

January 3, 2014

Organic Seed Growers and Trade Association: Contamination Avoidance & Testing Protocols Project

Project Summary

The Contamination Avoidance and Testing Protocols Project's primary objective is twofold. It seeks to limit transgenic contamination of organic seed while also facilitating early identification of contaminated seed lots. The project focused on creating a comprehensive manual as an educational tool for organic seed growers and organic seed company professionals to achieve these objectives. A sub-goal of this project is to begin documenting the challenges and burdens organic producers must bear in order to maintain genetic purity when faced with the regulatory realities of GE crops.

The project consisted of analyzing and developing variety specific GE avoidance and testing strategies to maintain strict purity standards in organic seed. While particulars are geared to crops with GE counterparts currently in commercial production— corn, soy, cotton, alfalfa, papaya, canola (*Brassica rapa*, *Brassica napus*), sugarbeet, and squash (*Cucurbita pepo*)—the process for determining best management practices remains the same for other crops and is helpful in assessing risk management for potential future GE releases, and even the impact of GE field trials.

While the project schedule has shifted to accommodate the rapidly shifting discourse surrounding transgenic contamination within the organic seed industry, the manual is slated for final review by the OSGATA policy committee and professional consultants later this month. It will be released according to the original distribution plan shortly thereafter.

Surveys of organic farmers and the organic seed industry will follow the outreach campaign (2014) to determine acceptance and adoption of recommended protocols within the organic community.

Introduction to Topic

The agricultural landscape of the US includes a breadth of different growing practices, often broken down into these three basic categories: organic, conventional, and genetically engineered (otherwise known as genetically modified, transgenic, or biotech). While genetically engineered (GE) crops currently out-surpass the total acreage of the latter two categories combined, the organic sector, until 2012, has been consistently on the rise— with organic cropland doubling between 1992 to 2001.

The number of organic farms, of various scales, is continually growing to meet the increasing consumer demand. Consumers are also the driving force behind in-country GE labeling efforts, with a March 2013 Huffington Post poll finding 82% of Americans standing behind labeling.

January 3, 2014

While consumer support bodes well for the organic industry, the loose regulatory framework concerning the "coexistence" of these differing agricultural practices is a direct threat to organics. Often relegated to the sidelines as "specialty" crops, the organic interests aren't front and center in the debate of how the differing agricultural sectors can exist and prosper side-by-side.

The very nature of organic, as defined and regulated by the National Organic Program (NOP), considers GE an excluded method. Contamination of organic crops by GE crops—whether via cross-pollination or inadvertent seed mixing along the supply chain—can, and does, result in economic losses for individual farmers, as well as losses in consumer confidence. A ripple effect could irreparably tarnish the organic brand as a whole.

The organic seed industry is at the same time especially vulnerable to transgenic contamination and also a crucial link to reducing contamination. Organic seed, which by definition is free of GE contaminants, is the foundation of organic agriculture. Crops grown with contaminated seed will inevitably yield a contaminated crop. Transgenic contamination, however trace, is unacceptable. Compromised organic seed integrity has broad-reaching impacts on the viability of organic farms and the credibility of organic products. Organic farmers also risk the threat of patent litigation in the face of contamination.

The OSGATA policy committee (the Working Group for this project) created the vision and objectives, initiating research on these issues in 2009.

Objectives Statements

Objective 1: Analyze and Develop *variety specific* GE avoidance strategies designed to maintain strict purity standards in organic seed.

Measurable outcomes:

- Current literature, policies on containment practices, and international standards were reviewed. Solicited input was also ascertained from organic farmers, seed company professionals, and seed breeders familiar with isolation and purity concerns, and implementation constraints in the field. Relevant information was synthesized into the basis of the manual.
- Two voluntary surveys were designed and shared throughout the organic seed community—one targeting organic seed growers, the other organic seed companies—to begin to identify and record practical limitations in the field and economic burdens of implementing avoidance strategies. Survey questions were focus-grouped by our Working Group prior to release.
- "Highly recommended" and "acceptable" strategies for GE avoidance were defined for inclusion in the farmer's manual.

Changes as project unfolded:

The project Working Group (OSGATA's Policy Committee) constituency changed since the initial grant proposal. While the individuals differed, those involved still represented the interests of organic seed growers and small seed companies. They did not convene on a bi-monthly schedule, but rather as necessary.

January 3, 2014

Objective 2: Develop and analyze *variety specific* GE testing protocols to assure presence or absence of GE content in organic seed.

Measurable outcomes:

- Specific testing protocols were surveyed to establish presence or absence of GE material. This process included analysis of international literature, as well as communication with scientific leaders in the testing industry.
- Protocols for testing and representative sampling, scalable by size for farming operations and seed companies, were determined in order to facilitate early identification of contaminated seed lots.

Changes as project unfolded:

The technology for testing continues to develop on an ongoing basis. Our recommended protocols are therefore based on the best currently available testing and may not remain contemporary as the technology continues to advance.

Objective 3: Create a *variety specific* comprehensive manual showcasing “best practices” for GE avoidance strategies and testing protocols.

Measurable outcomes:

- Our manual will be finished undergoing its peer-review process and released later this summer.
- Another series of surveys will be designed in order to determine acceptance and implementation of strategies amongst organic farmers and seed companies (2014).

Changes as project unfolded:

The manual was originally slated for dissemination in March of 2013. Due to pressing and timely developments (see below) concerning the organic seed industry, the initial timeline for adoption and publishing of the manual—and the subsequent education and outreach—has changed.

- AC21
- NOSB Seed Purity Discussion
- Pervasive GE Contamination
- Ruling in *OSGATA et al. v. Monsanto* lawsuit regarding liability

Objective 4: Create supplemental sections re: economic burdens and updated farmer liability.

Measurable Outcomes:

- Two voluntary surveys were designed and shared throughout the organic seed community—one targeted organic seed growers, the other organic seed companies—to begin to identify and record practical limitations in the field and economic burdens of implementing avoidance strategies.
- The Working Group has been invited to participate in the discussion on seed purity by the NOSB GMO Ad Hoc Subcommittee.
- Research regarding farmer liability concerns when contamination occurs has also been included.

January 3, 2014

Changes as project unfolded:

Ruling in *OSGATA et al. v. Monsanto* lawsuit regarding liability.

Objective 5: Disseminate information broadly and present workshops to farmers, seed companies and certifying agencies. Make available to non-GE and conventional growers.

Measurable outcomes:

- Following the release of the manual this summer, we will distribute hardcopy manuals at the Organic Seed Growers Conference.
- It will also be made available for download on the OSGATA website, with links on OSGATA members' and seed companies web sites. News of this accessibility will be posted to OSGATA's blog, social networking platforms, and through our organization's newsletter. A press release will also accompany the debut.
- OSGATA has applied to present the manual at two national conferences geared towards organic seed growers and breeders, organic farmers, and the organic community at large:
 - The 7th Organic Seed Growers Conference (January 30- February 1, 2014)
 - The MOSES Organic Farming Conference (February 27-March 1, 2014)
- The PowerPoint for the presentations will be made available on osgata.org (2014).
- We will assess distribution through monitoring downloads from OSGATA website and comments received through our social media network media (2014).
- Attendees' evaluations at workshops will also be considered (2014).
- Another series of surveys will be designed in order to determine acceptance and implementation of strategies amongst organic farmers and seed companies (2014).

Changes as project unfolded:

The education phase was scheduled to begin in March of 2013, with completion by March 2014. While it is starting this fall, a full assessment of the campaign will be completed on target.

Educational Approach

The project works to ensure the integrity of the organic seed industry by supporting organic farmers and organic seed companies with both science-based research on GE contamination avoidance practices and testing, and input directly from the field. To that end, synthesis of research included a broad review of international literature along with contributions from experts from within the organic seed community. Organic seed growers of various scales, seed companies dealing in organic seed, and genetic testing specialists were contacted throughout the research, adoption, and editing phases of the manual.

Our resulting comprehensive education package includes our peer-reviewed manual and an accompanying 90-minute overview presentation— both of which will be available as a free download from osgata.org, as well as in hard copy. While the manual outlines standards of mitigating risk of transgenic contamination of currently at-risk crops, it is intended to act as a resource applicable to any crops that are threatened by potential future GE releases.

Project Results / Discussion

The topic of transgenic contamination is increasingly addressed within the context of organic seed. Since the start of this project, the USDA's Advisory Committee on Biotechnology and 21st Century Agriculture (AC21) was charged with strengthening coexistence amongst agricultural sectors. The NOSB also started an ongoing discussion regarding seed purity and GMOs.

There is a growing awareness that contamination prevention will become increasingly difficult. As this report is submitted, the number of GE crops awaiting deregulation looms large and adoption of contamination avoidance practices will remain integral to protecting the organic seed industry. With OFRF's support, OSGATA has been able to produce the first comprehensive manual on the subject.

Manual content includes:

Part 1. Introduction

- Overview of risk of contamination from genetically engineered (GE) crops and impact on organic seed integrity, the viability of organic farms, and the credibility of organic products.

Part 2. Avoidance & Testing for Threatened Varieties

- General overview of avoidance and testing protocols.
- Delivery of the protocols in an easy-to-reference variety specific format with each section detailing: crop biology, avenues of gene flow, seed contamination avoidance strategies and variety-specific testing.
- For each of the threatened varieties, different options for both avoidance strategies and testing are discussed.
- Breakdown of currently at-risk crops:
 - *Zea Mays*: corn
 - *Glycine max*: soybeans
 - *Gossypium spp*: Cotton
 - *Medicago sativa*: Alfalfa
 - *Beta vulgaris*: sugar beet, table beet, Swiss chard
 - *Curcubita pepo*: summer squash/zucchini, acorn squash, spaghetti squash, striped/warty gourds
 - *Brassica napus*: canola, rutabaga, Siberian kale
 - *Carica papaya*: papaya

January 3, 2014

Part 3. Supplemental Sections

- Economic Burdens: What are the practical limitations in the field and the related economic burdens of implementing avoidance strategies?
- Farmer Liability Concerns: What happens when contamination does occur?
 - Industry standards of contamination
 - Obligations of farmers (to not sell as organic)
 - Who is responsible for preventing contamination? (legal precedents impacting farmers; farmer patent infringement liability for contamination; *OSGATA et al. v. Monsanto*)

To date, the project results have met our objectives. We look forward to submitting copies of the manual, as well as other supplemental outreach materials and photographs compiled during the final phase of this project.

Outreach

To accomplish reaching this target audience, we have worked to develop a comprehensive outreach package to disseminate both our peer-reviewed manual (for organic seed farmers and seed company professionals) and an accompanying 90-minute overview presentation. The products of this project will be made available for free via a printed manual, on a CD and for free download from the web.

As the project has evolved, OSGATA has grown their network of partners and collaborators for additional outreach upon completion of the manual. Announcements will be made through a nationally disseminated press release, a regular newsletter to our membership, and via social media on OSGATA and affiliates' websites. Letters will be sent to ~50 certifying agencies that they can in turn choose to share with their clients.

A full assessment of the project's education approach, originally slated for 2014, will follow the completion of our initial outreach timetable.

Financial Accounting

All budget expenditures have been spent accordingly; see the detailed budget submitted. OSGATA has financial policies and procedures in place to ensure internal systems compliant with all federal mandates.

Leveraged Resources

January 3, 2014

OSGATA provided matching funds totaling \$4,198. No other funds have been leveraged to date. However, we plan to increase our print number from the original 50 copies to 500. Additional funds will need to be raised to cover the increased material costs.

Additionally the project has received volunteer time by the Working Group during the editing and peer-review process.

References

1. Abud, S., P.I.M. de Souza, G.R. Vianna, E. Leonardecz, C.T. Moreira, F.G. Faleiro, et al. 2007. "Gene Flow from Transgenic to Nontransgenic Soybean Plants in the Cerrado Region of Brazil." *Genetics and Molecular Research*. 6(2):445-452.
2. "Appeals Court Binds Monsanto To Promise Not To Sue Organic Farmers." 2013. Public Patent Foundation. Online at <http://www.pubpat.org/osgatavmonsantocafcdecision.htm>.
3. Ashworth, Suzanne. 1995. *Seed to Seed: Seed Saving Techniques for the Vegetable Gardener*. Decorah: Seed Savers Exchange, Inc.
4. Barker, Debbie, Bill Freese, and George Kimbrell, et al. 2013. "Seed Giants vs. US Farmers." Center for Food Safety and Save Our Seeds. Online at http://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/files/seed-giants_final_04424.pdf.
5. Bartsch, D., U. Wehres, U. Goddecke, and A. Gathmann. 2003. "Introduction to Field Trial Data of Crop to Weed Beet Gene Flow." *Proceedings: The 1st European Conference on Co-existence of Genetically Modified Crops with Organic and Conventional Crops*. Slagelse, Denmark: Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences.
6. Bartsch, D., S. Driessen, A. Gathmann, A. Hoffmann, M. Lehnen, T. Muecher, C. Saeglitz, U. Wehres, and I. Schuphan. 2002. "Monitoring the Environmental Consequences of Gene Flow from Transgenic Sugar Beet." *Scientific Methods Workshop: Ecological and Agronomic Consequences of Gene Flow from Transgenic Crops to Wild Relatives Meeting Proceedings*. Columbus, OH, March 5-6.
7. "Best Management Practices for Roundup Ready Alfalfa Seed Production." 2008. National Alfalfa and Forage Alliance. Online at <http://www.alfalfa.org/pdf/CSBMPForRRA.pdf>.
8. Binimelis, Rosa. 2008. "Coexistence of Plants and Coexistence of Farmers: Is an Individual Choice Possible?" *Journal of Agriculture and Environmental Ethics*. 21:437-457.
9. "Biotech Test Methods and Protocols for Use in Organic Compliance." 2013. The National Organic Program. Online at <http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSV1.0/getfile?dDocName=STELPRDC5103060>.
10. Blancas, L., D.M. Arias, and N.C. Ellstrand. 2002. "Patterns of Genetic Diversity in Sympatric and Allopatric Populations of Maize and its Wild Relative Teosinte in Mexico: Evidence of Hybridization." *Scientific Methods Workshop: Ecological and Agronomic Consequences of*

January 3, 2014

Gene Flow from Transgenic Crops to Wild Relatives Meeting Proceedings. Columbus, OH, March 5-6.

11. Bondera, Melanie and Mark Query. 2006. "Hawaiian Papaya: GMO Contaminated." Hawai'i Seed. Online at <http://gmofreehawaiiisland.org/>.
12. Brookes, Graham. 2004. "Coexistence of GM and Non GM Crops: Current Experience and Key Principles." PG Economics Ltd.
13. Brunet, Y., X. Foueillassar, A. Audran, D. Garrigou, S. Dayau, and L. Tardieu. 2003. "Evidence for Long-Range Transport of Viable Maize Pollen." *Proceedings: The 1st European Conference on Co-existence of Genetically Modified Crops with Organic and Conventional Crops*. Slagelse, Denmark: Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences.
14. Cecen, Semiha, Fehmi Gurel, and Ayse Karaca. 2008. "Impact of honeybee and bumblebee pollination on alfalfa seed yield." *Soil and Plant Science*. 58:77-81.
15. "Certified organic and total U.S. acreage, selected crops and livestock, 1995-2011." 2013. USDA Economic Research Service. Online at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/organic-production.aspx>.
16. Chan, Kahon. 2011. "War of the papayas." *China Daily*, September 8. Online at http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/hkedition/2011-09/08/content_13645581.htm.
17. Chen, Xin, Heping Gu, Jinxin Yi, Hongmei Zhang, Big Gao, and Peerasak Srinives. "Gene Flow from Transgenic Roundup-Ready Soybean to Wild Soybean." Online at <http://www.intlcss.org/files/congress-proceedings/2008-papers/cs3-s7/cs3-s7-o5-xin-chen.pdf>.
18. Chiari, Cesar Wainer, Maria Claudia Colla Ruvolo-Takasusuki, Emerson Dechechi Chambo, Carlos Arrabel Arias, et al. 2011. "Gene Flow Between Conventional and Transgenic Soybean Pollinated by Honeybees." In *Herbicides- Mechanisms and Mode of Action*, edited by Dr. Mohammed Nagib Hasaneen. InTech. Online at <http://www.intechopen.com/download/get/type/pdfs/id/25157>.
19. Christey, M. and D. Woodfield. 2001. "Coexistence of Genetically Modified and Non-Genetically Modified Crops." AgResearch Ltd. Online at <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/organisms/coexistence-feb01.pdf>.
20. Cline, Harry. "RR canola evolves into vexing weed." 2010. *Western Farm Press*, August 20. Online at <http://westernfarmpress.com/management/rr-canola-evolves-vexing-weed>.
21. Cotter, Janet and Arnaud Apoteker. "Contamination of Conventional Rice with Genetically Engineered Rice?" Green Peace International. Online at <http://greenpeace.to/publications/rice-contamination-poster-final.pdf>.
22. Crouch, Martha. "How to Interpret the Test for the Presence of Genetically Engineered Traits in Papaya Seeds." GMO Free Hawai'i Island. Online at <http://gmofreehawaiiisland.org/>.

January 3, 2014

23. Cummins, Joe. 2005. "Escape of the Transgenic Zucchini." Organic Consumers Association. Online at <http://www.organicconsumers.org/monsanto/zucchini092205.cfm>.
24. Daniells, Stephen. 2014. "U.S. organic food market to grow 14% from 2013-18." *Food Navigator USA*, January 3. Online at <http://www.foodnavigator-usa.com/Markets/US-organic-food-market-to-grow-14-from-2013-18>.
25. Darmency, Henri and Marc Richard-Molard. 2008. "Gene Flow in Sugar Beet Production Fields." ISB news Report. Online at <http://www.isb.vt.edu/news/2008/artspdf/apr0804.pdf>.
26. Devos, Yann, Matty Demont, Koen Dillen, Dirk Reheul, Matthias Kaiser, and Olivier Sanvido. 2008. "Coexistence of Genetically Modified (GM) and Non-GM Crops in the European Union." *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*. Online at <https://biblio.ugent.be/input/download?func=downloadFile&recordId=512574&fileId=512579>.
27. Dillon, Matthew and Kristina Hubbard. 2011. *State of Organic Seed*. Organic Seed Alliance.
28. Dyer, George A., J. Antonio Serratos-Hernandez, Hugo R. Perales, Paul Gepts, Alma Pineyro-Nelson, et al. 2009. "Dispersal of Transgenes through Maize Seed Systems in Mexico." *PLoS ONE*. 4(5). Online at <http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0005734>.
29. Egelko, Bob. 2012. "U.S. Judge OKs Alfalfa Strain Made by Monsanto Co." *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 7. Online at <http://www.sfgate.com/business/article/U-S-judge-OKs-alfalfa-strain-made-by-Monsanto-Co-2447198.php>.
30. Ellstrand, N.C. 2002. "Gene Flow from Transgenic Crops to Wild Relatives: What Have We Learned, What Do We Know, What Do We Need to Know?" *Scientific Methods Workshop: Ecological and Agronomic Consequences of Gene Flow from Transgenic Crops to Wild Relatives Meeting Proceedings*. Columbus, OH, March 5-6.
31. "Enabling the Coexistence of Genetically Modified Crops and Conventional and Organic Farming in Finland." 2005. Finland Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Expert Work Group on Coexistence. Online at <http://www.biotechnologie.de/BIO/Redaktion/PDF/en/laenderfokus/gruene-gentechnik-finnland-2005,property=pdf,bereich=bio,sprache=en,rwb=true.pdf>.
32. Fabi, Randy. 2001. "USDA to buy seed tainted with Starlink bio-corn." *Reuters*, March 7. Online at <http://www.connectotel.com/gmfood/re070301.txt>.
33. "Factsheet: Genetically Modified Crops in the United States." 2004. Pew Initiative on Food and Biotechnology. Online at http://www.pewtrusts.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/Fact_Sheets/Food_and_Biotechnology/PIFB_Genetically_Modified_Crops_Factsheet0804.pdf.
34. Fagan, John Dr. 2013. Personal communication with author, September 12.

January 3, 2014

35. "FDA, EPA and USDA conclude that accidental release of genetically engineered cotton poses no safety risk to humans or animals." 2008. USDA Newsroom, December 3. Online at http://www.aphis.usda.gov/newsroom/content/2008/12/ge_cotton.shtml.
36. "Five Reasons Why GE Sugar Beets Threaten Organic." Organic Seed Alliance. Online at <http://www.seedalliance.org/uploads/Why%20GE%20Sugar%20Beets%20Threaten%20Organic.pdf>.
37. "Food Safety Fact Sheet: Tainted Sugar." 2008. Center for Food Safety. Online at http://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/files/final_sugar_beet_fact_sheet-color.pdf.
38. "GE Contamination Avoidance and Testing: Surveying Organic Seed Growers and Organic Seed Companies." 2014. Organic Seed Growers and Trade Association. Online at <http://www.osgata.org>.
39. Geisler, Malinda. 2012. "Squash." Iowa State University Ag Marketing Resource Center, May. Online at http://www.agmrc.org/commodities__products/vegetables/squash/.
40. "Genetically Engineered Crops: Agencies Are Proposing Changes to Improve Oversight, but Could Take Additional Steps to Enhance Coordination and Monitoring." 2008. United States Government Accountability Office. Online at <http://www.gao.gov/highlights/d0960high.pdf>.
41. Gillam, Carey. 2013. "Exclusive: Washington state testing alfalfa for GMO contamination." *Rueters*, September 11. Online at <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/09/11/us-usa-alfalfa-gmo-idUSBRE98A16H20130911>.
42. Gillbert, Natasha. 2010. "GM crop escapes into the American wild." *Nature News*, August 6. Online at <http://www.nature.com/news/2010/100806/full/news.2010.393.html>.
43. Giovannini, Tiziana and Luigi Concilio. 2002. "PCR Detection of Genetically Modified Organisms: A Review." *Starch/Starke*. 54:321-327.
44. "GM Contamination Report 2005: A Review of Cases of Contamination, Illegal Planting, and Negative Side Effects of Genetically Modified Organisms." 2005. Gene Watch UK and Greenpeace International. Online at <http://www.greenpeace.org/international/Global/international/planet-2/report/2006/3/gm-contamination-report.pdf>.
45. "GM Crop Events approved in the United States of America." 2013. International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-Biotech Applications. Online at <https://www.isaaa.org/gmapprovaldatabase/approvedeventsin/default.asp>.
46. "GMO Contamination Prevention and Market Fairness: What Will it Take?" 2010. National Organic Coalition.
47. "GMO Papaya Contamination." Hawai'i Seed. Online at <http://hawaiiiseed.org/local-issues/papaya/>.
48. "GMO Testing Guidelines for the 2013 Harvest." 2013. Genetic ID.

January 3, 2014

49. Hershaw, Eva. 2013. "Seeds of Discontent: A Texas Organic Cotton Farmer Takes on Monsanto." *Texas Observer*, February 7. Online at <http://www.texasobserver.org/seeds-of-discontent/>.
50. Holst-Jensen, Arne, Sissel B. Ronning, Astrid Lovseth, and Knut G. Berdal. 2003. "PCR Technology for Screening and Quantification of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs)." *Anal Bioanal Chem.* 375:985-993.
51. "How Many Foods Are Genetically Engineered?" 2012. UCBiotech. Online at <http://ucbiotech.org/answer.php?question=15>.
52. Howe, Lyn. 2013. Personal communication with author, August 10.
53. Hubbard, Kristina. 2010. "The Problem of Contamination: Sugar Beet Update." Organic Seed Alliance. *Seed Broadcast Blog*, December 21. Online at <http://blog.seedalliance.org/2010/12/21/the-problem-of-contamination-sugar-beet-update/>.
54. Hubbard, Kristina and Neva Hassanein. 2013. "Confronting Coexistence in the United States: Organic Agriculture, Genetic Engineering, and the Case of Roundup Ready Alfalfa." *Agriculture and Human Values.* 30:325-335.
55. Jaffe, Gregory. 2012. *Straight Talk on Genetically Engineered Foods: Answers to Frequently Asked Questions*. Center for Science in the Public Interest. 2012. Online at <http://cspinet.org/new/pdf/biotech-faq.pdf>.
56. Jefferson, R.A., T.A. Kavanagh, and M.W. Bevan. 1987. "GUS Fusions: beta-glucuronidase as a sensitive and versatile gene fusion marker in higher plants." *The Embryo Journal.* 6(13): 3901-3907.
57. Kahler, Dr. Alex. 2013. Personal communication with author, March 7.
58. Lew-Smith, Jodi. 2012. "Seed Companies Strive to Prevent GMO Contamination." *Organic Seed Growers Conference Proceedings*. Organic Seed Alliance. Port Townsend, WA, January 19-21.
59. Lies, Mitch. 2010. "Feds Mum on GMO Spread." *Capitol Press*, November 19. Online at http://www.orenews.com/Contests/2011/bnc/webhtml/img/amc2011_103-a-3b.pdf.
60. Lutman, P.J.W. 2003. "Co-existence of conventional, organic, and GM crops- role of temporal and spatial behavior of seeds." *Proceedings: The 1st European Conference on Co-existence of Genetically Modified Crops with Organic and Conventional Crops*. Slagelse, Denmark: Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences.
61. Mador, Eric and Jennifer Hopwood. 2013. *Pollinator Management for Organic Seed Producers*. The Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation. Online at <http://www.xerces.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/PollinatorManagementForOrganicSeedProducers.pdf>.
62. "Major Crops Grown in the United States." 2009. U.S. EPA. Online at <http://www.epa.gov/agriculture/ag101/cropmajor.htm>.

January 3, 2014

63. Mallory-Smith, Carol and Maria Zapiola. 2008. "Gene flow from glyphosate-resistant crops." *Pest Management Science*. 64:428–440.
64. Manshardt, Richard. 2002. "Is Organic Papaya Production in Hawaii Threatened by Cross-Pollination with Genetically Engineered Varieties?" University of Hawaii at Manoa Cooperative Extension Service. Online at <http://www.ctahr.hawaii.edu/oc/freepubs/pdf/BIO-1.pdf>.
65. Marvier, Michelle and Rene C. Van Acker. 2005. "Can Crop Transgenes Be Kept on a Leash?" *Front Ecol Environ* 3(2): 99-106.
66. Mellon, Margaret and Jane Rissler. 2004. *Gone to Seed: Transgenic Contaminants in the Traditional Seed Supply*. Union of Concerned Scientists. Online at http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/food_and_agriculture/seedreport_fullreport.pdf.
67. Menrad, K. 2003. "Introduction to strategies and economic assessments." *Proceedings: The 1st European Conference on Co-existence of Genetically Modified Crops with Organic and Conventional Crops*. Slagelse, Denmark: Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences.
68. Mills, Allison. 2013. "A question of coexistence: Lewiston neighbors lay bare national GMO debate." *Science Source*, March 9. Online at <http://umsciencesource.com/2013/03/09/a-question-of-coexistence-lewistown-neighbors-lay-bare-national-gmo-debate/>.
69. Moeller, David R. 2001. "GMO Liability Threats for Farmers: Legal Issues Surrounding the Planting of Genetically Modified Crops." Farmers' Legal Action Group, Inc. Online at http://www.gepolicyalliance.org/pdf/gmo_liability_threats.pdf.
70. Moeller, David R. and Michael Sligh. 2004. *Farmers' Guide to GMOs*. Farmers' Legal Action Group and Rural Advancement Foundation International-USA. Online at http://issuu.com/rafi-usa/docs/farmers_guide_to_gmos.
71. Morisset, Dany. 2013. "How it Works: Digital PCR for GMO Quantification." Lab Manager, December 6. Online at <http://www.labmanager.com/how-it-works/2013/12/digital-pcr-for-gmo-quantification#.UsibdoeBuM8>.
72. Navazio, John. 2012. *The Organic Seed Grower: The Farmer's Guide to Vegetable Production*. White River Junction: Chelsea Green Publishing.
73. "OSGATA Board Member Dissents from USDA's Biotechnology Report and Recommendations." 2012. Organic Seed Growers and Trade Association. *Seed News Blog*, November 21. Online at <http://www.osgata.org/2012/osgata-dissents/>.
74. "Peaceful Coexistence Among Growers of: Genetically Engineered, Conventional, and Organic Crops. Summary of a Multi-Stakeholder Workshop." 2006. Pew Initiative on Food and Biotechnology. Boulder, CO: March 1-2. Online at http://sbc.ucdavis.edu/old_files/29322.pdf.
75. "PSD Rules and Regulations: R3-4-501. Colored Cotton Production and Processing." 2013. Arizona Department of Agriculture. Online at <http://www.azda.gov/PSD/ColoredCottonProductionProcessing.aspx>.

January 3, 2014

76. Putnam, Daniel H. "Methods to Enable Coexistence of Diverse Production Systems Involving Genetically Engineered Alfalfa." *Agricultural Biotechnology in California Series*. University of California. Online at <http://anrcatalog.ucdavis.edu/pdf/8193.pdf>.
77. Quemada, Hector and Laura Strehlow. 2002. "Case Study: Gene Flow from Commercial Transgenic *Cucurbita pepo* to "Free-Living" *C. pepo* Populations." *Scientific Methods Workshop: Ecological and Agronomic Consequences of Gene Flow from Transgenic Crops to Wild Relatives Meeting Proceedings*. Columbus, OH, March 5-6.
78. Ramsay, G., G.R. Squire, C.E. Thompson, D. Cullen, J.N. Anderson, and S.C. Gordon. 2003. "Understanding and Predicting Landscape-Scale Gene Flow in Oilseed Rape." *Proceedings: The 1st European Conference on Co-existence of Genetically Modified Crops with Organic and Conventional Crops*. Slagelse, Denmark: Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences.
79. Ray, Dr. Daryll E. 2004. "Monsanto vs. Percy Schmeiser: The Canadian Supreme Court Rules." University of Tennessee Agricultural Policy Analysis Center. Online at <http://agpolicy.org/weekpdf/202.pdf>.
80. Remund, Kirk M., Doris A. Dixon, Deanne L. Wright, and Larry R. Holden. 2001. "Perspectives in Seed Technology: Statistical Considerations in Seed Purity Testing for Transgenic Traits." *Seed Science Research*. 11:101-119.
81. Riddle, Jim. 2012. "GMO Contamination Prevention: What Does it Take?" University of Minnesota Southwest Research and Outreach Center.
82. Robinson, Raoul A. 1996. *Return to Resistance: Breeding Crops to Reduce Pesticide Development*. Davis: agAccess.
83. Salisbury, Phil. "Gene Flow Between *Brassica Napus* and Other *Brassicaceae* Species." 2002. Institute of Land and Food Resources, University of Melbourne. Online at <http://abe.dynamicweb.dk/images/files/Gene%20flow%20to%20other%20Brassicaceae%20species%20report%20-%20April%2002.pdf>.
84. "Sampling for the Detection of Biotech Grains." 2000. USDA GIPSA. Online at <http://www.gipsa.usda.gov/fgis/biotech/sample2.htm>.
85. Sicard, G. and L. Nardi. 2003. "Definition of specific rules for GM sugar beet seed growing." *Proceedings: The 1st European Conference on Co-existence of Genetically Modified Crops with Organic and Conventional Crops*. Slagelse, Denmark: Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences.
86. Sinemus, K. 2003. "Communication measures for establishing co-existence: technical, economic, and social components." *Proceedings: The 1st European Conference on Co-existence of Genetically Modified Crops with Organic and Conventional Crops*. Slagelse, Denmark: Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences.
87. Spears, Tom. 2013. "Pooping Canada geese may have spread GM wheat seeds." *Ottawa Citizen*, July 23. Online at <http://www.ottawacitizen.com/technology/Pooping+Canada+geese+have+spread+genetically+modified+wheat+documents+show/8701092/story.html>.

88. Spencer, Lawrence J. and Allison A. Snow. 2001. "Fecundity of Transgenic Wild-Crop Hybrids of *Cucurbita pepo* (Cucurbitaceae): Implications for Crop-to-Wild Gene Flow." *Heredity*. 86:694-702.
89. Stewart, C. Neil Jr., Matthew D. Halfhill, and Suzanne Warwick. 2002. "Gene Flow and its Consequences: *Brassica napus* (Canola, Oilseed Rape) to Wild Relatives." *Scientific Methods Workshop: Ecological and Agronomic Consequences of Gene Flow from Transgenic Crops to Wild Relatives Meeting Proceedings*. Columbus, OH, March 5-6.
90. Strauss, Debra M. 2012. "Liability for Genetically Modified Food: Are GMOs a Tort Waiting to Happen?" *SciTech Lawyer*. 9(2).
91. Swanson, Emily. 2013. "GMO Poll Finds Huge Majority Say Food Should Be Labeled." *HuffPost*. Online at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/03/04/gmo-poll_n_2807595.html.
92. Sweet, J. 2003. "Pollen Dispersal and cross-pollination." *Proceedings: The 1st European Conference on Co-existence of Genetically Modified Crops with Organic and Conventional Crops*. Slagelse, Denmark: Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences.
93. "The Biology and Ecology of Papaya (paw paw), *Carica papaya* L., in Australia." 2008. Australian Government Department of Health and Aging. Online at [http://www.ogtr.gov.au/internet/ogtr/publishing.nsf/content/papaya-3/\\$FILE/biologypapaya08.pdf](http://www.ogtr.gov.au/internet/ogtr/publishing.nsf/content/papaya-3/$FILE/biologypapaya08.pdf).
94. "The Failure of GE Papaya in Hawaii." 2006. Green Peace International. Online at <http://www.greenpeace.org/international/Global/international/planet-2/report/2006/5/FailureGEPapayainHawaii.pdf>.
95. Thomison, P.R. and M.M. Loux. 2001. "Commonly Used Methods for Detecting GMOs in Grain Crops." Ohio State University Extension Fact Sheet. Online at <http://ohioline.osu.edu/agf-fact/0149.html>.
96. Tusumime, Emmanuel, Hugo De Groote, Jeffrey Vitale, and Brian Adam. 2010. "The Cost of Coexistence Between Bt Maize and Open-Pollinated Maize Varieties in Lowland Coastal Kenya." *AgBioForum*. 13(3):208-221.
97. "Twelve Reasons Why Genetically Engineered Alfalfa Threatens Organic Farming." Organic Seed Alliance. Online at <http://www.seedalliance.org/uploads/Twelve%20Reasons%20GE%20Alfalfa%20Threatens%20Organic.pdf>.
98. Van Deynze, Allen E., Frederick J. Sundstrom, and Kent J. Bradford. 2005. "Pollen-Mediated Gene Flow in California Cotton Depends on Pollinator Activity." *Crop Science*. 45:1565-1570.
99. Van Deynze, Allen E., Sharie Fitzpatrick, Bob Hammon, Mark H. McCaslin, Daniel H. Putnam, Larry R. Teuber, and Daniel J. Undersander. 2008. "Gene Flow in Alfalfa: Biology, Mitigation, and Potential Impact on Production." The Council for Agricultural Science and Technology. Online at <http://sbc.ucdavis.edu/files/CAST%20Alfalfa%20Gene%20Flow157.pdf>.

January 3, 2014

100. Vidhya, S. Shree, P.H. Ramanjini Gowda, K.N. Yogendra, T.M. Ningaraju, and T. Salome. 2012. "Detection of genetically modified cotton seeds using PCR and real-time PCR." *Indian Journal of Biotechnology*. 11:176-181.
101. "Which Papayas are Genetically Modified?" 2013. GMO Free Hawai'i Island. Online at <http://gmofreehawaiiisland.org/>.
102. White, James L. 2002. "U.S. Regulatory Oversight for the Safe Development and Commercialization of Plant Biotechnology." *Scientific Methods Workshop: Ecological and Agronomic Consequences of Gene Flow from Transgenic Crops to Wild Relatives Meeting Proceedings*. Columbus, OH, March 5-6.
103. Zapiola, M.L., C. K. Campbell, M. D. Butler and C. A. Mallory-Smith. 2008. "Escape and Establishment of Transgenic Glyphosate Resistant Creeping Bentgrass *Agrostis stolonifera* in Oregon." *Journal of Applied Ecology*. 45:486–494.