae* in cases raising important questions of consumer protection law.⁷ Since its inception, TINA.org has filed legal actions against hundreds of companies and entities, published more than 1,300 ad alerts, written over 1,000 news articles, and tracked more than 4,000 federal class actions alleging deceptive marketing. Notably, since 2015, state and federal agencies have obtained more than \$250 million from wrongdoers based on TINA.org legal actions and evidence, and returned millions in ill-gotten gains to consumers.

Additionally, over the last 10 years, TINA.org has taken an active role in working to expose marketers who engage in greenwashing, as well as educating consumers about such deceptive marketing campaigns.⁸ TINA.org’s experience demonstrates that this tactic is a serious, widespread and insidious problem present throughout the economy.⁹

RECYCLABLE CLAIMS

To make rational economic decisions concerning eco-friendly marketed goods and services, consumers must have accurate information. However, the serious informational imbalance between companies and consumers concerning environmental claims, coupled with the abundance of misinformation present in eco-friendly marketing, puts consumers at a distinct disadvantage and allows companies to easily exploit them. Unlike other types of marketing claims, the vast majority of Americans do not have the resources or technical education to vet most environmental marketing claims. As a result, consumers are very much dependent on the FTC to protect them from greenwashing.

The FTC’s Green Guides state that products should not be marketed as “recyclable” unless the products “can be collected, separated, or otherwise recovered from the waste stream through an established recycling program for reuse or use in manufacturing or assembling another item.”¹⁰ The Guides go on to state that brands can only make

unqualified recyclability claims “[w]hen recycling facilities are available to a substantial majority of consumers or communities where the item is sold,” which means 60 percent according to the FTC.¹¹ As such, “[t]o make a non-deceptive unqualified claim, a marketer should substantiate that a substantial majority of consumer or communities have access to facilities that will actually recycle, not accept and ultimately discard, the product.”¹²

FTC guidance does not completely align with consumer perception.

- Most consumers believe that “recyclable” means a product will be recycled most of the time and 30 percent (a substantial minority) of surveyed consumers think that “recyclable” means a product will be recycled 100 percent of the time;¹³
- 73 percent of U.S. consumers are unclear as to what is recyclable.¹⁴ In fact, most consumers mistakenly believe that plastic is endlessly recyclable;¹⁵
- 92 percent of consumers do not understand the plastic resin code labels found on the vast majority of plastic packaging and products, and 68 percent assume that any item with a plastic resin code symbol is recyclable;¹⁶
- Similarly, the vast majority of consumers interpret the chasing arrows logo to represent a universal recycling symbol with 81 percent of consumers believing that the chasing arrows logo means a product and/or packaging is definitely recyclable and 16 percent interpreting the logo to mean the product and/or packaging is probably recyclable;¹⁷
- Further, 85 percent of Americans are “somewhat-to-very confident that what they throw in the recycling bin is actually recycled.”¹⁸

The results of these polls and surveys documenting consumer perception of recycling claims should be used to reassess the FTC Green Guides and whether recyclable representations deceive consumers.

As the above surveys make clear, what appears on labeling and packaging plays a key role in shaping consumers’ perception of what is and is not recyclable. Despite the plethora of data indicating that reasonable U.S. consumers believe that marketing an item as “recyclable” means that the product or packaging will be recycled in practice, all too often brands (and the plastics industry) take the position that marketing a good or packaging as “recyclable” only means that the item is recyclable in theory.

By way of example, The Coca-Cola Company took the position in a federal class-action lawsuit that “no reasonable consumer would understand ‘100% recyclable’ to mean that the entire product will always be recycled”;¹⁹ 7-Eleven argued in a federal class action that “recyclable” simply means “capable of being recycled” as opposed to actually being recycled;²⁰ and Keurig took the position in a class-action lawsuit that its pods were recyclable despite the fact that they were too small for the vast majority of centers to recycle.²¹

Supporting the plastic industry’s contention that consumers’ perception of what the term “recyclable” means is irrelevant to how brands are using the term in marketing products,

the Vice President of Sustainability at the Plastics Industry Association noted at the FTC's Talking Trash workshop:

I think it's really important to focus on the specific claim that we're talking about, which is recyclable, not ultimately recycled... We want to see more plastics be recycled, but the term recyclable, and especially when we use it in an unqualified way, is that you have the ability to, not is actually. And again, I also want to point out to the fact that that is consistent with industry definitions like from ISO and others. So that's really important to point out. And again, also, when judges find that words mean what their definitions are, that's important to consider when we set policy around guidance documents which are supposed to say how do we interpret whether or not something is true or not.²²

The plastics industry's position is further exemplified in a 2021 exchange between a reporter and a representative of Colgate-Palmolive concerning the recyclability of toothpaste tubes:²³

Representative: "So we're here today to showcase our first of its kind recyclable tube."
Reporter: "So if, if you put this in your curbside tonight, do you think that this tube would be recycled?"
Representative: "Uh, we need more work; we're working with other organizations to get the word out..."
Reporter: "So not yet."
Representative: "Not yet."
Reporter: "Not yet."
Representative: "Not yet."
Reporter: "I noticed that you guys put the big chasing arrows..."
Representative: "Correct."
Reporter: "Do you think that because it's not quite recyclable yet that that might be a little misleading?"
Representative: "We don't think that we're being misleading because technically it is recyclable."

Pursuant to the Green Guides, whether a product or packaging is recyclable or not depends on where it ultimately ends up – and if it is a landfill then brands and companies have no business claiming their products or packaging are recyclable. Nevertheless, there is abundant evidence that many corporations are embracing a theoretical or technical definition of recyclable that ignores the tenets of the Green Guides and consumer perception data in order to take advantage of consumer demand for eco-friendly products and packaging. As such, it is imperative that the FTC strengthen its position on what support is required for a brand or company to make an unqualified recyclable claim in the Green Guides.

CONCLUSION

The Commission's objective in promulgating guidelines ultimately revolves around setting standards that will ensure corporations and brands do not mislead or deceive consumers. There can be no doubt that the Green Guides have been ineffective at stemming the tide of deception when it comes to eco-friendly marketing. Greenwashing is a pervasive problem and nowhere is that more apparent than in the case of deceptive and misleading unqualified recyclable claims. Alarming, the injury caused by this type of corporate deception is not limited to consumer harm – greenwashing also harms honest businesses and the one thing eco-conscious consumers are trying to protect with their purchases – the environment. For these reasons, and those articulated in our April 24 Comment regarding the Green Guides, TINA.org respectfully urges the agency to undertake a rulemaking addressing unqualified recyclable claims.

Sincerely,



Bonnie Patten
Laura Smith
Truth in Advertising, Inc.

¹ Public Workshop Examining Guides for the Use of Environmental Marketing Claims, 88 Fed. Reg. 14092 (Mar. 7, 2023), <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2023/03/07/2023-04589/public-workshop-examining-guides-for-the-use-of-environmental-marketing-claims>. See also TINA.org’s Comment of FTC’s Green Guides Review (Apr. 24, 2023), https://truthinadvertising.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/4_24_23-TINA-Green-Guides-Comment.pdf.

² Press Release, GreenPrint, GreenPrint Survey Finds Consumers Want to Buy Eco-Friendly Products, but Don’t Know How to Identify Them (Mar. 22, 2021), <https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20210322005061/en/GreenPrint-Survey-Finds-Consumers-Want-to-Buy-Eco-Friendly-Products-but-Don%20t-Know-How-to-Identify-Them>. See also Greg Petro, *Consumers Demand Sustainable Products and Shopping Formats*, Forbes, Mar. 11, 2022, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/gregpetro/2022/03/11/consumers-demand-sustainable-products-and-shopping-formats/?sh=325c20c26a06> (“In the two years since First Insight’s first report on Gen Z and sustainability was published, Gen X consumers’ preference to shop sustainable brands increased by nearly 25% and their willingness to pay more for sustainable products increased by 42%. In fact, consumers across all generations—from Baby Boomers to Gen Z—are now willing to spend more for sustainable products. Just two years ago, only 58% of consumers across all generations were willing to spend more for sustainable options. Today, nearly 90% of Gen X consumers said that they would be willing to spend an extra 10% or more for sustainable products, compared to just over 34% two years ago.”); Andrew Martins, *Most Consumers Want Sustainable Products and Packaging*, Bus. News Daily, Feb. 21, 2023, <https://www.businessnewsdaily.com/15087-consumers-want-sustainable-products.html> (“According to a survey from McKinsey & Co., 66% of all respondents and 75% of millennial respondents say that they consider sustainability when they make a purchase. ... [R]esearchers said 72% of respondents reported that they were actively buying more environmentally friendly products than they did five years ago, while 81% said they expected to buy even more over the next five years. ‘The shift in consumer buying, with more consumers willing to pay extra for environmentally friendly products, reinforces the need for companies to increase their commitments to responsible business practices.’”); *Majority of US Consumers Say They Will Pay More for Sustainable Products*, Sustainable Brands, Aug. 29, 2022, <https://sustainablebrands.com/read/marketing-and-comms/majority-of-us-consumers-say-they-will-pay-more-for-sustainable-products> (“66 percent of US consumers and 80 percent of young US adults (ages 18- 34) surveyed are willing to pay more for sustainable products versus less sustainable competitors, according to the second Business of Sustainability Index by GreenPrint, a PDI company.”); Jordan Bar Am et al., *Consumers Care About Sustainability – And Back It Up With Their Wallets*, McKinsey & Co., Feb. 6, 2023, <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/consumer-packaged-goods/our-insights/consumers-care-about-sustainability-and-back-it-up-with-their-wallets> (“in a 2020 McKinsey US consumer sentiment survey, more than 60 percent of respondents said they’d pay more for a product with sustainable packaging. A recent study by NielsenIQ found that 78 percent of US consumers say that a sustainable lifestyle is important to them. ... Products making ESG-related claims averaged 28 percent cumulative growth over the past five-year period, versus 20 percent for products that made no such claims.”); Press Release, DS Smith, *Consumers More Likely to Buy Goods With Clearer Recycling Directions as DS Smith Reveals Its Top 12 Hard-To-Recycle Items* (Mar. 24, 2022), <https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20220324005752/en/> (“Nearly two thirds (63%) of those polled say they’re more likely to purchase those well-marked products, yet another sign of environmental concerns driving shopper preferences.”).

³ TINA.org’s Mercedes-Benz Investigation, <https://truthinadvertising.org/brands/mercedes-benz/>.

⁴ TINA.org’s MyPillow Investigation, <https://truthinadvertising.org/brands/mypillow/>; TINA.org’s doTerra Investigation, <https://truthinadvertising.org/brands/doterra/>; TINA.org’s Young Living Investigation, <https://truthinadvertising.org/brands/young-living/>.

⁵ TINA.org’s HelloFresh Investigation, <https://truthinadvertising.org/brands/hellofresh/>.

⁶ *Safeguarding American Consumers: Fighting Fraud and Scams During the Pandemic Before the Subcomm. on Consumer Prot. and Com. of the Comm. on Energy and Com.*, 117th Cong. (Feb. 4, 2021) (testimony of Bonnie Patten, Exec. Dir., Truth In Advertising), <https://truthinadvertising.org/action/house-testimony-2021-summary-action/>; *Curbing COVID Cons: Warning Consumers about Pandemic Frauds, Scams, and Swindles Before the Subcomm. on Consumer Prot., Prod. Safety, and Data Sec. of the Comm. on Com., Sci., & Transp.*, 117th Cong. (Apr. 27, 2021), (testimony of Bonnie Patten, Exec. Dir., Truth In Advertising), <https://truthinadvertising.org/action/senate-testimony-2021-summary-action/>.

⁷ For example, TINA.org participated as amicus curiae in *AMG Capital Management, LLC v. Federal Trade Commission*. Brief of Amicus Curiae Truth In Advertising, Inc. In Support of Respondent, *AMG Capital Mgmt., LLC v. Fed. Trade Comm’n*, No. 19-508 (U.S. Dec. 7, 2020), https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/19/19-508/162934/20201207192719389_19-508%20brief.pdf. TINA.org also filed an amici curiae brief in *Federal Trade Commission v. Quincy Bioscience Holding Co., Inc.*, which reinstated a Section 13(b) suit against a business falsely marketing a dietary supplement to the elderly as clinically proven to improve memory. Brief of Amici Curiae Truth In Advertising, Inc. et al. in Favor of Appellants and in Support of Reversal, *Fed. Trade Comm’n v. Quincy Bioscience Holding Co., Inc.*, 753 Fed. Appx. 87 (2d Cir. 2019) (No. 17-3745), https://truthinadvertising.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Prevagen_Amici-Curiae-brief.pdf.

⁸ *Companies Accused of Greenwashing*, TINA.org, Apr. 22, 2022 (updated May 24, 2023), <https://truthinadvertising.org/articles/companies-accused-greenwashing/>. See also TINA.org’s Comment of FTC’s Green Guides Review (Apr. 24, 2023), https://truthinadvertising.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/4_24_23-TINA-Green-Guides-Comment.pdf; *The Proliferation of Greenwashing*, TINA.org, Apr. 17, 2023, <https://truthinadvertising.org/articles/the-proliferation-of-greenwashing/>; TINA.org’s Deceptive Marketing 101: Recyclable Claims, <https://truthinadvertising.org/resource/deceptive-marketing-101-recyclable-claims/>; *CATrends: ‘100% Recyclable’ Water Bottles*, TINA.org, Sept. 28, 2021, <https://truthinadvertising.org/articles/catrends-100-recyclable-water-bottles/>.

⁹ TINA.org’s Comment of FTC’s Green Guides Review (Apr. 24, 2023), at 2-9, https://truthinadvertising.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/4_24_23-TINA-Green-Guides-Comment.pdf.

¹⁰ Guides for the Use of Environmental Marketing Claims, 16 C.F.R. § 260.12(a) (2012).

¹¹ 16 C.F.R. § 260.12(b).

¹² FTC The Green Guides: Statement of Basis and Purpose, at 174-5, <https://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/attachments/press-releases/ftc-issues-revised-green-guides/greenguidesstatement.pdf>.

¹³ *How Consumers Feel About and Respond to Recycling & How2Recycle: A Consumer Research Summary*, How2Recycle, July 29, 2022, <https://how2recycle.info/news/2022/how-consumers-feel-about-and-respond-to-recycling-how2recycle-a-consumer-research-summary>.

¹⁴ *Reduce. Reuse. Confuse.*, Consumer Brands Association, at 6 (2019), https://consumerbrandsassociation.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/ConsumerBrands_ReduceReuseConfuse.pdf (“Upon learning that only two of the seven codes were typically recyclable curbside, 73 percent were surprised. Even more confusing, those codes are intended for the recycling processing centers, but consumers are interpreting them – and incorrectly at that.”).

¹⁵ Alison Borochoff-Porte et al., *Applying Consumer Protection Basics to Greenwashing Recyclability Cases*, Harv. L. Rev., Apr. 10, 2023, at 12 (“Research suggest that a significant portion of consumers exhibit confusion about the term recyclable and could in fact view the label ‘recyclable’ to mean that the product would always or would likely be recycled. One survey suggests that most consumers mistakenly believe that plastic is endlessly recyclable. And the National Consumers League has written that symbols like the green, three-arrow recycle symbol ‘add[s] to consumer confusion,’ and that ‘the language used on ... packaging related to recycling or recyclability is often vague, inconsistent, and relatively unhelpful to even savvy consumers.’”). See also National Poll: A Survey of American Adults (July 10, 2019), https://www.consumer-action.org/downloads/Recycling_Survey_July2019.pdf (showing that 58 percent of consumers believe that plastic is endlessly recyclable).

¹⁶ *Reduce. Reuse. Confuse.*, Consumer Brands Association, at 6 (2019), https://consumerbrandsassociation.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/ConsumerBrands_ReduceReuseConfuse.pdf.

¹⁷ Carl Latkin et al., *The (Mis)Understanding of the Symbol Associated with Recycling on Plastic Containers in the U.S.: A Brief Report*, 14 Sustainability 9636 (2022), <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/14/15/9636>.

¹⁸ Suzanne Shelton, *Managing Packaging Perception vs. Realities for a Truly Circular Future*, Green Biz, Sept. 2, 2019, <https://www.greenbiz.com/article/managing-packaging-perceptions-vs-realities-truly-circular-future>. See also Alison Borochoff-Porte et al., *Applying Consumer Protection Basics to Greenwashing Recyclability Cases*, Harv. L. Rev., Apr. 10, 2023, at 12; Suzanne Shelton *Managing Packaging Perceptions vs. Realities for a TRULY Circular Future*, Shelton Group, Aug. 29, 2019, <https://sheltongrp.com/managing-packaging-perceptions-v-realities-for-a-truly-circular-future/>.

¹⁹ Defendants’ Consolidated Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint; Memorandum of Points and Authorities at 1, *Swartz v. Coca-Cola Co.*, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 209641 (N.D. Cal. 2023) (No. 3:21-cv-4643). See also *Swartz v. Coca-Cola Co.*, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 209641 (N.D. Cal. 2022) (granting company’s motion to dismiss); Alison Borochoff-Porte et al., *Applying Consumer Protection Basics to Greenwashing Recyclability Cases*, Harv. L. Rev., Apr. 10, 2023, at 6, <https://harvardelr.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/12/2023/04/HELLR-Vol.-47-Recyclability.pdf> (“The Court in *Swartz* granted the defendants’ motion to dismiss in its entirety in a 2.5-page decision. The court wrote that ‘no reasonable consumer would understand ‘100% recyclable’ to mean that the entire product will always be recycled.’ The decision went on to assert that ‘a reasonable consumer would understand that making an object recyclable is just the first step in the process of converting waste into reusable material.’ In essence, the court

satisfied itself with an understanding of recyclability that is divorced from the likelihood that the product will in fact be recycled.”).

²⁰ Defendant 7-Eleven’s Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Class Action Complaint, at 2, *Curtis v. 7-Eleven, Inc.*, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 164850 (N.D. Ill. 2022) (No. 1:21-cv-6079); Memorandum Opinion and Order, at 26, *Curtis v. 7-Eleven, Inc.*, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 164850 (N.D. Ill. 2022) (No. 1:21-cv-6079). *See also* *Curtis v. 7-Eleven, Inc.*, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 164850 (N.D. Ill. 2022) (granting in part and denying in part the company’s motion to dismiss); Alison Borochoff-Porte et al., *Applying Consumer Protection Basics to Greenwashing Recyclability Cases*, Harv. L. Rev., Apr. 10, 2023, at 6, <https://harvardelr.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/12/2023/04/HELRL-Vol.-47-Recyclability.pdf> (“In *Curtis*, the court dismissed the claims brought with respect to the products that were labeled with identifying plastic resin numbers but denied the motion to dismiss claims regarding the unlabeled products. The court wrote that ‘the term ‘recyclable’ is about the inherent qualities of the product,’ cited dictionary definitions, and likewise emphasized that ‘recyclable’ meant ‘capable of being recycled.’ The court further found that while it was ‘unfortunate’ that ‘there [we]ren’t any facilities nearby’ that recycled No. 6 plastics, it was not deceptive.”).

²¹ Defendant Keurig Green Mountain, Inc.’s Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint; Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support Thereof, *Smith v. Keurig Green Mountain, Inc.*, 393 F. Supp. 3d 837 (N.D. Cal. 2019) (No. 4:18-cv-06690). *But see* *Smith v. Keurig Green Mountain*, 393 F. Supp. 3d 837, 847 (N.D. Cal. 2019) (denying company’s motion to dismiss finding “Keurig fails to show how Plaintiff’s claims to not satisfy the reasonable consumer test, for two reasons. First, Keurig again ignores that the complaint avers that the disputed Pods are not recyclable at all. As a result, Defendant’s purportedly analogous cases where disclaimers were sufficient to render an advertisement not false or misleading are irrelevant. Similarly, cases where courts have found that a modicum of common sense would reveal the truth behind advertising are also inapplicable: common sense would not so clearly lead a person to believe that a package labeled ‘recyclable’ is not recyclable anywhere. Second, although Keurig argues that its labeling is sufficient under the Green Guides, as discussed above, the complaint alleges facts that indicate the opposite, facts which this Court must accept as true at this stage.”) *See also* Joseph Winters, *Inside the Industry Push to Label Your Yogurt Cup ‘Recyclable’*, Grist, Oct. 13, 2022, <https://grist.org/accountability/inside-the-industry-push-to-label-your-yogurt-cup-recyclable/>; Alison Borochoff-Porte et al., *Applying Consumer Protection Basics to Greenwashing Recyclability Cases*, Harv. L. Rev., Apr. 10, 2023, at 6, <https://harvardelr.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/12/2023/04/HELRL-Vol.-47-Recyclability.pdf>; Sheila Millar et al., *Keurig Agrees to Pay \$10 Million to Settle Class Action Over Charges of Misleading Recyclable Claims*, Nat’l L. Rev., Mar. 1, 2022, <https://www.natlawreview.com/article/keurig-agrees-to-pay-10-million-to-settle-class-action-over-charges-misleading>.

²² Transcript of *Talking Trash at the FTC: Recyclable Claims and the Green Guides* (May 23, 2023), at 47, https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/Talking-Trash-at-the-FTC-Recyclable-Claims-and-the-Green-Guides.pdf; Video of *Talking Trash at the FTC Recyclable Claims and the Green Guides* (May 23, 2023), <https://www.ftc.gov/media/talking-trash-ftc-recyclable-claims-green-guides-may-23-2023>.

²³ FrontLine: Plastic Wars (PBS 2021), <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/documentary/plastic-wars/>.