

A Summary of Legislative Actions Undertaken Since 1999 To Stop, Curb and Label Genetically Modified (Genetically Engineered) Food and Fish

Prepared By the Institute for Responsible Technology
For Rep. Richard Roy, Connecticut General Assembly
February 2012

Overview

In the following pages, we have organized legislation by sections:

- (1) national, page 2
- (2) by state, page 5
- (3) labeling of rBGH (also known as rBST) milk, page 12
- (4) lawsuits concerning GE sugarbeets, page 12
- (5) county ordinances to create GMO-free zones, page 13.

Reasons why GMO legislation has failed

We cannot offer a detailed analysis of why each single bill failed, but there are multiple reasons that explain the overall difficulty to get a bill to vote and/or to gain a majority vote. We have identified six main reasons.

(1) **INFLUENCE OF THE BIOTECH INDUSTRY**, both financial (example: political donations to Chairs of Agriculture Committees and general election support to both Democratic and Republican presidential candidates); and ideological i.e. legislators buy into the propaganda generated by the industry which describes GM products as harmless, beneficial to farmers, productivity, trade, as a means to alleviate hunger, build resistant traits to offset climate change, and so forth.

(2) **LACK OF EDUCATION**. Most people are largely unaware or have very superficial knowledge of the issue. Further, they tend to rely on the opinions of mainstream media, government and industry's representation of the issue.

(3) **POLITICAL WEAKNESS**. Examples include sponsors who do not sit on the committee of jurisdiction, who lack sufficient political support and influence to move a Bill (especially, in a Republican legislature, bills lacking influential Republican co-sponsors in key positions like Ag and Appropriations Committees).

(4) **RELATIVE LOW-IMPORTANCE OR MIXED, CONTROVERSIAL OPINIONS AMONG THE LEGISLATOR'S CONSTITUENTS, AS PERCEIVED BY LEGISLATORS**.

(5) INEFFECTIVE FRAMING OF THE BILL TO SUCCEED IN A LEGISLATURE HOSTILE TO ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES AND TO SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE. The rationale behind regulating GE crops, fish or other animals, should be sufficient per se, yet in difficult times the political process may require expediency in framing the issue. Does the language and the frame of the bill address any interests significant to legislators that would oppose “yet another liberal bill”? For instance, for a conservative it is generally easier to support a bill that protects US exports rather than a bill that promotes and defends the right to know.

(6) FAILURE TO ADDRESS CONVINCINGLY THE ARGUMENT OF COST TO DISTRIBUTORS AND ULTIMATELY CONSUMERS. Opponents often use the argument that mandatory labeling would dramatically increase costs that are eventually shifted to consumers—the costs are not just of labeling, but also of segregation etc. Even if their data are plain wrong, only strong, clear evidence that costs are minimal can persuade many legislators and constituents.

1. NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legislation to label and contain GMOs was first introduced in 1999 by Rep. Kucinich, who has re-introduced it every year since (see 1.2. below). In this 112th Congress, additional action includes: the Petition to Label Genetically Engineered Foods (see 1.1. below); legislation to prohibit funding to the FDA to approve GE salmon, and to label GE salmon (see 1.3 below), previously filed in 2010. And the most recent February 7th, 2012 “Dear Colleague Letter” written by Sen. Boxer and Rep. DeFazio. advocating support for mandatory labeling of GMOs.

Other legislation introduced in the 111th Congress is listed beginning on page 4 (1.4).

1.1. The Petition to Label Genetically Engineered Foods (Docket #FDA-2011-P-0723-0001/CP)

The Center for Food Safety, on behalf of several other organizations and businesses, filed [a formal Legal Petition to FDA to Require Labeling of Genetically Engineered Foods](#) in 2011. The petition has already collected 500,000 signatures and it will continue to gather signatures until April 2012. The petition demands that FDA:

1. Issue new regulations requiring labeling of all foods produced using genetic engineering; *and*
2. Issue a new policy redefining a “material” fact as a change in food at the atomic, molecular, or genetic level that a significant share of consumers would find relevant to their purchasing decisions

The main rationale points of the petition are:

1. Unlabeled GE Foods Are Misleading, and Therefore Prohibited
2. A Broader Interpretation of “Material” Facts Is Both Permissible And Necessary
3. Consumers Have a Judicially Recognized Right to Know
4. The patentability of GE foods demonstrates they are materially different
5. The lack of any independent testing or review by FDA supports requiring labeling
6. The demonstrated adverse environmental impacts of GE crops supports requiring labeling.

1.2. Rep. Kucinich, beginning with the 106th Congress (1999-2000) has introduced several bills, and reintroduced them every year. The summary below refers to the bills filed in the 112th Congress.

[H.R.520](#) : To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require labeling of genetically engineered fish (introduced 2/8/2011)

Sponsor: [Rep Young, Don](#) [AK] [Cosponsors](#) (25)

Committees: House Energy and Commerce

Latest Major Action: 2/15/2011 Referred to House subcommittee. Status: Referred to the Subcommittee on Health.

[H.R.521](#) : To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prevent the approval of genetically engineered fish (introduced 2/8/2011)

Sponsor: [Rep Young, Don](#) [AK] [Cosponsors](#) (15)

Committees: House Energy and Commerce

Latest Major Action: 2/15/2011 Referred to House subcommittee. Status: Referred to the Subcommittee on Health.

[H.R.3553](#) : Genetically Engineered Food Right to Know Act (introduced 12/2/2011)

Sponsor: [Rep Kucinich, Dennis J.](#) [OH-10] [Cosponsors](#) (15)

Committees: House Agriculture; House Energy and Commerce

Latest Major Action: 12/9/2011 Referred to House subcommittee. Status: Referred to the Subcommittee on Health.

[H.R.3554](#) : Genetically Engineered Safety Act (introduced 12/2/2011)

Sponsor: [Rep Kucinich, Dennis J.](#) [OH-10] [Cosponsors](#) (3)

Committees: House Agriculture; House Energy and Commerce

Latest Major Action: 12/19/2011 Referred to House subcommittee. Status: Referred to the Subcommittee on Rural Development, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture.

[H.R.3555](#): Genetically Engineered Technology Farmer Protection Act (introduced 12/2/2011)

Sponsor: [Rep Kucinich, Dennis J.](#) [OH-10] [Cosponsors](#) (4)

Committees: House Agriculture; House Energy and Commerce; House Judiciary

Latest Major Action: 12/14/2011 Referred to House subcommittee. Status: Referred to the Subcommittee on Courts, Commercial and Administrative Law.

1.3. Legislative actions to label or halt approval of GE salmon

[Letter to the FDA to halt approval of genetically engineered salmon](#)

On December 19, 2011, a coalition of 11 food safety, environmental, consumer and fisheries organizations sent [a letter](#) to the U.S. Food & Drug Administration (FDA) calling for a halt to its approval of a genetically engineered (GE) salmon after learning that the company's – AquaBounty Technologies, Inc. – research site was [contaminated with a new strain of Infectious Salmon Anaemia \(ISA\)](#), the deadly fish flu that is devastating fish stocks around the world. AquaBounty has claimed that the company's process for raising GE fish is safer than traditional aquaculture. However, [documents that were revealed last December](#) indicate Canadian Authorities discovered contamination in Nov. 2009. This information was hidden from the public and potentially FDA and other Federal agencies consulting on the GE salmon application. ISA is a deadly disease and is classified as a '[Listed](#)' disease by the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) – alongside diseases such as Anthrax, Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), rabies, avian influenza, West Nile fever, etc. Erich Pica, President of Friends of the Earth US, noted: "Infectious Salmon Anaemia threatens wild fisheries around the world and the communities whose livelihood depend on those fish. ISA infections in Chile cost the industry around two billion dollars. A similar infection in Canada and the U.S. could be the last blow to wild Atlantic salmon populations and bring a collapse in wild salmon fisheries."

Despite nearly 400,000 comments in opposition, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is expected to announce its approval of genetically engineered (GE) salmon any day now. The FDA argues that GE salmon doesn't even need to be labeled.

In response to FDA's imminent approval, Senator Mark Begich (D-Alaska) and Representative Don Young (R-Alaska) introduced bipartisan legislation in Congress that would ban GE fish (Bill# S. 230/H.R. 521) and require mandatory labeling for consumers if approved (Bill# S. 229/H.R. 520).

The legislation has been endorsed by 64 consumer, worker, religious and environmental groups, along with commercial, recreational and subsistence fisheries associations, food businesses and retailers, who know that the approval of GE salmon would represent a serious threat to the survival of native salmon populations, many of which have already suffered severe declines related to salmon farms and other man-made impacts. Wild Atlantic salmon are already on the Endangered Species List in the U.S.; approving these GE Atlantic salmon could be the final blow to these wild stocks. Additionally, the human health impacts of eating GE fish are entirely unknown. If GE salmon are approved, these fish must be labeled so people can make informed choices.

[H.AMDT.449](#) to [H.R.2112](#) An amendment to prohibit the use of funds made available by this Act to the Food and Drug Administration to approve any application for approval of

genetically engineered salmon (introduced 6/15/2011)

Sponsor: [Rep Young, Don](#) [AK] **Cosponsors** (None)

Latest Major Action: 6/15/2011 House amendment agreed to. Status: On agreeing to the Young (AK) amendment (A031) Agreed to by voice vote.

[S.229](#) : A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require labeling of genetically-engineered fish (introduced 1/31/2011)

Sponsor: [Sen Begich, Mark](#) [AK] **Cosponsors** (6)

Committees: Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Latest Major Action: 1/31/2011 Referred to Senate committee. Status: Read twice and referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

[S.230](#) : A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prevent the approval of genetically-engineered fish (introduced 1/31/2011)

Sponsor: [Sen Begich, Mark](#) [AK] **Cosponsors** (4)

Committees: Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Latest Major Action: 1/31/2011 Referred to Senate committee. Status: Read twice and referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

1.4. Other GMO Labeling Legislation

[H.R.6325](#) : Consumer Right To Know Food Labeling Act of 2010 (introduced 9/29/2010)

Sponsor: [Rep DeLauro, Rosa L.](#) [CT-3] **Cosponsors** (2)

Committees: House Energy and Commerce; House Agriculture

Latest Major Action: 11/16/2010 Referred to House subcommittee. Status: Referred to the Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry.

1.5. Legislation introduced during the 110th Congress

[H.R.1709](#) : Pollinator Protection Act

Sponsor: [Rep Hastings, Alcee L.](#) [FL-23] (introduced 3/27/2007) **Cosponsors** (52)

Committees: House Agriculture

Latest Major Action: 3/27/2007 Referred to House committee. Status: Referred to the House Committee on Agriculture.

[S.1694](#) : Pollinator Protection Act of 2007 (introduced 6/26/2007)

Sponsor: [Sen Boxer, Barbara](#) [CA] **Cosponsors** (10)

Committees: Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Latest Major Action: 6/26/2007 Referred to Senate committee. Status: Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

2. STATE LEGISLATION

2.1 Alaska

HJR 8 - [OPPOSE GENETICALLY ENGINEERED SALMON](#) Offered: 3/18/11

Referred: Rules

Sponsor(s): REPRESENTATIVES KAWASAKI, Miller, Peggy Wilson, Kerttula, Thompson, Gara, Seaton, Austerman, Herron

HB 100 - [BAN CULTIVATION OF GENETICALLY MOD. FISH](#)

BY REPRESENTATIVES KAWASAKI, Miller, Kerttula

Introduced: 1/18/11

Referred: House Special Committee on Fisheries, Resources

HB 99 - [LABEL FARMED & GENETICALLY MODIFIED FISH](#)

BY REPRESENTATIVES MILLER, Kawasaki, Kerttula

Introduced: 1/18/11

Referred: House Special Committee on Fisheries, Labor and Commerce

2.2. CALIFORNIA

[AB 88](#) **Mandatory Labels for genetically engineered salmon** (introduced in 2011)

Sponsor: Assembly Member Jared Huffman

The bill passed the California Assembly Health Committee in 2011 but was held as a 2-year bill. It was subsequently brought to the Appropriations Committee in January 2012 and lost 9-7.

California Right To Know Genetically Engineered Food Act (a ballot initiative under consideration for the 2012 ballot)

Begun as a grassroots organizing effort and headed now by a committee

(carighttoknow.org), the initiative is collecting 560,000 qualified signatures during a 10 week period, beginning February 18 through April, 2012.

2.3. CONNECTICUT

H.B. 5868. An act requiring the labeling of genetically modified food (introduced 1/31/2011)

Sponsors: Diana Urban (D-North Stonington) and Richard Roy (D-Milford)

Status: Change of Reference, Senate to Committee on Public Health

2.4. HAWAII

SB 2279 - [The Genetically Engineered Crops Right to Know Act](#) (introduced Jan 2011)

Sponsor(s): Gabbard, Shimabukuro, English, Espero, Ihara

Status: 1/25/12 Referred to AGL/ENE, CPN/JDL

SB 2190 - [The Genetically Engineered Fish Right to Know Act](#) (introduced Jan 2011)

Sponsor(s): Gabbard, Shimabukuro, English, Ihara

Status: referred to AGL/ENE, CPN/JDL

SB 713 - [Genetically Engineered Crops; Required Labeling](#) Introduced 1/21/2011

Sponsors: Gabbard, English, Shimabukuro, Tsutsui

Status: 2/1/11 Committee on AGL referred the measure, carried over to 2012 Regular Session.

SB 712 - [Department of Agriculture; Notification; Genetically Engineered Plants](#)

introduced 1/21/11

Sponsors: Gabbard, Shimabukuro, English

Status: Referred to ENE/AGL, the committee deferred the measure, carried over to 2012 Regular Session.

HB 2746 - [The Genetically Engineered Crops Right to Know Act](#) introduced 1/25/2012

Sponsor: Say

Status: 1/27/12 Referred to AGR/ERB, CPC/JUD, FIN

HB 2101 - [The Genetically Engineered Fish Right to Know Act](#)

Sponsors: Carroll, McKelvey

Status: 1/20/12 Referred to AGR/ERB, CPC/JUD, FIN

HB 2034 - [The Genetically Engineered Ingredients Right to Know Act](#) 1/19/12

Sponsors: Carroll, Wooley, C. Lee

Status: 1/25/12 Re-referred to HLT/AGR, CPC/JUD, FIN,

HB 2031 - [The Genetically-Engineered Food Right to Know Act](#) 1/19/12

CARROLL, Awana, C. Lee

1/25/12 Re-referred to AGR/HLT, CPC, FIN

HB 1534 - [H.B. No. 1534 - Hawaii's GMO Truth-in-Labeling Bill](#) 1/26/11

Sponsors: Souki, Tsuji

12/1/11 Referred to AGR, CPC, FIN, Carried over to 2012 Regular Session

HB 434 - [Genetically-Engineered Food; Labeling](#) 1/24/11

Sponsors: Saiki

Status: Referred to AGR, CPC, FIN, Carried over to 2012 Regular Session.

HB 216 - [Food Labeling; Genetically Engineered Material](#) 1/21/12

Sponsors: Carroll, Hanohano

Status: Referred to HLT, CPC/JUD, FIN, carried over to 2012 regular session

2.5. Iowa

HF 375 - [Genetically Engineered Food Truth-In-Labeling Bill](#) (introduced 2/23/2011)

Sponsor: Murphy

Status: ref to Agriculture Committee, then to Subcommittee on 3/1/11

2.6. Illinois

HB 1249 - [GEN ENGINEERED FOOD LABEL ACT](#) (Introduced 02/08/11)

Sponsor: Rep. Deborah Mell

2.7. Maryland

[HB 1261](#) Public Health - Food Product Labeling - Genetically Engineered Ingredients (introduced 2011)

Sponsored By: McConkey

Status: 2/22/11, first reading house rules and executive nominations, No further action

2.8. New Mexico

SB 384 - [Farmer Protection For Engineered Products](#) (introduced 2011)

Sponsor: Stephen H. Fischmann

Status: Died

HB 46 - [Farmer Liability For Certain Products](#) (2011)

Sponsor: Paul C. Bandy

Status: Died

2.9. New York

[A1367 The New York Genetically Engineered Food Right to Know Act](#) (filed January 5, 2011)

Sponsor: Jeffries

Status: 01/05/2011 referred to consumer affairs and protection

Same as S 3908

[S3908 The New York Genetically Engineered Food Right to Know Act](#) (2011)

Sponsor: Lavallo

Same As Same as A 1367

Status: 01/05/2011 referred to consumer affairs and protection

Never went to a vote.

[A3716](#) An act to amend the agriculture and markets law, in relation to the labeling requirements for seeds which are or include genetically engineered organisms (2011)

Sponsor: Rivera P.

Status: 01/26/2011 referred to agriculture 01/04/2012 referred to agriculture.

There are no votes for this bill in this legislative session.

SB 785 - [Senate Bill to Protect Farmers from Monsanto's Lawsuits](#) (2011)

Sponsor: Young

Status: 01/04/2012 Referred To Judiciary

AB 4825 - [A Bill to Ban Genetically Engineered Pharmaceutical and Industrial Crops](#) (2011)

Sponsor: Rivera P.

Status: 01/04/2012 referred to agriculture

AB 3716 - [Genetically Engineered Seed Labeling Bill](#) (2011)

Sponsor: Rivera P.

Status: 01/04/2012 referred to agriculture

AB 2117 - [A Bill for a Five Year Moratorium on Genetically Modified Crops](#) (2011)

Sponsor: McEneny

Status: 01/04/2012 referred to agriculture

AB 2111 - [Assembly Bill to Protect Farmers from Monsanto's Lawsuits](#)

Sponsor: McEneny

Status: 01/23/2012 referred to judiciary

AB 1897 - [New York: AB 1897 - A Bill to Label Milk Produced With Growth Hormones](#) (2011)

Sponsor: Wright

Status: 01/04/2012 referred to agriculture

2.10 North Carolina

[HB 446](#) "Labeling Requirements/GMOs & rBGH in Food" (introduced Jan 2011)

Sponsors: Representative Bradley

Status: referred to Agriculture Committee on 3/24/11

2.11 Oregon (all introduced in 2011)

[SB 517 Genetically Engineered Fish Right to Know Act](#)

Sponsor: Senator Dingfelder

Status: Jan 18, 2011: Referred to General Government, Consumer and Small Business Protection, 6/30/11 In committee upon adjournment.

[HB 3272 Genetically Engineered Food Right to Know Act](#)

Sponsor: Representative Holvey

Status: 2/23/11 Referred to General Government and Consumer Protection. 6/30/11 In committee upon adjournment

HB 3502 - [Genetically Engineered Crops Right to Know and Farmer Protection Act](#)

Sponsor: Barnhart; Representatives Bailey, Holvey

Status: 2/28/2011: Referred to General Government and Consumer Protection, 6/20/11 In committee upon adjournment. No votes

HB 3501 - [Genetically Engineered Food Consumer Safety Act](#)

Sponsor: Barnhart; Representatives Bailey, Holvey

Status: 2/28/ 2011: Referred to General Government and Consumer Protection, 6/30/11 In committee upon adjournment.

HB 3346 - [Oregon Genetically Engineered Food Right to Know Act](#)

Sponsor: Boone

Status: 2/28/11 Referred to General Government and Consumer Protection, 6/30/11 In committee upon adjournment

HB 3314 - [A Bill to Ban Genetically Engineered Fish](#)

Sponsor: Representative Holvey

Status: 3/10, 2011: Public Hearing held, 6/30/11 In committee upon adjournment.

2.12. Rhode Island

H 5796 - [Genetically Engineered Food Right to Know Act](#)

DaSilva, Dickinson, Guthrie, Nunes, and Morrison

Referred To: 3/3/11 House Health, Education & Welfare

2.13. Tennessee

[HB 1928](#) Genetically Engineered Food Labeling Act of 2011 Filed 02/17/2011

Sponsor: Towns

Status: assigned to Agriculture Subcommittee 3/1/2011, taken off notice 03/23/2011
Note: estimated fiscal impact: increase state expenditures - \$332,800/FY11-12
\$151,500/FY12-13 and subsequent years

2.14. Vermont (all introduced in 2011)

[H.123](#) An Act Relating to Labeling Genetically Engineered Salmon

Sponsor: Deen, David L.

Status: referred to Committee Fish, Wildlife & Water Resources

[H.367](#) An Act Relating to Labeling Genetically Engineered Food

Sponsors: Lorber, Mrowicki, Bartholomew, Bohi, Edwards, Hass, McCullough, Sharpe, Taylor, Trieber, Wizowaty

Status: and referred to Committee on Agriculture

[H.421](#) An Act Relating to the Use and Registration of Genetically Engineered Alfalfa Seeds in Vermont.

Sponsors: Pearson, Browning, Courcelle, Davis, Fisher, Greshin, Johnson, Martin, Masland, Mrowicki, Nuovo, Sharpe, Stevens, Waite-Simpson

Status: read 3/8/11 and referred to Committee on Agriculture

H.722 An Act Relating To The Labeling Of Food Produced With Genetic Engineering

Sponsors: Reps. Webb, Cheney, Lanpher, Lenes, Lorber, Masland, McCullough, Mrowicki, Ram, Sharpe and Taylor.

Status: referred to the Agriculture Committee.

2.15. Washington State

HB 2637 Concerning labeling of foods that contain genetically engineered material (2012)

Sponsor: Rep. Condotta

Status: 1/19 first hearing, 1/29 public hearing in the House Committee on Agriculture & Natural Resources

SB 6298 Concerning labeling of foods that contain genetically engineered material (2012) companion bill to HB 2637

Sponsor: Senator Chase, Nelson, Shin, Keiser, Rolfes, and Conway

Status: referred to Committee on Agriculture, Water & Rural Economic Development

2.16. West Virginia

HB2178 - "Genetically Engineered Food Right to Know Act." (2011)

Sponsor: Manypenny and Guthrie
Status: No information.

3. LABELING rBGH (rBST) MILK

Pennsylvania and Indiana: refused to pass laws prohibiting dairy manufacturers from labeling their products rBGH-free

Ohio: put restrictions on such labeling.

Kansas introduced in 2008 SB 595, a bill banning the labels.

Indiana: state representative William Friend introduced House Bill 1300 in January 2008, another bill that would have banned rBGH-free labeling in the state. After the bill was introduced, consumer advocates delivered a petition with more than 70 organizations and businesses expressing opposition to the bill. The bill passed the House Agriculture Committee 10-0, but Friend declined to bring it to the House floor for a vote because he didn't have the votes to pass it. The bill may not be completely dead.

4. GE SUGARBEETS and ALFALFA

Information provided by The Center for Food Safety:

In 2008, the Center for Food Safety (CFS), Organic Seed Alliance, High Mowing Seeds, and the Sierra Club successfully sued the Department of Agriculture (USDA) for its illegal approval of Monsanto's genetically engineered (GE) Roundup Ready sugar beets. In 2010, the court banned GE sugar beets until USDA prepares a valid environmental impact statement. Since then, CFS has twice gone back to court, because USDA insists on allowing continued commercialization without proper environmental review. The third case is currently pending in federal district court. USDA has once again failed to adequately analyze the threat that transgenic contamination, glyphosate-resistant weeds, and increased herbicide use poses to farmers, consumers, and the environment.

In 2011, USDA released a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) proposing a full-scale deregulation of Monsanto's genetically engineered (GE) Roundup Ready sugar beets and accepted public comments until December 2011.

Unfortunately, the USDA continues to dismiss the serious concerns of non-GE farmers and consumers regarding the environmental and socioeconomic effects of such an action. Genetically engineered sugar beets threaten the environment through transgenic contamination and weed resistance; threaten consumers by inhibiting the fundamental right to choose, and; threaten organic and non-GE farmers by placing the

burden for contamination prevention on them instead of on the producers of the GE crop.

On January 27, 2011, Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack [officially approved the unregulated planting of Monsanto's genetically engineered alfalfa](#). In a move that set a precedent for what comes next (namely, the question of [whether or not to deregulate GE sugarbeets](#)).

5. GMO Free Zones in California

On March 2, 2004, [Mendocino County](#), California became the first county in the United States to ban the growing of genetically modified crops and animals. Measure H was supported by 57% of the voters (see [text of the Initiative](#)).

Marin County Measure B (see <http://www.gmofreemarin.com/pages/initiative.html> for text) was passed with 61% vote of support.

Vermont, towns that have passed resolutions to be GMO-free http://gefreevt.org/index.php?ID=17&name=town_to_town

Santa Cruz County outlawed genetically engineered plants in 2006.

GMO-free Monterey County has an initiative in progress. See their [petition](#). So does Lake County

Attempts to create GMO-free zones failed in Trinity and Shasta County.