

March 3, 2017

Dear Petersburg Borough Council:

I would like to offer my support to Holly Winje and request the Borough reevaluates its practice of adding fluoride to our water supply. It is time to investigate what the current research is on the safety of fluoride after so many years of public use.

I found that fluoride in drinking water does give dental benefits to people across the board, and over and over I read, "the benefits outweigh the risks." But that made me wonder, if there *are* recognized risks associated with fluoride introduced into the drinking water of municipalities, why don't we find out what they are? "While the benefits of fluoridation have been held to be unquestionable, accumulating evidence points to a frightening prospect: that fluoride may have serious adverse health effects, including infant mortality, congenital defects and IQ." ([democracynow.org](http://democracynow.org) June 17, 2004) That was 13 years ago. I wonder what new research there is about fluoridating public water? Shouldn't we find out? Do the people measuring the fluoride into our water supply wear masks and gloves? Do the bags or drums of fluoride come with warning labels? Is their health at risk? They already have to handle chlorine which is also dangerous in concentration. Yet chlorine is easy to remove from your water if you don't want to drink it. Fluoride is more troublesome. I have compromised teeth from not taking care of them when I was a kid. Fluoride in the water may have helped my teeth, but what about its impact on the rest of my body? Can't we decide as individuals to use fluoride mouthwash or toothpaste if we like the benefits? Consider this:

"Currently, the increasing knowledge of the activation of G proteins by fluoride compounds suggests that such effects may result in corollary effects of fluoride on vesicle traffic, cell migration, cell proliferation, gene expression and other key functions in the cell. However, the complexity of fluoride's effects on these processes should be appreciated because the effects induced by fluoride are closely related to dose and concentration (hormesis effect). Furthermore, even though some studies report no clear evidence on the potential negative effects of fluoride exposure at permissible concentrations (e.g., studies that support water fluoridation), others have shown evidence of fluoride's effects on cellular processes at biologically relevant concentrations. When discussing these controversial results, it is important to highlight that fluoride must be actively considered as a potent toxic compound in the field of toxicology, both in epidemiologic/ecological research and in fundamental or applied research. In conclusion, this evidence of the positive and negative effects of fluoride needs to be considered along with the ethical, environmental, ecological, financial, and legal issues that surround any decisions about water fluoridation."<sup>1</sup>

For me, the real crux of the matter is this: I did not want fluoride in my water but the majority of voting citizens did. Democracy at work; fair enough. Yet I wonder-why does someone else get to make that decision about my health for me? Why does someone else get to weigh the good against the harm in regards to what I have to put in my body? Anytime you are dosing a whole town with a chemical I believe it would be a good idea to study current research to see if there is any new information on the affect of the chemical on the human body. I do not have much faith in those that deem a chemical benign or a drug safe. So often it is found, 10-20 years down the road, that by golly-chemicals such as DDT and drugs such as Thalidomide and OxyContin aren't that harmless after all and those companies pushing them had and still have much to gain.

Respectfully Yours,

Tamara J. Evens

1. O. Barbier, L. Arreola-Mendoza, L.M. Del Razo

**Molecular mechanisms of fluoride toxicity** Chemico-Biological Interactions, Vol. 188, Issue 2, Nov. 2010, Pages 319-333