What’s in the News…

A Sustainable Society is Possible
Submitted by Chad Park on June 24, 2013

“…sustainability issues are the intersection of social, economic, environmental and cultural issues – hence their inherent complexity. When we compartmentalize and isolate them in our minds, we risk missing the greatest opportunities to transform.”
Read the article.
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**US GM rice trials contaminate world rice supplies**


During 2006 and 2007 traces of three varieties of unapproved GM rice owned by Bayer CropScience were found in US rice exports in over 30 countries worldwide. At the time of discovery only one of the contaminating varieties (LLRICE62) had approval for cultivation in the US, the other two varieties (LLRICE601 and LLRICE604) had not. None of the contaminating varieties had approval for cultivation or consumption anywhere else in the world.

No GM rice has ever been grown commercially in the US and the source of the contamination is believed to be field trials of herbicide tolerant rice conducted between the mid-1990s and early-2000s by Bayer CropScience (or its precursor companies Aventis CropScience and AgrEvo). Bayer abandoned these trials in 2002. Despite two of their rice varieties, (LLRICE06 and LLRICE62) receiving deregulated status in 2002, none of Bayer's GM rice varieties have ever been placed on the market US. The USDA official report into the incident identified the field trials as the source of contamination but was unable to decide whether gene flow (cross pollination) or mechanical mixing was the mechanism responsible for the contamination.

The incident has had a major impact on US rice exports with US rice being pulled from shelves worldwide. Many countries including the European Union, Japan, South Korea and the Philippines imposed a strict certification and testing regime on all rice imports, whilst Russia and Bulgaria imposed bans on US rice. By contrast other rice exporting
countries have seen an increase in trade. The contamination episode has also affected seed producers; an entire non-GM rice variety Clearfield 131 was banned by US regulators in early 2007 when it was found to be contaminated, costing producer BASF billions of dollars in losses.

Bayer has sought retrospective approval for the contaminating rice varieties. Approval for commercial growing of LL601 was granted in the US in 2006 and approval for import was granted for LL62 in Canada in 2006.

For more information see:

‘Rice industry in crisis’ Greenpeace International 06/02/07 [click here]
‘Bayer CropScience contaminates our rice’ Greenpeace International 08/10/07 [click here]
‘Risky Business’ Greenpeace International 06/11/07 [click here]
‘Biotechnology Noncompliance History’ United States Department of Agriculture 2007 [click here]

For full details of the global rice contamination by LLRICE601 [click here]

Bayer rice contamination timeline:

1998-2001 Aventis field trials of LL601 are conducted in the United States including sites at Louisiana State University.

2002 Bayer buys Aventis and discontinues rice field trials. Field trials of other GE rice varieties continue worldwide. Plans for commercialization of LL601 apparently abandoned.

2005 USDA criticised heavily by its Inspector General for poor oversight of field trials of GE crops.

2006 January - Riceland, the largest US producer and exporter of rice, tests rice intended for export. Presence of GE LL601 is revealed. Further testing conducted and confirmed in Arkansas, Missouri, Louisiana and Texas.

2006 May - Bayer claims it was first made aware of the contamination. No explanation for Riceland's delay in notifying Bayer.

2006 June - LL62 approved for use as food and feed in Canada.

2006 July - Bayer notifies the USDA of contamination and requests deregulation of the strain. No explanation for the delay in notifying the USDA.

2006 August - The USDA publicly releases the contamination information. No explanation for delay in notifying rice importing countries and traders. Sharp trading decline in US rice market.
2006 August - EU issues Emergency Declaration (2006/578/EC) in order to prevent ongoing contamination of EU rice supplies. Japan suspends imports of long grain US rice. South Korea demands that its importers be guaranteed there is no GE content in US rice shipments. Other countries follow suit.

2006 August - Bayer CropScience applies to Philippine Government for approval of LL62 rice for food and feed use.

2006 September - Japan widens testing of US rice to look for GE contamination in short- and medium-grain rice.

2006 September - Two multi-million dollar class action lawsuits filed by farmers and rice traders against Bayer.

2006 October - France detects LL62 in long grain rice. LL62, approved in the US but not in the EU, represents an entirely new contamination problem. Testing in the US indicates that the problem is widespread in US rice supplies.

2006 November - USDA approves LL601 for consumption, despite 15,000 objections and the European Food Safety Authority finding that there was insufficient data to make a finding of safety. No penalties or prosecutions of Bayer to date.

2007 March - USDA announces contamination in Clearfield rice seed (CL131) and its use is banned.

# # #

The Hidden Costs of Free Shopping Bags


By Noemi de la Puente
Special to newjerseynewsroom.com

Sometimes it feels like things are set up to help us waste our money.

Case in point: The distribution of "free" plastic and paper shopping bags.

The average consumer uses 500 bags a year (about 80% plastic, and 20% paper). They cost the grocery store 2 – 5 cents, if plastic, and 5 – 23 cents if paper. I'm paying for them: The cost is hidden in the cost of the items I buy. I figure I spend $13 – $43 per year on bags I think I am getting for free. The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments estimates the hidden costs of bags to be $37.50 per person per year.

Let's follow the money. Grocery stores are stuck in the middle. They typically pay $1,000 - $6,000 per month on bags alone. They do this because they think I will stop shopping there if I don't get “free” bags, feeling compelled to keep on buying and distributing the bags, and hiding the costs. The money the grocery stores spend goes to
the plastic bag manufacturers who make tens of millions of dollars on plastic bags alone. Poor grocery stores – they had to pay for that. Wait a minute – poor us! The stores pass those costs along to you and me.

So right now, even though I bring my reusable bags to the store, I still pay the hidden costs for other people’s bag use, because stores won’t charge individuals for bags.

Can we give the NJ consumer a choice here and stop automatically subsidizing the plastic bag industry and paper bag industry? Couldn’t retailers declare their independence, lower their overhead, and side with the consumer? How about charging only the people who use the bags, and leaving the rest of us to our big reusable bags so we can save money (and carry more stuff, to boot)? Would it help if we as consumers take a pledge that we will still shop at our local stores?

There is more to the story and the trail of money out of my pocket. Here in the Garden State all 8.8 million of us use about 4.4 billion, yes billion, bags a year (not counting the bread bags, produce bags, newspaper bags, etc that we also use). Most of the bags end up in landfills where we taxpayers foot the bill to dispose of tons of them. In Lawrence Township, where I live, we pay $104 per ton to dispose of our garbage. So our township could save a lot of money if we generated less trash.

There are solutions. San Jose, California passed a law making every bag cost 10 cents. People in San Jose stopped using bags by about 90%. San Jose reported an 89% drop in the amount of bag litter in their storm drains. That city estimates it is saving $1 million a year by not having to repair municipal recycling equipment that previously got jammed with plastic bags. What’s more, the city saved landfill and transfer station bag litter control costs estimated at $318,000 per year.

On the other hand, San Francisco tried recycling their plastic bags for a while, then learned it cost the taxpayers about 17 cents per bag for their marginal recycling program. So the recycling option isn’t so thrifty as one would hope.

In Washington D.C., a five-cent fee on bags went into effect recently, and bag usage plummeted about 86%, along with the associated costs I mentioned earlier. Fee revenues dedicated to a good purpose: cleaning up the Anacostia River, a body of water which flows through some of the poorest neighborhoods in the area.

What galls me more: almost half of all plastic film (includes plastic bags) recovered in the United States was shipped overseas for processing. What a waste of time and resources. I don't want to pay for that. I’d rather just bring my own bag in the first place.

Plastic bags are notorious for ending up in waterways that lead to our oceans. Who wants to see plastic bags instead of dolphins off our shores? North Carolina’s Outer Banks area passed a plastic bag ban, because they felt that plastic bag litter was affecting tourism. Why jeopardize the Jersey Shore and its $19 billion tourism industry with plastic bag litter?

There is a solution in sight. Senate Bill S-812, and Assembly Bill A-3787, would put a five cent fee on all paper and plastic shopping bags. Four cents would go to the DEP to clean up Barnegat Bay, and one cent would remain with the merchant. And if you’re like
me – all five cents per bag will remain in your pocket as you bring your own bag!

I urge people to support these bills. Tell elected officials not to listen to the deep-pocketed plastic bags lobby. We need solutions to the problem of plastics proliferation and this one that deserves action.

# # #