



Fluoridation of Public Drinking Water

January, 2009

I. Introduction

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)¹⁻⁴. 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 20th century^{1, 5, 6}. Despite these gains, a debate exists concerning the potential health risks of water fluoridation versus the observed benefit of the intervention¹. As a result, Public Health Madison & Dane County occasionally receives phone calls, emails, and letters from residents expressing concern about the fluoridation of local water supplies. Therefore, this document was produced to provide a brief overview of the current status of public concerns and a review of the scientific literature.

II. Overview

Naturally occurring fluoride is found in all water supplies across the United States; the concentration is dependent upon the geology of the water body and the occurrence of fluoride-bearing minerals and materials^{1, 7}. 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 cities the following year¹. The City of Madison, Wisconsin began the fluoridation of drinking water supplies in 1948.

Effectiveness of Water Fluoridation to Prevent Dental Caries

Opponents of water fluoridation of community water supplies cite two major issues to question the effectiveness of the program; a comparable reduction in dental caries in non-fluoridated communities and the improved availability of fluoride-containing products make the treatment of community drinking water unnecessary.

Research has demonstrated that differences in the rate of dental caries in fluoridated and non-fluoridated communities have gradually decreased since the inception of water fluoridation programs. Related research has reported that communities that end fluoridation both have and have not observed increases in dental caries^{1, 7-8}. A survey involving over 39,000 children conducted in the United States from 1986-1987 evaluating this issue indicated that the benefit to fluoridated compared to non-fluoridated communities amounted to an estimated 0.6 fewer decayed tooth surfaces per child⁸. 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^{1, 7}. 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.

Oral hygiene has gradually improved in the United States over the past several decades, including the increased use of fluoride-containing dental products such as rinses, toothpaste, and topical gels^{8,9}. However, disparities in use of and access to products and services promoting oral health remain, especially among low socioeconomic status and ethnic populations. The use of water fluoridation has provided an effective and cost efficient method to deliver preventative services to promote oral health to all residents within a community served by municipal water supplies, regardless of socioeconomic status or access to care⁶. Currently, an estimated 184 million Americans are served by drinking water supplies that contain the accepted levels of fluoride (0.7 – 1.2 ppm) to reduce dental caries; the Healthy People 2010 initiative calls for an expansion of this coverage from approximately 69% of the population to 75%^{5,10}.

Potential Health Concerns

The beneficial health effects of exposure to low concentrations of fluoride result from its ability to reduce tooth enamel solubility, decrease acid production of plaque-producing organisms, and promote the remineralization of the enamel¹. Efforts to prevent or remove community water fluoridation are most commonly motivated by concerns of fluorosis of teeth and bone, increased risk of hip fracture among the elderly, and cancer.

1. Acute fluoride toxicity

This condition has been reported when fluoridated drinking water supplies reach a level of 30ppm⁷. Due to the utilization of well-designed fail-safe equipment, proper maintenance and calibration, and appropriate operating procedures these overdosing incidents are rare in the United States. Symptoms normally occur within hours of exposure and include skin irritation, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, and muscle weakness. Depending upon severity, observable symptoms resolve quickly following cessation of exposure; approximately 24 hours. In severe cases, fluoride poisoning may result in cardiac arrest.¹¹⁻¹³

2. Dental and skeletal fluorosis

These conditions are well-documented results of prolonged exposure to excess fluoride^{1,7-8}. The development of dental fluorosis and skeletal fluorosis are attributed to the toxicokinetic properties of fluoride following exposure. Following ingestion, 75-90% of the compound is absorbed and readily distributed throughout the body⁷. Approximately 35-48% of the absorbed fluoride is retained by the body; an estimated 99% of the compound body burden is stored in the calcium rich areas of the bones and teeth (dentine and enamel)^{7,14}. This pattern of distribution and storage may lead to adverse impacts on the teeth and skeletal systems of individuals chronically exposed to excess natural and/or introduced levels of fluoride in public drinking water supplies^{1,7,8,14}.

Dental fluorosis is characterized by the staining and disruption of normal enamel formation of the teeth; the markings can range from unnoticeable in very mild cases (most common) to brown stains and pitting of the enamel in severe cases (rare)^{1,7,14,15}. Although severe cases can lead to brittle teeth and more teeth wear, all forms of dental fluorosis are

considered by the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to be a cosmetic concern rather than an adverse health effect¹⁵. Reported cases of dental fluorosis have increased in the United States since the widespread initiation of water fluoridation. Prior to the adoption of the program, the prevalence of dental fluorosis was 12-15%; modern rates of this condition have shown reported increases¹⁶⁻¹⁷. A recent study conducted by the CDC reported that an estimated 23% of persons aged 6 to 39 years had a very mild or greater dental fluorosis while approximately 32% of children and adolescents aged 6 to 19 years were reported with the condition. The risk of dental fluorosis development is limited to children 8 years of age or younger; tooth development occurs during this age range and the enamel has not matured and is susceptible to the effects of fluoride. Children older than 8 years, adolescents, and adults are not susceptible to dental fluorosis³.

Skeletal fluorosis is a disease that is characterized by increased density and brittleness of the skeletal system; the disease occurs in a range of severity dependent upon the level and duration of fluoride exposure. The mildest form of the disease can lead to arthritis-like symptoms including painful joints, limitations in movement, and reduced flexibility. Continual exposure to fluoride concentrations of 5ppm or greater may lead to osteosclerosis^{1,7}. In the most severe cases, skeletal fluorosis can be a crippling disease, confining a patient to a wheelchair. The condition is extremely rare in the United States with only 5 confirmed cases reported in the last 35 years; each of these cases occurred in areas where natural fluoride levels were greater than 20ppm¹.

3. Hip fracture

Both excessive and inadequate intake of fluoride has been associated with an increased risk of hip fracture among the elderly^{1,7-8}. However, two recent studies reported no difference in the rates of hip fracture between fluoridated and non-fluoridated communities at recommended levels of fluoride additive to water supplies¹⁹⁻²⁰.

4. Cancer

According to the World Health Organization (WHO), a large number of studies exploring the issue demonstrate no consistent evidence of any association between the consumption of controlled fluoridated drinking water with an increased risk of cancer⁷.

III. Fluoridation Compound Sources and Potential Contaminates

There are three basic compounds that are utilized for water fluoridation; sodium fluoride, sodium fluorosilicate, and fluorosilicic acid. Each of these compounds is derived from phosphorite rock, a source that is primarily used in the production of phosphate fertilizer²¹. Phosphorite contains a mixture of calcium phosphate, calcium carbonate (limestone), and apatite; the mineral apatite contains approximately 3 to 7% fluoride overall and is considered the primary source of the fluoride used in water treatment^{1,21}. The association of water fluoridation additives and the production of phosphate fertilizer have led to safety concerns by opponents of the intervention¹. The majority of these concerns center on potential impurities entering the drinking water supply as a result of the water fluoridation; specifically lead, arsenic, and radionucleotides^{8,21}.

Regulatory processes are in place to protect community water supplies that either restricts and/or prevents the introduction of impurities from the fluoridation of drinking water. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is responsible for the regulation of drinking water and to assure its safety in accordance with the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA). The SDWA requires that all additives used in water treatment plants, including fluoride additives, must meet strict regulatory standards in regards to their production, maintenance, and application. Each additive is subject to a system of standards, testing, and certification by the American Water Works Association (AWWA) and the National Sanitation Foundation/ American Standards Institute (NSF/ ANSI). Testing by the NSF for water quality has demonstrated that the vast majority of fluoride additive samples do not have detectable levels of arsenic derived from the addition of these compounds; water samples that do test positive are much lower than the EPA allowable levels. Other impurities, including lead and radionucleotides, are typically reported at levels lower than the detected arsenic levels²¹. Aside from the testing of impurities, the recommended optimum fluoride concentration is 1ppm (0.7 – 1.2 ppm); these levels are monitored to ensure appropriate concentrations are maintained in communities that fluoridate drinking water supplies^{5, 21}.

The water fluoridation program for the City of Madison currently utilizes hydrofluorosilicic acid as its primary source for the fluoridation of community drinking water supplies. The compound is obtained from Hawkins Chemical, Inc. via an annual renewable contract. In addition to the federal requirements to ensure water quality, the City of Madison Water Utility has also designed and initiated additional safe guards to maintain safe water supplies. Standard operating procedures (SOPs) were designed in cooperation with Public Health Madison and Dane County to govern the operation of water fluoridation, routine maintenance of all equipment associated with the fluoridation process, and the daily monitoring of the water fluoride levels that normally average from 1.1 – 1.2 ppm but can vary from 0.6 – 1.6 ppm. Impurities, including potential impurities introduced by water fluoridation are also monitored in order to ensure that water quality standards are in accordance with regulatory policies; samples are derived from water entering the distribution center which occurs after fluoridation to ensure the accurate reporting of water quality²².

IV. Summary and Recommendations

The occurrence of dental caries has been substantially reduced in the United States in recent decades, predominately through the widespread use of fluoride. Unfortunately, disparities among low socioeconomic status and ethnic populations are still quite prevalent^{2, 5, 7}. This trend has also been reported in Wisconsin. In a recent oral health screening survey of third grade children conducted for the state the results demonstrated that these underserved populations reported a disproportionate number of dental caries; racial/ ethnic minority populations were particularly impacted. In this study, the oral health status comparisons demonstrated that approximately 57% of white children sampled during this survey had a history of dental caries while 65% of African American children, 84% of Asian children, and 80% of American Indian children displayed similar findings²³.

To reach children and other at-risk populations for dental caries, water fluoridation is still the most efficient method of delivering safe and effective levels of fluoride. Therefore, Public Health Madison and Dane County supports and recommends water fluoridation using the optimum fluoride concentration of 1ppm (0.7-1.2 ppm) as recommended by the CDC and World Health Organization (WHO)^{5, 7, 10}. However, it should be recognized that drinking water fluoridation is a complex process that must be well monitored and controlled.

Careful review of the scientific literature and consultation with local and national experts has identified no evidence for adverse health effects associated with water fluoridation at recommended levels. While not a health concern, dental fluorosis is, for some, a cosmetic concern. Increased rates of dental fluorosis are due to increased exposure to fluoride containing products found in general US society and are noted in both fluoridated and non-fluoridated communities. This fact and the continued high prevalence of dental caries and associated pain, expense and potentially serious medical consequences make the continuation and expansion of well controlled drinking water fluoridation in the United States a public health imperative.

Prepared by: Jeffery S. Lafferty, Environmental Epidemiologist
John Hausbeck, Environmental Health Supervisor
Tommye Schneider, Director of Environmental Health and Labs
Thomas Schlenker, Director of Public Health

V. References

1. Ananian, A, Solomowitz, BH, and Dowrich, IA. (2006). Fluoride: a controversy revisited. *New York State Dental Journal*, 72(3), 14-18.
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2008). CDC statement on the 2006 National Research Council (NRC) report on fluoride in drinking water. Retrieved on December 16, 2008 from: http://www.cdc.gov/Fluoridation/safety/nrc_report.htm
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2007). Safety. Retrieved on December 16, 2008 from: <http://www.cdc.gov/Fluoridation/safety.htm>
4. Yeung, CA. (2007). Fluoride prevents caries among adults of all ages. *Evidence Based Dentistry*, 8(3), 72-73.
5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2008). Populations receiving optimally fluoridated public drinking water – United States, 1992-2006. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 57(27), 737-741.
6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1999). Ten great public health achievements – United States, 1900-1999. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 48(12), 241-243.
7. Fawell, J, Bailey, K, Chilton, J, Dahi, E, Fewtrell, L, and Magara, Y. (2006). Fluoride in drinking water. The World Health Organization. IWA Publishing: London, UK.

8. Connett, P, Connett, E, and Connett, M. (2001). Fluoridation: time for a second look? Retrieved on December 16, 2008 from: <http://www.toxics.net/fluoridation.htm>
9. American Dental Association. (2005). Study shows oral health improvements but disparities remain. Retrieved on December 17, 2008 from: http://www.ada.org/prof/resources/topics/science_improving_health.asp
10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2008). Background information. Retrieved on December 17, 2008 from: <http://www.cdc.gov/fluoridation/benefits/background.htm>
11. Hoffman, R, Mann, J, Calderone, J, Trumbull, J, and Burkhart, M. (1980). Acute fluoride poisoning in a New Mexico elementary school. *Pediatrics*, 65(5), 897-900.
12. Vogt, RL and Witherell, L. (1982). Acute fluoride poisoning associated with an on-site fluoridator in a Vermont elementary school. *American Journal of Public Health*, 72, 1168-1171.
13. Gessner, BD, Beller, M, Middaugh, JP, and Whitford, GM. (1994). Acute fluoride poisoning from a public water system. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 330(2), 95-99.
14. Garg, VK and Singh, B. (2007). Fluoride in drinking water and fluorosis. Retrieved on December 18, 2008 from: <http://www.eco-web.com/editorial/070207.html>
15. United States Department of Health and Human Services. (1991). Review of fluoride: report of the ad hoc subcommittee on fluoride of the committee to coordinate health and related programs. Retrieved on December 18, 2008 from: <http://www.health.gov/environment/ReviewofFluoride/>
16. Clark, DC. (1994). Trends in prevalence of dental fluorosis in North America. *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology*, 22(3), 148-152.
17. Heller, KE, Eklund, SA, and Burt, BA. (1997). Dental caries and dental fluorosis at varying water concentrations. *Journal of Public Health Dentistry*, 58(3), 136-143.
18. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2005). Surveillance for dental caries, dental sealants, tooth retention, edentulism, and enamel fluorosis- United States, 1988 – 1994 and 1999-2002. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 54(03), 1-44.
19. Park, EY, Hwang, SS, Kim, JY, and Cho, SH. (2008). Effects of long-term fluoride in drinking water on risks of hip fracture of the elderly: an ecologic study based on database of hospitalization episodes. *Journal of Preventative Medicine and Public Health*, 41(3), 147-152.
20. Phipps, K. (1995). Fluoride and bone health. *Journal of Public Health Dentistry*, 55(1), 53-56.

21. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2008). Community water fluoridation. Retrieved on December 22, 2008 from:
http://www.cdc.gov/Fluoridation/fact_sheets/engineering/wfadditives.htm

22. Personal conversation with Joseph Grande, Water Quality Manager, City of Madison Water Utility.

23. Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services. (2002). Make your smile count survey. Retrieved on January 7, 2008 from:
http://dhs.wisconsin.gov/health/Oral_Health/pdf_files/pph0001makeyoursmilecount.pdf

