From: tniwrek@hotmail.com on behalf of bob kerwin
To: Water
Subject: Contact Water Utility Board
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 8:32:49 AM

I am a Madison physician opposed to fluoridation of our water. I have been following this issue closely for over 10 years and it surprises me that a progressive community like Madison continues to fluoridate its water while communities around the world are discontining it. There are many arguments against it. I will try to be brief. Statements from the Madison Public Health policy statement on Fluoridation are in red and my response below that.

***

Communities throughout the United States have utilized the fluoridation of drinking water supplies for over 60 years as a strategy to reduce tooth decay (dental caries).

This is not evidence to support it. People have been misguided about for many things for years - this is another.

The observed decline in national averages for the prevalence and severity of dental caries since the initiation of the program in 1945 has been deemed one of the greatest modern public health successes of the 20 th century.

There is little substance behind this statement. In the supporting document the CDC ignored all published studies from 1993-1999 that reported adverse effects, citing a single review that was already 6 years old when the CDC statement was issued in 1999. The charts cited in this document suggest cause and effect between fluoridation and decreasing tooth decay but WHO data shows the same declines in tooth decay in countries that have never fluoridated.

The discovery of the potential health applications of fluoride in the early 1930s led to the development of the first clinical trial of artificial fluoridation of community water supplies in Grand Rapids, MI in 1945. The trial was designed to last for 15 years prior to any potential recommendation for the expansion of water fluoridation to other communities; however, the popularity of the program led to its initiation in other cites the following year.

This study was never completed and safety of fluoridation was not demonstrated in a comprehensive and scientific study. In addition a large number of studies implicating fluoride's impact on bones and the thyroid were ignored prior to endorsement by the U.S. Public Health Service and expansion of fluoridation.

However, this argument ignores the diffusion effect of fluoride containing products including food, beverages, dietary supplements, and dental products that were manufactured in

fluoridated communities and sold in non -fluoridated areas. Therefore, the non-fluoridated communities also experience an indirect benefit derived from water fluoridation programs resulting in the comparable reduction of dental caries observed in these areas.

This cannot possibly explain the similar declines in rates in Europe where the majority of countries are nonfluoridated and there can be little to no fluoridated products moving into nonfluoridated areas.

Potential Health Concerns

The list is actually much longer and includes thyroid toxicity, neurological effects like decreased IQ, and renal damage. These are all outlined in the 2006 National Research Council report.

Other arguments against Fluoridation:
1. Bad medical practice - there is no control over the dose or who gets it.

2. It is equivalent to prescribing a medication without informed consent. While public health may claim a right to do this with TB or other serious public health problems, tooth decay is not life threatening nor contagious.

3. The predominant effect of fluoride on teeth is topical so forcing systemic ingestion doesn't make sense.

4. It is not FDA approved.

5. The amount of dental fluorosis among children (32%, and more among minorities) indicates overexposure.

6. The 2006 National Research Council review, "Fluoride in Drinking Water: A Review of EPA's Standards" concluded the U.S. safe drinking water standard of 4ppm was not protective of health. Since that report more evidence has emerged of lowered IQ. Clearly, our children's brains are more important than their teeth.

I will conclude with a quote from Dr. John Doull, the chairman of the 2006 NRC review panel:
"What the committee found is that we've gone with the status quo regarding fluoride for many years - for too long really - and now we need to take a fresh look... when we looked at the studies that have been done, we found that many of these health questions are unsettled and we have much less information than we should, considering how long this has been going on. "

Sincerely,

Robert Kerwin, Jr MD