

WHY COLORADO FARMERS AND FOOD PRODUCERS OPPOSE PROPOSITION 105

Proposition 105 is a costly and unreliable food labeling measure that will appear on Colorado's November 2014 statewide ballot. It would mandate complex new food labeling regulations in Colorado that don't exist in any other state. Proposition 105 would unfairly hurt our state's farmers, cost Colorado taxpayers millions, and increase grocery costs for Colorado families by hundreds of dollars per year.

Proposition 105's flawed and costly labeling system -- which would only exist in Colorado -- would not even do what it claims to do: It would not give Colorado consumers reliable information about which foods actually contain GMO ingredients and which do not.

Here's why family farmers and agricultural groups from across our state urge NO on Proposition 105.

Costly new bureaucratic requirements would impact farmers regardless of whether or not they grow GE crops

Proposition 105 would require tens of thousands of common food and beverage products to be specially relabeled just for our state unless they are remade with higher-priced, specially handled ingredients. These labeling requirements would apply to foods produced in Colorado and exported to other states or countries as well.

Proposition 105 would require every party in the food supply chain (seed companies, suppliers, farmers, food processors, distributors and retailers) to provide "sworn statements" declaring that food ingredients have not been produced using genetic engineering. Without this documentation and "paper trail," foods which may have been harvested, transported, handled or "commingled" with food ingredients from GE sources would be required to carry special, new "warning" labels. Farmers, retailers and manufacturers would be exposed to fines, penalties and imprisonment for "misbranding" of food products if these requirements are not met.

Farmers and food producers would have to install separate and costly new production systems for growing, harvesting, packing, processing and transporting products, and create extensive new recordkeeping systems to track these operations. All foods would have to be tracked, regardless of whether they are produced or handled with GE ingredients. Conventional (non-GE) ingredients and food products would require documentation in order to avoid being labeled as "genetically engineered."



NO on
Prop **105**

“The cost of labeling involves far more than the paper and ink to print the actual label. Accurate labeling requires an extensive identity preservation system from farmer to elevator to grain processor to food manufacturer to retailer (Maltsbarger and Kalaitzandonakes, 2000). Either testing or detailed record-keeping needs to be done at various steps along the food supply chain. Estimates of the costs of mandatory labeling vary from a few dollars per person per year to 10 percent of a consumer’s food bill (Gruere and Rao, 2007).”

Byrne, Patrick. “Labeling of Genetically Engineered Foods.” Colorado State University Extension Fact Sheet No. 9.371. 9/2010.

Proposition 105 would require Colorado food exports to be specially labeled – putting our farmers at a competitive disadvantage

This measure would require food that is produced in Colorado and exported to other states to have special labels that aren’t required in any other state. These labels would suggest that Colorado food products are somehow unsafe or different from food products from other states. This would put our farmers and food producers at an unfair competitive disadvantage and cause them to lose hundreds of millions of dollars in sales.

Studies of similar measures in other states have concluded:

“Mandatory labeling, especially at a state versus federal level, is likely to affect trade and impose higher costs on firms producing and selling products in Washington. These costs are likely to be passed on to the consumer resulting in higher food prices. Importantly, these costs will be borne by firms and consumers for both GM and non-GM foods as labeling foods as non-GM will require oversight costs.”

WA State Academy of Sciences, White Paper on I-522, 10/2013

Proposition 105 would create costly new bureaucracies

Proposition 105 will also require new state government bureaucracies to regulate and enforce its costly new requirements, with no limit on taxpayer costs for new regulations. Studies of regulatory costs for similar measures in other states have estimated taxpayer costs in the tens of millions per year (WA Research Council Special Report on I-522).

Additionally, Proposition 105 would authorize penalties for “misbranding” of food under Colorado state law of up to \$2,000 per violation against any farmer, food producer, retailer or individual who is found to be in violation of its complex provisions.

Join Our Coalition

A statewide coalition of Colorado farmers, business organizations, food producers, taxpayers and consumers has joined together to urge a NO vote on Proposition 105. You can help by joining our coalition to show that farm families, food producers and other Coloradans involved in agriculture throughout our state oppose this deeply flawed and costly proposal. Joining will cost you nothing, but it could save you a lot.

For more information, or to join our coalition, contact us at:

(877) 322-3560 • info@NOon105.com

Thank you.