



Fairfax VOTER

March 2014

Volume 66, Issue 7

Agricultural Technologies and Management Techniques

This month's topic, Part II of the national agriculture study, includes genetic engineering, animal production, and nanotechnology. Add your voice to the national consensus by attending a unit meeting or sending your responses to the consensus questions to program@lwv-fairfax.org.

Annual Meeting is April 5!

Note the date; the annual meeting is much earlier than usual! Annual meeting is a wonderful opportunity for us to get together, enjoy a great lunch, and plan future programs. Our keynote speaker is Delegate LeMunyon who will discuss government transparency legislation. Make your reservations today—the form is on page 5!

Calendar

March 2014

- 1 Briefing and At-Large meeting**
- 3 VOTER deadline
- 5 Women's Legislative Roundtable,
Richmond
- 7 LWNCA Board meeting
- 8 General Assembly session ends
- 9 Daylight Savings Time begins
- 10-13 Unit Meetings**
- 16-22 Sunshine (open government) Week
- 19 Board meeting, Packard Center**
Fairfax County budget presentation to
LWVFA
- 22 Democracy in Action Awards
Luncheon, Richmond

Inside This Issue

Presidents' Message	2
Appreciation Expressed by Colvard	2
FCBOS Representative to Review 2015 Budget With LWVFA	2
GMU Archives House LWVFA Materials	3
League Lobby Day Draws Large Crowd	4
Part II - LWVUS Agricultural Study	EF-1
Study Consensus Questions	EF-7
Annual Meeting Registration Form	5
Kelly Applauds FCPS Budget Process	6
Workhouse Announces Lectures	6
BOS Establishes Community Concerns Forum	6



Presidents' Message



Sincere Appreciation Expressed by Bernice Colvard

I'd like to thank all my League friends who sent condolences and/or attended the January 17 Memorial Service to honor my husband Pat who died January 2, 2014. It meant a great deal to me and my daughters, Anita and Lisa.

Pat was a loyal League friend who supported our objectives through the years. We have the special banners he made to be used for Voters Service and other events as our own memorial to him. Seeing them will bring him to mind again and again.

Spring is fast approaching and will bring with it two League events in quick succession.

On March 22, the State League will hold its annual Democracy in Action awards luncheon at the Louis Ginter Botanical Gardens in Richmond. This is a great opportunity for us to recognize the contributions of League members and community leaders. There will also be a silent auction for the benefit of LWV-VA, and each person who attends will receive a discount certificate to tour the gardens.

And on April 5, we'll hold our Annual Meeting at Clyde's of Tysons Corner. Our meeting room is called Overlook West – a room with a view.

Our speaker will be the Honorable Jim LeMunyon (R) District 67 Fairfax / Loudoun. As elected Vice Chair of Virginia's Freedom of Information Advisory Council, Delegate LeMunyon will describe the Council's work and tell us about legislation he sponsored during the 2014 General Assembly session to improve our state government's transparency and accountability.

As Delegate LeMunyon put it:

“Sunshine is the best disinfectant for ensuring open government. We must always remember that any exception to FOIA must consist only of what the people agree should be kept from public view, never what the government decides to keep from the people.”

After Delegate LeMunyon's presentation, he'll take our questions. If you have concerns about the Commonwealth's willingness to share information on any aspect of its government activities, please come prepared to ask questions. We look forward to a lively discussion.

You can find the Annual Meeting registration form on Page 5 of this *VOTER*. We look forward to seeing you there and to hearing your thoughts on open government.

Julie and Helen

Fairfax County OMB Representative to Speak on 2015 Budget

On Wednesday, March 19, at 10:30 a.m. at the Packard Center, a representative from the County Office of Management and Budget will speak to League Board members about the proposed Fairfax County budget for FY 2015 and answer any questions that we have. All members are welcome and we encourage you to attend. Do you have questions about schools? Libraries? Social services? It's your chance to speak up! Call or email Rona at the LWVFA office if you'll be there.

LWVFA Fairfax VOTER 2013 - 2014

This newsletter, partially funded by the League of Women Voters of Fairfax Area Education Fund, is published 10 times each year— from September to June by:

The League of Women Voters of the Fairfax Area
4026-B Hummer Road
Annandale, VA 22003-2403
703-658-9150 (Info/fax/answering machine)
www.lwv-fairfax.org league@lwv-fairfax.org

Co-Presidents: Julia Jones 703-476-8347
dave.julie.jones@verizon.net
Helen Kelly 703-437-3087
hmkelly1@verizon.net
Editor: Ron Page 703-690-0908
pagegolfer@cox.net
Coordinator: Liz Brooke 703-281-3380
lizbrooke@cox.net

Subscriptions to the *Fairfax VOTER* are available to non-Fairfax League members for \$15 per annum. Send your check to the above address and request a subscription.

Please e-mail address corrections to the office
or call 703-658-9150

Serendipity at Work for League . . .

GMU Archives House Special Collection of LWVFA Materials

By Bernice Colvard, LWVFA Historian

In late 1994, my husband Pat was telling a dental patient about various projects underway to commemorate League's 75th anniversary in 1995. For one of my projects he had made a three-panel display board for a public library traveling exhibit, "Modern Pioneer Women of Northern Virginia." It was a serendipitous moment because the patient, Rosemary Hogg, worked in special collections and archives at George Mason University. She commented that the League sounded like a group that should have a special collection at GMU. Rosemary introduced me to GMU, and the Fairfax Area League's Special Collection was born in early 1995.



Many Leaguers, especially LWVFA presidents, have contributed toward preserving League records for the future. Vivian Watts began compiling our Bulletins from the late 1950s forward; this project has been continued to provide an LWVFA chronicle. GMU Special Collections & Archives (SC&A) has been receiving our Bulletins (now VOTERS) from the inception of our special collection. Olga Hernandez did a thorough sorting of office files during her presidency and Administrative Aide Baba Freeman made many stops at my door to leave materials for transfer to GMU. Sherry Zachry and others have continued the practice.

The Collection includes:

- General Fund and Education Fund administrative files with Board agendas, minutes, annual meeting kits, Board lists, membership directories, budgets, etc. Action testimony and other Action files. Extensive Voters Service files.
- Many publications: *Tracing Our Roots*, *Remember the Ladies*, our Recycling Guide, flyers, and, of course, our Voters Service products: *What's on the Ballot*, *Voters Guide*, and our signature publication, *Facts for Voters*. GMU has a complete set of *Facts for Voters* from its inception in the early 1970s.
- Oral histories include numerous Leaguers as well as some elected officials. Leaguer Sibyl Vanneman, who recalled for us her Suffragist mother, Augusta Street, is the most recent oral history.

- Correspondence (both pieces) is particularly prized in collections of this sort and efforts have been made to secure such items.
- Artifacts such as buttons, banners, ribbons, posters, bookmarks are much appreciated as they add color and variety to displays.
- Perhaps the most appreciated items are properly identified photographs.

If one is looking for a specific item, or wishes to peruse the collection, a "Finding Guide" to the Collection is provided online and/or GMU may be visited in person. The SC&A is located on the Fairfax Campus of George Mason University in the Fenwick Library, in room C-204. For answers to questions regarding the collections, hours, usage, duplications, or directions to the facility, telephone 703-993-2220, fax your inquiry to 703-993-8911, or email at speccoll@gmu.edu.

To access the Finding Guide online, go to: <http://sca.gmu.edu>. Once on the Home Page, click on "Collections;" scroll down to next screen and click on "L" and an alphabetical listing appears; click on "League of Women Voters of the Fairfax Area." This brings up our Finding Guide. Click on the desired topic which should then show the box number and folder number of the desired material. At this point, a person, either someone in GMU's SC&A department, or a League researcher, would need to retrieve the desired document(s) in order to review or copy it.

We are pleased to have a nearby repository to safeguard LWVFA materials of all kinds that tell the story of the League of Women Voters in Fairfax County and City. The partnership with GMU Special Collections and Archives is not only serendipitous but a valued asset for the League.

*Plan Now to Attend the
LWVFA Annual Meeting
on April 5, at Clyde's in
Tysons Corner*

Registration Form on page 5

League Lobby Day in Richmond Draws Large Audience to Hear From Legislators

By Helen Kelly, Co-President

Standing room only was the order of the morning as seven delegates and six senators made presentations to a packed conference room in the general Assembly Building as part of League Lobby Day held in conjunction with the Women's Legislative Roundtable. Many legislators from Northern Virginia's delegation spoke to the group about issues that concern them. Attending the briefing representing LWV-FA were Jones, Kelly, Hernandez, and the Pages. Here is a brief sampling:

Senator Adam P. Ebbin (Dist. 30)

Sponsored SB333 providing that failure to write a middle name or initial on an absentee ballot is not sufficient reason to disqualify that ballot from being counted.

Senator Barbara Favola (Dist. 31)

Opposes SB607 that makes electrocution the default method of executing prisoners and gives those on death row no choice in the matter. European manufacturers will no longer sell lethal injection drugs to the U.S. for the purpose of executing prisoners.

Delegate Vivian Watts (Dist. 39)

Before the recession, the GA passed a major transportation bill but raided the maintenance fund, leaving local

governments no money to pay for local projects. She maintains that transportation needs adequate funding that cannot be diverted for other purposes. On the issue of mental health, she proposes more money to train first responders, police and others who work with the public to recognize and deal with emotional problems. She also wants to revisit requirements for emergency detention and emergency commitment of people with emotional difficulties.

Senator John Miller (Dist. 1, Richmond)

Co-sponsored a bill on redistricting reform. It provides for a nonbinding referendum in the 2014 election asking if the General Assembly should establish a nonpartisan redistricting commission. (Virginia held its last referendum in 1914 on the subject of Prohibition.)

Delegate Kay Kory (Dist. 36)

Co-sponsored (with Delegate Anderson) HB410 providing that (1) youth sports leagues using public school property establish policies and procedures for identifying and handling concussions and (2) that they follow the local school division's policies on this issue. The bill also adds information on academic performance to the Guidelines for Policies on concussions.

LeMunyon Will Be Keynote Speaker at Annual Meeting



Our Annual Meeting speaker will be the The Honorable James M. LeMunyon, 67th District's representative to the Virginia House of Delegates and Vice Chair of Virginia's Open Government Council. Jim LeMunyon is a 30-year resident of Northern Virginia.

He and his wife, Robin, have three children who are college graduates and alumni of Oakton High School. The LeMunyons have been active in the community for many years through organizations including

church, Scouts, PTAs, and sports and music boosters. Jim is a Republican and was first elected to the Virginia House of Delegates in November 2009. During his first campaign, Jim walked 533 miles and knocked on 10,821 doors to listen to voters and share his ideas. Jim continues his door-knocking tradition each year on behalf of other candidates and himself. He serves on three committees: General Laws, Education, and Transportation. Delegate LeMunyon is a Deputy Whip for the Republican majority. He also serves on three state-sponsored commissions that address specific issues: Transportation Accountability (Technology Subcommittee Chair), the Code Commission, and the Freedom of Information Act Advisory Council (Vice-Chair). Since he was first elected in 2009, 24 of Jim's bills have become law in addition to his resolution requiring Members' voting records be easily retrievable online.

Part II - New Agricultural Technologies and Management Techniques

Ed. Note: This Fact Sheet was prepared by the LWV of Montgomery County, Maryland (LWVMC) based upon research conducted for the LWVUS Agricultural Update. The LWVMC committee is: Margaret Chason, Chair; Elaine Apter, Maxine Montgomery, Judy Morenoff, Lorna Post, Alyce Ortuzar, and Marilyn Smith. Their report is used with permission. The overview and Part I appeared in the February issue of The Fairfax VOTER.]

The discovery of DNA and research in genetics and molecular biology in the mid-twentieth century made possible a new approach to both plant and animal breeding through genetic engineering: the alteration of genetic material through direct manipulation of the DNA sequence. While the term “genetic engineering” (GE) is sometimes used to include anything from controlled hybridization to chemically or radioactively induced mutations, the following USDA definition suggests the most common usage of the term:

Genetic engineering is the manipulation of an organism’s genes by introducing, eliminating or rearranging specific genes using the methods of modern molecular biology, particularly those techniques referred to as recombinant DNA techniques.

GENETIC ENGINEERING IN AGRICULTURE

Genetic engineering is utilized in plants to induce characteristics that could: generate a higher yield for the crop; provide resistance to disease, insects or herbicides; enhance nutritional value; allow plants to thrive under unfavorable growing conditions such as cold, drought or soil salinity; increase pharmaceutical value; or create a plant more effective for phytoremediation (pulling pollutants from soil or water). While many of these objectives can be accomplished through traditional hybridization techniques, new varieties can often be created more quickly and in a more targeted way through genetic engineering.



An understanding of the basic principles is important because confusion arises when people generalize and use terms like biotechnology, genetic engineering (GE) and genetic modification (GM) interchangeably. For clarity, this segment will use, “GE” or “GM” (without a following noun) to refer to any of several technical *processes or techniques* for transferring genes between species (transgenesis), whereas the use of “GMO” or “GE” or “GM,” with a corresponding noun, will refer to any organism, food, crop, animal, etc., resulting from such a genetic transfer.

The Evolution of GE Crops in the United States

The earliest advances in GE were in the pharmaceutical field. Insulin derived from recombinant DNA was first marketed in 1978, followed by the first genetically engineered vaccine in 1984. The enzyme chymosin produced from GM microorganisms, the first GE food application, was approved for use in cheese production in 1990. In 1994 Calgene, Inc., a biotechnology research company, received FDA approval to market the first GE food crop—the *Flavr Savr* tomato—which had been submitted for FDA review in 1992.

This was followed by the introduction of several GE crops in 1995: insect resistant (Bt) corn; herbicide resistant (Ht) soybeans, virus resistant squash, canola with modified oil composition, and an (Ht) cotton. The same year also marked the regulatory approval of the first “stacked” GE seed, which was a cotton seed containing both a Bt and an Ht gene. Stacked seeds are also known as multiple stacked trait seeds (MSTs); they employ multiple genetically engineered genes and may combine one or more Ht and Bt combinations. Stacked seeds can provide resistance to multiple insects (a possible response to the

emerging problem of Bt resistance) while at the same time providing tolerance to various formulations of herbicide (currently, glyphosate or glufosinate). As of 2013, stacked crops accounted for more than half of all U.S. corn and cotton. Genetic engineering is also being used to develop potatoes and apples that resist browning, such as the non-bruising potato submitted for FDA and USDA approval in May 2013 (this is an example of *cisgenesis*, where genes from the same species are used).

To date, FDA reports having completed 98 reviews of GE crops or traits proposed for commercialization. Farmers have rapidly adopted GE crops and expanded their production; by 2013, GE cotton and corn represented 90% of planted acreages while soybeans and canola represented 93 % of respective acreages. According to the Grocery Manufacturing Association, “70% to 80% of the food we eat in the United States, at home and away from home, contains ingredients that have been [produced from] genetically modified [crops]. GMOs are also expanding worldwide; a record 170.3 million hectares of biotech crops were grown globally in 2012, up 10.3 million from 160 million hectares in 2011, with adoption growing three times faster in developing than in industrialized countries.

Ht and Bt Crops

The most widely used GE crops incorporate gene coding for a glyphosate resistant enzyme from the bacteria *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*. This practice creates herbicide tolerant crops (or Ht crops) that can be sprayed with glyphosate without harm to the crop; glyphosate is commonly found in weed killing products such as Roundup. Farmers have adopted Ht crops because they offered less spraying, less traffic on the field, and lower operating costs. Ht crops allow farmers to practice no-till methods, thereby reducing soil erosion and runoff. Over time, monoculture methods, that use only these GE seeds and do not rotate crops, can create a field situation that is selective for the development of “superweeds” which are resistant to the herbicide. As a result, herbicide use, including more toxic herbicides, may increase. Because the databases on pesticide use are weak and researchers differ over the choice of analytical methods, there are contrasting results on pesticide trends and impacts in the literature for the US and globally even when the same time period is covered.

A naturally occurring bacterium, *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt), is often used by organic farmers as an insecticide because of its natural origin and low toxicity to humans and animals. When genetic material from Bt is introduced through genetic modification into certain plants, the plants become resistant to insect predation. Raising crops from such Bt plants results in increased yields and less money

spent on post-planting applications of insecticide for many farmers. The rapid growth in reliance on Bt for insect control, following the introduction of GE crops, appears to be contributing to rootworm resistance to the Bt rootworm protection, while a second major corn pest targeted by a Bt trait—the corn borer—has not shown resistance. Although the threat of resistance can be reduced by good management practices, such as planting non-GE refuge crops, there is debate about the size of refuge areas needed and concern that recommended refuge practices are not always used or effective.

Potential Ancillary Concerns: Research on environmental impacts of Bt crops has focused on the possibility that beneficial insects or animals (e.g., bees and bats) will be harmed by ingesting the crops or pollen; while some studies have documented problems, others have found that the effect on non-target insects is minimal. Studies have also been conducted on the animal health impacts of consuming Ht and Bt products. While many studies have found no negative health impacts, there are some peer-reviewed studies that have identified problems in animals, leading their authors to call for more health impacts research and improvements in research methods.

The spread of Ht and Bt crops has raised concern about exposure to GE pollen contamination of non-GE crops. Alfalfa pollen can be carried as far as five miles by wind drift or movement of bees; GE sugar beet pollen can cross pollinate not only non-GE sugar beets, but also Swiss chard and table beets. There are two potential problems for farmers: (1) the possibility that unintended genetic modification may result in loss of income because farmers cannot sell contaminated products in their target market at the higher prices usually offered for non-GE products, and (2) the possibility that a manufacturer would sue a farmer whose crop was unintentionally contaminated. The latter issue has been partially resolved with Monsanto pledging not to prosecute unintended contaminations. The question of compensation is being dealt with by a few pending lawsuits seeking manufacturer compensation for past or potential income losses and by specialists in agricultural law. The specialists are evaluating the various legal options for facilitating the co-existence of GE and non-GE farms. A USDA Advisory Committee on Biotechnology and 21st Century Agriculture issued a report on enhancing co-existence in November of 2012.

Approval Process: The approval processes used by various agencies (FDA, USDA, EPA) varies, yet they all aim at providing risk assessment to eliminate or minimize potential harmful consequences. Before a transgenic crop can be

grown outside a laboratory, it must receive Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) approval. The existing notification, permitting, and deregulation procedures are discussed in the GMO Overview [on the LWVUS website](#). Post deregulation monitoring has been recommended in some studies.

Regulation in Foods: Regulation of GMOs is based upon the concept of *substantial equivalence*, wherein products are evaluated by regulatory agencies in a manner that compares them to conventional (non-GM) products or processes.

If a new food is determined to be substantially equivalent in composition and nutritional characteristics to an existing food, it can be regarded as being as safe as the conventional food (FDA, 1992; Kuiper et al., 2001; Maryanski, 1995; OECD, 1993) and does not require extensive safety testing. The evaluation of substantial equivalence includes consideration of the characteristics of the transgene and its likely effects within the host, as well as measurements of protein, fat and starch content, amino acid composition, vitamin and mineral equivalency, along with levels of known allergens and other potentially toxic components

Although the concept of substantial equivalence is a starting point for the safety assessment for GM foods that is widely used by national and international agencies - including the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Japan's Ministry of Health and Welfare and the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Health Organization and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), some scientists and organizations object to the concept. A much quoted discussion, published in *Nature* in 1999 asserts:

The concept of substantial equivalence has never been properly defined; the degree of difference between a natural food and its GM alternative before its 'substance' ceases to be acceptably 'equivalent' is not defined anywhere, nor has an exact definition been agreed by legislators. It is exactly this vagueness that makes the concept useful to industry but unacceptable to the consumer.

Public Views on the GMO Regulatory Processes and Findings

Public views on the health and environmental safety of GE products marketed in the US and the adequacy of the regulatory framework come from peer-reviewed journal articles and the popular press. Critics of the review process maintain that participation is voluntary, testing is conducted by the applicants as opposed to the agencies themselves, and responsibility for safety rests, in most cases, with the individual developers. Developers believe that the process is really mandatory (though labeled "voluntary"), rigorous, highly prescribed, and data generation is both time consuming and costly, with an average price per approval of \$136 million over 13.1 years. The reasons for the differing points of view are well explained in a recent *Grist.org* blog, which concludes, surprisingly, that both sides are correct.

A recent review of the GE literature by Nicolina et al. concluded that the majority of peer-reviewed papers do not indicate a health risk for animals or humans consuming GE products or provide evidence of environmental hazards. Also, official statements by regulatory agencies in many countries and organizations with acknowledged scientific credentials (e.g., The US National Academies, the American Medical Association, the World Health Organization, the Royal Society, the European Commission, and Center for Science in the Public Interest) all agree that there is no evidence that it is dangerous to eat genetically modified foods. Recently, science-oriented publications including *Nature* and *Scientific American* also concluded there is no evidence that GMOs are harmful to us. The statements concerning the absence of evidence that GE foods pose health risks, however, are generally accompanied by calls for continued vigilance because it is impossible to prove anything absolutely safe.

Despite the above assurances of safety and statements such as "Several *trillion* meals containing genetically engineered food ingredients have been consumed by people around the world, with not a single adverse effect documented," concerns continue to be raised about GE risk assessment. In response to discussions in the popular press about a growing consensus among scientists on GE safety, 97 scientists have published a statement to say that such a consensus does not exist. Epidemiologists point out, for example, that it is difficult to actually study the link between GMOs and adverse effects in the US due to the absence of GMO product labeling, as this means that "...people don't know whether they've actually consumed [GMOs]." Others point to weaknesses in individual studies, while some have described perceived flaws in assessment protocols, and yet others have

critiqued those having critiqued. Others mention knowledge gaps in scientists' understanding of gene sequencing and interrelationships and their understanding of how genetic expression is turned on and off; this has led to research on methods for assessing the risk from complex exposures that might include GE foods, animal antibiotics and hormones, pesticide residues, nanomaterials, and novel food processing materials in addition to a myriad of other factors.

Genetically Engineered Animals

The first GE application in animals took place in 1974, when viral DNA was inserted into a mouse embryo to create a transgenic mouse. GE mice have since been used for research on human disease and pharmaceutical testing. While more than 40 different breeds of animals have been genetically engineered, for research and medical purposes, as of yet, none have been approved for market release as human food. Traits being developed include "improved milk production and composition, increased growth rate, improved feed utilization, improved carcass composition, increased disease resistance, and enhanced reproductive performance." In 2008, the FDA provided guidelines for the regulation of transgenic animals, premising the rules on the agency's authority to regulate new drugs. More information on the guidelines is available in the [GMO Overview on the LWVUS website](#).

Regulatory hurdles and consumer acceptance of GE animals in the food chain have also discouraged research and development investment (e.g., the case of the Enviropig™), but rapidly declining stocks of fish worldwide have spurred significant research on GE fish such as AquaBounty's salmon, which grows twice as fast as wild salmon as a result of inserting genes from other fish. AquaBounty's salmon have been slowly nearing FDA approval after more than two decades of research and an investment of over \$60 million. Consumer groups, including Consumers Union and Food & Water Watch however, have petitioned the FDA to assess the GE fish as a food additive, rather than an animal drug, and have expressed concerns about the transparency of the review process and the adequacy of the analysis of health impacts. The FDA responded to some of these concerns by arranging an open meeting and providing more data and information about the decision process. There has also been some discussion of potential environmental impacts if the GE fish escape and mate with wild fish. Scientific studies show that mating between transgenic and wild fish is possible, just as it is with non-GE farmed fish. The FDA appears satisfied with evidence presented by AquaBounty showing that this would not pose a significant problem given current production locations and methods.

U.S. seafood consumption has increased 50% since 1950 and has remained fairly consistent the past few years (finfish consumption is down, but shellfish consumption is up). According to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), about half of the seafood consumed in the United States is farmed, yet American aquaculture accounts for less than 5% of that consumption. Eighty-six percent of our seafood is imported. In light of these consumption and availability patterns, multiple steps have been taken towards expansion of U.S. marine aquaculture. See more about aquaculture in the [Overview of Animal Management on the LWVUS website](#).

ANIMAL PRODUCTION

In the past two decades, four important trends have emerged in the livestock sector: (1) growth and concentration; (2) shifting geographic location; (3) increasing scale; and (4) the movement of meat processing from urban centers to rural communities.

Consolidation

Following World War II, increased grain yields, improvements in refrigeration and expanded transportation options made possible the growth of intensive animal feed operations. In 1935, 5.1 % of the nation's 42.8 million beef cattle were being fattened in feedlots, where cattle spend the last 90-120 days before slaughter rapidly putting on weight by consuming a grain-intensive diet. By 1963, that number had jumped to 66 %. By the end of the century, almost all cattle were being fattened on feedlots. While feedlots with less than 1,000 head of cattle are still in the majority, they "finish" only a small percentage of cattle production. Lots with 1,000 head or more finish 80 to 90 % of US cattle, and of those the few feedlots with 32,000 head or more account for around 40 % of the cattle production.

Even greater consolidation has taken place in the dairy sector. In 1940, 76.4 % of all US farms included cows for milking. As of 1997, that number was down to just 6.1 %. While the number of cows kept primarily for milking dropped from around 24 million in 1940 to about 9 million in 2000, milk production rose steadily as a result of more efficient milking technology, advances in animal nutrition and health, as well as biotechnological interventions in breeding and pharmacology (discussed in the [Overview of Animal Management on the LWVUS website](#)). Similar consolidation has taken place in the management of hogs and of poultry. According to the General Accountability Office (GAO), there were about 3,600 large-scale poultry and meat operations in the US in 1982. By 2002 that number had jumped to about 12,000.

Animal Feeding Operations (AFO)

According to EPA, an operation is an AFO if animals have been, are, or will be stabled or confined and fed or maintained for a total of 45 days or more in any 12-month period, and crops, vegetation, forage growth, or post-harvest residues are not sustained in the normal growing season over any portion of the lot or facility. CAFOs (concentrated animal feeding operations) are more narrowly defined as AFOs “with potential to impact water supply, either as a result of size (number of head of animals housed at any



given time) and/or impact on proximate surface water.” The EPA estimates that there are about 450,000 AFOs in the US, with about 15% of those designated as CAFOs.

Production efficiencies realized in concentrated animal systems have increased the national supply of inexpensive, readily available meat. Efficiencies of scale, capital-intensive new technologies for breeding, feeding, and processing; pressure from global competition; and consumer demand for uniform, convenient, inexpensive meat products all point to the continuing need for concentrated, consolidated animal management. Biogas experimentation suggests that aggregated animal waste could be an important new source of biofuel, potentially adding more economic incentive to further consolidation.

Feed for use in confined management systems is influenced by price and supply, which are in turn influenced by federal commodity subsidies. About 80% of US corn, 22% of US wheat, and 77% of global soy are used in animal feed each year. Ground fish meal provides protein: a third of the fish caught every year (31.5 million tons) are used in animal feed. A GAO report issued in September 2011 noted the necessary connection between antibiotic use and consolidated animal feeding. For more information on this see the Overview of Animal Management [on the LWVUS website](#).

Of concern is the administration of antimicrobials to conventionally raised livestock in non-therapeutic doses for disease prevention. Many of the antibiotics used in animals are the same as those administered in humans. Others, like ionophores, have been developed for exclusive use in animals. Widespread use of antimicrobials in animal feed is linked to antibiotic resistant bacteria. According to the Animal Health Institute, which represents animal health drug sponsors, animal antibiotics make our food supply safer and people healthier. Antibiotics are a critical tool to prevent, control and treat disease in animals. In doing so, they also reduce the chance of bacterial transmission from animals to humans.

According to the FDA, the approval process involves evaluation of research conducted by the drug’s sponsor, including a review for (1) safety to the animal and food products made from the treated animal, (2) effectiveness, (3) impact on the environment, and (4) safety of the people administering the drug or who may come into contact with the drug. To prevent drug residues in animal-derived foods from entering the food supply, FDA approval specifies a “withdrawal time”, i.e. a waiting period following administration of a drug to when the animal may be slaughtered or when milk may enter the food supply.

Questions have been raised about the impact of CAFOs on local communities. A report funded by the National Association of Local Boards of Health found significant impacts on surface water (rivers, ponds, lakes), including “pathogens... growth hormones, antibiotics, chemicals used as additives to the manure or to clean equipment, animal blood, silage leachate from corn feed, or copper sulfate used in footbaths for cows.” The same study documented concerns about noxious odors, dramatic increases in air-borne insects (primarily flies and mosquitoes), as well as the health impacts of CAFO air pollutants.

A corresponding concern for small and mid-size farmers is the loss of open, competitive markets (“spot markets”) for independent growers. Farm coalitions have asked for passage of a Livestock Marketing Fairness Act, and would like to see legislation prohibiting packer-owned livestock. Farmers are also interested in seeing increased support for local food hubs and continuing expansion of farm cooperatives.

Indirect and Direct Subsidy of Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations

In 2007, researchers at Tufts Institute reviewed the impact of Farm Bill commodity subsidies (see Subsidies and Crop Insurance) on the economic structure of animal management.

Their conclusion was that federal subsidies on corn and soy guaranteed below-cost feed, making purchase of feed less expensive than growing feed on-site or maintaining adequate pasture. In effect, subsidies of industrial feed saved large scale farms “an estimated \$3.9 billion per year . . . a reduction amounting to 5%-15% of operating costs.”

The implicit subsidy to industrial feed has contributed to the consolidation of factory hog operations. With a 15% discount on operating costs compared to hog farmers who grew their own feed crops, factory farms enjoyed a competitive advantage that did not come simply from their economies of size. Using cost data from the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other published sources, we estimate that mid-sized diversified farms – those with 500-2,000 hogs fed largely by on-farm crops – would have comparable production costs to those of industrial producers if the latter had to pay full cost for their feed.

CAFOs receive a more direct subsidy through Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) funding. Through EQIP, farmers can apply for financial and technical assistance “to help plan and implement conservation practices that address natural resource concerns.” Introduced in the 1996 Farm Bill, EQIP originally targeted small and mid-size farms. In 2002, the program was reauthorized with greatly expanded funding and removal of the restrictions on large-scale waste management systems. The National Sustainable Farm Associations has petitioned for greater transparency regarding disbursement of EQIP funds, economic and environmental analysis of the impact of EQIP contracts, lower caps with no “special exceptions,” and restriction of EQIP funds to mitigation of existing environmental challenges, rather than financing waste management operations of new or expanding CAFOs.

EPA Regulation of CAFOs



In 2008, the GAO issued a report noting EPA’s inability to gather adequate information about CAFO size, location, and waste management strategies, as well as its failure to assess the impact of CAFO pollutants on the environment or human health. Operations that meet CAFO size thresholds are only registered for

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits if they voluntarily acknowledge waste discharges. Therefore, the majority of facilities are not regulated


under EPA rules, although they may be subject to widely varying state laws. In 2009, an EPA working group found that, since only a small percentage of CAFOs seek permits to discharge, EPA oversight of feeding operations was limited. The taskforce recommended that EPA lower the regulatory threshold for AFOs, set a threshold for multiple AFOs in impaired watersheds, begin “a comprehensive data collection plan” to provide information on all CAFOs and their waste management plans, and “inspect more AFOs to determine which might be significant contributors of nutrient pollution to waters.” Such regulation was introduced in 2011, but withdrawn in 2012 following strong opposition from the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture and other groups. See more information [on the LWVUS website](#).

NANOTECHNOLOGY

Nanotechnology is defined by the Royal Society/Royal Academy of Engineering Working Group as follows: “Nanoscience is the study of phenomena and manipulation of materials at atomic, molecular and macromolecular scales, where properties differ significantly from those at larger scale. Nanotechnologies are the design, characterization, production and application of structures, devices and systems by controlling shape and size at nanometre scale.” Nanotechnology is a process that builds, controls and restructures materials that are the size of atoms and molecules. A nanometer (nm) is one-billionth of a meter. (In a more familiar frame of reference, a sheet of paper is about 100,000 nanometers thick.)

As of 2013, over 1600 commercially available products contain nanomaterials. Some examples of newly developed products include a stain repellent in clothing, material to extract toxins from water, sunscreens to absorb light, and a barrier in packaging such as beer bottles (producing a lighter weight bottle with longer shelf life).

Research is underway for a variety of future uses in agriculture production such as 1) precision farming—acting as sensors that are distributed in the field and linked through GPS to detect soil conditions, insects or presence of disease; 2) smart delivery systems, delivering chemicals in a controlled, targeted manner, to address a problem such as disease, nutrient deficiency, or insects even before the farmer can visually detect a problem; and 3) water filtration. Researchers report that “so-called multi-walled carbon nanotubes” can penetrate through the thick coatings on seeds, stimulate germination of the seeds and stimulate the growth of certain plants.



Safety Concerns

There is agreement that this technology may be important in the future; however, with the rapid expansion of research and development (R&D) of new uses, questions as to safety and potential toxicity from these products need to be addressed as soon as possible. The risks include the ability of the particles to cross the blood-brain, dermal, placental and other barriers, potential impacts on biological systems and control and tracking of the particles. For example a recent

study from the University of Missouri indicates that silver particles used as a pesticide in the treatment of pears, can be retained on the pear surface and penetrate into the pulp, and could potentially be taken into the human body. Whether or not these could be toxic is not yet known. Other concerns include effects in the environment on soil organisms and insects. Both industry and the public are seeking to have rules and guidance to address health and safety concerns.

The National Nanotechnology Initiative (NNI) is a collaborative, multi-agency, cross-cutting program among 25 federal agencies, 15 of which have specific nanotechnology budgets: R&D funds for research to advance understanding and control of matter at nanoscale with a goal of “national economic benefit, national and homeland security, improved quality of life.” The NNI’s 2010 research budget totaled an estimated \$1.78 billion. About 5% of that was devoted to environmental, health, and safety research, with the rest going toward basic research into nanomaterial behavior, research facilities, and developing nanoscale devices and systems. Through this initiative governmental organizations have combined funding and are exchanging information. The EPA is in the process of developing rules and guidance.

For more information on this and other technologies see the Overview of Nano and Other Technologies on the [LWVUS website](#).

AGRICULTURE UPDATE CONSENSUS QUESTIONS

I Economic Health of the Agricultural Sector

- Should government financial support for agriculture be directed to:
 - Subsidized agricultural credit (loans)

- Disaster assistance
 - Crop insurance
 - Farms that supply local and regional markets
 - Subsidized implementation of best management practices
 - Commodity crop programs, e.g., corn, soybeans, sugar, cotton, wheat
 - Commodity livestock program
 - Commodity dairy program
 - Specialty crops, e.g. fruits, vegetables, nuts, etc.
 - Other production methods, e.g. organic, hydroponic, urban, etc. farms
- What changes should government make regarding **direct payment programs** to farm operators? Note: Farm operators can be anything between family farms to huge corporations.
 - Eliminate direct payments to farm operators
 - Update the rules for direct payments to farm operators to support sustainability
 - Broaden the types of farms that are eligible
 - Broaden the types of crops that are eligible
 - Effectively enforce existing rules
 - What changes to current crop insurance programs should government make?
 - Extend to more types of crops
 - Link to the use of conservation practices
 - Limit insurance for the cultivation of marginal and environmentally sensitive land
 - Cap amount of premium subsidy to a single farm operator (see note in question 2)
 - Should government act on any of the following?
 - Revise anti-trust legislation to ensure competitive agricultural markets
 - Enforce anti-trust laws as they relate to agriculture
 - Promote alternative marketing systems, including regional hub markets, farmer cooperatives, farm markets, etc.

II Animal Management

- Which of the following approaches to animal management should government achieve?
 - Transparently collect and disclose data about regulated animal feeding operations (AFOs) or aquaculture operations and about the health of animals in such regulated operations
 - Apply and enforce existing clean air and clean water regulations to animal or seafood management facilities
- Which of the following approaches to animal waste management should government require or bring about?

- a) Treat animal waste with environmentally sound technologies for all regulated AFOs
- b) Prioritize federal funds to mitigate existing environmental challenges (such as Environmental Quality Incentives Program, cost share, loans, etc.) rather than construction of new facilities

III Research and Development

7. Which of the following approaches to research and development (R&D) should government fund or accomplish?

Note: For the purpose of these questions and some questions below, “**developed using any new technology**” or “**new technologies**” refer to any of many scientific processes for developing new crops or animals with genetic engineering, nanotechnology or other new techniques, which are not the traditional breeding or hybridization techniques.

- a) Basic research
- b) Independent third-party (such as an academic institution) risk assessment of products *developed using any new technology*
- c) Research to assess the impacts of *new technologies* on human health and the environment, prior to their widespread adoption
- d) Research that advances the continuation of diversified and sustainable agricultural systems
- e) Seed banking, research, and other means that promote and preserve genetic diversity
- f) Both transparency in the reporting of research studies related to approval of new products **and** respect for intellectual property rights of private enterprises engaged in research
- g) Research on long-term effects of new crops, products and processes
- h) Development of new practices and technologies to promote conservation for all types of farms

IV Food Safety

8. Which of the following approaches to food safety should government perform or fund?

- a) Clarify and enforce pre-market testing requirements for new foods and food additives *developed using any new technology* (see note below question 7)
- b) Require developers to monitor all food products *developed using any new technology* after releasing to the market
- c) Withdraw marketing approval if products are shown to be unsafe
- d) Require post-market monitoring of approved

pharmaceutical applications in animal production for human health and environmental impacts

- e) Require developers of new products to provide data and other materials to independent third-parties (such as academic institutions) for pre- and post-market safety assessment as appropriate
- f) Limit use of antibiotics in animal production to treat and control disease
- g) Fund independent third-party (such as academic institutions) risk assessment of long-term and multiple exposures from foods on human health and the environment
- h) Promote crop management practices that decrease dependency on added chemicals (pesticides, herbicides, and synthetic fertilizers)
- i) Fund, train and add personnel for assessment and compliance functions of regulatory agencies

V Food Labeling

9. How sufficient are the following regarding current food labeling?

- a) Nutrition Facts on food labels
- b) Nutrition Facts on food labels as a means of consumer education
- c) Common allergen labeling
- d) Health and ingredient claims that consumers can understand

10. Which of the following should government achieve regarding marketing and ingredient claims on food labels?

- a) Define (and approve for use) health and safety marketing terms (e.g. immunity support, humane, pasture-raised, natural, etc.)
- b) Regulate the use of images or other sensory advertising
- c) Require that ingredient marketing claims accurately represent what is in the required ingredient list

11. Recognizing that each food developed using any new technology can be unique, and assuming that required food labeling should be useful to consumers, should the following generalized information relating to how products or components are developed be presented on food labels?

See note below question 7. All these questions also assume some percentage threshold of new technology ingredients, such as the 0.9% used in the European Union.

- a) Contains ingredients developed using any new technology stating which technologies are involved
- b) Does **not** contain ingredients developed using

- any new technology
- c) If meat, fish, eggs, or dairy products are from animals that have consumed feed developed using any new technology stating which technologies are involved

Morenoff, Lorna Post, Alyce Ortuzar and Marilyn Smith.

TO ACCESS THE AG UPDATE INFORMATION ON THE LWVUS WEBSITE GO TO www.lwv.org/member-resources/agriculture-update

This Fact Sheet was prepared by the LWVMC based upon research conducted for the LWVUS Agricultural Update. The LWVMC committee is: Margaret Chas-son, Chair; Elaine Apter, Maxine Montgomery, Judy

~ You are cordially invited to attend ~



LWVFA Annual Meeting
 on
Saturday, April 5, 2014
 at
Clydes of Tysons Corner
8332 Leesburg Pike, Vienna, VA

Meeting Agenda

- 9:30 a.m. Registration & Coffee
- 10:00 a.m. Business Meeting
- 11:00 a.m. Speaker: Hon. Jim LeMunyon
- 12:00 noon Luncheon (Cost \$35 per person)
- 2:00 p.m. Conclusion of Business Meeting

Find Clyde’s of Tysons Corner From I-495

Take Exit 47 (Tysons Corner), Route 7 West (Leesburg Pike). Go west (.9 miles). Tysons Corner Center Shopping Mall will be on the right. Go under the Route 123 overpass. Make a right at the light onto West-park Drive. Make your next right at the light onto Greensboro Drive. Go to the next traffic light and make a right onto Pinnacle Drive. Go to the end of the road and make a right. Clyde’s will be located 150 yards down on your right.

Deadline for Reservations: March 31, 2014

Please choose – Pan-Seared Salmon _____ Chicken Marsala _____ Seasonal Vegetable Pasta _____

Program is free; Luncheon, \$35 per person.

Make checks payable to LWVFA and mail with reservation form to:
2013 Annual Meeting, 11020 Burywood Lane, Reston, VA 20194

Name _____ Lunch @\$35 ea. _____

Phone Number & E-mail _____

Guest Name(s) _____ Lunch @\$35ea. _____

Total \$ enclosed _____

For special dietary needs or questions, call Viveka at 703-404-0498

January 27, 2014 Testimony . . .

Kelly Applauds Efforts of School Board in Budget Process

Good evening Mr. Velkoff, members of the board, and Superintendent Garza. I'm Helen Kelly, Co-President of the League of Women Voters of the Fairfax Area. I speak on behalf of League members throughout Fairfax County.

We would like to commend you, Dr. Garza, and your staff for the excellent publication, *The Citizens Guide to the Budget*. This booklet makes the school budget process much more understandable and transparent.

We also applaud your effort to balance the FY2015 budget through a combination of cost reductions, revenue enhancements and transfer increases. We understand your need to request the proposed increase in the County transfer. Given the current economic situation, however, we doubt that the Board of Supervisors will approve the five-cent tax increase needed to fund the higher transfer to FCPS. We urge you to seek additional combinations of revenue increases and cost reductions to allow for a more realistic increase in the tax rate.

If additional reductions need to be made, we recommend that you preserve these two budget items:

- **\$41 Million for Teacher STEP Increases** – These increases will help keep our experienced teachers in

Fairfax County classrooms, and;

- **Kindergarten Instructional Assistants** – Kindergarten teachers' aides offer necessary support for our youngest and least self-sufficient students.

We are very pleased that many of you on the School Board have been pursuing later start times at all high schools and middle schools. The League believes that delaying the beginning of class for these students will improve student learning and will promote adolescent health and safety. We support cost-effective later start times and hope to see them implemented at least in some schools in September 2014.

We appreciate the efforts you have made to maintain a high-quality educational system while facing the twin challenges of higher enrollment and funding that cannot keep pace with the student population. Should it be necessary to reduce teacher salaries, we recommend a furlough rather than a contract length change. And we believe that continued examination of all budget options will yield the best fiscal solution for these difficult times.

Thank you for the opportunity to address you tonight and for your continuing efforts to improve the services that Fairfax County provides to its students.

Workhouse Lecture Series on Women's Equality in America

Years of Hope, Turmoil and Anger (1960s and 1970s)

March 5 - Women reached out for greater fairness and equality in the work place and at home. They pushed to take control of their reproductive rights and to eliminate legal inequalities.

Breaking the Glass Ceiling (1980s-present) April 2

- These years saw invisible barriers holding women back from senior management positions begin to crumble and access to more traditionally male roles increased.

Equality: What Does It Really Mean? April 30 - Join a discussion with three panelists about the differing ways men and women now think and feel about their work and home life. Should there still be gender-specific roles in contemporary society?

All lectures are: - 7:30-9pm at the Workhouse Arts Center W-3 Theatre, 9601 Ox Road, Lorton, VA 22079 All lectures are free with a suggested donation of \$10. Please register online at: www.WorkhouseArts.org Call 703-584-2900 for information.

BOS Establishes Forum to Discuss Community Concerns

Last November, the Board of Supervisors established a Planning Commission Residential Studios Committee. The group's meetings are open to the public and will allow opportunities for discussion of key community concerns about the proposed zoning ordinance that would permit residential studios. Information and updates are available at <http://fairfaxcounty.gov/rsu/reu.htm>. People are encouraged to submit questions and comments through the Planning Commission's email at plancom@fairfaxcounty.gov. This month, meetings will be held March 3 at 7 p.m. in Conference Rooms 4/5 in the Government Center and on March 26 at 7 p.m. in the Shared Conference Room 120C, inside the cafeteria at the Government Center.

This Month's Unit Meeting Locations

Topic: Part II - Agricultural Update Study

Members and visitors are encouraged to attend any meeting convenient for them, including the "At Large Meeting" and briefing on Saturdays when a briefing is listed. As of February 1, 2014, the locations were correct; please use phone numbers to verify sites and advise of your intent to attend. Some meetings at restaurants may need reservations.

Saturday, March 1

10 a.m. At-Large Unit and Briefing

Packard Center
(in Annandale Community Park)
4026 Hummer Rd.
Annandale 22003
Contact: Judy, 703-725-9401_

Monday, March 10

1:30 p.m. Greenspring (GSP)

Hunters Crossing Classroom
Spring Village Drive
Springfield 22150
Contact: Kay, 703-644-2670

Tuesday, March 11

10:30 a.m. Centreville-Chantilly (CCD)

Sully District Gov. Center
4900 Stonecroft Blvd.
Chantilly 20151
Contact: Olga, 703-815-1897

Wednesday, March 12

9:30 a.m. Mt. Vernon Day (MVD)

Mt. Vernon District Gov. Center
2511 Parkers Lane
Alexandria 22306
Contact: Louise, 703-960-0073

9:30 a.m. McLean Day (MVD)

Star Nut Café
1445 Laughlin Ave.
McLean 22101
Contact: Peggy, 703-532-4417 or
Sharone 703-734-1048

10 a.m. Fairfax Station (FXS)

7902 Bracksford Ct.
Fairfax Station 22039
Contact: Lois, 703-690-0908

7:30 p.m. Reston Evening (RE)

Reston Art Gallery at Heron House
Lake Anne Village Center
Reston 20190
Contact: Lucy, 703-757-5893

Thursday, March 13

9 a.m. Reston Day (RD)

1949 Waybridge Ln.
Reston 20191
Contact: Sidney, 703-476-0581

9:30 a.m. Springfield (SPF)

Packard Center
4026 Hummer Rd.
Annandale 22003
Contact: Nancy, 703-256-6570 or
Peg, 703-256-9420

1 p.m. Fairfax/Vienna (FX-V)

Oakton Regional Library
10304 Lynhaven Pl.
Oakton 22124
Contact: Bobby, 703-938-1486 or
Liz, 703-281-3380

7:45 p.m. Mt. Vernon Evening (MVE)

Paul Spring Retirement Community
Mt. Vernon Room
7116 Fort Hunt Road
Alexandria 22307
Contact: Jane, 703-960-6820

April: No Unit Meetings

Sign Up for the Annual Meeting!



The League of Women Voters of the Fairfax Area (LWVFA)
 4026-B Hummer Road, Annandale, VA 22003-2403
 703-658-9150. Web address: www.lwv-fairfax.org

Non-Profit Org.
 U.S. Postage Paid
 Merrifield, VA
 Permit No. 1202

**The LWVFA Fairfax VOTER ©
 March, 2014**
Julie Jones, Co-President
Helen Kelly, Co-President
Ron Page, Editor
Liz Brooke, Coordinator

The League of Women Voters is a nonpartisan political organization that encourages the public to play an informed and active role in government. At the local, state, regional and national levels, the League works to influence public policy through education and advocacy. Any citizen of voting age, male or female, may become a member.

The League of Women Voters never supports or opposes candidates for office, or political parties, and any use of the League of Women Voters name in campaign advertising or literature has not been authorized by the League.

LWVFA MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION
 (Dues year is July 1 through June 30. Current dues year ends June 30, 2014.)

Membership Category: Individual \$65 ____; Household (2 persons-1 VOTER) \$90 __; Donation \$ ____
 Student \$32.50 ____; (Coll. Attending _____)

Membership is: New ____; Renewal ____; Reinstate ____; Subsidy Requested ____
 We value membership. A subsidy fund is available, check block above and include whatever you can afford.

Dues are not tax deductible. Tax-deductible donations must be written on a separate check payable to LWVFA Ed. Fund.

Please Print Clearly!

Name _____ Unit _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip + 4 _____

Phone (H) _____ (M) _____ E-Mail _____

Thank you for checking off your interests:

<input type="checkbox"/> County Govt	<input type="checkbox"/> Voting Procedures	<input type="checkbox"/> Health Care	<input type="checkbox"/> Schools
<input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal	<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Human Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Libraries	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Judicial Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Affordable Housing
<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> Water	<input type="checkbox"/> Juvenile Problems	<input type="checkbox"/> Domestic Violence

Mail to: LWVFA, 4026-B Hummer Road, Annandale, VA 22003-2403