

§ 260.8

16 CFR Ch. I (1-1-07 Edition)

asserted unless a system is provided for the collection and return of the package for refill or the later refill of the package by consumers with product subsequently sold in another package. A package should not be marketed with an unqualified refillable claim, if it is up to the consumer to find new ways to refill the package.

Example 1: A container is labeled “refillable x times.” The manufacturer has the capability to refill returned containers and can show that the container will withstand being refilled at least x times. The manufacturer, however, has established no collection program. The unqualified claim is deceptive because there is no means for collection and return of the container to the manufacturer for refill.

Example 2: A bottle of fabric softener states that it is in a “handy refillable container.” The manufacturer also sells a large-sized container that indicates that the consumer is expected to use it to refill the smaller container. The manufacturer sells the large-sized container in the same market areas where it sells the small container. The claim is not deceptive because there is a means for consumers to refill the smaller container from larger containers of the same product.

(h) *Ozone safe and ozone friendly:* It is deceptive to misrepresent, directly or by implication, that a product is safe for or “friendly” to the ozone layer or the atmosphere. For example, a claim that a product does not harm the ozone layer is deceptive if the product contains an ozone-depleting substance.

Example 1: A product is labeled “ozone friendly.” The claim is deceptive if the product contains any ozone-depleting substance, including those substances listed as Class I or Class II chemicals in Title VI of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, Public Law 101-549, and others subsequently designated by EPA as ozone-depleting substances. Chemicals that have been listed or designated as Class I are chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), halons, carbon tetrachloride, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, methyl bromide and hydrobromofluorocarbons (HBFCs). Chemicals that have been listed as Class II are hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs).

Example 2: An aerosol air freshener is labeled “ozone friendly.” Some of the product’s ingredients are volatile organic compounds (VOCs) that may cause smog by contributing to ground-level ozone formation. The claim is likely to convey to consumers that the product is safe for the atmosphere as a whole, and is therefore, deceptive.

Example 3: The seller of an aerosol product makes an unqualified claim that its product

“Contains no CFCs.” Although the product does not contain CFCs, it does contain HCFC-22, another ozone depleting ingredient. Because the claim “Contains no CFCs” may imply to reasonable consumers that the product does not harm the ozone layer, the claim is deceptive.

Example 4: A product is labeled “This product is 95% less damaging to the ozone layer than past formulations that contained CFCs.” The manufacturer has substituted HCFCs for CFC-12, and can substantiate that this substitution will result in 95% less ozone depletion. The qualified comparative claim is not likely to be deceptive.

[57 FR 36363, Aug. 13, 1992, as amended at 61 FR 53318, Oct. 11, 1996; 61 FR 67109, Dec. 19, 1996; 63 FR 24248, May 1, 1998]

§ 260.8 Environmental assessment.

(a) National Environmental Policy Act. In accordance with section 1.83 of the FTC’s Procedures and Rules of Practice⁷ and section 1501.3 of the Council on Environmental Quality’s regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.* (1969),⁸ the Commission prepared an environmental assessment when the guides were issued in July 1992 for purposes of providing sufficient evidence and analysis to determine whether issuing the Guides for the Use of Environmental Marketing Claims required preparation of an environmental impact statement or a finding of no significant impact. After careful study, the Commission concluded that issuance of the Guides would not have a significant impact on the environment and that any such impact “would be so uncertain that environmental analysis would be based on speculation.”⁹ The Commission concluded that an environmental impact statement was therefore not required. The Commission based its conclusions on the findings in the environmental assessment that issuance of the guides would have no quantifiable environmental impact because the guides are voluntary in nature, do not preempt inconsistent state laws, are based on the FTC’s deception policy, and, when used in conjunction with the Commission’s policy of case-by-case enforcement, are

⁷ 16 CFR 1.83.

⁸ 40 CFR 1501.3.

⁹ 16 CFR 1.83(a).

Federal Trade Commission

§ 260.8

intended to aid compliance with section 5(a) of the FTC Act as that Act applies to environmental marketing claims.

(b) The Commission has concluded that the modifications to the guides in this part will not have a significant effect on the environment, for the same reasons that the issuance of the original guides in 1992 and the modifications

to the guides in 1996 were deemed not to have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, the Commission concludes that an environmental impact statement is not required in conjunction with the issuance of the 1998 modifications to the Guides for the Use of Environmental Marketing Claims.

[63 FR 24251, May 1, 1998, as amended at 63 FR 24248, May 1, 1998]