

## Revisit Plastic Packaging Policies

**Whereas:** Often environmentalism-themed pressure groups – masquerading as objective researchers – demonize products that for the most part safely meet essential needs, save money, and improve and protect lives.

Such is the case with plastic packaging and goods.

In recent years activist shareholders have sponsored proposals at various companies that urge them to address an alleged “plastics pollution crisis,”<sup>1</sup> which is primarily blamed on “virgin” or “single-use plastics” (SUPs), whose production is generated from the even more demonized “fossil fuels” and are alleged to be harmful.

Evidence shows these claims are exaggerated, distorted, or false.<sup>2</sup>

Anti-SUP activists cite two reports as the primary sources for their policy positions: *Breaking the Plastic Wave*,<sup>3</sup> published by the Pew Charitable Trusts, and *Plastics: The Costs to Society, the Environment, and the Economy*,<sup>4</sup> by WWF. Discerning observers can see in these biased reports’ titles that these “studies” intend to drive readers to the authors’ desired conclusions.

Intellectually objective and honest research would not only highlight the “costs” (real or projected) and negative consequences (real or projected) of SUP use, but also would consider the economic and environmental *benefits* from their use, as well as examine both costs and benefits to viable alternatives for SUPs. The agenda-driven Pew and WWF reports do neither.

Plastic pollution is primarily the result of poor disposal practices, not production.<sup>5</sup>

**Supporting Statement:** Walmart Inc. (“Company”) deceives consumers and investors regarding any environmental-, science-, economics-, or fiduciary-based necessity to achieve “zero waste.”<sup>6</sup> For example, it has established global Private (i.e. Walmart’s) Brand packaging goals of 100% “recyclable, reusable or industrially compostable by 2025,” and 17% of such packaging “made of post-consumer recycled content by 2025.”<sup>7</sup> In North America, the goal is for 20% of such packaging “made of post-consumer recycled content by 2025.” Yet the company is just a little more than halfway towards those goals globally, and at only seven percent in North America.

Other misleading claims by Walmart regarding plastics abound.<sup>8</sup> Despite claims of recyclability, the vast majority of such waste ends up incinerated, exported or in landfills.<sup>9 10</sup> The Company

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.chevron.com/-/media/shared-media/documents/chevron-proxy-statement-2024.pdf> (p. 114)

<sup>2</sup> <https://apnews.com/article/microplastics-human-health-9cac65b9ac32d7ef5830360b7bde2985>

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.pewtrusts.org/-/media/assets/2020/07/breakingtheplasticwave\\_report.pdf](https://www.pewtrusts.org/-/media/assets/2020/07/breakingtheplasticwave_report.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> [https://wwfint.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/wwf\\_pctsee\\_report\\_english.pdf](https://wwfint.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/wwf_pctsee_report_english.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> [https://oursharedseas.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Jambeck\\_et\\_al\\_Plastic-waste-inputs-from-land-1.pdf](https://oursharedseas.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Jambeck_et_al_Plastic-waste-inputs-from-land-1.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> <https://corporate.walmart.com/purpose/esgreport/environmental/waste-circular-economy>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.walmartsustainabilityhub.com/waste/sustainable-packaging/progress>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.walmartsustainabilityhub.com/project-gigaton>

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/technology/the-myth-of-plastic-recycling-is-finally-unravelling/ar-AA1seGt0>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.kiteandkeymedia.com/videos/truth-about-recycling-in-america-landfill-plastic-recycle-ewaste/>

also states it will “reduce or avoid one billion metric tons of greenhouse gases (GHGs) from [its] global value chain by 2030” via its gimmicky “Project Gigaton.” Yet a wide body of credible research consistently shows that infusing the supply chain with recycled materials in place of “virgin” plastics (for example) adds weight to products and packaging, thus increasing GHGs.<sup>11</sup>

**Resolved:** Shareholders request the Board to (re-)examine its plastic production and packaging policies in light of non-biased, objectively verifiable, scientifically accurate, and economically thorough research. It would be best if a quantifiable assessment of fact-based potential policy changes versus current practices, as it affects the Company’s financial position, be included, with a report of its findings published – at reasonable cost and omitting proprietary information – by March 31, 2026.

---

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.city-journal.org/article/on-second-thought-just-throw-plastic-away>