

---

**From:** Bret D. [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 18, 2017 12:10 AM  
**To:** AMS - GMO Labeling  
**Subject:** GMO labeling questionnaire

Here are my answers to your questions:

1. Just call it what is it: genetic engineering. 64 other countries around the world already label GMO's and their labels are simple and easy to understand--just like Vermont's law was: "produced with genetic engineering" or "partially produced with genetic engineering. Other claims like "bioengineering" of "biofortified" are little more than misleading spin control by the biotech industry.
2. CRISPR should definitely be added to the list.
3. The criteria should be "commonly found in nature." let's not bend over backwards to try and convince consumers that GMOs are "natural" because MAYBE, at some point in the past, a naturally occurring GMO sweet potato was formed. Even if that turns out to be true, it is a one in a hundred thousand quadrillion occurrence, exceptionally rare. There isn't a GMO crop or animal on the market that was created outside of a lab. Quit trying to fool people into believing that transgenic organisms are "all natural."
4. Yes. It's important for consumers to know where their food comes from and how it was produced. If you make designer jeans in a sweatshop in Thailand, and then ship them to LA, you don't get to claim that they were made in the US even though at the molecular level they are nearly identical to designer jeans made in the US. People are concerned with how a product is grown/produced, NOT with the items molecular structure.
5. No answer.
6. If an animal is fed a GMO diet, then it should be labeled as "produced with genetically engineered feed."
7. See above.
8. Use the same standard that 64 other countries already use: if it contains more than .9% GMO, it needs to be labeled.
9. No answer.
10. See 8.
11. Yes. ANY product whether food, supplement, etc that contains GMOs should be clearly and plainly (on the package--NO discriminatory QR codes!) identified as such
12. Stick with Vermont's law. It is nearly identical to what 64 other countries are already using.
13. Symbols are confusing and misleading. Everyone knows what GMOs are, and that is the language that should be used. Your job isn't to sell GMO foods, your job is to provide simple and accurate information to consumers so that they can make informed choices at the point of purchase. Again, no need to reinvent the wheel here, 64 other countries already label GMOs and they have been for decades now.

14. Electronic or digital links are highly discriminatory against people without smart phones, without high-speed internet (i.e. rural areas) and people in areas without cell service. This is just an attempt by the biotech industry to avoid using the words "genetic engineering" on a GMO product because they are afraid this disclosure will reduce sales. This is ridiculous--tobacco products have dire warning right on the package and the tobacco industry still makes billions of dollars each year.

15. See above.

16. See above.

17. The existing EPA guidelines seem fine.

18. See above.

19. No opinion.

20. No opinion.

21. Restaurant and retail food products should both be labeled.

22. No opinion.

23. "Scan for more information" is woefully inadequate. Scan for what? The wording should be: "scan for more information about if this product is produced with genetic engineering."

24. Use Vermont's standard.

25. You can't. Which is precisely why you need to include clear, easy to understand, on package GMO labeling. Period.

26. No opinion.

27. No opinion.

28. No opinion.

29. No opinion.

30. If the imports originate in a country that requires GMO labeling, then that standard should be used. All other imports containing GMOs need to be clearly labeled on the package.

Thank you!

--

**"If we truly desire a global system of agriculture that is sustainable, affordable, and just, then surely having the world's food supply controlled by 5 or 6 chemical companies is not the answer."**